

Refounding Rome

Ktistic renewal in the Augustan
Age and Late Antiquity

Raphaël Georges Robert Hunsucker

Radboud Institute for
Culture & History

RADBOUD
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Radboud
Dissertation
Series

Refounding Rome

Ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity

Raphaël Georges Robert Hunsucker

This publication has been made possible by a grant awarded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) to the National Research School in Classical Studies in the Netherlands (OIKOS).

Refounding Rome. Ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity

Raphaël Hunsucker

Radboud Dissertation Series

ISSN: 2950-2772 (Online); 2950-2780 (Print)

Published by RABDOUD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Postbus 9100, 6500 HA Nijmegen, The Netherlands
www.radbouduniversitypress.nl

Design: Proefschrift AIO | Annelies Lips

Cover: Proefschrift AIO | Guntra Laivacuma

Printing: DPN Rikken/Pumbo

ISBN: 9789465150796

DOI: [10.54195/9789465150796](https://doi.org/10.54195/9789465150796)

Free download at: <https://doi.org/10.54195/9789465150796>

© 2025 Raphaël Hunsucker

**RADBOUD
UNIVERSITY
PRESS**

This is an Open Access book published under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-NoDerivatives International license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). This license allows reusers to copy and distribute the material in any medium or format in unadapted form only, for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator, see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Refounding Rome

Ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity

Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor

aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

op gezag van de rector magnificus prof. dr. J.M. Sanders,

volgens besluit van het college voor promoties

in het openbaar te verdedigen op

woensdag 9 april 2025

om 12.30 uur precies

door

Raphaël Georges Robert Hunsucker

geboren op 17 mei 1986

te Amsterdam

Promotoren:

Prof. dr. O.J. Hekster

Prof. dr. S.L. de Blaauw

Prof. dr. D. Rijser (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

Manuscriptcommissie:

Prof. dr. E.M. Moormann

Prof. dr. T. Fuhrer (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Duitsland)

Prof. dr. B.M.C. Breij

Prof. dr. D. Slootjes (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

Dr. J.W. Drijvers (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DANKWOORD	i
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Ktistic renewal in the Ancient world	2
2. Refounding Rome: a survey of the material and contents	8
3. Methodology and approach	18
PART A: The Augustan Age	26
CHAPTER 1 - OVERVIEW: Augustus as <i>alter conditor</i>	27
1.1. <i>Status quaestionis</i>	28
1.2. Imperial views	31
1.3. The faceless founder	37
1.4. Contemporary coinage and the foundation of Nicopolis	41
1.5. Livy's Camillus as refounder of Rome: a prefiguration of Augustus?	50
CHAPTER 2 - CASE STUDY: Vergil's <i>Aeneid</i> as a ktistic epic	61
2.1. The theme of foundation in the scope and structure of the <i>Aeneid</i>	64
2.2. From Troy to Rome: the prologue and the end of the <i>Aeneid</i> (I.1-33, XII.950-952)	70
2.2.1. The structure of the prologue	73
2.2.2. The <i>proœmium</i> proper and the first couplet: Troy, Lavinium, Rome	75
2.2.3. <i>Aen.</i> I.12-22: Carthage and Roman history	80
2.2.4. <i>Aen.</i> I.33 and the prologue: Carthage, Troy, Rome	83
2.2.5. The end of the <i>Aeneid</i>	86
2.3. From Aeneas to Augustus: the prophecy of Jupiter (I.223-304)	94
2.4. <i>Augustus Caesar ... aurea condet saecula</i> : the Parade of Heroes (VI.751-892)	103
2.5. Echoing ktistic Vergil: Propertius II.34	130
2.5.1. From ktistic poetry to ktistic poets	132
2.5.2. Actian and Lavinian shores intertwined	134
2.5.3. Inscribing ktistic character	137
PART A: The Augustan Age – CONCLUSION	141

CHAPTER 3 - CASE STUDY: Maxentius and the AETERNAE VRBIS

SVAE CONDITORES: Rome's founders from Maximian to Constantine (289-313)	149
3.1. The celebration of Rome's foundation during the reign of Maximian and Diocletian: Dyarchic Emperors as <i>alteri conditores</i>	152
3.2. Rome under the Tetrarchic Emperors: a reappraisal?	158
3.3. Maxentius and the founders of Rome: urban topography and ktistic renewal	161
3.4. Maxentius, Maximian, Augustus: ktistic traditions compared	171
3.5. Maxentius as (false) Romulus	173
3.6. Conclusion: Maxentius and Constantine	175

CHAPTER 4 - CASE STUDY: Refounding Rome on the Bosphorus?

Ktistic traditions and contemporary politics in Constantinople	179
4.1. Introduction: Constantine as founder of cities	180
4.2. The source material	185
4.3. Approach and <i>status quaestionis</i>	189
4.4. A fresh look at the sources: Themistius and 324	193
4.5. The years 328/330 in the sources: the <i>Chronicon Paschale</i>	200
4.6. A new reconstruction: Rome and Constantinople from 324 to 330	214
4.7. Conclusion: <i>Constantinus conditor</i>	227

CHAPTER 5 - OVERVIEW: Rome's Christian founders: Damasus, Ambrose and Prudentius on Peter and Paul

	233
5.1. Church founders and city founders in the Bible and the earliest Christian authors	235
5.2. Damasus on Peter and Paul as <i>nova sidera</i>	244
5.3. Ambrose's hymn <i>Apostolorum passio</i> : foundation by martyrdom	252
5.4. Prudentius on Rome's Christian founders: classical tradition, Christian innovation	276
5.5. Augustine's <i>City of God</i> as a reaction to the Sack of Rome in AD 410: Romulus and Christ compared	288
5.6. Conclusion	

GENERAL CONCLUSION	307
BIBLIOGRAPHY	315
Bibliographic abbreviations	316
Primary sources (editions and translations)	318
Scholarly literature	319
APPENDIX	353
The meaning(s) of <i>condere</i> – an etymological and lexicological overview	354
SAMENVATTING IN HET NEDERLANDS	359
CURRICULUM VITAE	375

DANKWOORD

D

Dit proefschrift is het verslag van een onderzoek dat, kort voor het bereiken van de 13^e verjaardag van het begin, nu eindelijk zijn lang verwachte einde heeft bereikt. Het begon formeel op 1 april 2012 met een aanstelling als promovendus aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, op basis van een promotievoorstel met de titel '*Memoriae conditorum, conditores memoriae. Founders of Rome and the invention of memory in the Augustan and Late Antique city*', gefinancierd uit een *block grant* van het *graduate programme* van de Nederlandse Organisatie voor wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO), toegekend aan de landelijke onderzoekschool voor klassieke studiën, OIKOS. Na afloop van die aanstelling werd, op 22 december 2017, een eerste versie van het manuscript, met de titel '*Refounding Rome. Ktistic renewals from Vergil to Augustine*', ter beoordeling ingediend. Toen die versie in maart 2018 niet geschikt bevonden bleek te kunnen worden voor het examen ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor, volgde een korte pauze in de werkzaamheden, waarna van de zomer van 2018 tot 31 augustus 2024 met grote tussenpozen aan een tweede versie van het manuscript werd gewerkt. Dat is in wezen de tekst die hier nu, behoudens een reeks kleine aanvullingen en verbeteringen naar aanleiding van het commentaar van de huidige manuscriptcommissie, voorligt onder de titel '*Refounding Rome. Ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity*', en tot mijn grote genoegen verschijnt in de dissertatie-reeks van *Radboud University Press*.

Dat het gelukt is om dit project, zij het dan vele jaren later dan gehoopt, tot een goed einde te brengen, is vooral te danken aan de niet aflatende ondersteuning van een lange reeks instellingen en individuen, zowel in de periode van 2012 tot 2017 als in de jaren van 2018 tot 2024. Mijn dankbaarheid daarvoor breng ik graag hier tot uiting, alvorens de inhoudelijke behandeling van het onderwerp te laten aanvangen. Hoewel dat laatste gedeelte, om toentertijd moverende redenen, in het Engels is gesteld, kan het de schrijver dezes hopelijk vergeven worden dat voor dit persoonlijke gedeelte toch de voorkeur is gegeven aan het Nederlands, her en der afgewisseld met dankbetuigingen in de taal van de geadresseerde.

Dit dankwoord begint vanzelfsprekend met het onvermoeibare driemanschap van mijn zéér gewaardeerde promotoren, die het scheppingsproces van dit proefschrift harmonieus hebben begeleid, en van het prille begin tot het bitterzoete einde hebben geïnspireerd. Hoewel U, Hooggeleerde HEKSTER, in formele zin de voorvechter bent geweest van dit triumviraat, en ik niet alleen navenant van de cruciale inhoudelijke ondersteuning, maar ook van de onvergelijkbare humane, mentale en institutionele steun heb mogen profiteren, die me op de moeilijkste momenten op de been heeft

gehouden, hoed ik mij uiteraard voor het risico om met een eerste vermelding al te zeer een primaat onder de *πρόμαχοι* te impliceren. Jazeker: wie van de nu levende stervelingen zou anders in staat zijn geweest, om mij met zoveel geduld heelhuids door de verraderlijk wateren van het hedendaagse academische bedrijf te loodsen, en me met zoveel liefdevolle tact voor nog meer averij te behoeden? Ik prijs me eindeloos gelukkig, beste Olivier, dat de fortuin me met jou de best denkbare eerste begeleider heeft gegund. Maar nee – een betere volgorde is wellicht de historische. Was het niet onder uw weldadige begeleiding, Hooggeleerde DE BLAAUW, dat niet alleen het onderwerp van dit onderzoek voor het eerst op mijn pad kwam, maar ook de fascinerende wereld van Rome in de late oudheid en vroege middeleeuwen zich voor me opende? Dáár kwam de Palatijn in beeld als herinneringsheuvel van de stichting van Rome, dáár Petrus en Paulus als wonderlijke nieuwe stichters, en waar anders dan dáár, in Rome zelf, begon voor mij het mooie Nijmeegse avontuur. Wat heb ik ongelooflijk veel geleerd van jouw eindeloze kennis, kunde en eruditie, beste Sible, waarvan ik steeds weer in Rome en de lage landen de vruchten heb mogen plukken, en met wat een helder oplichtend voorbeeld van wetenschapsbeoefening heb je mij al die jaren richting gegeven, als een kloeke hoogmiddeleeuwse kerktoren aan de horizon van het weidse Groninger landschap, met ook van verre kraakhelder klinkende klokken. Zonder deze noordelijke variant van de *sperduta* was ik zeker buiten de stadsmuren blijven ronddolen als een verdwaalde Trojaanse pelgrim. Dat heilbrengend bouwwerk staat uiteraard op een stevig klassiek fundament, en waar had ik überhaupt aan kunnen beginnen, als ik niet onder uw hoede, Hooggeleerde RIJSER, de basis had kunnen leggen en uitbouwen waar alles in de volgende bladzijden op rust? Zo ik enigszins als een mes door de romige boter van al het Latijns-, en zeker ook Griekstalige bronnenmateriaal kon snijden dat daarin aan bod komt, was het omdat dergelijke werktuigen jarenlang steeds scherper zijn geslepen in de Rijseriaanse smidse, verhit door hoog oplaiende vulkanische vuren, en immer aangewakkerd door de ademtocht van de muzen. Het begon allemaal bij Vergilius, en diezelfde profetische passages die ook nu weer helder licht werpen op het stichtelijk woordgebruik van de dichter. Zelfs tot het taaiste proza der *Πωμαῖοι* was geen tekst veilig voor jouw feilloos acribische blik, en waar mijn mentale krachten dreigden te bezwijken, beste David, liet jij stevast vaderlijk de flessen aanrukken en ontkurken, die het smeulende vuur van het gemoed weer deden opvlammen.

Dat alles heeft me steeds weer bemoedigd en op gang gehouden, vooral ook omdat jullie drieën elkaar zo goed aanvullen. Zoals het een triumviraat betaamt zijn jullie uiterst verschillend, en schuilt daarin juist de kracht; maar in tegenstelling tot het Eerste en het Tweede, heeft dit Derde Driemanschap de harmonie tot het einde toe behouden, in een sterk staaltje *concordia promotorum* – zeker in de moeilijke overgang

van de Iliadische naar de Odysseïsche helft van dit traject. Ik hoop dat we elkaar nog vaak mogen treffen, maar wat ik waarschijnlijk het meeste ga missen na de afgelopen 13 jaar, is het geregelde contact met jullie. *Nono primatur in anno*, luidde ooit het advies – *tertio decimo tandem imprimatur*, zullen we maar zeggen.

Naast mijn begeleiders dank ik, wederom in historische volgorde, allereerst de leden van de sollicitatiecommissie van OIKOS, die mij in december 2011 het vertrouwen gaf om een van de nodige *hybris* doordrongen promotievoorstel uit te voeren. Ik hoop dat ik dat vertrouwen, al heb ik het wellicht wat te ijverig op de proef gesteld, uiteindelijk niet heb beschaamd. De gedachte om enkele van de leden van die commissie binnenkort weer te zien bij een bijzondere zitting van het college van promoties, verheugt mij bijzonder. Ik dank voorts het Koninklijk Nederlands Instituut Rome (KNIR), en de toenmalige stafleden Bernard Stolte, Gert-Jan Burgers, Arthur Weststeijn en Marieke van den Doel, voor de ideale omstandigheden om mijn onderzoek te beginnen tijdens een verblijf als Ted Meijer-stipendiaat, en de buitengewone eer om mijn eerste ideeën en de resultaten van dat vooronderzoek te presenteren tijdens de *Valle Giulia Dialogues*. Een betere start was niet denkbaar geweest.

Het woordveld van de lexemen 'ondenbaar' en 'dankbaar' biedt bij uitstek de gelegenheid om hier meteen ook mijn dankbaarheid aan Nathalie de Haan te vermelden, zonder wier herculeïsche inspanningen het zojuist vermelde begin überhaupt nooit denkbaar zou zijn geweest. Jouw rol, beste Nathalie, als eerste begeleider van mijn masterscriptie, die in veel opzichten aan dit proefschrift ten grondslag ligt, maar ook jouw ruimhartige ondersteuning bij het uitwerken van die scriptie tot een promotievoorstel en een aanvraag voor het Ted Meijer-stipendium, zou eigenlijk tot uiting moeten zijn gekomen in een rol als copromotor – een rol die evenwel om institutionele redenen onmogelijk was. Het zou jouw professionaliteit, fenomenale bescheidenheid en onkreukbare integriteit te na zijn geweest, om daar ooit ook maar op een of andere manier uiting aan te geven, maar weet dat ik je oneindig erkentelijk ben voor alles wat je voor mijn wetenschappelijke werk en mijn persoonlijke ontwikkeling hebt gedaan en betekent. Ik prijs me gelukkig met het idee, ook jou straks bij de eerdergenoemde plechtigheid te mogen treffen in een fysieke positie, die het dichtst de plek benadert waar je in een andere historiografische variant van dit verhaal zeker had moeten zitten.

Ook Charles Hupperts, die me in februari 2012 uitnodigde om een lezing te geven over de Palatijn op de nascholingscursus over de Romereis van uitgeverij Eisma, heeft alleen al daarmee meer voor mij en dit onderzoek betekend dan hij wellicht zelf

had kunnen bevreden. Die uitnodiging zette, mede dankzij de aanwezigheid van Joep Beijs, het proces in gang dat leidde tot de oprichting van het tijdschrift *Roma Aeterna*, en de talrijke nascholingsactiviteiten die daar op hun beurt weer uit zijn voortgekomen. Lieve Charles, ook jij bent als onvermoeibare leermeester (*non modo scholae, sed potius vitae*) overal op de achtergrond van dit proefschrift te bespeuren. In geen geval ga ik ervan uit dat de Griekse auteurs die in het vervolg aan bod komen jouw esthetische goedkeuring kunnen wegdragen, maar ik ben natuurlijk wel benieuwd hoe slecht je ze nu eigenlijk vindt, en of we in ieder geval elkaar in onze interpretaties van het zesde boek van de *Aeneïs* kunnen vinden. Ik dank je bovendien voor de voorzienigheid en het ongebreidelde enthousiasme waarmee je Jori Castricum, Niels Koopman, Elsa Lucassen en mijzelf bijeen hebt gebracht in jouw *privatissimum (olim) homericum*, dat in de jaren van noeste arbeid steeds weer gezelligheid en verlichting bracht. Ik vermeld hier ook heel graag nog Mathieu de Bakker, Floris van den Eijnde, Jacqueline Klooster, Johan Weststeijn, Diederik Burgersdijk en Willemijn Waal, die me – behalve in talrijke andere rollen – met hun daverende promoties, soms nog lang voor ik er zelf aan zou beginnen, al een lichtend voorbeeld gaven van hoe waardevol het schrijven van een dissertatie kan zijn.

Ik dank voorts alle Nijmeegse collega's voor de hartelijke ontvangst waardoor ik me, vanaf 2012, zelfs in de uit glasplaat, gestorte grindvloeren en cellenbeton opgetrokken blokkendoos van het Erasmusgebouw al snel thuis voelde: met name mijn meest langdurige kamergenoten Ylva Klaassen en Coen van Galen, in 10.23, maar ook Lien Foubert, Nathalie de Haan, Daniëlle Slootjes, Bert Roest en Gerda de Kleijn, in de oud-historische en mediëvistieke hoek van de 10^e verdieping. Die dank strekt zich zeker ook uit tot mijn toenmalige mede-promovendi, met name Sanne van Poppel, Liesbeth Claes, Roald Dijkstra, Eveline van Hiltten-Rutten, Janric van Rookhuijzen, Suzanne van de Liefvoort, Maarten van Deventer, Kor Bosch, Floris Solleveld, Floris Meens en Anne Huijbers, voor de inspiratie, interessante gesprekken, steun en de gezelligheid die ik, ondanks mijn beperkte integratie, ook vaak buiten kantooruren in Nijmegen heb mogen ervaren. Speciale dank aan Anne voor de gastvrijheid in die jaren op de van den Havestraat, aan Janric voor de gezamenlijke excursies op het terrein van de "memoria-maffia", en aan Roald voor een bibliografische correspondentie zonder weerga op het gebied van de late oudheid in het algemeen en de apostelen in het bijzonder. Naast Eveline ben ik ook Jeremy Collins en Katrine Smiet dankbaar voor hun kritische lezing van mijn eerste Engelstalige pennenvruchten in onze door de Nijmeegse *Graduate School for the Humanities* gefaciliteerde *Writing Support Group*.

De jury van de scriptieprijs van de Werkgroep Italië Studies, en met name Asker Pelgrom, ben ik dankbaar voor de academische erkenning en de unieke mogelijkheid

die de toekenning van die prijs me bood, om enkele weken op het Nederlands Interuniversitair Kunsthistorisch Instituut (NIKI) te Florence in alle vrijheid over mijn onderzoeksopzet te mijmeren, omringd door de Toscaanse heuvels, en het hoofdstuk over Vergilius in de steigers te zetten. *Inoltre, è un piacere ringraziare prof. Mario Labate per l'ospitalità accademica al Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia/Scienze dell'antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze, nonché Laura Aresi per la sua gentile accoglienza ed aiuto durante tutto questo soggiorno. Vielen herzlichen Dank auch an Jürgen Müller für den tollen Gedankenaustausch und die angeregten Gespräche.* Ik spreek ook graag mijn dankbaarheid uit aan alle collega's van de vakgroepen Grieks en Latijn (GLTC) van de Universiteit van Amsterdam, bij wie ik me, in het kielzog van Davids rol als (toen nog) copromotor, als gastonderzoeker op het oude honk mocht aansluiten. De beschikbaarheid van de uitstekende Amsterdamse vakkunstbibliotheek heeft veel voor dit onderzoek betekend. Ik prijs me gelukkig dat ik nog zoveel jaren 'op Boot' heb mogen werken voordat de huidige kaalslag zich opdrong.

Aan al deze feestvreugde kwam abrupt een einde toen de rampspoed voor het eerst keihard toesloeg, en ik in 2014 door ingrijpende RSI-klachten (*repetitive strain injury*) volledig moest overschakelen op spraakherkenning. Voetnoot voor voetnoot moet een groot deel van dit boek in de aan een haperend softwareprogramma gekoppelde microfoon worden getetterd. Dat was zeker niet gelukt zonder de rol van jou, Gerda, als reddende engel, toen jij samen met Olivier de onmisbare logistieke steun van een eigen werkruimte wist te bieden; veel dank ook aan Wim van Ooijen voor alle hulp. Hetzelfde geldt voor de assistentie van Maurits Lesmeister, Marije van der Vorm, Figen Geerts, Caroline van Toor, Dingena Blankenstein, Romkje de Bildt, Laura Cleven, Evelien Roels en Kasper Knaack bij het op (het virtuele) papier krijgen van mijn ideeën. Ik dank daarnaast John-Alexander Janssen, die me in die zware jaren het fijnste huis bood dat ik maar kon wensen, en Evelien Roels, die me op de been hield, en tot voor kort van een aanzienlijk deel van dat getetter heeft mogen meegenieten. Van de *Graduate School for the Humanities* dank ik de coördinatoren Tanja Döller, Peter van der Heiden en natuurlijk ook jou, Suzanne, voor alle steun, en vooral ook voor het vaak door mij op de proef gestelde geduld, als ik weer eens schandalig laat was met het inleveren van de zoveelste voortgangsrapportage. Ook Rachel van de Logt verdient alhier een speciale vermelding, voor alle hulp en voor haar stralende aanwezigheid, die een bezoek aan het secretariaat telkenmale tot een plezier op zichzelf maakte.

Gelukkig bleven de mooie momenten nog steeds in de meerderheid. In die vroege jaren had ik het genoegen de aantrekkelijke kansen die een bestaan als promovendus kan bieden ten volle te benutten. Ik ben een hele reeks instellingen zeer erkentelijk voor hun gastvrijheid bij het (vaak volledig kosteloos) bezoeken van congressen, zoals

de Université Libre de Bruxelles, de Universiteit Leiden, het Nederlands Instituut in Turkije te Istanbul (*thanks also to Paul Stephenson and Ingela Nilsson*), Cambridge University, de Getty Villa in Malibu, Californië (*with a special thanks to Karl Galinsky, now so dearly missed*), de Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, de Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, het Deutsches Historisches Institut in Rome, het Museo Nazionale Romano in Rome en de Fondazione Mediaterraneo/Centro di studi sulla fortuna dell'antico "Emanuele Narducci" in Sestri Levante. Juist toen ik het zelf hard nodig had, werd ik bovendien met open armen ontvangen door Ineke Sluiter en André Lardinois op de congressen en bijeenkomsten van het *Anchoring Innovation* project. De legendarische edities, met name in hotel de Reehorst te Ede, zullen me nog lang heugen. Ik dank alle vroege leden van het project voor de interessante en gezellige momenten, met name Roald (en later ook Dorine van Espelo) als coördinator(en), maar ook de promovendi, in het bijzonder Aniek van den Eersten, Esmée Bruggink, Andrea De March en Aurora Raimondi Cominesi. Ook aan de samenwerking met Raf Praet, die binnen *Anchoring Innovation* opbloeide, bewaar ik goede herinneringen, zeker wanneer we konden afspreken in Café "de Poldervriend". Het hoogtepunt van mijn mooie tijd als geassocieerd lid van dit project was de Masterclass op het KNIR, met bijzondere dank aan Ineke Sluiter voor haar hulp en aanmoediging bij het te lijf gaan van Augustinus, *and thanks to Bernard Frischer for a memorable trip to Villa Adriana and Licenza*. Lisenka Fox dank ik voor alle hulp bij het besteden van het Budget Internationalisering/Uitgaande mobiliteit van PhD-ers, ook aan de meest onoverzichtelijke treinreizen. Naast *Anchoring Innovation* zorgde het reguliere programma van OIKOS steeds voor een grote impuls. Ik dank de coördinatoren en alle leden voor hun bijdrage aan een waarlijk uitstekend onderzoeksclimaat voor de oudheidstudies in Nederland. Dit proefschrift heeft met name kunnen profiteren van de reeks masterclasses en soortgelijke bijeenkomsten, speciaal bedoeld voor promovendi – speciale dank daarvoor aan Rianne Hermans en Johannes Hahn. *I am particularly grateful to Nicholas Purcell for his expert and erudite feedback, as well as his encouragement, on no less than two occasions, on topics as diverse as Iron Age huts in Rome and Byzantine chroniclers of the foundation of Constantinople.*

Daarnaast ben ik dankbaar voor de uitnodiging om lezingen te verzorgen over mijn onderzoek op de volgende instellingen, waar ik telkens nuttige reacties mocht ontvangen: University of California Irvine (*with special thanks to Andrew Zissos*), Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica (AIAC)/Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana (PIAC) (*con un ringraziamento a Elizabeth Fentress, Vincent Jolivet e Domenico Palombi*), Cusanuswerk (*Dank an Thomas Kieslinger*), het Collegivm Classicvm Amstelodamense cvi nomen PVLCHRA LAVERNA en het Allard Pierson Museum van de Universiteit van Amsterdam, Stichting Zenobia en de Vereniging Vrienden

van Satricum (met dank aan Marijke Gnade). In dit rijtje hoort ook Eva Mol, en haar geweldige workshop 'The material dimensions of myth in the city of Rome' op het KNIR. Hetzelfde geldt voor de externe instellingen, waar mijn bijdrage aan een cursus of congres werd geaccepteerd: de Universidade de Lisboa, het KNIR & Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut – Abteilung Rom (met dank aan Eva Hagen, Marleen Termeer & Michael Teichmann), Det norske institutt i Roma (*with special thanks to Bettina Reitz-Josse, Han Lamers and Tara Welsh*), de Koninklijke Nederlandse Academie van Wetenschappen en de Universiteit Leiden (met dank aan Susanna de Beer, Antje Wessels en Jacqueline Klooster). Dergelijke dank geldt ook hen, die me uitnodigden om een bijdrage te leveren aan publicaties: Mariëtte Verhoeven, Hanneke van Asperen & Lex Bosman; Diederik Burgersdijk & Alan Ross; Ineke Sluiter; Stephen van Beek & Philip van Reeuwijk. Voor overige hulp bij onderzoek ben ik dank verschuldigd aan Gitte Lønstrup Dal Santo, Lily Withycombe-Taperell, Christopher Smith, Giulia Tozzi, Paolo Liverani, Ingo Herklotz, Taylor Fitzgerald, Alessandro Maranesi, Joshua Hartman, Jürgen Zangenberg, Ignazio Tantillo, Stéphane Martin, Dorine van Espelo, Irene Leonardis, Paul van Geest, Johannes Singer, Alexander Evers, Bernard Stolte en Stefan Ardeleanu.

Hoewel de werkkamer op het Erasmusgebouw en de bibliotheek van de RU de thuisbasis vormden voor mijn onderzoek, kwam een groot deel van dit proefschrift feitelijk elders tot stand. Voor hun gastvrijheid en prettige werkomgeving dank ik de talrijke bibliotheken waar ik cruciale werken mocht raadplegen, zoals de École française d'Athènes, de Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik in München, vrijwel alle buitenlandse instituutsbibliotheken in Rome, de Universiteitsbibliotheken van o.a. Bologna, Rethymno en Girona, maar ook het Paloma Renaissance Antalya Beach Resort & Spa, waar ik in de schaduw van de antieke beschaving de ondergang van de huidige kon overpeinzen, terwijl ik me in de stad Gods van Augustinus kon vastbijten, en het Diocesaan Heiligdom "Onze Lieve Vrouw ter Nood" te Heiloo, waar de laatste hand aan de inhoudelijke structuur van dit proefschrift kon worden gelegd. *Besonderer Dank gilt zwei deutschen Universitäten für die wissenschaftliche Gastfreundschaft und die Möglichkeit, meine Forschungsergebnisse vorzustellen zu dürfen: der Universität Tübingen und dem Seminar für Alte Geschichte (besonders Frank Kolb, Sebastian Schmidt-Hofner, Laura Carrara, Lisa Eberle, Jonas Borsch, Fabian Schulz, Maurits de Leeuw und Kamil Cyprian Choda), und der Universität Freiburg und dem Institut für Archäologische Wissenschaften (besonders Ralf von den Hoff, Jens-Arne Dickmann, Matthias Bensch und Sebastian Meurer).*

Vier andere instellingen vermeld ik graag apart, omdat wat nu voorligt zonder hun rol ondenkbaar zou zijn geweest. *Un mot de remerciement chaleureux à la Fondation*

Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique à Vandoeuvres, pour l'attribution d'une bourse de recherche pour jeunes chercheuses et chercheurs, with heartfelt thanks to Gary Vachicouras for his practical assistance, and to Damian Nelis for stimulating conversation on Vergil and kind advice, not only on the banks of lake Geneva, but also on several other occasions. Ik dank hierbij graag ook Daan den Hengst voor zijn hulp, en zijn ambassadeurschap als onderdeel van de illustere *quadriga Batavorum*, die de koninklijke weg naar Zwitserland voor zoveel latere vaderlandse classici heeft geplaveid. *Ich danke der Universität Heidelberg und dem Seminar für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik (besonders Christian Witschel) ganz, ganz herzlich, für die Möglichkeit, die hervorragenden Bestände der verschiedenen Bibliotheken nahezu unbegrenzt nutzen zu können, und Stefan Ardeleanu, Jon C. Cubas Díaz, Giuditta Mirizio, Giulia D'Alessandro und Katinka Sewing für ihre unverzichtbare Hilfe.* Uiteraard geldt ook hiervoor mijn dankbaarheid aan Evelien Roels. *Another institution I couldn't thank enough is the American Academy in Rome and its superb Arthur & Janet C. Ross Library, where many parts of this dissertation were written, and countless others rewritten. The access you kindly provide to outside researchers like myself is a true gift. I am grateful to Sebastian Hierl, the Drue Heinz Librarian, for many nice chats over a cup of tea, and for keeping Vergil in the Arthur Ross Reading Room when (and where) I needed him most.* *Un ringraziamento particolare a Paolo Brozzi, per aver regalato, con il suo sorriso e la sua impeccabile ospitalità, una sensazione di allegria durante ogni visita alla biblioteca, specialmente nei momenti più disperati. Sono persone come Lei, caro Paolo, che fanno sì che la ricerca sia sempre un piacere.*

De laatste instelling in dit rijtje is natuurlijk het Koninklijk Nederlands Instituut Rome, in veel opzichten de Alfa en Omega van dit onderzoek. Zonder de nachtelijke beschikbaarheid van de prachtige bibliotheek had dit boek er zeker niet nu, maar wellicht nooit gelegen – datzelfde geldt voor de talrijke ideeën, die tijdens cursussen, lezingen, congressen en andere (soms toevallige) ontmoetingen binnen en buiten de muren aan de Via Omero zijn ontstaan. Dat Nederland over een dergelijk instituut mag beschikken, heeft in ieder geval in mijn leven als wetenschapper het verschil gemaakt. Ik dank alle stafleden die, vanaf mijn eerste bezoek in 2008 tot nu, aan de ongedwongen sfeer van absolute toewijding aan de *humaniora* hebben bijgedragen, maar ook al diegenen, die in het verleden en op afstand zich voor het (voort)bestaan van deze instelling als ware broedplaats van inspiratie hebben ingezet. In het bijzonder vermeld ik, naast de reeds genoemde Bernard Stolte, Gert-Jan Burgers, Arthur Weststeijn en Marieke van den Doel, van de wetenschappelijke staf graag Hans de Valk, Bert Treffers, Jeremia Pelgrom, Harald Hendrix, Asker Pelgrom, Tesse Stek, Rita Landeweerd, Susanna de Beer en Laura Overpelt. Ik dank Marieke in het bijzonder voor de gelegenheid om, vanaf het najaar van 2012, iets terug te mogen doen als voorzitter van de ambassadeurs van het instituut, en Harald en Asker voor een vergelijkbare mogelijkheid, als onderdeel van de nascholingscursussen voor

docenten, georganiseerd in samenwerking met Roma Aeterna. Verder maak ik graag van de gelegenheid gebruik om een langdurig opgebouwde dankbaarheid tot uitdrukking te brengen aan alle medewerkers van het secretariaat, in het bijzonder Agnieszka Konkol, voor de talloze kerlen dat ik tijdens mijn onderzoeksverblijven ook buiten de grenzen van het toelaatbare een beroep op hen heb gedaan. *Impensabile, poi, non menzionare gli altri membri dello staff che hanno fatto i miei soggiorni e permanenze all'istituto non solo produttivi senza precedenti, ma soprattutto singolarmente piacevoli, in particolar modo Janet Mente, Angelo Coccarelli, Ivana Bolognese, Mohammed Boukasse e Fernando Maggi. Grazie di cuore, ragazzi!* Naast de staf ben ik tot in de grond van mijn hart de dierbare collega's en vrienden dankbaar die ik daar heb ontmoet, en die samen met alle andere bezoekers elk verblijf of bezoek aan het instituut tot zo'n levendige plaats van uitwisseling maken: Marleen Termeer, Eva Mol, Anne Huijbers, Floris Meens, Rogier Kalkers en Susanne Bartels verdienen hier toch wel een speciale vermelding, net als Miguel John Versluys en zijn hele VIDI-onderzoeksgroep.

Dit gratulatorische tapijtbombardement brengt ons vervolgens weer bij de afronding van de eerste versie van het manuscript, in het najaar van 2017. Ik dank mijn familie, met name mijn grootmoeder Hedwig Gravez, voor de mogelijkheid om in de relatieve rust van Antwerpens *caput Flandriae* naar die versie toe te werken, en de dierbare, mijn wetenschappelijke kopzorgen relativerende gesprekken en uitstapjes van die jaren. Eén van de weinige zaken die me werkelijk spijt van het feit dat het in 2018 niet tot een openbare verdediging is gekomen, is dat zij de plechtigheid daardoor niet meer kan meemaken. De collega's van de afdeling Geschiedenis van de Radboud Universiteit (met name Maaike van Berkel en Harm Kaal) dank ik voor de prettige samenwerking tijdens mijn onderwijsaanstelling in 2017, die me in staat stelde dat manuscript af te ronden met een zinvol inkomen. Bijzonder erkentelijk ben ik degenen, die in 2017 bereid waren op extreem korte termijn op te treden als proeflezers: Mirte Liebregts, Victor Broers, Inger Kuin, Esmée Bruggink, Janric van Rookhuijzen en Martje de Vries. Ondanks dat ik de tekortkomingen die, door mijn schuld, het ingediende manuscript ontegenzeggelijk bezat, graag in het openbaar had verdedigd, ben ik de toenmalige manuscriptcommissie achteraf vooral dank verschuldigd voor hun afwijzing, en uiteraard ook voor hun inzichtelijke commentaar en talrijke correcties. Die eerste gaf me, na al langer aanzwellende twijfel, definitief het duwtje dat ik nodig had om de felbegeerde, maar weinig begerenswaardige academische loopbaan vaarwel te zeggen; die laatste deden me inzien, hoezeer ook in toegewijde wetenschapsbeoefening vorm niet minder belangrijk kan zijn dan inhoud. Ik maak graag van de gelegenheid gebruik om mijn oprechte excuses uit te spreken aan al diegenen, die ik sinds maart 2018 zo lang op een tweede versie heb laten wachten.

Dat het uiteindelijk zover is gekomen, is zeker ook te danken aan hen, in wier gezelschap ik nieuwe wegen mocht inslaan. Op professioneel gebied betreft dat mijn compagnons bij de Italië Centrale, en later Choo-Choo: Marcella Mul, John-Alexander Janssen, Cato van Paddenburgh, Manuela Talana en Filip de Jonge. Ik dank met name Manuela en Filip voor hun geduld, op de spaarzame momenten dat ik me langere tijd geheel moest afsluiten van wereldse negoziën om me aan de afronding van die tweede versie te wijden. Op persoonlijk vlak dank ik iedereen die eraan bij heeft gedragen, dat ik van “Casa Falda” in de Romeinse wijk Monteverde mijn nieuwe thuis kon maken: *grazie infinite a Lorenzo Zanotti, Maria Gabriella Cruciani (†), Maria Antonietta Cruciani e Gabriele Zanotti, innanzitutto, ma anche a Frederick Whitling, Ornella Polato, Irene Leonardis, Johan Ickx, Laura Ruhé, Maarten Kleijn e Esther Boer*. In deze fase waren de steun en het advies van onder meer Charles Hupperts, Maurice Whitehead, Susanne Bartels, John-Alexander Janssen, Jarl van der Ploeg en Pepijn Corduwener bovendien onontbeerlijk, net als die van iedereen bij Roma Aeterna, de leukste en meest waardevolle afleidingsmanoeuvre die ik me kan voorstellen. *Grazie RÆgazzi!* Mijn speciale dank gaat ook uit naar Jori Castricum, Riemer van der Veen en Pax Veerbeek, die me uit de wind hielden van andere verplichtingen op de momenten dat het er het meeste toe deed.

Dat er nu dan toch een proefschrift ligt, is het resultaat van een gevecht dat tot het laatste moment spannend bleef. Ik ben de leden van de huidige manuscriptcommissie buitengewoon erkentelijk voor de talrijke opmerkingen, correcties en suggesties die ze na hun positieve oordeel met me wilden delen. Voor hulp bij het verkrijgen van de afbeeldingen dank ik Liesbeth de Vries, Willy Piron en Andreas Faßbender; voor haar eindeloze geduld bij de opmaak Annelies Lips; voor de logistieke ondersteuning het *Humanities Venture Lab*, Klaas Hernamdt en Marjolein Vogel. Bij het afronden van de tweede versie van het manuscript kon ik gelukkig rekenen op de cruciale hulp van Joep Beijst, Martje de Vries, Kristel Henquet, Milou Kerkhof, Rogier Kalkers, Arthur Weststeijn, Richard Haasen en Pax Veerbeek, die me als een gedroomde escorte naar de eindstreep wisten te leiden. Het vervult mij met dankbaarheid en trots, lieve Joep en Martje, dat jullie ondanks jullie overvolle dagen ook nu, jaren later, de rol van paranimfen op jullie hebben willen nemen, en die met zoveel verve vervullen.

Ook mijn ouders kan ik hier uiteraard niet onvermeld laten. Behalve dat ik hen eeuwig dankbaar ben voor een liefdevolle opvoeding, waarin klassieke deugden als plichtbesef, decorum en spaarzaamheid centraal stonden, en kunst, natuur en intellectuele verdieping als de enige valide vormen van vrijetijdsbesteding werden geëtabileerd, hebben ze, bewust of onbewust, vooral door hun neigingen om mijn recente levenskeuzes stevast in twijfel te trekken aan de vervulling daarvan

bijgedragen. Mijn vader Laval ben ik dankbaar voor zijn hulp bij netelige Engelse taalkwesties en zijn ruimhartige dotaties aan mijn boekenbezit; mijn moeder Lucretia voor het feit dat ze haar inspanningen om datzelfde bezit weer te verminderen wist te richten op delen van de collectie die voor dit proefschrift niet rechtstreeks, maar slechts zijdelings relevant waren. Ik hoop uiteraard, dat dit boek hun goedkeuring mag wegdragen, zowel wat de inhoud, als wat het fysieke zijnsstatuut ervan betreft. Waar deze woorden wellicht wat afwijkend mogen overkomen van de norm die in dit soort dankwoorden wordt gehanteerd, brengt de gewoonte om die af te sluiten met de warmst mogelijke dankbetuiging aan een partner, en eventueel daarmee geproduceerd nageslacht, mij thans in de grootst mogelijke verlegenheid. De grootste klap die mijn toewijding aan dit project te verwerken kreeg was tevens de meest recente, en het valt me zwaar om hier nu recht te doen aan de vrijwel onvoorwaardelijke, vaak heroïsche, altijd bemoedigende hulp, steun en zorg die mijn ex-partner Evelien aan dit project heeft gespendeerd. Voor haar niet aflatende betrokkenheid, van het prille begin tot het in zicht komen van de eindstreep, wil ik haar hartelijk danken. Het was een groot voorrecht en genoegen, om samen de antieke wereld te doorkruisen, van Sbeïtla tot Yalvaç, op zoek naar stichters en inscripties. Aan de talrijke verblijven in Heidelberg bewaar ik de warmst mogelijke herinneringen. Er is echter één stad, die binnen en buiten de pagina's van dit boek op alle fronten de leidende rol heeft vervuld, en die nu vrij schaamteloos, zonder ingewikkeld omtrekende bewegingen, het laatste en hoogste woord van deze *gratiarum actio* mag opeisen, in de voor dergelijke opdrachten gebruikelijke derde naamval.

Mesch, sub S. *Pancratio in conspectu Belgarum*, PR. EID. MART. MMXXV

GLORIOSISSIMAE VRBI AETERNAE

INTRODUCTION

I

The legendary tales about Rome's foundation, such as those about the twin brothers Romulus and Remus and the she-wolf, are a valuable indicator of how ancient Romans reflected on the origins of their mighty city. Tellingly, there was not just one version of the story, fixed in a single canonical and authoritative text. Romans told and recorded many different versions of the story about Romulus and Remus, as well as many other stories about their origins. Parallel foundation myths, for example, revolved around famous Greek and Trojan heroes like Hercules and Aeneas. Romulus' twin brother, Remus, was sometimes considered to be Rome's founder alongside Romulus – and sometimes was not. Ancient sources also mention the Arcadian king Evander as the founder of an even older city at the site of Rome. In many ways, in fact, the foundation of Rome could not be attributed to a single founder: the story of Rome's origins was written in the plural, almost from the beginning. Nor was Romulus, moreover, the last to be considered a foundational figure. Apart from all these mythical heroes, the Romans also came to regard a series of later, historical figures as new 'founders' of their city. Although these figures evidently did not create Rome from scratch, they were nevertheless considered to have 'founded' Rome, in one way or another. The Eternal City thus came to boast multiple founders, situated both before and long after Romulus. Interestingly, this process never came to a halt: even in Late Antiquity, the narrative of Rome's foundation continued to be remodeled, in accordance with contemporary concerns. Rome became a Christian city – and Christian founders succeeded Romulus and Remus. Paradoxically, the origins of Rome and the question who founded the city were not only historical subjects, things of the past – they were very much a societal and political concern, in the present.

This thesis investigates *how, why, when, by whom* and *under which circumstances* such historical actors could come to be regarded as city-founders, sometimes even in their own lifetime. What did Romans mean when they hailed the emperor Augustus or the apostles Peter and Paul as founders of their city? What was the relation between these 'new' founders and the original, legendary founders of Rome? And what did 'founding' actually mean when the term was applied to something that – evidently – already existed, like the age-old city of Rome? Was that meaning fixed and stable, or did it evolve over time, changing from one context to another?¹

¹ A summary of this thesis was published in Dutch as Hunsucker (2018b); I am very grateful to Ineke Sluiter and Laval Hunsucker for stimulating discussions about that article, also touching upon aspects of this thesis at large.

1. Ktistic renewal in the Ancient world

The case of Rome is in many ways exceptional, but not unique. Before we focus on Rome, it may be useful to zoom out for a moment, and look at our subject from a wider angle. The phenomenon of naming new founders was not as unusual as it may seem at first glance. In different times and places in the Ancient world, individuals who had had a fundamental impact on the political entity in which they operated came to be described as ‘founders’ of that entity.² A ruler or military commander who had saved a city from destruction, for example, could be hailed as the one who had ‘founded’ that city. The city remained roughly as it was, in a physical sense, but the founder changed. Accordingly, individuals who had evidently not created a city from scratch could be seen as operating on a par with, or even instead of such a city’s original founder.³ The obvious similarity to the original founder is that such a ‘foundational’ individual inaugurated a new era or state of affairs for the pre-existing entity, as a sort of civic rebirth. Although the entity concerned had existed before, and continued to do so, the original founder or foundation could be glossed over, implying that the recent events amounted to an entirely new beginning. This would stress a sense of disruption vis-à-vis the past, a rupture in the continuity of civic tradition. In other cases, a foundational individual operating in a pre-existing entity was more explicitly connected to an earlier, original founder, and hailed as a ‘second’ or ‘new’ founder, or a particular event was interpreted as a repeated foundation.⁴ This way of phrasing things emphasized both continuity and discontinuity with the past.⁵

In modern academic discourse, we tend to describe such instances of cities being founded again more explicitly as ‘re-foundations’, and speak of such individuals as ‘re-founders’. In antiquity, the distinction was often not so clear-cut.⁶ That is partially where the difficulty in defining these phenomena originates. At the center of this dissertation are the dynamics that enabled such events and individuals to be regarded in terms related to foundation, and the discursive strategies used to make

2. Cf. Prehn (1922); Cornell and Speyer (1983); Strubbe (1984-1986) 289-302; Pont (2007); Mortensen (2015).

3. A famous case is the city of Amphipolis: see Thuc. V.11 with Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1112, 1142; Malkin (1985) 125-127; McGlew (1993) 22, 153-154; Zuchtriegel (2017) 94; cf. also Thuc. VI.5.3 on Camarina.

4. Cf. briefly Strubbe (1984-1986) 297-298, 300-301 for some examples from Asia Minor.

5. In this respect, the phenomenon of ktistic renewal is similar to ‘the invention of tradition’, after Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983); see now Boschung, Busch and Versluys (2015). In the former volume, an intriguing foundation ceremony is described by Cohn (1983) 177-178.

6. Some early examples in Herodotus, e.g. I.16.2 (Smyrna), V.43 (Heraclea Minoa). Cf. Radt (2007) 148 *ad* Strabo VI.1.5/255 C 21: ‘das griechische Wort ‘Gründung’ (*κτίσμα*) kann auch die Neugründung/Neubesiedlung oder den Ausbau einer bereits existierenden Siedlung bezeichnen’. Radt’s monumental commentary, sadly, does not remark on the novelty of Strabo’s use of compounds with *ἀνα-* and *ἐπι-*, mentioned in the next note, below.

that happen. When we speak and think about ancient refoundations, it is crucial to keep in mind that – in most cases – ancient sources did not differentiate between ‘original’ foundations and what we would call ‘re-foundations’, or at least did not do so as explicitly as we would. Greek and Latin authors often used words like *κτίζειν*, *condere* and *fundare* (‘to found’) or *κτίστης*, *conditor* and *auctor* (‘founder’) for both categories. Various terms meaning ‘refoundation’ or approximating its sense did exist in Greek, but they are both late and rare.⁷ Latin *recondere* never occurs with the sense ‘to re-found’;⁸ *refundare* or *refundatio*, from which our English terms derive, are not even attested.

Paradoxically, then, the phenomena under discussion here were not uncommon in Greek and Roman Antiquity, but the ancients had no specific term for them.⁹ For lack of an existing term, either ancient or modern, that adequately describes this complex of phenomena, I propose to label it *ktistic renewal*.¹⁰ This term is consciously

⁷ In Greek, the noun *ἀνοικισμός* first occurs in Diodorus Siculus (XXVIII.12.1, on Lysimacheia, if the phrasing is not influenced by the Constantinian Excerpts (see Sacks (1990) 119 n. 5, 163-164)) or Strabo (IX.2.17/406 C, on various towns in Boeotia) and *ἀνάκτισις* first in Flavius Josephus (AJ. XV.421, on the temple in Jerusalem), while *ἐπίκτισις* and *ἀνοικιστής* first occur in Byzantine Greek. The verb *ἐπικτίζειν*, as far as we can tell from directly transmitted authors, first means ‘to re-found’ – interestingly – in the Augustan author Strabo (XVII.3.12/831 C, on Caesarea/Iol; the instance in BNJ 680 F 4b.17, where Berossus is quoted as a source by Syncellus, may well be Byzantine in its phrasing), with the first century BC author Alexander Polyhistor (L. Cornelius Alexander) as a likely contemporary/predecessor (BNJ 273 F 72). Its cognate *ἀνακτίζειν* first occurs – again – in Strabo: IX.2.5/403 C (on Thebes, rebuilt by Cassander in 316 BC), IX.2.32/412 C (on Cadmeia/Thebes), XIII.1.42/601 C (on Ilium; cf. the comparable phrases *τῶν τειχιούντων πάλιν τὸν τόπον* and *ἀπέδοσαν δὲ ἀνοικισθείσας* later in the same passage); see also Flavius Josephus, AJ. I.165, XI.12-13. The verb *ἀνοικίζειν* first means ‘resettle, colonize afresh; rebuild’ (LSJ II) in Diod. Sic. XVI.90.1 (on Timoleon in Sicily), but the instance there is actually Dindorf’s conjecture – Flavius Josephus (BJ. IV.442, on Vespasian in Peraea) has the first textually secure instance.

⁸ TLL s.v., with p. 404, l. 3-5 (II.A) for the only (late) cases with a temple and a city as object. Classical Latin does not have a proper noun which means ‘foundation, founding’. *Fundatio* is ‘very rare’ (L&S s.v.), and its only specific occurrences referring to city foundation are few and late (TLL s.v. *fundatio*); the same is true for *conditio* (used by e.g. Oros. VII.2.11 for the foundation of Rome).

⁹ The general idea of renewal or renovation is expressed by the verbs *ἀνανεοῦν*/*ἀνανεοσθαι* in Greek and *renovare* in Latin, with the corresponding substantives *ἀνανέωσις* and *renovatio*. Cf. Cic., *Agr.* 2.34 for a Latin instance related to cities, and Lampe et al. (1961) s.v. ‘ἀνανε-όω’, ‘ἀνανέωμα’ and ‘ἀνανέωσις’ for similar instances in (Late Antique) Greek literature. Related terms include *παλιγγενεσία* and *renasci*.

¹⁰ The adjective ‘*ktistic*’, derived from the Greek word for founding, *κτίζειν* (see Hardie (1994) 11-12), is not in the *OED*, but has become current in classical scholarship as a designation of anything related to the act of founding in senses 2 (‘To build (an edifice, town, etc.) for the first time; to begin the building of, be the first builder of’) and 3a (‘To set up or establish for the first time (an institution, etc.), esp. with provision for its perpetual maintenance; to originate, create, initiate (something which continues to exist thenceforward)’) of the word according to the *OED* (s.v. ‘found, v.²’). The adjective ‘foundational’ often relates to ‘foundation’ in the sense of a physical (sub)structure (*OED* s.v. ‘foundation’, 5) or the basis, groundwork, underlying ground or principle of something (*OED* s.v. ‘foundation’, 6), having ‘fundamental’ as a synonym.

intended to accommodate the complex and varied processes underlying the presentation or interpretation of changes as an act of foundation. I take it to mean both that individual agents of change (e.g. new rulers, renovators, restorers, rescuers or reformers) describe themselves or are described as founders, and that changes (e.g. a new dynasty, renovations, restorations, escape from disaster or reforms) are described as acts of foundation, even though the entity at which the described actions are directed existed before. The crucial aspect of ktistic renewal is that changes to an entity are reflected on that entity's (perceived) origins.¹¹ A claim on or narrative about those origins can then become a discursive way to legitimize or historicize such changes, or to highlight them as especially important.

It is not entirely surprising that ancient sources did not clearly differentiate between 'original' foundations and what we would call 're-foundations'. Whether or not something 'existed before' is partially a matter of definition, and ultimately negotiable. It is therefore also important to look at ktistic renewal in conjunction with actual new foundations. Just like the Hellenistic kings who founded new cities and were honored as founders of existing ones (see below), it is likely that in other cases ktistic activity in one area or sphere combined well with ktistic renewal in another. There are also cases where both activities converge. Newly founded cities could be presented or interpreted as the continuation of earlier cities, located elsewhere, that had been abandoned or destroyed.¹² The new location could be previously unoccupied, or be the site of an already existing city.

Greek Sicily in the early fifth century BC provides ample examples. In 475 BC, Hieron, tyrant of Syracuse, founded the city of Aetna on the site of Catana (modern Catania), a Chalcidian colony dating back to 729 BC, which Hieron had just destroyed.¹³ The inhabitants of Catana were relocated to Leontini, but returned after Hieron's death, when the inhabitants of Aetna were transferred to Inessa; Inessa was renamed Aetna, and Hieron was consecrated as its founder.¹⁴ This process is sometimes described as ἀνοικισμός or μετοικισμός.¹⁵ Another variant is known as συνοικισμός,¹⁶ e.g. in the famous case of Athens, where Theseus allegedly united pre-existing settlements into one city.¹⁷ Recent research suggests that only a minor percentage of Hellenistic city

^{11.} For this 'urgeschichtliches Denken' more generally, see e.g. von Ungern-Sternberg (1998) 171.

^{12.} Demand (1990); cf. Beck (1964) 166-167. Troy is perhaps the most famous example from Augustan literature (cf. Kraus (1994)), to which we will amply return in chapter 2, below.

^{13.} Pind. *Pyth.* I, *Nem.* IX; Diod. Sic. XI.66; Basta Donzelli (1996).

^{14.} Diod. Sic. XI.49, 76; Strabo VI.2.3/268 C.

^{15.} Cf. Thuc. I.58 on Olynthus.

^{16.} Busolt (1926) 156-159. On the terms, see Boehm (2011) 6-8.

^{17.} Thuc. II.15.2; von den Hoff (2010).

foundations occurred on previously unoccupied sites, raising the question how many acts of ktistic renewal possibly masked themselves as *ex novo* foundations.¹⁸ On the other hand, some ‘new’ foundations in terms of physical building activity actually presented themselves as successors to earlier cities that had existed on the spot but no longer did so. Two good (and related) examples are the conspicuous rebuilding of Plataea by Alexander the Great in 337 BC, shortly before he ostentatiously destroyed Thebes,¹⁹ and the poignant rebuilding of Thebes by Cassander in 316 BC, as part of his policy of city founding in Greece and Thrace.²⁰

Ktistic renewal thus comes in a variety of tastes, often intermingling amongst themselves, and in various degrees of ‘novelty’. We may distinguish a ‘disruptive’ variant, where a new founder displaces the previous one(s), and an ‘incremental’ variant, where new founders join the ranks of their predecessors, adding themselves to the total number of ktistic agents. In sum, ktistic renewal covers both refoundations presenting themselves as new foundations and new foundations presenting themselves as refoundations, as well as explicit refoundations presenting themselves as such. In the first case, something old is presented as something new; in the second, something new as something old; in the last case, something is presented as new and old at the same time. Ktistic renewal may thus be seen as a particular instance of ancient discursive strategies to deal with the tension between the new and the old, a topic that can be studied productively as an example of ‘anchoring innovation’.²¹

In what spheres, and on what levels of reality, did ktistic renewal occur? It might be tempting to interpret this phenomenon solely in rhetorical terms, seeing it as a hyperbolic metaphor or literary *topos* used to describe profound change, as an Ancient way to describe far-reaching innovation. There is no denying that rhetoric played a crucial part, and an analysis of the literary discourses involved is an integral part of this thesis. Yet considering someone as a founder was more than merely a matter of words. Founders frequently received cult.²² They were entitled to special treatment, such as burial within the city walls.²³ Their name and image appeared in prominent places and on various media, artistically represented in ways otherwise

^{18.} Boehm (2011) 3; cf. Priol (2017).

^{19.} Wallace (2011) 148-150.

^{20.} Boehm (2011) 14-15. The description of this event in Strabo (IX.2.5/403 C) is the first instance of the verb *ἀναχτίζειν*, meaning ‘to rebuild’ – see note 7, above.

^{21.} For the concept, see Sluiter (2017) and (2018); for a relevant application of the concept to the apostle Peter, Dijkstra (2020b). Cf. e.g. D’Angour (2011) on Classical Greece; on innovation in general, see e.g. Godin (2015).

^{22.} Her. VI.38.1; Fustel de Coulanges (1876⁶) 165-167; Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1130, 1139-1145; Strubbe (1984-1986) 289-290; Malkin (1987) 189-260.

^{23.} Strubbe (1984-1986) 298-300.

reserved for gods and heroes. Many founders, in fact, *were* gods and heroes. Their activity as founder could coincide with their divine status, or they were divinized exactly because of that activity. Just like cities represented themselves by referring to their patron deities, they could do so by referring to their (heroic) founders.

Hailing someone as a founder thus carried far-reaching implications, and opened up a perspective of status and prestige normally inaccessible to mortals. In a way, speaking about ktistic renewal allowed a community to define in terms of human or divine agency what might otherwise have been a more abstract process, devoid of great aspirations, noble intention and divine inspiration. Founders were a way to anthropomorphise and personalize huge communal efforts, making them more accessible in religious, emotional, visual and narrative terms.²⁴ Moreover, the founder of a city also determined its status, in terms of both antiquity and prominence. Important cities (or the ones that thought of themselves as such) required impressive foundation narratives.²⁵ The moment of foundation represented a crucial juncture in historical development, and by resetting that moment, the history of the entity concerned was also rearranged. Identifying someone as the founder of something focused special historical attention on that person (destining him or her to loom large in the memory of posterity) and on the moment of renewed foundation. A city that was considered to have been founded again often witnessed changes in its status and important attributes (such as its official name), its power and possessions or its (overall) physical appearance. Profound changes could, accordingly, not only be the reason of a renewed foundation, but also its consequences – or both.

There is also a historical trajectory along which these phenomena most likely developed. The earliest development of cities and other political entities was often a gradual process, not easy to pin down to a single, individual founder.²⁶ It is commonly assumed that historical awareness of founders, in the ancient cities of Greece, developed in the wake of the great migration waves of the Archaic Age.²⁷ As new settlements were founded in great numbers, and prominently started to boast either a patron deity or a leading colonizer as their founder, older colonies and the mother

^{24.} Cf. McGlew (1993) 18.

^{25.} Cf. Osborne (2015) 229: 'Every city wanted to believe that it was exceptional in the eyes of other cities, and the stories that cities told about their past were ways of showing why'. It is worth remembering that founders, 'though creatures of political legend, possessed a significance for Greek political language that stands in inverse proportion to their doubtful historicity' (McGlew (1993) 17). On Capua as a Trojan foundation, linked to the foundation of a Caesarean colony there in the first century BC, see Luke (2014) 184–188.

^{26.} See Busolt (1926) 153–160 and the classic treatment, first published in 1864, by Fustel de Coulanges (1876⁶) 146–155.

^{27.} Malkin (1987) 12–13, 261–266, unconvincingly challenged by McGlew (1993) 18; cf. Malkin (2002).

cities who sent out the colonists followed suit, constructing similar foundation narratives.²⁸ We have many testimonies to the popularity of such narratives in ancient literature, to the point that they were parodied.²⁹ As Naoíse Mac Sweeney states in the introduction of a recent volume on ancient foundation myths, '[s]tories of beginnings and myths of foundation were ubiquitous in classical antiquity'.³⁰

The question who founded which city became more complex when city foundation became an instrument of larger, imperialist states.³¹ They founded new cities to mark conquered territory or to function as military and commercial outposts and strongholds.³² The leaders of such states adopted city foundation as a way of seeking legitimacy or prestige, or a way of ritually marking important achievements. Philip II of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, was probably the first to found a city named after himself (Philippi, followed soon after by Philippopolis).³³ Alexander followed suit, founding a considerable number of Alexandrias, and his successors followed in his footsteps.³⁴ A city named after a reigning king or (member of his) dynasty broadcasted allegiance to its founder. Apart from new foundations, a great number of existing cities also received or adopted a new, dynastic name to show their allegiance to a ruler,³⁵ who was often consequently honored as founder. Both founding new cities and being honored as founder of pre-existing ones became part and parcel of Hellenistic royal ideology.³⁶ That makes ktistic renewal an integral part of the political history of the ancient world.

At the same time, foundation narratives were a sort of literary subgenre from the Archaic and Classical period onwards, surfacing as a fully developed genre in the

^{28.} Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1140.

^{29.} Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1108; McGlew (1993) 18. A nice example is the satirical scene in Aristophanes' *Birds* (819–1169) describing the foundation of Νεφελοκοκκυγία, 'Cloudcuckooland', including a lovely parody (924–930) of Pindar's hymn for Hieron as founder of Aetna, and another of how founders are addressed with deference in public (1277–1283); see Bowie (1993) 152–166.

^{30.} Mac Sweeney (2015) 1.

^{31.} An issue from early on: cf. Diod. Sic. XII.10–35 on Thurii.

^{32.} On Near Eastern and Egyptian traditions and precedents, see e.g. the contributions in Azara, Mar Medina and Subías Pascual (2001); Grandpierre (2005); Tallet (2005); Xella (2006); Mazé (2017); Dabin (2017).

^{33.} Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1142; cf. Malkin (1985); Gschmitzter (1987); Lichtenberger (2001).

^{34.} Erskine (2013); Fraser (1996).

^{35.} See the striking case of the Antigonias founded by Antigonus in 310 BC, which would be renamed Alexandria Troas and Nicaea only a decade later, after they came under Lysimachus' rule (Strabo XII.4.7/565 C, XIII.1.26/593 C): Antigonus' dynastic name could not persist.

^{36.} See Boehm (2011). At p. 121, he identifies Cassander as the instigator of this development; see also Plischke (2011) 63–64.

Hellenistic age.³⁷ The tradition of which this genre was the literary embodiment continued down to Late Antiquity, when the subgenre of *laus urbium* ('praise of cities') flourished anew, especially in oratory.³⁸ Almost by definition, specimens of such praise devoted ample attention to city-founders, among whom both Roman emperors and Christian saints came to figure.³⁹ That emphasizes the connection between historical events and literary representation. Both the political history and its literary representations are crucial aspects of this thesis.

The phenomenon of ktistic renewal was highly present in the Ancient world, played a prominent part in discourses about identity and the legitimization of power, and did so from early on all the way through Late Antiquity. Yet it has hardly been researched systematically. This dissertation makes a first attempt to do so. It does so through the analysis of a single, paramount case, which may hopefully illuminate general dynamics in an exemplary way: the city of Rome. This focus implies a double restriction: it limits our investigation of ktistic renewal to one specific city, but also, more generally, to ktistic renewal of *cities*, rather than other entities. A wealth of material still lies in wait of being studied through the lens of ktistic renewal, religious institutions (rituals, cult sites, organized belief systems) and political systems (forms of government and territorially organized expressions of power, but also societal institutions) prime among them. The present research will touch upon those spheres in discussing the case of Rome as a city,⁴⁰ but much more work, far beyond the scope of a PhD thesis, will have to be done to compare and contextualize this case within a broader perspective on ktistic renewal.

2. Refounding Rome: a survey of the material and contents

This dissertation is about one particularly rich example of ktistic renewal: the city of Rome. As the city on the Tiber grew to boast near-universal dominion in the Ancient Mediterranean world for centuries, laying claim to the foundation of Rome became an increasingly powerful and popular political instrument. Most interestingly, Rome probably provides an unparalleled example of a succession of ktistic renewals over a time-span long outliving the Roman Empire, or even Antiquity as such. Two of the

^{37.} Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1109-1109; Dougherty (1993); Dougherty (1994); Sistikou (2008²) 311-340.

^{38.} Humphries (2019) 20-25, 30-31 ('...well-entrenched tropes for the description of cities proved remarkably tenacious, even in the face of observable changes, such as the emergence of Christianity...', *ibid.* 31).

^{39.} Cf. *ibid.* 28-29 on Iustiniana Prima's foundation, exalted by Procopius (*Aed.* IV.1.19-25).

^{40.} A major political system addressed in passing in this thesis is the one we tend to identify as the Roman Empire, as it is often, and intentionally so, synonymous with the city of Rome in our ancient sources: see further below.

most prominent and influential ktistic renewals occurred, unsurprisingly, at two major turning points in Roman history: the Augustan Age and the fourth century AD.⁴¹ These periods witnessed the transition from Republican to Imperial Rome, with the successful implementation of lasting autocratic rule by Caesar Augustus, on the one hand, and the transformation from Rome as imperial capital of the Mediterranean world to spiritual capital of the Christian church, with the rise to power of Rome's bishop as the successor of St. Peter, on the other. Strikingly, both these epochal developments were presented and interpreted in terms of ktistic renewal. This dissertation considers both refoundations of Rome in a chronologically comparative perspective, viewing them not only in the political, cultural and religious contexts of their own time, but also as part of a longer and broader tradition of ktistic renewal.

Accordingly, the present work provides new readings of well-known ancient evidence, understood within a larger historical dynamic of ktistic renewal that has until now not been sufficiently considered. Furthermore, it attempts to break new ground by reconsidering existing interpretations of the evidence, and existing debates, in the context of that dynamic. It thereby hopes to make a useful contribution to Roman studies more generally, as it aims to shed new light on some hotly debated issues, where this perspective has hitherto not (fully) been taken into account. These include the way Augustus legitimized his position as monarchical ruler, the complex dynamic between the *princeps* and Augustan poets, the novel position of Rome in the polycentric imperial politics of Late Antiquity, the nature and purpose of the foundation of Constantinople, Christian responses to traditional Roman modes of representation, the changing religious role of Rome in the fourth and early fifth century, and – finally – the way the bishops of Rome managed to affirm themselves as new leading figures in both the Eternal City and the Christian world.

One of the most important reasons for choosing such a broad time-span as window of analysis, even if comparing both ends of the chronological spectrum rather than trying to cover everything in between, is that our subject shows tendencies of change in the process. The city of Rome, under Augustus, starts to become ever more synonymous with Rome as an empire: interestingly, Augustus is both a refounder of Rome, as a city, and the 'true' founder of the Roman Empire. That dynamic is exactly at the centre of our investigation: not only 'founding' becomes increasingly fluid in its meaning, also 'Rome' liquidizes.⁴² That is, perhaps, even more true of Late Antiquity,

^{41.} On the notion of such turning points in history, see Steffensen (2018) 19.

^{42.} The two senses may be described as autohyponyms; see e.g. Murphy (2010) 96 on the term 'Yankee'. For a sweeping treatment of the developments from the Republic to Late Antiquity, see Storoni Mazzolani (1967).

as the city is, progressively and paradoxically, abandoned by the Empire bearing its own name. In the fourth and fifth century, Roman emperors become strangers to the ancient *caput mundi*, and the city is partially forced to revert to its pre-imperial self-image.⁴³ Simultaneously, 'Rome' starts to become invested with increasing ideological significance for Christians, becoming a nomer for certain theological positions, religious orthodoxy and, eventually, papal claims to power based on apostolic primacy.

Most of the material discussed in this dissertation has been given scholarly attention in its own right, making it particularly challenging to work trough the copious bibliography and existing debates. Yet there is, to date, no dedicated study of Rome's refounding, neither in general nor in the two crucial periods discussed here. Accordingly, the present thesis aims to fill a part of that gap by a comparative study of ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity. It is organized in two parts, one devoted to each period. Both parts include a broader overview (chapters 1 and 5), as well as a selected number of case studies treated in detail (chapters 2, 3 and 4). In that way, both general developments and specific examples can be tested against the main idea of ktistic renewal as an important aspect of political, literary and intellectual culture. Although it would certainly be illuminating to study ktistic renewal at Rome in the preceding, intermediate and subsequent periods, the customary limits of time and space in a modern PhD thesis spoke in favour of a dedicated focus on the two important periods that seemed most promising in terms of expected results. Fortunately, much valuable research has been conducted on the closely related topic of the reception and memory of Rome's founders in the periods not covered by this thesis.⁴⁴ By way of introduction to the periods that make up the focus of this study, the following section will try to sketch, in a (necessarily) cursory fashion, the vicissitudes of Rome's founders and refoundations over time. Following the summary of developments preceding each of the two periods examined in this

^{43.} The situation was such that a Roman senator could claim, in the last years of Constantine's reign, that the *Caesariana tempora*, after 381 years, were over – implying that Rome would again be ruled by a Republican senate (*CIL VI.41318*, with Alföldy's notes in VI.8.3: 5051-2, line 2: *post Caesariana tempora id est post annos CCCLXXX et I*). See further Chenault (2012) 107-108. The location of the inscription and its accompanying statue on the Capitol seems to have been more than just 'rare and exclusive' (*ibid.* 108) – for an implicit proclamation of the restoration of the Republic after almost four centuries of imperial rule, few more historically evocative sites could have been chosen: see e.g. Wiseman (2009b) 64-65, 190, 218-228; cf. Edwards (1996) 85.

^{44.} Major works and recent contributions include Doignon (1966); Bruggisser (1987), with Cameron (2011) 609-10; Ver Eecke (2008); Mazzoni (2010); Rodríguez Mayorgas (2010); Dardenay (2010); Dardenay (2012); Neel (2014) 65-70; Quaranta (2015); Wiseman (2015); Gassman (2017); Swist (2020); Tennyson (2022); Stocks (2022); see also the material collected in Carandini (2006-2014). Dulière (1979) is still useful. I was unable to consult the unpublished works of Pansard-Besson (2007) and (2012), and of di Fazio (2015).

thesis, this overview will also introduce the case studies chosen to illustrate those periods – and briefly pause at the period in between.

Rome's traditional foundation narrative, focusing on the story of Romulus and Remus nurtured by a she-wolf, was used as a symbol of identity and self-definition from early onwards.⁴⁵ The first silver coins minted by the city, in the third century BC, featured a savvy she-wolf reclining towards the baby twins.⁴⁶ When Rome decided how to present itself to the outside world, it made a prominent choice for the city's founding myth. That was entirely in keeping with well-established Greek tradition, and it is interesting to note that many of the oldest known representations of Rome's founders coincide, chronologically, with Rome's increasing contact with the Greek cities of Southern Italy. A case in point may be Poseidonia, a Greek colony south of Naples founded around the start of the sixth century BC, best known by its later Latin (or Lucanian) name, Paestum. Roman military interest and expansion in the area reached a peak in the first decades of the third century BC, culminating in the foundation of a colony in Paestum in 273 BC.⁴⁷ Around the same time, the oldest statue of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus that is attested in Roman literature was put up in Rome, by the Ognulii brothers in 296 BC,⁴⁸ and the aforementioned silver coins were minted. Perhaps, Poseidonia/Paestum was one of the places where Romans became acquainted with Greek founder-cults. An exceptional sanctuary or tomb that was excavated on the Greek *agora* of the city, with its ritual deposit almost entirely preserved inside, is currently interpreted as a *heroon*, a shrine for the veneration of the city's founder (perhaps named Megyllos).⁴⁹ When the Romans founded their colony, they integrated the *heroon* in the new urban planning, preserving (perhaps even monumentalizing) rather than completely obliterating it – thus showing respect for the city founder.⁵⁰ It is not unthinkable that such cultural encounters helped shape the way the Romans came to represent their own city founders.⁵¹ That is not to

⁴⁵ It is now becoming increasingly clear that the Capitoline she-wolf, long believed to be the oldest statue from Rome dating back to fifth century BC, is a medieval work of art: see the summary in Mazzoni (2010) 36–39, with updates in Formigli (2012) and Rissanen (2014) 336–337.

⁴⁶ RRC 20.1 (often dated to 269 BC), 39.3, 183.1–6, 235.1. See Dardenay (2010) 52–55.

⁴⁷ See Torelli (1999) and Termeer (2024).

⁴⁸ Papi (1999).

⁴⁹ See Greco (2014); Zuchtriegel (2017) 84–86; Ficuciello (2022); cf. Longo (2019) and Cipriani (2019).

⁵⁰ Termeer (2015) 164–165; Ficuciello (2022) 73. For a possible similar case in Luceria, see Termeer (2015) 162–164.

⁵¹ Similar monuments interpreted as founder-shrines have been excavated in Selinunte, Cyrene, Iasus, Cassope and Amphiapolis: see Zuchtriegel (2017) 85–86 (also for an interesting similarity between material from Selinunte and Paestum), 94; Greco (2021); Ficuciello (2022) 71. For a similar monument in Lavinium, (re)interpreted as a *heroon* of Aeneas but seldom involved in the discussion of the Greek examples mentioned above, see Hall (2014) 122–130.

say, however, that the story of Romulus and Remus was merely the product of Greek cultural influences – it seems to have been much older. According to Peter Wiseman, the introduction of Remus to an earlier version of the myth featuring only a single founder was a reflection of the intense social struggles in the fourth century BC.⁵² If Wiseman's much-debated hypothesis is correct, the introduction of Remus would be an early Roman example of how a foundation narrative was retrofitted to accommodate contemporary social and political concerns.

In the turbulent political struggles of the first century BC, various leading men were associated or associated themselves with the city founders, approximating the idea of ktistic renewal.⁵³ Cicero, considering himself to be the savior of Rome after dismantling the Catilinarian conspiracy, explicitly invited comparison with Romulus.⁵⁴ Julius Caesar may have done the same,⁵⁵ but seems to have been more occupied with claiming descent from Venus and Aeneas through the latter's son Julius, thereby giving appropriation of Rome's founders a Hellenistic twist of claiming heroic and divine genealogy.⁵⁶ It was also in this period that Roman generals, especially in the East, increasingly followed in the footsteps of Hellenistic kings who were honored and venerated as city founders (*κτίσται*).⁵⁷ Both the foundation of new cities and the restoration or refoundation of existing ones could be an occasion for such honors. In the struggle for control over Rome, it made sense to appropriate the city's foundation and fuel widespread hopes of restoration and reform. Ktistic renewal, so to speak, was in the air.⁵⁸

The discursive strategy of ktistic renewal was used perhaps most famously towards the end of the first century BC by the man who came to rule the Roman Empire as Caesar Augustus. In the literature, urban design, political rhetoric and visual arts

^{52.} Wiseman (1995). To boast multiple founders was exceptional, but far from unique: see Thuc. VI.4.3-5.3 for some Greek examples, all from Sicily, with McGlew (1993) 18-19.

^{53.} For an explicit reference to this phenomenon as 'l'abituale *romulisme* dei maggiori generali repubblicani', see Cadario (2006) 47, borrowing the term from Martin (1994) 278-296. On Sulla, see Ver Eecke (2006) 79-80 and (2008) 101-192; on Marius, Luke (2014) 36 n. 13.

^{54.} Vasaly (1993) 42-59, 79-80; Havas (2000); Habinek (2001) 84-87; Cole (2013) 85-110; Neel (2014) 65-70; cf. Borzsák (1975).

^{55.} DeRose Evans (1992) 90-93; Zecchini (2001b) 14-34; Fraschetti (2002) 116-121; Havas (2004); Cadario (2006); Ver Eecke (2008) 355-423; Smith (2010); Vuković (2023) 287; cf. Zecchini (2010). The classic treatment is Weinstock (1971) 176-190.

^{56.} Binder (1997); Hekster (2015) 15-16, 240; cf. Erskine (2001) 36, 244-250.

^{57.} Prehn s.v. 'Ktistes' in RE XI.2 (1922) 2086; Pont (2007) 527-528.

^{58.} An air swarming with literary evocations of Rome's distant past: on Varro, e.g., see Leonardis (2019) and (2023); Smith (2019); Binder (2018); Scheithauer (1998) 294; older references in MacCormack (1998) 178 n. 12 and note 44, above. According to Richardson (2022) 470, Varro might have been responsible for at least one 'outright antiquarian invention' concerning Romulus.

of his time, he was compared to the founders of Rome, and his rule over both city and Empire was, significantly, described in terms of city-foundation. Rather than cancelling the memory of his ktistic forerunners, however, the age of Augustus witnessed a proliferation of references to earlier founders. While it is almost a standard feature of foundation narratives to showcase a plurality of variants,⁵⁹ the extraordinary achievement of the Augustan Age was that these various founders were no longer juxtaposed as alternatives, but were subjected to a single historical logic.⁶⁰ Connected to each other in an overarching narrative which presented them in succession rather than competition, Augustan authors lined up an impressive array of Roman founders and re-founders. Also, Augustus was seen to succeed rather than to replace them, adding to a long and impressive list of predecessors (Hercules, Evander, Aeneas, Romulus, Brutus, and Camillus).⁶¹

This suggests that Romans of the Augustan Age perceived foundation as less exclusive than we tend to do – a distinction that has not been duly recognized, and which is an important point of departure for this thesis. One of the main insights underpinning the first part of this thesis is that foundation – for the Romans of the Augustan Age – was not necessarily limited to a single moment of creation, but was rather presented as an incremental, partially cyclical process.⁶² The resulting plurality of founders and foundation narratives is mirrored in the city's urban topography, in many cases featuring multiple locations or monuments connected to the same event in the city's earliest history. The master narrative on Rome's foundation in the Augustan Age became a patchwork of traditional and innovative ktistic components, with the *princeps* as the thread that held this variegated garment together, making it seem like a seamless whole.⁶³

This is where chapter 1 starts to investigate ktistic renewal. For the Augustan Age, the analysis begins with an overview of the evidence indicating that the so-called 'Roman Revolution'⁶⁴ of Augustus was expressed and interpreted in terms of ktistic renewal of Rome as a city. An important hint that this was the case is offered by the

⁵⁹ Mac Sweeney (2015) 1-3.

⁶⁰ Miles (1986) [= (1995) 75-109; cf. (1988) 195] attributes this achievement to Livy. See further below, note 253.

⁶¹ For a Roman example of the idea that a later founder would naturally replace rather than succeed an earlier founder, see von Ungern-Sternberg (2001) 291 on Plut., *Cam.* 31.2, and cf. Gaertner (2008) 37-38. Plutarch's Greek outlook may indeed play a role here.

⁶² This (in some ways) obvious point is not always duly recognized, e.g. by Woodman (2023) 85-88 in his discussion of the word *condendamve* in Livy's preface (6) – the gerund could be more satisfactorily explained by the fact that Livy thus refers to the foundation of Rome as an ongoing process.

⁶³ Von Ungern-Sternberg (1998); cf. e.g. Mazzoni (2010) 1.

⁶⁴ Syme (1939).

contemporary historian Livy, whose massive work on the history of Rome known as the *Ab urbe condita* has, however, only partially been preserved.⁶⁵ As the later books on contemporary history and Augustus himself are irretrievably lost, the evidence offered by the preserved books is only partial and implicit. For the complete set of direct and explicit evidence, we have to look outside of the Augustan period itself. That evidence is scattered over different sources, some of them postdating the Augustan Age by a century or more. To base our investigation on such later evidence is to run the risk of being misled by later retrojections and the products of hindsight knowledge. For that reason, this evidence, as well as that offered by Livy, is put to the test in chapter 2, in a detailed and lengthy case study of the most important contemporary source that has been preserved intact: the *Aeneid* of the poet Vergil. This monumental epic poem was written relatively early in Augustus' reign. It instantly became highly influential in shaping attitudes to the *princeps* and counts as a reliable (and manifestly innovative) indicator of Augustan developments. The poem will be examined in a close reading analysis designed to reveal the intricacies of the epic's ktistic themes. Zooming in, moreover, on the verb *condere* (one of the Latin words meaning 'to found'), I argue that there was a deliberate attempt to widen the sphere of activities that could be seen as contributing to an act of foundation. It is my hypothesis that Vergil thereby devised a way to accommodate Augustus' actions within a verbal and mental framework of foundation. To put this hypothesis to the test, I will not only look at Vergil's *Aeneid*, but also at a contemporary reaction to the *Aeneid* from another Augustan poet, Propertius. It is impossible to determine definitively what Augustus's own role in this process was, but we have strong indications that he was actively involved. Those indications are examined in the first part of chapter 1, and will be evaluated in the conclusion of part A.

In the centuries following the Early Augustan Age (31 - 12 BC) and its presentation of the principate as a ktistic renewal of Rome, Roman emperors continued to connect their reigns to the city's founders and foundation narratives.⁶⁶ Ritual occasions of raised interest were provided by the centennial celebrations of Rome's foundation in AD 48, 148 and 248, under the emperors Claudius, Antoninus Pius and Philip the Arab.⁶⁷ Ideas connected to ktistic renewal also seem to have surfaced on several other occasions, revolving around emperors like Nero and Commodus, who allegedly

^{65.} On the title, see Woodman (2023) 85 n. 8.

^{66.} See the useful survey in Swist (2020) 374-380.

^{67.} Cf. Mattingly, Sydenham and Sutherland (1949) 55-63; Gagé (1974); Zecchini (2001a); Ziemssen (2011) 102-104. On Claudius see Maccari (2017), Swist (2020) 92-98 and O'Neill (2020). On Philip, see Loriot and Nony (1997) 193-196; Körner (2002) 248-259; Davenport (2017) 28; and below, note 677 and page 283.

wanted to rename Rome after themselves,⁶⁸ and Hadrian, who was the first to institute the cult of Roma in the *Urbs* itself and seems to have elevated ‘Roma Aeterna’ to an important ideological concept.⁶⁹ In other cases, such as the Flavian period, the Severans or the third century emperor Aurelian, the establishment of a new imperial dynasty or the extension of Rome’s circuit of walls seem to have stimulated discourses of ktistic renewal.⁷⁰ At the same time, Roman emperors came to be honored as founders in countless cities throughout the empire.⁷¹

While some of these developments hint at shifting adaptations of and modifications to the Augustan concept of ktistic renewal, the major changes that this thesis focuses on occurred in Late Antiquity. As many scholarly and popular works on Early Christian Rome notice (but few set out to investigate), the city’s rise to prominence as Christian capital is accompanied by a shift in founders: Peter and Paul would come to replace Romulus and Remus.⁷² This striking case of ktistic renewal forms the inspiration of the second part. It is, however, not as simple as that. The shift occurs long after Rome first started to become a prominent Christian center, under Constantine the Great. Also, the situation in which Peter and Paul replace Romulus and Remus as founders is extremely complex. In order to trace the evolution of Rome’s new Christian founders it is necessary to follow a double trajectory, looking both at Christian attitudes towards city foundation, and at the developments at Rome in Late Antiquity at large.⁷³

Part B will begin with the latter (in chapter 3), but also take us away from Rome for a moment (in chapter 4). The developments in Rome, namely, are intimately connected to another prime example of ktistic renewal. Constantinople, an ancient Greek city by the name of Byzantium, was renewed and renamed by the emperor Constantine. Within half a century, his act was considered to imply that Constantinople had been founded as a Christian capital. That Constantinople also became known as ‘New

^{68.} Tac., *Ann.* XV.40; Suet., *Nero* 55; Aymard (1936); De Ranieri (1995); Hekster (2022) 95-96, 107-109; Pouille (2010); Swist (2020) 98-104.

^{69.} Haley (2005); Swist (2020) 129. Cf. Gagé (1936), Ziemssen (2011) 81-89, Brown (2020), and, for the wider context of the Greek East, Strubbe (1984-1986) 280-284.

^{70.} See e.g. p. 120 on Statius and Domitian, below, and Swist (2020) 391 on Septimius Severus, as well as *ibid.* 340 on Aurelian.

^{71.} Pont (2007); a nice example of a literary source reflecting ideas about ktistic renewal are the orations of Aelius Aristides on Smyrna (*Or.* XVII.2-4; XIX.4, 10; XX.5, 20, 23).

^{72.} E.g. Harries (2012) 282; Krautheimer (1983) 41; see now Humphries (2020).

^{73.} In a way, this course of action is in line with due criticism on the regular practice to put (Christian) religion at the forefront of investigations of Late Antiquity: see Humphries (2019) 8-9. Like the changing nature of cities, the Christian appropriation of ktistic renewal was heavily conditioned by broader political developments.

Rome' (or simply 'Rome')⁷⁴ shows the complex interaction between different modes of ktistic renewal. Byzantium was an old city.⁷⁵ Its refoundation as Constantinople framed it as a new city, but the epithet 'New Rome' actually made it appear as if it was the renewed version of a far older city – not Byzantium, but Rome.

The Late Antique evidence for ktistic renewal differs substantially from the Augustan material. Late Antique Rome also witnessed revolutionary developments, but these are spread out over a larger chronological span and geographical area than was the case in the Augustan Age, involving many different contexts, points of view and historical influences. While Vergil can count as a key author for the Early Augustan Age, whose activity coincided chronologically with the revolutionary developments he described, ktistic renewal in Late Antiquity cannot be studied in a single representative author. Augustine is active only in the last part of the period and is anything but representative (although very influential). Therefore, the net has to be cast wider, tracing the evolution of a new, Christian idea of ktistic renewal back to its origins in Late Antiquity and before. Our analysis must start with the moment when the meaning of Rome as a city first began to change, even before it was largely christianized. In fact, the ktistic renewal of Byzantium as a New Rome on the Bosphorus cannot be separated from the vicissitudes of the old imperial capital on the Tiber. Rome played a crucial role in Constantine's rise to universal rule over the Roman Empire. In what became his first major expansion of territorial power, Constantine conquered the city from his imperial opponent Maxentius in the year 312, after what became known as the battle of the Milvian Bridge. Before Constantine defeated him, Maxentius had initiated an intensive campaign of ktistic renewal at Rome, associating himself and his dynasty closely to the mythical twin founders of the city, Romulus and Remus.

The first case study of part B, in chapter 3, is concerned with the city of Rome itself around the turn of the fourth century. Contrary to the *communis opinio*, I will argue that Maxentius' campaign of ktistic renewal was not directed against the legacy of the Tetrarchic emperors that had preceded him, but instead copied and continued significant aspects of Tetrarchic ideology, also in terms of ktistic renewal. Because of the centrifugal impulses that characterize it, the Tetrarchic period is generally seen as the moment when the city of Rome lost its political pre-eminence. At the same time, however, it also gave rise to the heavily Rome-centered regime of Maxentius. Both circumstances merit attention in terms of how rulers positioned themselves vis-à-vis the city's foundation. The same is true for the reign of Constantine, who

^{74.} Bowersock (2009).

^{75.} See Russell (2017) for a good survey.

captured Rome from his opponent, founded a new city on the Bosporus that would eventually become an Eastern equivalent of Rome, and instigated an increasing Christianization of the Roman Empire. We will treat all three of those aspects, and ask ourselves whether and how they are related in the context of our theme. Additionally, it is interesting to see to what extent the Tetrarchic, Maxentian and Constantinian concepts of ktistic renewal differed from the one developed in the Augustan Age, shedding further light on the complexities of the phenomenon from a comparative perspective.

The Constantinian period is the second case study, treated in chapter 4. The interpretation of Constantine's reign and revolutionary actions remains a matter of intense academic debate, and the foundation of Constantinople in particular, as either a typical provincial capital or a decidedly Christian replacement of Rome, is heavily contested. The foundation of Constantinople, and especially the way it was viewed in the decades following the death of its founder, was probably related to the active involvement with the ktistic traditions of Rome under Maxentius. Conversely, developments at Constantinople can be seen to have had their effect on the last case of ktistic renewal studied in this dissertation. Precisely at the time when Constantinople started to affirm itself as a city founded in a Christian key by a Christian emperor, Romans in Italy started to claim that Rome also had its Christian founders. Rather than one Christian emperor, however, they boasted Christendom's two most important saints and martyrs.

As this was a long and complex development, the last chapter provides a chronological overview, rather than a single case study. It takes us back to Rome, but half a century further in time, when Christian authors in the West first explicitly made the claim that Rome was founded by the apostles Peter and Paul. That proved an immensely powerful strategy: to present these saints, whose veneration in Rome was by no means recent, in the new guise of city-founders. Consequently, Christians at Rome could claim that Peter and Paul had replaced Romulus and Remus. They thereby provided the old imperial capital with a new identity and claim to political power. This striking case of ktistic renewal, adopted by a Christian ruling class, seems to have affirmed itself gradually along with the establishment of the supreme authority of Rome's bishop. We will investigate the stages of its creation. In order to do so to the full, and understand the proper background of this striking development, it is necessary to look back at earlier Christian attitudes towards city foundation. This is where chapter 5 begins.

Alongside the Roman notion of ktistic renewal, the biblical canon and the apostolic fathers constitute a different but complementary tradition of speaking about city foundation. An awareness of that tradition contributes significantly to our understanding and interpretation of presenting Peter and Paul as new founders of Rome. Ambrose, a Roman who became highly influential as bishop of Milan, was among the most prominent to advocate this particular ktistic renewal, in a hymn (*Apostolorum passio*) dedicated to both saints. He presented the Roman martyrdom of Peter and Paul as their foundational act. In doing so, he redefined what 'foundation' could mean. This analysis will be supplemented by a glance at Ambrose's most significant predecessor in that regard, the Roman bishop Damasus, and an important follower of his, the poet Prudentius. The plot thickens after the (supposedly) epochal event of the fall of Rome in 410. The reaction this prompted from Augustine, the prolific bishop of North-African Hippo, is recorded in his major work, *de civitate Dei*, composed in the aftermath of the sack of the city by the Goths. Although it is occasioned by the fall of Rome, it dwells far more extensively on the foundation of the city, and on the foundation of a Christian, heavenly city that eclipses all earthly events. The vicissitudes and complexities of ktistic renewal are revealed once more in Augustine's massive and influential work on the city of God. Analogous to Propertius' reaction to Vergil, Augustine's line of reasoning will be evaluated by looking at the reaction from his contemporary, Jerome, as well as the forceful reinstatement of Ambrose's and Prudentius' concept of ktistic renewal by the Roman pontiff Leo the Great, around 450.

3. Methodology and approach

The vast topic of ktistic renewal in the Roman world is understudied as a separate phenomenon. Therefore, the material analysed in this thesis is limited in several ways. First of all, two restricted periods of time are selected for investigation. This thesis treats the phenomenon of ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity. These periods were chosen because they represent major turning points of Roman history, during which the changes in Roman society and the political system are most likely to reflect on the way Roman rulers reconfigured themselves vis-à-vis the foundation of Rome. Moreover, it was in these periods that the position of Rome as a centre was increasingly challenged, a circumstance that is likely to have reflected on attitudes towards the city's foundation. Treating two such periods in a comparative approach has the additional advantage of bringing to the fore both their particular characteristics and the general qualities they share. Moreover, Late Antique conceptions of ktistic renewal heavily depend on Augustan precedents. Therefore, it is crucial to study them in conjunction.

Apart from a chronological focus, the material treated in the case studies is limited largely to written documents and literary texts. This dissertation approaches ktistic renewal as a discursive practice, a corollary and extension of what has recently been described as 'foundation discourses'.⁷⁶ Ktistic renewal will certainly have impacted society at large, finding expression in cult practices, urbanistics, artistic representation and public festivities, but our evidence for the phenomenon is most explicit in written sources. The conceptual development of ktistic renewal is perhaps comparable to that of divinization and deification, a topic intensively studied by classical scholars, also in recent years.⁷⁷ Although there always remained a neat (though far from impenetrable) barrier between gods and mortals, some mortals were thought to have transgressed that boundary and to have become gods. Logically, such transgression affects the conceptual value of divinity. Scholars stress, in fact, that divinization can be hard to define.⁷⁸ Moreover, divinization also had literary and rhetorical aspects, like ktistic renewal, but it was no less 'real' because of that: the practice was present in the everyday reality of ancient people. Unfortunately, the sources that have come down to us are mostly of a literary and rhetorical nature. That is the main catch, and one of the problems to overcome when studying phenomena such as these.

Ultimately, considering someone a founder was a speech act, designating that person with the appropriate title of *κτιστης* or *conditor*. Such designations have come down to us on coin legends, public inscriptions and, most of all, in the works of ancient literature. Poets, historiographers and authors active in other genres devoted ample attention to city founders, and often used the appropriate terms in a conscious way to make their identification of a certain individual as founder quite explicit. The verbs *κτίζειν*, in Greek, and *condere* (as well as, increasingly, *fundare*), in Latin, became the standard technical terms to describe acts of foundation.⁷⁹ The importance of the use or avoidance of these terms will be studied in particular in chapters 2 and 5, revealing the care authors employed in using them (or not). Ktistic renewal depended heavily on language, as the traditional rituals related to city founding (augury/oracular guidance; tracing the city's circumference; establishing cults, laws and social organization) were not always, or not all, (explicitly) re-performed or re-

⁷⁶ Mac Sweeney (2015). On discourse theory in general, see e.g. Landwehr (2001), and, for a concise definition applied to ancient sources, Schauer (2007) 35–36.

⁷⁷ See Koortbojian (2013), Cole (2013), Petrović (2015), Xinyue (2022). Habicht (1956), reprinted in 1970, and Price (1984) remain fundamental.

⁷⁸ Cf. Koortbojian (2013) 2: '(...) Romans began to offer other citizens those same rites that were the staple of, indeed, that defined, their relations with their gods. But what such rites *meant* in these instances is far from clear' (italics in the original) and Xinyue (2022) 6–8.

⁷⁹ For a full linguistic spectrum, see chapters 2 and 5, below.

enacted in the case of refoundation. Augustus never drove a plow around Rome, as far as we know.⁸⁰ Significantly, he did reorganize Rome in terms of cults and temples, legislation, administration, infrastructure and urban planning. While these actions in themselves did not make him a founder, they may very well have given rise to, or have strengthened, the interpretation of his reign as an act of renewed foundation. That interpretation only becomes manifest, however, as soon as ktistic vocabulary is employed to describe it. If all other sources apart from the *Res Gestae* had been lost, there would be no evidence to interpret Augustus' own claim to have restored (*refeci*, 20.4) no less than 82 temples as an act of ktistic renewal. The fact, however, that Livy refers to the same achievement by naming Augustus *templorum omnium conditorem ac restitutorem* ("founder and rebuilder of all temples", IV.20.7),⁸¹ in close connection to a Roman leader, Cornelius Cossus, who was compared to Romulus, clearly provides evidence that Augustus' actions were interpreted as ktistic renewal.⁸²

There were, in fact, many alternative paradigms and discursive strategies to interpret momentous changes to a political entity and/or an individual's role in bringing them about, often approximating the ktistic paradigm: heroism, divine election, rebirth, salvation, resurrection, rejuvenation, blossoming, etc. That ancient societies such as the Greek and Roman ones used ktistic paradigms to express great changes amounting to a new beginning was, undoubtedly, culturally determined. That cultural determination speaks to us predominantly in ancient (literary) language.⁸³ Iconography and ritual, for example, are prominent categories of evidence when it comes to investigating ancient ideas of deification and divine honors for mortals. For foundation and refoundation, these categories offer less clear evidence.⁸⁴ In Greek culture, so invested with colonial foundations, there was no foundation ritual that could be enacted or depicted. Although Roman culture did know a very specific foundation ritual, i.e. driving a plow along the circumference of the new city

^{80.} For the assumption that he did, see Alföldi (1951) 213, with 205 on Sulla.

^{81.} Sailor (2006), especially 338-339, 364-365; cf. Ovid's undoubtably intentional departure from Livy's terms in *Fasti* II.63, employing the recondite synonyms *positor* and *repositor*.

^{82.} Miles (1988) 193-204 = (1995) 119-125; cf. Galinsky (1996) 286.

^{83.} Also the range of paradigms and the distinctions between them are of course culturally determined, and sometimes even linguistically; cf. the subtle distinctions (e.g. Goldammer (1976) 215 s.v. 'Gründer') between German *stiften* and *gründen* (next to *schöpfen*, 'to create'), as alternative verbs denoting what English typically amasses under the single lexeme 'to found', just like the Dutch cognate of 'stiften', i.e. *stichten*, which also means '*gründen*'. Although this thesis investigates ancient perceptions and expressions of these concepts in Latin and Greek, one should be aware of one's own culturally determined frames of reference – such as the one imposed by the decision to write this thesis in English.

^{84.} For an attempt to use the ritual of the Lupercalia as a case study for cultural memory of Rome's foundation, see Vuković (2023).

dressed in a specific way,⁸⁵ we have no depiction of Rome's legendary founders in an iconography which is even related to that ritual. The most prominent iconographic theme related to Rome's foundation is, of course, the scene of the she-wolf nursing the twins, followed at some distance by the scene of Aeneas leaving Troy.⁸⁶ To the best of my knowledge, however, there is no recorded iconography of a refounder of Rome being nursed by the she-wolf, nor a variant of Aeneas' pose when leaving Troy, which shows a later figure in the position of Aeneas carrying the *sacra* or Augustus carrying Julius Caesar on his shoulders and one of his designated successors by the hand. Most of what we have, apart from written documents, is evidence that refounders could occupy a position that was otherwise occupied by founders: the reverse of coins, a tomb in the agora, the beneficiary of a civic cult, representation as divine figure. These traits, however, were not exclusively reserved to founders, and they could equally point to one of the approximating paradigms mentioned above. They cannot, by themselves, provide sufficient evidence of ktistic renewal.

That is not to say that nonverbal evidence is to be neglected – in fact, several such types of material will be included where they offer additional or circumstantial evidence for ktistic renewal. Certainly, much could be – and is – made of juxtapositions of founders and their ktistic successors in contemporary art, architecture, coinage, religious practices and urban design, especially since the work of Paul Zanker and others.⁸⁷ The *casa Romuli* on the Palatine Hill, the iconography of the Ara Pacis and the layout and decoration of the Forum Augustum have all been studied in depth in recent decades (see further below, and chapter 1). A systematic attempt to apply that specific type of iconographical, architectural and urbanistic analysis to rare Augustan cases that have not yet been examined, or to Late Antique cases of ktistic renewal (which still eagerly await such treatment), would far exceed both the scope of this thesis and the capacities of its author. Some attempt will nevertheless be made – especially in chapter 3, dealing with a period for which a large part of the literary sources, for a very specific reason, have been lost.

⁸⁵ See the classic treatment in Fustel de Coulanges (1876⁶) 155–161, and Termeer (2015) 129, with further references, on the notion that 'the ploughing ritual may well be a Late Republican invention'.

⁸⁶ For an interesting medieval iconographic theme depicting Constantine as founder of Constantinople, see Hekster (2020b) 35, 37; I am less sure whether '[m]any images show Constantine as founder of the cities (...), like a fourth-century cameo from the Hermitage'.

⁸⁷ Zanker's seminal study on *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Zanker (1990²)) first appeared in 1987; an English translation appeared in 1988 (and has not been updated since). Although he is often quoted alone as the fountainhead of a new view on Augustan imagery and iconography, Zanker's work was part of a wider development: see Edmondson (2009) 23–25; Hekster (2020a).

Apart from the fact that the analysis of these types of material often, implicitly or explicitly, departs from notions extracted from (literary) texts, another problem presents itself. This investigation of ktistic renewal focuses on authorial agency and chronological precedence. It is of crucial importance to investigate when a given circumstance or act was first interpreted as ktistic renewal, and – if possible – by whom. Ancient non-literary sources are, notoriously, harder to pin down in terms of agency. More importantly, they are often hard to date with precision, or – as in the case of the Augustan examples mentioned above – postdate the first attestations of claims of ktistic renewal in the literary record.⁸⁸

The nonverbal evidence could (and perhaps should) fill a dissertation of its own, which is why it can only be treated in passing in this thesis. Still, the present author is convinced that the method adopted and the case studies chosen have the potential to reveal the major developments. Two examples may illustrate this. The way Vergil (like Livy) represents the foundation of Rome as an incremental process, for example, in which multiple founders are seen to supplement one another, seems to tie in rather well with the existence of multiple, seemingly contradictive monuments related to Rome's foundation in the Augustan Age, such as the two huts of Romulus (on the Palatine and Capitol) and the two fig-trees associated with Rumina (on the Forum and near the Palatine), under which the twins would have been suckled.⁸⁹ That seeming contradiction, on a different note, is largely resolved when these monuments are treated as 'mnemotopes'.⁹⁰ Similarly, developments that can be traced in Late Antique texts seem to have their visual and cultic counterparts. The gradual promotion of Peter and Paul to Christian founders of Rome seems to keep track with the increasing importance of their communal feast on 29 June, and the joint iconography which showcases their *concordia apostolorum*.⁹¹

How to read and interpret the literary texts that make up the bulk of our material? The interpretation of intensively discussed literary artifacts naturally calls for specific methodological reflection. Vergil's *Aeneid*, treated in chapter 2, is a prime example. Any interpretation of the epic is forced to position itself methodologically in the wide array of contrasting interpretations of the poem's purpose and meaning in the vigorous academic debates between interpreters associated with the so-called

^{88.} The Lupercalia is a good example: as Vuković (2023) 282 himself states, '[t]he first extensive evidence on the festival comes from the late Republic', making it hard to reconstruct the festival prior to Caesar's and Augustus' involvement.

^{89.} Edwards (1996) 31-43; Klodt (2001) 11-36; Hunt (2012); Wiseman (2013) 251, 253-263; cf. Hunsucker and Praet (2016) 2-3.

^{90.} See van Rookhuijzen (2017) 25.

^{91.} See note 1006, below.

'optimistic' and 'pessimistic', or 'Augustan' and 'ambivalent' schools.⁹² The problem any study of the *Aeneid* has come to face is that almost any given passage can be interpreted in contrasting, even opposing ways. This is not so much because of a different interpretation of that same passage and its immediate context, but because any given and apparently straightforward meaning can be radically altered by its position and connections within the larger textual universe of the *Aeneid* as a whole, Vergil's entire oeuvre and the totality of Latin, indeed all of classical poetry and literature.⁹³

As a consequence, it has become suspect, sometimes almost impossible, to wrest meaning from a single episode or a set of passages. While it is probably for the better that a variety of literary contexts is necessarily taken into account, it should also be clear that this style of investigation may risk to perilize any attempt at overall interpretation. Any conclusion could be booby-trapped by hidden meanings revealed only through intertextual analysis that scholars outside (classical) literature departments may consider exceedingly sophisticated.⁹⁴ The postulate governing this hermeneutical imperative is that poets like Vergil worked in a literary culture that expected intimate familiarity with the works of predecessors, also on the side of the audience, and mastery of the knowledge and tools required to 'decode' several layers of meaning.⁹⁵ At the same time, one may wonder if the possibility of subverting a given reading by adducing intertextual parallels also entails the necessity to interpret a passage along these lines.

Apart from that, most of the more sophisticated literary critics are less obsessive about other, none-literary contexts to be taken into account, which risks making a work like the *Aeneid* a hermeneutical bastion of literary-awareness detached from its historical context. The fierce debate about the epic's finale, for example, – a debate indicative of the contrasting interpretations of the political message of the work as a whole – rests not only on a diverging ideological interpretation, but also on different methods and privileged working principles. In general, there is a divide between approaches leaning more towards a focus on literary technique, intertextuality

⁹² See the overviews in Tarrant (2012) 16–17, 24–26; Schauer (2007) 27–28; Schmidt (2000); Hardie (1998) 94–101; Harrison (1990).

⁹³ Exemplary Putnam (1995) 1; see also the short overview in Galinsky (1996) 245. For macrotextual developments in Vergil's oeuvre, see Buchheit (1972), with (1973); Boyle (1986); Hardie (1998) 1; and more specifically G. Maddoli s.v. 'Romolo' in *EV IV* (1988) 571–573, observing 'continuity of the poetical and political programme of Vergil between the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*' (*ibid.* 572).

⁹⁴ See e.g. the ancient historian J.A. Crook in *CAH X²*, 143: 'Some recent claims may have come to be thought exaggerated.'

⁹⁵ See Galinsky (1996) 229.

and narratology (e.g. Putnam and Thomas) and those favouring a more ‘historical’ reading, leaning towards a focus on the work’s historical and social context, contemporary with political developments (e.g. Horsfall, Galinsky and Stahl). While the former, for example, may attach great weight to the intertextually evoked context of a distant and implicit poetical model,⁹⁶ the latter will more likely lean to a reading where intertextually evoked connotations are less important than the rhetoric of a passage in its immediate narrative context and its consistency with Roman social values more broadly.⁹⁷

It is assumed here that the *Aeneid* was composed for an audience that consisted not exclusively (and perhaps not even mainly) of fellow poets, literary critics, and twenty-first century classicists, and that there is a point where allusive sophistication no longer governs the meaning of a work as popular and as widely read as the *Aeneid*. It is also assumed that when a conclusion drawn from literary analysis is in harmony with contemporary historical phenomena, it is rendered more likely, and when less so, less likely.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, it should be clear that I do not aim to produce a single, ‘essential’ reading of the poem as a self-contained set of pre-configured meanings. Rather, I hope to give an interpretation that builds on more dynamic readings and re-readings, informed by intra- and intertextual awareness to such an extent that it becomes a statement of the obvious that a given passage or expression in the *Aeneid* has more than one layer of meaning. The approach taken here is sympathetic to what Galinsky describes (in more elegant terms) as an ‘historical approach’ to Augustan poetry.⁹⁹ That approach is a viable way to read literary texts from Late Antiquity as well, and is broadly adopted in this thesis.

Augustan poetry calls for specific methodologies in addition to the one outlined above. When it comes to Vergil’s treatment of a theme as historically significant and embedded in contemporary cultural discourse as the foundation of Rome, it should come as no surprise that different reactions to such a treatment, i.e. different readings of the poem, are possible. Typical ‘Augustan polysemy’, to use Karl Galinsky’s term,¹⁰⁰ is a key feature of the *Aeneid* which informs this interpretation: I hope my treatment accommodates the complexity of the process that gives meaning to a text

^{96.} E.g. Putnam (2011) 50 on such a ‘latent parallel’, and cf. Stahl (2016) 13–17 *contra* Putnam (1965) 154–156 (revisited in Putnam (2011) 108–109).

^{97.} Cf. Stahl (2016) 24–25 for an illuminating case, and 96 n. 1 for an explicit statement on the limited value of intertextuality for interpretation.

^{98.} Cf. Horsfall (1995) 195.

^{99.} Galinsky (1996) 245. For the typological interpretation of, e.g., Vergil’s *Aeneid*, see briefly notes 285 and 301, below.

^{100.} E.g. *ibid.* 225.

as saliently interactive (both with other texts and with different possible audiences) as the *Aeneid*. My working principle closely coheres to Ernst Schmidt's point that a more 'Augustan' and a less 'Augustan' reading of the whole need not necessarily oppose and exclude one another.¹⁰¹ Laudatory and critical passages can coexist and need not necessarily subvert one another's meaning. It seems furthermore questionable to link the moral attitudes involved in support of military prowess and empire-building vs. empathy and sorrow for the costs of war and violence directly to political affiliations: as if partisans of Augustus were all ruthless, and his opponents all peace-loving. Any attempt at a neat political distribution of attitudes breaks down when the patriotic element of Rome's foundation is concerned. Doubtlessly there were those who opposed the Augustan regime and found recognition and respect for their loss, or even hope and inspiration in the *Aeneid*. Doubtlessly, there were others who equally found hope and inspiration in a poem that nurtured their patriotism and sense of pride. Whatever the political affiliations were among the audience Vergil was writing for, if his work were to praise the *princeps*, he did very well to do so through a sustained focus on the arguably suprapartisan, integratory story of Rome's origins, rather than outright personal praise detached from Roman tradition and exemplary history.

So far for the interpretive minefields of Augustan poetry. Similar considerations apply also to the contexts Late Antique panegyrists and Christian poets like Prudentius were working in, and the audiences they were writing and performing for. Recently, Kaldellis has issued the valuable warning that Late Antiquity, by now, tends to invite or favour its own specific methodological approach, which risks a tunnel-vision of sorts.¹⁰² It is the explicit goal of the present thesis to study the phenomenon of ktistic renewal over time in a methodologically uniform way. The Late Imperial panegyrics or the poetry of Prudentius are equally intricate literary works, deserving an equal amount of attention to style and detail. There is, however, one major difference, albeit a circumstantial one. Just like there is much less scholarly work on the urbanistic analysis (familiar from studies on Augustan Rome) of Late Antique cases of ktistic renewal, also the interpretation of Late Antique poetry and prose featuring passages about Rome's foundation is much less discussed. Often, rather than being contested, the passages discussed in this thesis have not been commented upon in detail by literary scholars. Therefore, hermeneutical discussions will often be a less prominent part of our investigation. It also entails that the interpretation offered here is more often a first attempt at wresting meaning from these texts as sources of political ideology, and it is hoped that this will invite later scholars to further improve upon it.

^{101.} Schmidt (2000) 146.

^{102.} Kaldellis (2020).

PART A

The Augustan Age

CHAPTER

I

OVERVIEW

*Augustus as *alter conditor**

The chapters in part A investigate the first case of ktistic renewal treated in this thesis, namely the way the Augustan principate was presented and interpreted as a refoundation of Rome. References to the original foundation of Rome in the Augustan Age were many, and most of them (if not all) seem to reflect on Augustus and his actions.¹⁰³ Because of this, we have a lot of circumstantial, implicit evidence at our disposal. One of the main difficulties in studying this case of ktistic renewal, however, is that explicit evidence for the identification of the *princeps* as refounder of Rome mostly postdates the Augustan period. That raises the question whether Augustus actively styled and presented himself as Rome's refounder (in which case explicit contemporary evidence could be expected to have existed, but may of course have been lost afterwards), or was rather presented as such only implicitly, in literary and artistic interpretations of his regime. In that case, the later, explicit evidence may be an indication that Imperial authors could no longer distinguish between Augustus' own statements and interpretations of his actions by his contemporaries, and projected these contemporary interpretations on the *princeps* himself. In a way, modern scholars have a tendency to do the same, and to connect both the contemporary, implicit evidence and the later, explicit evidence directly to Augustus himself.

Chapter 2 will try to tackle the difficult question of Augustus' own involvement versus the role of contemporary authors by treating Vergil's interpretation of the Augustan principate as ktistic renewal in the *Aeneid*, and Propertius' reaction to it. Before turning to those authors, this chapter will provide some of the necessary context by addressing both the *princeps'* own actions and their explicit interpretation as ktistic renewal by later authors and modern scholars alike. As a prelude to chapter 2, the final paragraph of this chapter will discuss how the work of Livy, the most prominent historian writing in the Augustan Age, is interpreted by modern scholars as contemporary evidence for Augustus' role as refounder of Rome.

1.1. *Status quaestionis*

The Augustan Age was a period of far-reaching and profound change (typically masked as some kind of continuity) in a wide variety of domains. Political, social, religious, cultural, economic and artistic elements of what has been termed the Augustan 'revolution' have all been studied with increasing intensity over the past decades.¹⁰⁴ There is one important aspect of Augustan culture, however, where the *princeps* is widely considered by the majority of modern scholars to have simply

^{103.} Cf. Smith (2010) 249: 'The intellectual and emotional connections between the emperor Augustus and the legends of early Rome are well known.'

^{104.} Cf. Osborne and Vout (2010) and see Woolf (2005), especially 108-109, for a poignant critique of predominant views on continuity and change.

preserved a long-standing tradition, merely using it to his advantage: the memory of Romulus and the other founders of the city. In an ocean of change, pre-existing traditions about the city's foundation would have functioned as a stable anchorage, a fixed point of reference used to legitimize the many changes.

There is, in fact, a strong tendency in modern scholarship to take attention for and devotion to Rome's founders in the Augustan Age for granted, as a self-explanatory phenomenon explaining many other phenomena.¹⁰⁵ The *princeps* would have seen himself as a new Romulus, thus motivating and legitimizing his many fundamental changes to Roman politics, society and the urban fabric. Syme stated that Augustus 'had a real claim to be known and honoured as the Founder' and, after his death, 'would receive the honours of the Founder who was also Aeneas and Romulus'.¹⁰⁶ In the decades before and after Syme's seminal study, many articles were devoted to Augustus' imitation of Romulus, resulting in the theory that the *princeps* had known a 'Romulean period'.¹⁰⁷ That view is still upheld by John Scheid, according to whom 'Octavian clearly made references to Romulus and tradition when he was elected consul in 43 B.C.' and the year 27 marks 'the end of the period when he considered Romulus as a possible model'.¹⁰⁸ That presumed period is then used to date Augustus' restoration of a specific priesthood before 27 BC.¹⁰⁹

When Gianfilippo Caretoni identified a house on the Palatine, next to the presumed location of Romulus' legendary hut, as the residence of the *princeps*, it became a commonplace of modern scholarship to explain young Caesar's choice of location by the proximity to the dwelling of Rome's original founder.¹¹⁰ Paul Zanker's reconstruction of the Forum of Augustus also sees imitation of Romulus as a guiding principle of the iconography and architecture of the complex.¹¹¹ Eugenio La Rocca has explained the location of the Augustan Pantheon as the site where Romulus probably ascended to heaven, and sees the axiality with the Mausoleum of Augustus, to the

^{105.} Some (announced) skepticism in Smith (2010) 250; Ver Eecke (2006) 76 n. 7 remarks on the absence of a synthesis of 'le «romulisme» d'Auguste'.

^{106.} Syme (1939) 520, 524; cf. 305–306.

^{107.} See the critical overview in Kienast (1982) 79–80 = (1999²) 93, with updated bibliography in n. 45. The idea seems to originate with von Premerstein (1937): see Kornemann (1938) 81, who alternates the terms 'Romulusepoche' (81–82), 'Romulusgedanken' (82 n. 3) and 'Romulus-Ideologie' (91).

^{108.} Scheid (2005) 184, 181.

^{109.} *Ibid.* 181; cf. La Rocca (2013) 96.

^{110.} See Edwards (1996) 31–43; Carandini and Bruno (2008); Wiseman (2009a), (2012) and (2013) 251, 253–263; Hall (2014) 119–143, 167–185; cf. Hunsucker (2014) 60–61 and (2025). A recent example is Kuhn (2021) 126 n. 52.

^{111.} Zanker (1990²) 196–217. See further Spannagel (1999) and, for the Pompeian evidence crucial to the reconstruction of the decorative program, Heslin (2015) 170.

north of it, as an architectural confirmation of the connection between Romulus as founder and Augustus as refounder of Rome.¹¹² Augustus' reconstruction of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitol, allegedly vowed and built by Romulus as the first temple of the city, is also seen as a case of Romulean policy.¹¹³ In a comprehensive recent book focused on mythological aspects, Antonietta Castiello argues that Augustan retellings of Rome's foundation myth acutely reflect many different contemporary socio-political concerns, from the conflict with Mark Antony to re-establishing a sense of common identity after the civil wars.¹¹⁴

Walter Eder sees 'an intricately thought-out scenario' approximating Augustus to Romulus, encompassing the Secular Games of 17 BC and the restoration of the temple of Quirinus in 16 BC.¹¹⁵ Diana Kleiner, discussing the iconography of the Ara Pacis, compares the role of Gaius and Lucius Caesar to Ascanius and Romulus.¹¹⁶ According to Andrew Erskine, also discussing the Ara Pacis, the positions of Augustus and Aeneas on the friezes drew 'attention to the role of Aeneas as a founder and by association to Augustus as a new founder'.¹¹⁷ Diane Favro remarks that Augustus may have conceived the Forum Augustum as an homage to Caesar and his Forum Iulium by linking Mars as father of Romulus to Venus as mother of Aeneas.¹¹⁸ Discussing how Augustus included worship of his family spirits in shrines at crossroads throughout the entire city after 12 BC, Favro casually notes that '[w]ith his presence permeating Rome, Augustus was *naturally* compared to the city's original founder'.¹¹⁹ Moving from architecture to numismatics, Victoria Györi interprets the presence of the *lituus* (the augural staff) on Augustan coinage as a reference to Romulus, indicating Augustus' status as refounder of Rome.¹²⁰ Confronted with the absence of explicit references to either Romulus or refoundation in Augustus' own *Res gestae*, scholars have attempted to pinpoint implicit references, reading between the lines rather enthusiastically.¹²¹

^{112.} La Rocca (2011) 185–186; (2013) 96, 98 [=126, 128 in the French edition (2014)].

^{113.} La Rocca (2013) 96 [=124 in the French edition (2014)]; Sauron (2014) 35–36 [only in the French edition].

^{114.} Castiello (2021). As the book appeared when the current study was largely completed, I have, sadly, not been able to use and discuss its results as much as I would have wanted. See *ibid.*, p. ix for the book's approach being neither archaeological, nor philological, nor purely historical – in fact, the word *condere*, Nicopolis and crucial passages like Suet., *Aug* 7.2 or Verg., *Aen.* VI.792 are not treated by Castiello.

^{115.} Eder (2005) 24, 28.

^{116.} Kleiner (2005) 224.

^{117.} Erskine (2001) 18, citing e.g. the English translation of the first edition of Zanker (1990), which appeared in 1987, and Galinsky (1996).

^{118.} Favro (2005) 237, 238.

^{119.} *Ibid.* 246 (my italics).

^{120.} Györi (2015).

^{121.} See note 153, below.

According to Trevor Luke, the opening chapters of the text were even structured in such a way, that they alluded to different stages in the life of Romulus.¹²²

Romulus and Aeneas were, by no means, insignificant figures in Augustan Rome, but their dominating influence in important decisions is not so well attested as these claims might make one think. What did Augustus actually do that would have made it natural and self-evident for his fellow Romans to compare him to the founders of their city and consider him to be the new founder? Many reasons could be (and in fact have been) suggested, connected to actions and events spanning the entire 50-odd years during which the adopted son of Julius Caesar ruled Rome. My main interest, however, is how and when this comparison and the discourse of ktistic renewal originated. Based on the early books of Livy's history of Rome, treating the foundation of the city and its earliest history, Gary Miles has made a convincing case that Livy was a major contributor to the idea that Augustus was the refounder of Rome.¹²³ As Livy's books on Augustus himself are lost, however, Miles was able to present only implicit evidence for that thesis.¹²⁴ We will come back to that evidence at the end of this chapter, but before we do so, it is important to look at the later, explicit evidence on which also Miles' interpretations are ultimately based. When studying the Augustan sources and artifacts on which our interpretation is based, we must take extra care to proceed deductively. It is beyond dispute that Augustus was compared to Romulus and other ktistic heroes of Rome, but instead of treating our sources as self-evident manifestations of a large-scale Augustan ideology, we must scrutinize every individual source in detail to find out how exactly it contributes to a general development.¹²⁵ That development is not necessarily a top-down process, nor is its result inevitable. In order to get a better grip on these issues, this thesis will take an unusual course and start with the explicit evidence from later authors, writing in the Imperial period. We will then work our way back through time and discuss the material from the Augustan Age itself that possibly points to a role of the *princeps* in this process.

1.2. Imperial views

At least from the second century AD onwards, it is a recurring feature of historiographical and biographical treatments of Caesar Augustus to connect significant aspects of his reign to the traditions surrounding the foundation of Rome.¹²⁶ This paragraph analyzes the treatments of Suetonius, Florus and Cassius Dio.

^{122.} Luke (2014) 200–206.

^{123.} Miles (1986), (1988).

^{124.} Miles (1995) 92, 94. See further below, p. 52.

^{125.} Cf. Clarke (2005) 277 for a similar expression of caution in the field of domestic interior decoration.

^{126.} See e.g. Pelling (1990) 48.

In the first decades of the second century, Suetonius wrote his biography of Augustus – still an invaluable source of information, although it ‘needs to be enjoyed with a lump, rather than a grain of salt’.¹²⁷ Such skepticism is warranted, for example, in the case of Suetonius’ catalog of omens portending Augustus’ future greatness (Suet. *Aug.* 94–95). After prodigious snakes, ominous eagles and prophetic palm trees, Suetonius recounts that “when he first took the auspices as consul, twelve vultures appeared to him, as they had appeared to Romulus” (*primo autem consulatu et augurium capienti duodecim se vultures ut Romulo ostenderunt*).¹²⁸ At the same time, it seems less likely that Suetonius (or any earlier source, including Augustus himself) invented the following scene, in the more reliable context of the history of Augustus’ nomenclature: (Suet. *Aug.* 7.2)

Postea Gai Caesaris et deinde Augusti cognomen assumpsit, alterum testamento maioris avunculi, alterum Munati Planci sententia, cum quibusdam censemibus Romulum appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis, praevaluisset, ut Augustus potius vocaretur, non tantum novo sed etiam ampliore cognomine, quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur, ab auctu vel ab avium gestu gustuve, sicut etiam Ennius docet sribens:

Augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est.

Later he took the surname of Gaius Caesar and subsequently the surname Augustus, the former by the will of his great-uncle, the latter on the motion of Munatius Plancus, since, when certain men expressed the opinion that he ought to be called Romulus, inasmuch as he himself too was a founder of the city, the motion of Plancus prevailed that he should rather be named Augustus, with not only a new, but also a more grand surname, inasmuch as sacred places too, and those in which anything is consecrated by augural rites are called “august” (*augusta*), from increase (*auctus*) or the movement or feeding of birds (*avium gestu gustuve*), as Ennius also teaches us when he writes:

“After illustrious Rome had been founded by august augury.”

This is the passage on which modern interpretations of Augustus as re-founder of Rome are often based. Reporting a debate in the Senate on 16 January, 27 BC,¹²⁹ Suetonius carefully represents the proposals of two different honorary *cognomina*

^{127.} Galinsky (2012) xix.

^{128.} Suet. *Aug.* 95. Cf. App. BC III.388; Dio LVI.46.2; Obseq. 69. See also Green (2009) 149; Singer (2022) 175–176 (whose argument for the omen’s presence in the works of Livy, based on Iulius Obsequens, should be treated with caution).

^{129.} For the date, recorded by the *Fasti Praenestini*, see Kienast (1982) 71 = (1999²) 83; Wardle (2014) 105.

for the *princeps*, ‘Romulus’ and ‘Augustus’, with their respective arguments. Some senators, it is said, were of the opinion that it would be proper that he would be called ‘Romulus’ *quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis* (“inasmuch as he himself too [was] a founder of the city”). It is important to scrutinize this phrase very precisely. Both the revised Loeb edition and Graves freely translate *et ipsum* ('he himself too') as ‘the second [founder]’,¹³⁰ an expression that must have been familiar to them from Livy, who speaks of Camillus being hailed as *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis* (“a Romulus and father of the fatherland and second founder of the city”, V.49.7) and *secundum a Romulo conditorem urbis Romanae* (“the second founder of the Roman city after Romulus”, VII.1.10).¹³¹ It is important to realize that, in Suetonius’ text, the senators’ proposal does not style Augustus as a second founder (*conditor alter* or *secundus conditor*), but describes the *princeps* as an outright *conditor urbis* himself, only adding that ‘he too’ was a founder of the city, on a par with Romulus. The ktistic paradigm employed by these elusive senators to interpret Augustus’ actions is that of foundation, not refoundation.

While the name Romulus explicitly presented him as founder, the alternative also had an implicit connection to the city’s foundation by Romulus. ‘Augustus’ was the word used in a famous line by the hallowed 2nd century poet Ennius to describe the foundation augury obtained by Romulus, i.e. the twelve vultures, as the *augurium augustum*. Accordingly, the name Augustus retained only the ktistic associations of Romulus’ name, excluding any other possible negative aspects of Romulus’ legacy, such as fratricide and monarchy.¹³² That made Munatius’ proposal quite a brilliant one, and it is noticeable that Velleius Paterculus (II.91.1) reports that it was accepted by “the universal consensus of the Senate and a Roman people”, without mentioning Romulus as an alternative. That the very name of Rome’s founder was an option to be seriously entertained is likely, nonetheless. Both Florus and Cassius Dio also mention it. The former, a contemporary of Suetonius, reports the discussion in the Senate in a slightly different fashion: (II.34/IV.12.66)

^{130.} Rolfe (1998) 159; Graves (1957) 54. Wardle (2014) 43 more accurately translates ‘on the grounds that he too was the founder of the city’ – although he seems to miss the nuance of *quasi*, and the use of the definite article (*the founder*) raises additional questions.

^{131.} See further below, p. 50-58.

^{132.} Furthermore, as Vergil’s *Aeneid* had yet to appear, it linked young Caesar to Ennius’ *Annales*, the epic poem that, perhaps more than any other work, represented the tradition of praise for the *exempla* of Rome’s (heroic) past to the generation preceding the *princeps*, and probably also to his own generation: see Goldschmidt (2013) 19-28. Sadly, Goldschmidt spends few words on Munatius’/Augustus’ evocation of Ennius here.

Tractatum etiam in senatu, an, quia condidisset imperium, Romulus vocaretur; sed sanctius et reverentius visum est nomen Augusti, ut scilicet iam tum, dum colit terras, ipso nomine et titulo consecraretur.

It was also discussed in the senate whether, because he had founded the empire, he should not be called Romulus; but the name of Augustus was deemed more holy and venerable, in order that already then, while he still dwelt upon earth, he might be regarded as divine through his very name and title.

The man to be named Augustus is now seen not as a city founder, but as the founder of the empire, a role that apparently equalled or called to mind that of Romulus.¹³³ Although the emphasis is slightly different, and decidedly wider in scope, it is revealing that Florus also connects the name of Romulus uniquely to his ktistic role. The name Augustus, on the other hand, only has divine associations in the condensed account of Florus.¹³⁴

The accounts of Suetonius and Florus contrast sharply with the treatment of the episode by Cassius Dio: (LIII.16.4-8)

(χαλεῖται δὲ τὰ βασιλεια παλάτιον, οὐχ ὅτι καὶ ἔδοξε ποτε οὕτως αὐτὰ ὀνομάξεσθαι, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐν τε τῷ Παλατίῳ ὁ Καῖσαρ ὥκει καὶ ἐκεῖ τὸ στρατήγιον εἶχε, καὶ τινα καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Ῥωμύλου προενόικησιν φῆμην ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ παντὸς ὅρους ἔλαβε: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κἀν ἀλλοθί που ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ καταλύῃ, τὴν τοῦ παλατίου ἐπίκλησιν ἡ καταγωγὴ αὐτοῦ ἰσχεῖ). ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτὰ ἐπετέλεσεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου ὄνομα καὶ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ δῆμου ἐπέθετο. βουληθέντων γάρ σφων ιδίως πως αὐτὸν προσειπεῖν, καὶ τῶν μὲν τὸ τῶν δὲ τὸ καὶ ἐσηγονμένων καὶ αἰρουμένων, ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐπεθύμει μὲν ἴσχυρῶς Ῥωμύλος ὄνομασθῆναι, αἰσθόμενος δὲ ὅτι ὑποπτεύεται ἐκ τούτου τῆς βασιλείας ἐπιθυμεῖν, οὐκέτι ἀντεποιήσατο, ἀλλὰ Αὐγούστος ὡς καὶ πλεῖόν τι ἡ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὡν ἐπεκλήθη: πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἐντιμότατα καὶ τὰ ἱερώτατα αὐγονστα προσαγορεύεται.

^{133.} Cf. Plin. N.H. XV.77 on Romulus and Remus as *conditores imperii*. The idea might go back to Alexander, who was honored both as founder of Alexandria and as founder of his empire in later sources: see Leschhorn (1984) 208, and cf. Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1144.

^{134.} Although that is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it would be interesting to delve further into the possible Hadrianic overtones of Augustus' ktistic connection to Romulus, at a moment in Roman History when Hadrian himself looked back at the foundation of Rome; cf., speculatively, Gagé (1936), and see page 15, above.

(The royal residence is called *Palatium*/Palatine, not because it was ever decreed that this should be called thus, but because Caesar dwelt on the Palatine and had his military headquarters there, though his residence also gained a certain degree of fame from the mount as a whole, because it had been Romulus' former residence before. Hence, even if the emperor resides somewhere else, his dwelling retains the name of the Palatine.) And when Caesar had actually carried out his promises, so the name Augustus was bestowed upon him by the senate and by the people. For when they wished to call him by some distinctive title, and some men were proposing and advocating one title, and other men another, Caesar strongly desired to be called Romulus, but when he perceived, however, that this caused him to be suspected of desiring the kingship, he did no longer pursue it, but was called Augustus, signifying that he was more than human; for all the most precious and sacred objects are termed *augusta*.

Dio, writing in the first half of the third century, intertwines various strands of arguments in this passage. The 'promises' carried out by Caesar (ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τῷ ἐργῷ αὐτὰ ἐπετέλεσεν), after which he was awarded the name Augustus, are described by Dio in a lengthly speech by the *princeps* himself addressed to the Senate (LIII.3-10). Almost the entirety of the previous book (LII) consists of a debate between Agrippa and Maecenas, arguing extensively that young Caesar ought to institute a democracy or monarchy, respectively.¹³⁵ What these three speeches (Agrippa and Maecenas to Caesar, and Caesar to the Senate) have in common is their theoretical and highly fictitious character.¹³⁶ Dwelling on constitutional matters at great length and drawing extensively on notions of political psychology, they seem more at home in the tradition of Greek historiography Cassius Dio was following, than in the mythical rhetoric at Rome in the early 20's BC.¹³⁷ Focusing on the nature of monarchy throughout these books, and drawing comparisons with his own recent experience and intermediate imperial history (LII.42.6, LIII.12.9, 14.4, 16.3, 17.3, 18.4-5) Dio's narrative is clearly tendential in presenting Caesar as motivated by a lust for monarchical power (LIII.11.5).¹³⁸ It thus comes as no surprise that Dio claims that "Caesar strongly desired to be called Romulus". All Dio relates about Caesar's connection to Romulus

^{135.} Dionysius of Halicarnassus ascribes a similar constitutional question to Romulus himself at the foundation of Rome (II.3.7).

^{136.} Wardle (2014) 216: 'highly artificial and unhistorical'.

^{137.} See e.g. Baron (2021) and some of the other contributions in Madsen and Lange (2021).

^{138.} Cf. Hellström (2021) 202-203. Kuhn (2021) seems to overstretch this point when arguing that Tiberius' comparison of Augustus with Romulus, in his funeral oration for the former (LVI.36.3), was a Severan anachronism that should be attributed to Cassius Dio, rather than the historical Tiberius.

is motivated in political terms and focused on political kingship.¹³⁹ Interestingly, that also seems to be so in the case of Dio's introductory digression on the Palatine as the site of Caesar's "royal residence" ($\tauὰ βασιλεια$; 16.5 picks up $\tauῶν βασιλείων$ in 16.4). The place is famous, says Dio, because of Romulus' $\piροενοίκησιν$, "former residence" there. Dio thus stresses that Romulus preceded Caesar in his political capacity of a monarchical ruler dwelling on the same Palatine hill – not, clearly, as founder of Rome. Dio completely glosses over the ktistic associations of the Palatine, 'Romulus' as a name and the title of 'Augustus'. To the Bythinian senator of the third century, Augustus' ktistic emulation of Romulus seemed not to have mattered much. Dio's interpretation of the title Augustus is clear from the allusion with which he lets Maecenas finish his plea for monarchy: the people "will pay reverence to your august position by still another term of address, so that you will enjoy fully the reality of the kingship without the odium which attaches to the name of 'king'" (LII.40.2). In a similar vein, Tacitus has opened his *Annals* with a miniature summary of Roman history implying that political development, from the kings to Augustus, had come full circle.¹⁴⁰

Tacitus and Cassius Dio, on the one hand, and Suetonius and Florus, on the other, thus represent contrasting ways of interpreting Augustus' connection to Romulus. The striking difference is very likely connected to the genre, political climate and intellectual milieu in which these authors operated. Tacitus and Cassius Dio were both senators with experience as active politicians under monarchical rule, and they both display a major interest in the political organization of the state and the distribution of power. Suetonius, by contrast, was an imperial official with active experience as a bureaucrat; the major interest of his work is in how the principate as a system can function in the best possible way.¹⁴¹ It makes sense that Suetonius regarded Augustus mainly as the initiator of that system, as the founder of the principate. Looking at Augustus with hindsight, it makes sense that these authors interpreted the connection between Romulus and Augustus in light of their own dominating view of the *princeps*, either as monarchical ruler or as founder of a new form of government. In the former case, continuity between Romulus and Augustus takes centre stage; in the latter, there is both continuity and discontinuity in a way that is typical for ktistic renewal. In order to evaluate properly what fueled a political, or constitutional, interpretation of Romulus' *exemplum* versus a ktistic or religious one, it would be necessary to relate these interpretations more fully to the

^{139.} On Dio and kingship, see the contributions in Davenport and Mallan (2021).

^{140.} Cf. Béranger (1953) 57–58 for the comparable views of Tacitus and Cassius Dio.

^{141.} See Mellor (1999) 152–153.

literary and historical contexts that produced them.¹⁴² That is beyond the scope of this study; it may suffice, therefore, to note that the connection between Romulus and Augustus was variously interpreted. At the same time, we have good reasons to attach credibility to the versions presented by Suetonius and Florus. Closing in on the *princeps*' own actions and attitudes, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at other valuable passages in the *Life* of Suetonius relating to Augustus' ktistic status.

1.3. The faceless founder

When the emperor Augustus lay on his deathbed, he looked back on his long and busy life with considerable sense of humor. According to Suetonius, at least, his last words before his loving goodbye to Livia were a witty parody of the usual end of a theatre play: “Since well I’ve played my part, all clap your hands and from the stage dismiss me with applause”.¹⁴³ This humorist tendency, however, spans the entire section on the end of Augustus’ life in Suetonius’ biography. When the emperor is on his last trip, he spends a couple of days in his villa on Capri. The island apparently instills a playful attitude in the *princeps*: he delights in collective cultural cross-dressing, and encourages local youths to joke around. In Suetonius’ words, ‘in fact, he indulged in every form of fun’ (98.3). Then, Suetonius tells us, Augustus’ humoristic mood suddenly takes a ktistic turn: (98.4)

Vicinam Capreis insulam Apragopolim appellabat a desidia secedentium illuc e comitatu suo. Sed ex dilectis unum, Masgaban nomine, quasi conditorem insulae κτίστην vocare consueverat. Huius Masgabae ante annum defuncti tumulum cum e triclinio animadvertisset magna turba multisque luminibus frequentari, versum compositum ex tempore clare pronuntiavit: κτίστον δὲ τύμβον εἰσορῶ πυρούμενον. conversusque ad Thrasyl<λ>um Tiberi comitem contra accubantem et ignarum rei interrogavit, cuiusnam poetae putaret esse; quo haesitante subiecit alium: ὁρᾶς φάεσσι Μασγάβαν τιμώμενον; ac de hoc quoque consuluit. Cum ille nihil aliud responderet quam, cuiuscumque essent optimos esse, cachinnum sustulit atque in iocos effusus est.

He called an island near Capreae “Apragopolis”, from the idleness of some of his entourage who sojourned there. Besides he had used to call one of his favourites, Masgaba by name, “Ktistes”, as if he were the founder of the island. When he had noticed from his dining-room that the tomb of this Masgaba, who had died the year before, was being

^{142.} See Swist (2020) for an excellent overview.

^{143.} Suet. Aug. 99.1: *Ἐπει δὲ πάνυ καλῶς πέπαισται, δότε κρότον / καὶ πάντες ἡμᾶς μετὰ χαρᾶς προπέμψατε.*

visited by a large crowd with many torches, he uttered aloud a verse composed on the spot:

“the founder’s tomb I see alight with fire“
and turning to Thrasyllus, Tiberius’ companion, who was reclining opposite him and was unaware of what was going on, he asked of what poet he thought it was the work. When Thrasyllus hesitated, he added another verse:

“Do you see Masgaba honoured with lights?“
and consulted him on this one too. When Thrasyllus could reply nothing else than that they were excellent, whoever composed them, Augustus burst into powerful laughter and made jokes about it.

Apparently, Augustus had been in the habit of calling his friend Masgaba *κτίστης*, “founder” (in Greek) of Apragopolis, “city of do-nothings” (also in Greek).¹⁴⁴ Whether that habit dated to before or after Masgaba’s death in the previous year is unclear, but it is interesting to read Augustus’ pun on the veneration of a founder’s tomb so close to his own death.¹⁴⁵ Evidently, part of the humor lies in the poignant reversal of roles (also evident earlier, in 98.3). Masgaba, as founder of the city where nothing happens, makes for a forceful mirror-image of Augustus himself, the restless ruler of the immense Roman empire, hailed as the second founder of Rome.¹⁴⁶ Possibly, moreover, Augustus was alluding also to his own veneration as founder, after his death,¹⁴⁷ as well as to poetry being written in honour of his own ktistic achievements.

That Augustus’ very specific ‘ktistic humor’ hinges on an evidently very important aspect of the *princeps*’ life,¹⁴⁸ is evinced by the striking similarity with Suetonius’ earlier choice of words. Augustus’ *quasi conditorem insulae κτίστην vocare consueverat* (98.4) recalls the phrase *Romulum appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis* (7.2), uttered not by but about Augustus when he received that very name. In a ring-composition spanning from §7 to 98, Suetonius skillfully stresses the ktistic dimension of

^{144.} Cf. Cassius Dio’s remark (LII.43.2) that young Caesar ‘obtained Capreae from the Neapolitans’ in 29 BC, adding that it ‘is good for nothing’ (χρηστὸν μὲν οὐδέν, ὄνομα δὲ καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτι διὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιβερίου ἐνοίκησιν ἔχουσα.).

^{145.} Pace Galinsky (2012) 176; cf. Wardle (2012) 320 and (2014) 546 for the link between the context of this passage and Augustus’ death. Notice the prominent initial position of the word *κτίστου* (which occurs only here in Suetonius’ extant works) in Augustus’ improvised verse.

^{146.} See Federico (1999) on the irony of depicting Masgaba as the ‘eroe-fondatore della città del dolce far niente’ (168) and the interesting debate about this passage in the 1930’s.

^{147.} See Wardle (2014) 546. Augustus had just been described in an act of *lustrum condere* (in 97.1), while his own burial in the Mausoleum, a little further down (100.4), is also described with *condere*.

^{148.} For jokes as revealing indicators of a person’s character in ancient biography, see e.g. Plut. *Ant.* 1.2; cf. also the observations on Suetonius’ final paragraphs in Wardle (2012) 320.

Augustus' life in his *Life of Augustus*.¹⁴⁹ Another passage, preceding the quotation of Augustus' famous dictum that he left Rome as a city of marble (28.3), also plays into this idea, combining Augustus' ktistic aspirations with his reputation after his death. Commenting on Augustus' intentions in retaining control of the state, Suetonius notes: (28.2)

1

Quam voluntatem, cum prae se identidem ferret, quodam etiam edicto his verbis testatus est: "Ita mihi salvam ac sospitem rem p. sistere in sua sede liceat atque eius rei fructum percipere, quem peto, ut optimi status auctor dicar et moriens ut feram mecum spem, mansura in vestigio suo fundamenta rei p. quae iecero." Fecitque ipse se compotem voti nisus omni modo, ne quem novi status paeniteret.

That intention [to continue to administer the state] he not only expressed from time to time, but put it on record as well in a certain edict in the following words: "May it be my privilege to establish a safe and sound state in its proper position, and to reap from that act the fruit that I desire, in such a way that I may be called the author of the best possible state of affairs, and that I bear with me the hope, when I die, that the foundations of the State which I will have laid down will remain in their place." And he did himself realize his vow by making every effort to prevent that anyone would regret the new state of affairs.

Although Augustus is speaking about the state, not the city of Rome,¹⁵⁰ it is interesting to observe that his edict uses ktistic vocabulary (*fundamenta...iecero*; cf. *auctor*) to do so.¹⁵¹ This edict, if genuine, is perhaps the closest we can get to the *princeps'* own vision of his ktistic role.¹⁵² Most of all, however, it seems telling that here, as well as in the passage about Masgaba, a precise and explicit attestation of Augustus as second founder of Rome in his own words eludes us.

^{149.} Cf. also 97.1: the first omen of Augustus' death occurs *cum lustrum in campo Martio magna populi frequentia conderet*, 'As he was bringing the lustrum to an end in the Campus Martius before a great throng of people' - his last public act mentioned by Suetonius.

^{150.} Pace Ceausescu (1981), on which see Wardle (2005) 186, 193-194.

^{151.} Cf. Cic. *De nat. III.2.5: Romulum auspicis Numam sacris constitutis fundamenta iecisse nostrae civitatis*, not quoted by Wardle (2005) 193 n. 42, nor (2014) 219.

^{152.} Although Wardle (2005) discusses '[Octavian's] position as a second founder of Rome' (191) in his commentary on the word *auctor*, he does not notice the ktistic overtones of *fundamenta iacere* (treated at 193); cf. Wardle (2014) 219. Given the ktistic register employed and the use of the future tense in *iecero* (not commented upon Wardle and other commentators), the edict may be linked (cf. Weber (1936) 27*-28*) to the conferral of the cognomen Augustus in 27 BC.

It may very well be that the common modern interpretation of Augustus as second founder of Rome is partly due to later authors like Suetonius. If so, that surely has something to do with the fact that Augustus did not leave a clear record of his ktistic status to posterity: no unequivocal statement to that effect is, for example, recorded in his *Res gestae*.¹⁵³ Also elsewhere, we may look in vain for such statements. Perhaps one of the best pieces of explicit and contemporary evidence for Augustus' own attitude towards Romulus as a founder is the *elogium* (concise honorary inscription) that would have served as a caption to the statue of Romulus in the colonnades surrounding the Forum of Augustus.¹⁵⁴ Two inscribed fragments of marble, still preserved in the palace of the Knights of Rhodes towering over the remains of this forum, have been interpreted as belonging to the *elogium* of Romulus.¹⁵⁵ Although only a few letters survive, it is possible to reconstruct the text of the inscription with some reliability through comparison with other fragments of *elogia* from the Forum of Augustus, and from a better preserved inscription from Pompei, believed to be modeled on these *elogia*.¹⁵⁶ Romulus' *elogium* introduces him as the son of Mars and founder of Rome, and then focuses on his many military exploits, the dedication of the *spolia opima* to Jupiter Feretrius and his deification. Apart from the fact that Mommsen doubted whether the text should be attributed to Augustus himself or his collaborator Verrius Flaccus,¹⁵⁷ nothing in Romulus' *elogium* even refers explicitly to Augustus. It does not mention the *augurium augustum* or the Palatine, for example, nor Rome's eternity, or anything linking the foundation of the city to its Augustan re-foundation.¹⁵⁸ Of course, the first king of Rome is prominently presented as Rome's founder, but this has limited value as evidence for a comparison with Augustus – it would have been remarkable if the *elogium* had *not* presented Romulus as Rome's founder. Again, in other words, a precise comparison is absent. Even if many Augustan sources and artifacts can be quoted that compare Augustus to the founder of Rome or construct some kind of parallel between them, the frame within which we interpret these sources and artifacts is inevitably influenced by later traditions.

^{153.} See the interesting but speculative attempt by Starr (2009) to read ktistic connotations in the text, vigorously reiterated by Luke (2014) 200–206. O'Neill (2020) 219 wrongly states that '[t]he *Res Gestae* provide the framework for interpreting the rhetorical deployment of Augustus' military and diplomatic achievements in terms of a legitimizing discourse of re-foundation', but thereby exemplifies modern expectations to encounter this important strand of Augustan politics in a document as important as the *Res gestae*; cf. Harrison (2013) 17 for a similar expectation.

^{154.} On such *elogia*, see Alföldi and Chioffi in *CIL VI*, pars VIII, fasc. 3 (2000) 4839.

^{155.} *CIL VI*.40937 and VI.40938.

^{156.} *CIL I².189 n. IV = X.809 = ILS 64 = Inscr. It. X.3, 86*. See Heslin (2015) 170.

^{157.} *CIL I* (Berolini 1863) p. 282; cf. *CIL I²* (Berolini 1893) p. 188.

^{158.} Cf. Galinsky (1996) 286 on how the *elogia* diverge from Livy's narrative of the same heroes.

Now that this interpretive frame is clear, it is time to turn to the contemporary material from the Augustan Age itself.

1.4. Contemporary coinage and the foundation of Nicopolis

Young Caesar's patronage of Rome and him being hailed as a new Romulus has a striking contrast, and perhaps even a precedent, in the behaviour of his fellow triumvir Marc Antony in the Eastern Mediterranean. According to a range of literary sources, Antony actively presented himself as 'new Dionysus', and induced others to address him as such.¹⁵⁹ Given the fact that this self-styling predated Antony's association with Cleopatra (in which it would, however, reach new heights), it cannot simply be explained as posing as a Hellenistic monarch under the influence of Egypt's Ptolemaic queen. In fact, the literary record seems to be confirmed by an inscription from Athens, probably set up around the time when Antony resided in the city during the winters of 39/38 and 38/37.¹⁶⁰ It refers to the Panathenean festival as the "Antonian Panathenaia" (ἐν τοῖς Ἀντωνιήσι τοῖς Πανα[θη]ναϊκοῖς, line 22-23) and adds the genitive "of Antony, a god, a new Dionysus" (Ἀντωνίου θεοῦ νέου Διονύσο[υ], line 23), if the highly probable interpretation of the lacuna in the stone is correct.

Scholars widely agree that Antony's self-styling as New Dionysus was exploited by Caesar's heir at Rome to stress Antony's degenerate character and un-Roman behaviour.¹⁶¹ Conversely, young Caesar could present himself all the more forcefully as hero of Rome and Italy. It is true that Octavius used Apolline imagery to counter Antony's Dionysiac associations, and Apollo was a powerful antidote to Dionysus in the realm of state religion and divine patronage. Apollo, nevertheless, was not a quintessential Roman god who could express young Caesar's allegiance to Rome and Italy (although he would gradually be presented as such, as Augustan discourse unfolded). Apollo, in other words, was not Octavius' only answer to Antony styling himself as New Dionysus: in Rome, young Caesar's answer, it seems, was to style himself as successor of Romulus and new founder of the city.¹⁶² Within a wider Mediterranean context that was both an established practice and a very specific Roman expression of a more general idea.

Paul Zanker has attempted to trace the evolution of such ideas in the last decades of the first century BC. He argues convincingly that Caesar's heir first associated

^{159.} Vell. Pat. II.82.4, Plut. *Ant.* 24.4-5, 60.5, Cass. Dio XLVIII.39.2, Athen. *Deipn.* IV.29 (148c) = BNJ 192 F2; cf. Wallmann (1989) 224-230, with Zanker (1990²) 53-55; Hjort Lange (2009) 42; Luke (2014) 158-159.

^{160.} *IG* II² 482 = *IG* II/III.1 1043.

^{161.} Cf. Kienast (1982) 375 = (1999²) 454-455; Beacham (2005) 155-157; Galinsky (2012) 46-48.

^{162.} In Athens, the Athenians may have honored Augustus as 'New Apollo': see Hoff (1992) 230.

himself with the Trojan cycle propagated actively by his adoptive father.¹⁶³ But he did so mostly to present himself as successor to his deified father, it seems, rather than to connect himself to the ktistic role of Aeneas. We may speculate, however, that the genealogical link with Aeneas facilitated or suggested a comparison with Romulus as well.¹⁶⁴ That comparison seems to have developed gradually in the course of the 30's and 20's BC. Our evidence for a connection with Romulus predating Actium is scarce and hypothetical, or suspect, in the case of Suetonius' remark about the *augurium Augustum* appearing at young Caesar's first consulship (see above). Not decisive, but perhaps telling, is that Horace's 7th *Epoche* (30's BC)¹⁶⁵ evokes Romulus not as saviour of Rome, but as legendary precedent to the civil wars because of the fratricide inflicted on Remus. It is likely that in this period of growing triumviral strife young Caesar affiliated himself most closely with Apollo. That god certainly had ktistic associations, but they seem to have been played out only rarely by Augustan poets (e.g. Verg. *Georg.* III.36), certainly in comparison with their Hellenistic predecessors.¹⁶⁶ The battle of Actium, as in so many other aspects of the politics of Caesar's heir, appears to have been the watershed. Establishing himself at Rome as saviour and ruler of the city, young Caesar finally had the full means to deploy his promised patronage and restoration of the newly affirmed capital of the Roman empire. In the decade following 31 BC, we begin to have solid evidence that Caesar's acts were seen and described in a ktistic paradigm. Von Ungern-Sternberg concludes that young Caesar's imitation of Romulus reached a peak in the years 29-27 BC.¹⁶⁷ Rather than the end of a 'Romulean period' that dated from 43 to 27 BC, as Scheid assumed, the years after Actium are likely to have been the period when the idea of ktistic renewal first fully developed.¹⁶⁸ What may have contributed to that development is not only the victory at Actium, presented as a victory of Roman and Italian (divine) forces over Eastern despotism and degeneracy, but also the way young Caesar commemorated his victory near the site of the battle in Western Greece.

Famously, the now sole ruler founded a city there, Actia Nicopolis. Commemorating a major victory in that way, Caesar's heir followed in the footsteps of his deified father and especially of Pompey the Great, who had in turn followed the examples

^{163.} Zanker (1990²) 44-45. See also Heslin (2015).

^{164.} See Hekster (2015) 240-250 for Aeneas as an ancestor of the Julian house.

^{165.} On the dating, see MacCormack (1998) 7 n. 25.

^{166.} There may be a (late?) reminiscence of a triumviral connection between young Caesar and ktistic Apollo in the statement by Appian (B.C. V.112.466) that the former escaped disaster by divine assistance near an Apolline shrine at Sicilian Naxos – this must be the cult site of Apollo Archègetès ("the Founder") mentioned by Thuc. VI.3.1. As Miller (2009) 42 n. 92 argues, however, the divine intervention may be Appian's invention.

^{167.} Von Ungern-Sternberg (1998), especially 172-173.

^{168.} See Scheid (2005) 181, 184.

of Hellenistic monarchs before them.¹⁶⁹ Actia Nicopolis was most probably young Caesar's first ktistic endeavour,¹⁷⁰ other than a colony created for veterans after the battle of Philippi. Nicopolis' own provincial coinage prominently broadcasted the victor's role as founder.¹⁷¹



Figure 1: Denarius of Augustus, 29 BC–27 BC (RIC I² Augustus no. 272), ANS 1947.2.413. Images courtesy of the American Numismatic Society.

Particularly evocative is a centrally issued coin from before 27 BC with a scene of Roman city-foundation on the reverse, showing young Caesar as the city founder *capite velato* tracing the furrow with a plow.¹⁷² It is a matter of scholarly debate whether this scene refers to Nicopolis in particular or to city-foundation in general.¹⁷³ According to Kraft, followed by Ruscu and others,¹⁷⁴ the laureate head of the Actian Apollo resembling young Caesar on the obverse indicates that the reverse should refer to the foundation of Nicopolis. Though that is a maximalist interpretation of the evidence, it is a tempting one, and more probable and convincing than Gurval's contrasting claim

^{169.} Kienast (1982) 368, 382, 388–390 = (1999³) 445, 458–459, 461–463, 469; Bowersock (2002) 3–5; Hjort Lange (2009) 96. See further note 204, below.

^{170.} Purcell (1987) 71, Ruscu (2006) 248; our main source is Cass. Dio LI.18.1, with 1.3. Gurval (1995) 73–74, on the contrary, believes the Nicopolis founded in Egypt after the capture of Alexandria came first.

^{171.} RPC I.1363–1367, all with the legend ΚΤΙΣΜΑ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ, some with Augustus' head. These coins obviously date from after 27 BC. See Calomino (2005) and (2011) 27–30, 219–220.

^{172.} RIC I², no. 272; see Ruscu (2006) 252–253, Hjort Lange (2009) 103. For a convenient overview of contemporary issues, see Gurval (1995), Plate 1–4.

^{173.} One may compare similar motives on provincial coinage referring to specific city foundations, e.g. RPC I.1283 (from Dyme, a colony founded by Julius Caesar, featuring only a plow), RPC I.1646 (from Philippi, a colony founded by Antony, featuring a man plowing with two oxen; cf. 1648), RPC I.1252 (from Patras, a colony founded by Augustus, also featuring a man plowing with two oxen) and RPC I.317–318 (from Caesar Augusta, a colony founded by Augustus, featuring a man plowing with two oxen, but also the names of the *duoviri*). Castiello (2021) 145 interprets the coins as 'segno evidente della sua volontà [di Ottaviano] di essere considerato il nuovo fondatore di Roma'.

^{174.} Ruscu (2006) 253; cf. Kraft (1969) 11–19.

that the issue should be dated after the battle of Naulochus in 36 BC.¹⁷⁵ The sources quoted by Gurval in support of his thesis (Appian, BC V.129 and Cassius Dio IL.13-14) actually contradict it, as both of them mention no colonial or other foundations after the battle of Naulochus, while they are elsewhere very attentive to this topic.¹⁷⁶ Regardless of their intended reference (if any) and dating, these beautifully produced *denarii* eloquently testify to the nascent importance of ktistic imagery in the years before 27. While the obverse remains without a legend, the coupling of the image of a founder in action with the legend IMP CAESAR produces a striking effect. Whatever the intended message may have been, these centrally circulated coins, together with the many city foundations by the young Caesar outside Rome, may have contributed significantly to the process that resulted to him being considered to have refounded Rome itself. Linking him to Romulus – either before, when, or after he was awarded the name Augustus – was the most powerful and straightforward way of expressing the *princeps'* efforts for Rome as an act of ktistic renewal.

The delicate balance between a conspicuous role as founder outside Rome and a far more restrained stance in the city itself is of course a well-known feature of Augustan politics and culture, e.g. in the case of the imperial cult.¹⁷⁷ But this dialectic can also be grasped from the differences between our principal sources for Augustus' deeds, i.e. the *Res gestae* and Suetonius' *Life*. Suetonius stresses Augustus' ktistic renewal of Rome, while the *Res gestae* contain not a single statement to that effect.¹⁷⁸ The reverse is true when it comes to city foundations outside Rome. Suetonius mentions them only in passing: in §46 on the 28 colonies founded in Italy, in §47 on the cities Augustus "founded again" after the destruction by earthquakes,¹⁷⁹ and in §18.2 on Nicopolis (*Quoque Actiaceae victoriae memoria celebratior et in posterum esset, urbem Nicopolim apud Actium condidit*, 'And to make the memory of his victory at Actium more renowned, also in the future, he founded the city of Nicopolis near Actium'). The much shorter *Res gestae*, on the contrary, refer to the foundation of colonies on no less than three occasions: first in §3.3, when speaking about Augustus' treatment of soldiers, then in §16.1-2 on expenditure for his veterans, and finally in §28.1, in a summary treatment of his colonial foundations in their geographical spread. On all three occasions, Augustus uses the technical terminology *colonias deducere*, rather than *urbes condere* or a similar expression that would subsume his colonial foundations under a general

^{175.} Gurval (1995) 58-59, following a similar argument by Franke (1976).

^{176.} Cf. App. BC V.3, 12, 14, 19, 99, 137 and Cass. Dio IL.34.4. Young Caesar seems to have avoided founding new colonies in Italy right after 36: cf. Kienast (1982) 50-51, 397 = (1999²) 57-58, 488-489.

^{177.} See Galinsky (2012) 169-170, but cf. Antoniou (2019).

^{178.} See note 153, above.

^{179.} The terminology deserves attention: *denuo condidit* is Suetonius' equivalent of Vergil's *rursus condere* (see below, p. 125), albeit in a very different context.

ktistic act, inviting comparison with his status as second founder of Rome. While the dividing line between colonial foundations outside Rome and the ktistic renewal of Rome is blurred in the visual media and the literary treatments, Augustus seems to have been keen to differentiate clearly between the two in his *Res gestae*. One may even observe an avoidance of the verb *condere* in the *princeps'* political testament: when speaking of the census in §8, Augustus repeatedly wrote *lustrum...feci* instead of the standard expression *lustrum condere*, also used by Suetonius (97.1).¹⁸⁰ Moreover, as has been noted already by Calomino, the foundation of Nicopolis is not even mentioned in the *Res gestae*, again in striking contrast with Suetonius.¹⁸¹

The cities themselves, which owed their foundation to the *princeps*, were less scrupulous in their choice of terminology. Nicopolis is a prime example among them: it inaugurated its own mint by striking coins with the unique reverse legend ΚΤΙΣΜΑ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ, “foundation of Augustus” – some also featured Augustus’ head, and others even had the ostentatious legend ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΣ, “Augustus the founder”.¹⁸² At Sicca Veneria in Africa, an inscription posthumously honoured him as *conditor* (CIL VIII.27568: DIVO AVGSTO / CONDITORI / SICCENSES). This is no insignificant choice, since a whole range of laudatory terms was available, e.g. *parens coloniae* (CIL III.2907 = 13264 = ILS 5336, IX.540; cf. III.3117 = 10117), *patronus* (CIL X.8035; cf. XII.3155). Of the towns stricken by earthquakes and refounded by Augustus, alluded to by Suetonius (§47, see above), we know that Tralles, in Lydia, and Cos honoured the *princeps* as their founder.¹⁸³ Augustus was also honoured as *κτίστης* at Abyses, Athens, Clazomenae, Ephesus, Ilium, Mytilene, Pergamum, Samos, Teos and Tlos.¹⁸⁴

Some of these, perhaps, were simply hyperbolic honours not connected to ktistic acts, but in most cases it seems that Augustus’ involvement was consciously presented as a case of ktistic renewal (e.g. at Amisus in Pontus, on the Black Sea, where Augustus put an end to the local *tyrannis*). A thorough study of all this material would be necessary to determine the precise value, context and chronology of these instances of ktistic renewal, but that is (yet again) beyond the scope of this thesis. The bare fact, however, that all cities listed here, with the exception of Sicca Veneria, came under

^{180.} See Varro, *De l.l.* VI.87, with TLL s.v. *condere*, p. 152, line 27-28, and Ogilvie (1961); cf. Bur (2017). One may attempt an explanation connected to the fact that Augustus performed the census not as censor, but through his consular powers: see Cooley (2010) 139-142. Luke (2014) 221-223 also struggles with Augustus’ avoidance of *condere*.

^{181.} Calomino (2008) 164 n. 21.

^{182.} Calomino (2005) 185, (2008) 169.

^{183.} Kienast (1982) 355 = (1999³) 435; Cooley (2010) 277; Wardle (2014) 350.

^{184.} Kienast (1982) 355-356 = (1999³) 436; see Taylor (1931) 270-283, Pont (2007); Györi (2015) 58.

young Caesar's control only after the battle of Actium already shows that their ktistic honours for the *princeps* likely postdate the foundation of Actia Nicopolis.

Colonial foundations before 27 apparently included Dyrrhachium and Philippi in Macedonia (both 30 BC),¹⁸⁵ and Carthage (29 BC), in Africa.¹⁸⁶ The latter is significant, since it also seems to play a prominent role in Vergil's *Aeneid* (to which we will return at length in the next chapter). Formally, Vergil treats the ancient city of Dido, but the way he describes Dido's foundation of Carthage rather makes one think of a Roman settlement, i.e. Augustus' *Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago*.¹⁸⁷ Yet these were pre-existing cities refounded as colonies, or even pre-existing colonies reinforced with new settlers, not new cities.¹⁸⁸ Although young Caesar's involvement in Carthage may very well have been considered one of his (major) ktistic endeavors (let alone a striking ktistic renewal of ancient Carthage), we have no explicit, contemporary evidence to that effect.¹⁸⁹ Also, it is unclear whether the massive restructuring works executed on the site, of which we have ample archaeological evidence, date to the moment of the colony's foundation in 29 BC, or to almost 20 years later.¹⁹⁰

^{185.} Kienast (1982) 398 = (1999³) 489. Augustus is still remembered as the founder of Philippi, alongside Philip II, on an interesting metrical epitaph from the third century AD (AE (1936) 47): δαίμων δέ μ' ἔκέλευσε θανεῖν κλυτῆς ἐπὶ γαῖης / κτίσματος Φιλίπποι καὶ Αὐγούστου βασιλῆος / εύστεφή στειχῶν ('fate ordered me to die in famous land, in the foundation of Philip and king Augustus, well girded with walls', lines 4-5). Himerius, rather predictably, ousts Augustus in favor of the Athenian Callistratus when addressing Philippi's 'two founders' in AD 361/362 (δι' ἔκατέρου τῶν οἰκιστῶν, *Him. Or. 40.2*): but note that also an Athenian founder links the city to Constantinople (Penella (2007) 37).

^{186.} Kienast (1982) 395 = (1999³) 486-487, with Singer (2022) 4 n. 28 on Carthage. On the difficulty of dating Caesarean and Augustan colonies on the Iberian peninsula (and assigning them to either Caesar or Augustus), see Houten (2018) 67 n. 270; cf. Blonce (2017) on Africa.

^{187.} See p. 70, below. On the *Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago*, see Singer (2022) 4-5, 167-169; Flügel, Dolenz, Schmidt and Baur (2018) 353-378; Hurlet and Müller (2017) 106-107; Modrow (2017) 237-245; Mokni (2008); Hurst (1985).

^{188.} On previous Roman attempts to re-colonize Carthage, see Singer (2022) 7-8, 164-167, 169-172; Flügel, Dolenz, Schmidt and Baur (2018) 378-384; Hurlet and Müller (2017) 99-102, 104-106; Modrow (2017) 222-237.

^{189.} On the so-called 'altar of the *gens Augusta*' found near the foot of the Byrsa Hill in Carthage (featuring a relief of Aeneas fleeing Troy, amongst other scenes), see Rödel and Ardeleanu (forthcoming); Ardeleanu, Houten and Panzram (2024) 372; Saladin (2023) 61, 144-150 (with some salutary remarks about the local context of the Aeneas-relief at 149); Goldman-Petri (2020) (arguing for a date in the Claudian, rather than the Augustan period). I am very grateful to Stefan Ardeleanu for his kind help on this topic.

^{190.} According to Hurlet and Müller (2017) 106-107, building on the work of Fishwick, a date after 13/12 BC is more likely; see further Flügel, Dolenz, Schmidt and Baur (2018), who argue for an earlier start soon after 44 BC.

While colonial foundations are often difficult to date with precision, the safest bet is that most of them date only from the middle of the 20's BC onwards.¹⁹¹ That wave of colonisation, and an accompanying wave of the foundation of non-colonial cities, certainly included communities founded from scratch – all postdating Nicopolis. The Victory City on the Ambracian Gulf, then, remains the possible *incipit* of young Caesar's explicit ktistic career. As many cities across the newly united empire followed suit in honouring the *princeps* as their founder, it seems likely that Rome could not stay behind. Literary authors had likewise started to experiment with the idea of configuring the city's patron and protector as second founder, but a more official statement to that effect was still to be made. When the meeting of the senate in January 27 conferred his implicitly ktistic cognomen on Augustus as a more intricate alternative to an outright 'Romulus', it did so at the very moment when the *princeps'* ktistic endeavours outside Rome were in full swing.

The relation between these two phenomena and their interdependency is a moot point. Gurval warns that 'athletic games and victory cities established by the victor at Actium must be judged in the context of Octavian's efforts at reorganisation and settlement of power in the Greek East and should not be confused with the formation of an imperial ideology shaped and articulated at Rome'.¹⁹² In general, I think Gurval is right to stress the importance of local contexts rather than a centralized program emanating from Rome. Nevertheless, the foundation of Nicopolis was more than a local affair. The massive inscription commemorating young Caesar's victory in the campside memorial is in Latin, not Greek. This strongly speaks to the supraregional importance of the commemorative aspect of Nicopolis' foundation, as its daily business was, eventually at least, conducted in Greek: 'Nicopolis was, above all, a Greek city with Greek institutions. Its local government, coinage, and public inscriptions were Greek'.¹⁹³ The scale of this inscription and the monument it accompanies (probably the first major structure to be built) also speak for its importance.¹⁹⁴ The quinquennial games founded in Nicopolis by Augustus, and celebrated in the venues especially built just below the campside memorial, must have attracted massive attention.¹⁹⁵ Victors of the Actian games come from all over the (Eastern) empire: Cyprus, Laodicea, Nicomedia, Pergamum, Alexandria and Ephesus feature in the provenance clausus of the early victors, who carry both Roman and Greek names. Nicopolis attracted the patronage of king Herod, and dedications

^{191.} Kienast (1982) 386-388, 392, 399 = (1999³) 474-476, 481, 491.

^{192.} Gurval (1995) 9.

^{193.} *Ibid.* 69; cf. Ruscu (2006) and Calomino (2008).

^{194.} Zachos (2003).

^{195.} See Gurval (1995) 74-81.

to the emperor from places as far away as Cilicia.¹⁹⁶ The two-tier relief frieze running along the enclosure of the altar in the campside memorial, in Pentelic marble and a classicizing style, cannot but remind one of the later frieze on the Ara Pacis regarding layout, workmanship and size.¹⁹⁷ The upper frieze represents the second day of the *princeps'* triple triumph in Rome, on 14 August 29 BC. The fact that a monument in Nicopolis, dedicated with a massive Latin inscription, depicts a Roman triumph is perhaps the best indicator of its supraregional importance, as a depiction of the battle itself would suit a regional interest far better.¹⁹⁸

Moreover, another part of the memorial's iconography referred clearly to Rome, and even to the city's foundation. The lateral terracotta *simas* (gutters) of the stoa surrounding the altar feature mirroring depictions of the she-wolf feeding Romulus and Remus, on each side of the water-spouts.¹⁹⁹ These intricately produced decorations alternate with *simas* showing dolphins. The latter seem to refer to Neptune and the battle of Actium, according to Zachos.²⁰⁰ He links the *lupa* suckling the twins to Augustus: 'the scene implies connections between Romulus, Rome's founder and first *triumphator*, and Augustus. We recall the story that Octavian first planned to take the name Romulus'. I would opt for a different interpretation. Rather than referring to Romulus in particular, let alone in his role as *triumphator*, the scene refers to the foundation of Rome; rather than implying a direct connection between Romulus and Augustus, then, the terracotta *simas* featuring Romulus and Remus imply a connection between the foundation of Rome and the foundation of Nicopolis. The striking presence of the she-wolf motif may elude us, at first, as we have grown accustomed to encountering the *lupa Romana* all over the Roman Empire. In the Augustan Age, however, these images were still rare outside Rome, apart from some examples on Republican coinage. According to a recent study, the she-wolf motif became widely known in the Roman provinces only in the second half of the first century AD.²⁰¹ That would only add to the significance of the iconography on the terracotta gutters surrounding the altar. Few early visitors of the campside memorial will have had to think of Augustus as second founder of Rome when seeing the small scene of Rome's foundation – they will more likely have had to think of Augustus as founder of the city under their very nose.

^{196.} Kienast (1982) 373 = (1999³) 458; cf. Roller (1998) 228-229.

^{197.} Zachos (2003) 92, Pollini (2012) 193.

^{198.} Cf. Pollini (2012) 196 for the connection with Rome and the Attic workshop brought to Nicopolis.

^{199.} Zachos (2003) 79-80.

^{200.} *Ibid.* 79.

^{201.} Rissanen (2014) 337. Rissanen does not mention the examples from Nicopolis.

That the – no doubt centrally coordinated – imagery of the victory monument at Nicopolis referred to the foundation of Rome is perhaps the first sign that, following the *princeps'* ktistic project on the Epirote coast, his involvement in Rome also began to be seen in a ktistic context. The monument in its entirety, or at least its monumental inscription, most likely dates between January 29 and January 27.²⁰² As Zachos remarks, based on this early dating, the monument ‘was probably the first major public monument of the newly founded city and served to inaugurate that city’.²⁰³ Coming back to the coin discussed earlier and believed to refer to the foundation of Nicopolis, we may observe that there is a striking chronological overlap between the monument, inaugurating Nicopolis’ foundation and referring to the foundation of Rome, and the coin, presenting *Imperator Caesar* as founder of the city that could very well have been Nicopolis.

There is one more reason to believe that the silver coin depicting a city-foundation refers to Nicopolis. The name of the city, Greek for “Victory City”, refers to homonymous cities founded by Pompey (on the border of Pontus and Armenia Minor) and Alexander the Great (at Issus).²⁰⁴ While the foundation of Actia Nicopolis by Caesar’s heir is rightly seen as part of his *imitatio Alexandri*,²⁰⁵ Gurval is, I think, wrong to postulate a fundamental difference between young Caesar’s victory *city*, in the Hellenistic fashion, and Antony’s *colony* founded after the battle of Philippi, in the Roman fashion, only because of the difference in the legal status of the respective cities. Antony’s colony was named *Colonia Victrix Philippi*, a name which provides a striking precedent for young Caesar’s Nicopolis, less remote in place and time than Pompey’s and Alexander’s Nicopoleis.²⁰⁶ Moreover, Actia Nicopolis actually celebrated a victory over Antony – how fitting, then, if Antony’s victory-colony in Macedonia were to be eclipsed by a new victory city in Western Greece, Actium taking precedence over Philippi. Sometime after 27, Augustus even refounded Antony’s colony at Philippi as *Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis*, effacing its former name.²⁰⁷

In fact, the name of Antony’s colony is known to us from the local coinage it had produced. One of these Antonian coins, datable to the colony’s foundation sometime after the battle in 42 BC, shows a man plowing with two oxen (RPC I.1646). While Nicopolis replaced Antony’s victory-colony at Philippi, it is perhaps not impossible

^{202.} *Ibid.* 76, with references.

^{203.} *Ibid.* 66.

^{204.} See Dreizehnter (1975), with Gurval (1995) 69 n. 125; Jones (1987); note 169, above. For eponymous city foundations by Pompey in Hispania, and an interesting case of an eponymous city by Q. Caecilius Metellus, see also Houten (2018) 63-64.

^{205.} Kienast (1982) 377 = (1999³) 463, with updated bibliography in n. 42; Gurval (1995) 69-70.

^{206.} Cf. Brélaz (2016) 122.

^{207.} *Ibid.* 124.

that young Caesar's silver coinage featuring a scene very similar to Antony's foundation issues at Philippi were designed to do the same. This hypothesis is certainly in accordance with wider practices in the coin issues of both triumvirs,²⁰⁸ and with the fact that Antony's coin imagery for Philippi imitated Julius Caesar's issues for the foundation of Lampsacus.²⁰⁹ Moreover, as Györi notes, the IMP CAESAR coin is part of a series on which 'Octavian styled himself in a myriad of Hellenistic monarchical roles', one of which was that of founder of (victory) cities.²¹⁰ Both Roman numismatic traditions and the direct numismatic context thus point to an identification with the foundation of Nicopolis.

The evidence treated so far, as well as the scholarly interpretations of it discussed above, suggest that there may have been a close connection between Augustus' own ktistic activity and the many references to the original foundation of Rome, as well as earlier refoundations of the city, during his reign. That connection may have contributed significantly to the idea that the Augustan Principate amounted to a refoundation of Rome – a view expressed on numerous occasions by Imperial authors, as we have seen above. At the same time, the question was raised whether Imperial evaluations of the Augustan Principate as ktistic renewal are due to the fact that Augustus, with the benefit of hindsight, could be regarded as the founder of the new polical system we now call the Principate. Just like Augustus' contemporary position as a founder outside Rome, his subsequent role as founder of the new political order may have influenced views and interpretations of his role as re-founder of Rome. It remains a moot point, however, whether there was any imperial agency behind this idea; whether, in other words, Augustus himself or his entourage promoted it either actively and explicitly, or only passively and implicitly admitted such notions to be expressed. As there is no explicit contemporary evidence available to answer these questions that can be connected directly to the *princeps* himself, we must proceed by investigating the contemporary sources available to us that best reflect 'Augustan' ideas.²¹¹

1.5. Livy's Camillus as refounder of Rome: a prefiguration of Augustus?

A strong case for the idea that Augustus was seen as a refounder of Rome in his own day and age is made by Gary Miles, based on his analysis of Livy's first pentad.²¹²

^{208.} Newman (1990); Györi (2015) 50, 57.

^{209.} RPC I.2268-2269, with Györi (2015) 56-57.

^{210.} *Ibid.* 58.

^{211.} I use the term 'Augustan' here, and throughout, in the broad sense advocated by Galinsky (1996), rather than 'in the narrow sense of political agreement with the *princeps*' (*ibid.* 225). See also *ibid.* 245-246.

^{212.} See further below. The idea was already current before Miles: cf. Girardet (2000) 241 n. 75 for some of the older literature.

Long before Miles argued his case, one particular passage in Livy's massive history of the Roman people, conceived in the early Augustan Age, was already taken as contemporary evidence for Augustus' position as refounder. It is Livy's treatment of the Early Republican hero M. Furius Camillus, who had first managed to conquer the Etruscan city of Veii, Rome's powerful neighbor and rival, in 396 BC, and later secured Rome's rebuilding and moral restoration after the Gallic sack of 390 BC. Livy explicitly and repeatedly compares Camillus' actions with those of Romulus. As we saw earlier in our discussion of Suetonius' explanation of the name Augustus and the expression *alter conditor*, "second founder",²¹³ Livy relates how Camillus was hailed as *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis* ("a Romulus and father of the fatherland and second founder of the city", V.49.7) and *secundum a Romulo conditorem urbis Romanae* ("second founder after Romulus of the city of Rome", VII.1.10) by the Romans.

Syme recognized that this particular phrasing could also apply to Augustus and fits contemporary concerns, but the great scholar did not attribute it to Livy himself.²¹⁴ Following earlier scholarship, Syme argued that Livy might have simply copied earlier accounts of Camillus, without necessarily intending to praise Augustus.²¹⁵ In the 1960's and '70's, scholars became increasingly convinced that Livy's representation of Camillus was intended to reflect on Augustus,²¹⁶ as it became clear how many other aspects of Camillus' characterization neatly overlap with what we know about how the *princeps* presented himself.²¹⁷ At the same time, not much importance was attached to Livy's comparison, other than a general intention on his part of writing exemplary history and highlighting useful similarities between the republican past and the Augustan present. In the 1980's, Miles gave a strong new impulse to the long-lasting debate about Livy's position towards Augustus, in two seminal articles focusing on the passages about Camillus.

In a paper published in 1986, Miles noted the similarities between Romulus & Camillus, Romulus & Augustus, and Camillus & Augustus,²¹⁸ concluding that 'Livy never explicitly acknowledges the parallels by which Augustus may be associated with Camillus and, through him, with Romulus'.²¹⁹ Nevertheless, he saw a pattern in Livy's conception of Rome's history, according to which 'the refounding of Rome by Camillus simultaneously recalls the original foundation of the city by Romulus and

^{213.} See p. 33, above.

^{214.} Syme (1939) 305–306; Syme (1959) 48 = (1979) 423; Syme (1959) 55 = (1979) 431.

^{215.} Syme (1959) 48 = (1979) 423; cf. Burck (1964²) xv-xvi *contra* Stübner (1941); Walsh (1961) 30–31.

^{216.} Miles (1986) 14 n. 30 = (1995) 89 n. 36; Girardet (2000) 241 n. 75; Burck (1992) xv, 170–171, 175.

^{217.} Burck (1992) 164–176.

^{218.} Miles (1986) 13–18 = (1995) 88–92.

^{219.} *Ibid.* (1986) 18 = (1995) 92

anticipates a similar achievement by Augustus.²²⁰ That pattern, Miles discovered, was more than a series of similarities, but had structural value for Livy's view of history. The historian has Camillus assign his refoundation of Rome, in a public speech in front of the assembly of the people, to precisely the 365th year since the foundation of the city.²²¹ Add another 365 years, counting inclusively, and you end up in 27 BC, a crucial year for Augustus, and the likely publication date of Livy's first pentad (at the end of which, one may note, the passage itself in which Camillus mentions the number is situated).²²² According to Miles, this makes the Augustan present emerge as 'a singularly fortuitous occasion for the reenactment of Rome's previous refounding by Camillus'.²²³ Miles identifies this view of Roman history – or of history in general – as unique to Livy, diverging from similar, but fundamentally different ideas of cyclical recurrence in Stoicism or notions familiar from Greek historians.²²⁴ Rome can be reborn more than once, making it unique among nations by granting its civilization eternity through the potential of continuous renewal.²²⁵ 'Refoundation, in the specific sense of restoring strengths embodied in an original foundation, is the key to this renewal.'²²⁶ Although we cannot know how Livy assessed Augustus' reign, 'the narrative of the first pentad builds to an unambiguous climax not with Rome's destruction by the Gauls, but rather with its dramatic refounding by Camillus and the hopeful possibility of a second refounding under Augustus'.²²⁷

Miles devotes special attention to Livy's innovative use of language in his 'particular interpretations of the founding and refounding of Rome'.²²⁸ He notes that the authors before Livy employed similar references to Romulus as founder when discussing political actors such as Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Cicero and Caesar, but that Livy first elaborated a view of Rome's founder that made comparisons to Romulus unambiguously honorable, rather than potentially depreciative (giving Romulus' associations with tyranny and fratricide).²²⁹ Miles links this new view of Romulus to the difference between Livy's use of the title *conditor* or *conditor alter*, in its 'fuller

^{220.} *Ibid.* (1986) 19 = (1995) 94.

^{221.} Liv. V.54.5: *trecentensimus sexagensimus quintus annus urbis, Quirites, agitur* ('It is now, Quirites, in its three hundred and sixty-fifth year.')

^{222.} For the discussion on the date of publication of the first pentad, see now Vasaly (2015) 3, with references.

^{223.} Miles (1986) 20 = (1995) 95.

^{224.} *Ibid.* (1986) 21-22 = (1995) 97-98.

^{225.} On renewal described through the metaphor of grafting (Livy VI.1.3), and the way Nicolò Machiavelli regarded this aspect as an essential element of Rome's history, see Rijser (2016) 282-286 and (2019) 55.

^{226.} Miles (1986) 22 = (1995) 98.

^{227.} *Ibid.*

^{228.} *Ibid.* (1986) 25 = (1995) 100.

^{229.} *Ibid.* (1986) 26-27 = (1995) 102-103.

sense', and the 'conventional and limited' sense of the Hellenistic title *κτίστης*, used to honour a 'hero' or a 'saviour'.²³⁰ Livy, as far as we know, was the first author to use the term *conditor alter*, and Miles sees this as evidence for 'a very recent consolidation of notions about founding and refounding that preceded Livy and to which he himself made a significant contribution'.²³¹

Miles' focus is on rehabilitating Livy as a creative and original intellectual who contributed significantly to a new view of Rome's foundation that became current in the Augustan Age. The flipside of his focus on Livy, however, is that Miles pays little attention to contemporary Augustan developments and presents Livy as operating in isolation. There is only a brief treatment of the hut of Romulus on the Palatine,²³² a passing reference to 'Romulus' as an honorary title for Augustus,²³³ and no substantial discussion at all of how other Augustan authors treated the concept of refoundation or presented the *princeps* as a refounder of Rome.²³⁴

In 1988, Miles returned to the linguistic aspects of his analysis in a second article focusing on Livy's use of the terms *maiores* and *conditores*, both 'highly charged with meaning and with powerful associations for Livy's contemporaries'.²³⁵ Livy's treatment of the "forefathers" (*maiores*) held in such high regard by the Romans is original in promoting 'a concept of Roman history as evolutionary', anticipating and making room for 'significant innovations in the future', rather than a pessimistic or conservative view of history advocating only a return to the hallowed tradition of old.²³⁶ In the past, some of the most significant innovations had been introduced by successive founders of Rome, rather than just one at the very beginning. Miles points out that 'Livy conceives of the conditor in unusually broad terms' and is unique 'in assigning to Rome not one *conditor*, but several, each of whom is responsible for a specific aspect of the state's complete foundation':²³⁷ Romulus, Numa, Servius Tullius and all other kings except Tarquinius Superbus, Brutus, Appius Claudius, Camillus and Augustus. Again, as in the 1986 article, Miles emphasizes Livy's departure from Hellenistic thought about who or what a *κτίστης* is and does.

^{230.} *Ibid.* (1986) 27-29 = (1995) 103-105.

^{231.} *Ibid.* (1986) 31 = (1995) 107.

^{232.} *Ibid.* (1986) 16-17 = (1995) 91.

^{233.} *Ibid.* (1986) 27 = (1995) 103.

^{234.} Vergil is mentioned only in passing, at Miles (1986) 16 n. 36 = (1995) 91 n. 42, with Vitruvius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at (1986) 27 n. 75 = (1995) 103 n. 77, with Horace, at (1986) 27 n. 76 = (1995) 103 n. 78, with Ovid, at (1986) 29 n. 82 = (1995) 105 n. 85 and at (1986) 30 = (1995) 106.

^{235.} Miles (1988) 186 = (1995) 110.

^{236.} *Ibid.* (1988) 192 = (1995) 117-118.

^{237.} *Ibid.* (1988) 194, 195 = (1995) 119, 121.

Focusing on the crucial role of individual *conditores*, rather than the traditional *maiores* as a collective, Livy stresses the ‘the decisive role of the charismatic leader’ in Rome’s history.²³⁸ Although Miles does not make this point explicit, one may add that such a view certainly sets Livy apart from the traditional, senatorial perspective of Roman historiography – always fearful of tyrants and monarchical aspirations. Rather, it aligns him with those whom the optimates used to call tyrants and would-be kings, *populares* like Caesar and Augustus – who put Livy’s ideal into practice. Even more so, Miles points out that there is a clear indication of hierarchy among Rome’s many founders. Romulus ranks first, and successive founders mostly build on his example. This is in sharp contrast with Livy’s Greek contemporary and counterpart Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who attributes all foundational developments to Romulus and his generation, and assigns to Romulus alone the role of founder.²³⁹

Livy’s succession of founders follows one type of logic from Romulus to Appius Claudius, focusing on what every founder added to the original foundation, and another in treating Camillus and Augustus. Rather than adding to Romulus’ foundation, they saved it from destruction and neglect, reaffirming the principles established by all previous *conditores*. By focusing on this difference, ‘Livy’s narrative, through its representation of Augustus and Camillus, calls special attention to the principle of refoundation’.²⁴⁰ Miles acknowledged that Augustus is presented as a refounder, that his ‘vaunted “transferral” of the republic from his own power to that of the Senate in 27 BC (RG 34.1) had made refoundation, perhaps hinted at in Cicero’s political thought and Julius Caesar’s propaganda, a matter of the highest politics.²⁴¹ Important as these observations are, it is again apparent that Miles’ analysis falls short of an interpretation of the wider cultural context of the Augustan Age in which Livy operates. There is no reference to other literary treatments of Rome’s foundation, let alone of the many other *conditores* discussed in those treatments but excluded from Livy’s list: Evander, Hercules, Aeneas.²⁴² Neither is there any reference to contemporary ideas about foundation in Augustan monuments, nor any thought about the fact that such treatments or ideas may have influenced Livy. For Miles, Livy operates in intellectual isolation as far as his ideas about foundation and refoundation are concerned.²⁴³

^{238.} *Ibid.* (1988) 196 = (1995) 122.

^{239.} *Ibid.* (1988) 197-199 = (1995) 122-125. See now Poletti (2018) for a detailed discussion.

^{240.} Miles (1988) 199 = (1995) 125.

^{241.} *Ibid.* (1988) 201 = (1995) 128.

^{242.} Miles seems unaware of Hirst (1926) on Hercules and Petersen (1961) 441-442 on Evander.

^{243.} See just Miles (1988) 207 n. 68 for the interesting observation that Tibullus and Ovid identified themselves as *conditores*. The entire last section of the article, in which this remark occurs, was not included in the 1995 reprint.

Initially, Miles' observations seem not to have aroused a great deal of interest. His work is not cited in some related publications from the late 1980's and early 1990's,²⁴⁴ and referred to rather than discussed in others.²⁴⁵ Perhaps his thesis was still out of tune with academic opinion; in 1990 Santoro Lhoir still noticed 'a reluctance to acknowledge Livian allusions to his sovereign'.²⁴⁶ Strikingly, Miles' work is hardly picked up in Christina Kraus' 1994 article on refoundation in Livy's fifth book: only his 1986 article is cited in passing.²⁴⁷ Although Kraus' article sports 'refoundation' as a word of its title, it treats the subject allusively rather than comprehensively – which is why it will merit our attention only briefly. The author is concerned with Livy's history as a literary edifice, 'the architectonics of the narrative proper', and analyzes the work's 'discourse space'.²⁴⁸ Kraus notices an overlap between Livy's remarks about the foundation and refoundation of Rome, on the one hand, and the growth of Livy's literary work about Rome's history, on the other. When Livy uses the expression *condere urbem* or *condita urbs*, '[e]ach occurrence is a kind of refoundation', according to Kraus, a statement illustrated by the example of the opening of book VI, where 'Livy's new pentad will refound the city and its history, both of which lie in ruins from the Gallic attack'.²⁴⁹ Kraus has little to say about the ktistic qualities of Camillus, and nothing at all about those of Augustus. In his comprehensive overview of Augustus' emulation of Romulus, published in 1998, also Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg refers to Miles' work only in passing.²⁵⁰ He does not make much of Livy's contribution to Augustus' status as refounder of Rome, and the Camillus-episode is not even mentioned. Von Ungern-Sternberg seems to have realised the latter omission and later addressed the role of Camillus as a second Romulus in a short contribution, published in 2001. Even there, though, Miles is only mentioned once, in a footnote, and his ideas are not discussed.²⁵¹

^{244.} Von Haehling (1989), Burck (1991), Burck (1992), Nesselrath (1990). Even later, there is no discussion in e.g. Scheithauer (1998) 298–301.

^{245.} Jaeger (1990) 19 n. 61, 41 n. 1, 54 n. 42; Konstan (1986) 206 n. 14, 208 n. 16; Santoro (1990) 222 n. 4, 236 n. 44, 237 n. 51.

^{246.} Santoro Lhoir (1990) 236 n. 45.

^{247.} Kraus (1994) 269 n. 13, 271 n. 20, 273.

^{248.} *Ibid.* 267.

^{249.} *Ibid.* 269. How Livy's work of history would be lying in ruins from the Gallic attack escapes the present author.

^{250.} von Ungern-Sternberg (1998) 176 n. 44.

^{251.} von Ungern-Sternberg (2001) 292 n. 26.

Miles' ideas started to gain traction after the articles from 1986 and 1988 were reprinted in 1995, partially altered and abridged, as chapters of his book on Livy.²⁵² The book was reviewed twice in the well-read *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, once by the history-oriented classical scholar Gary Forsythe, and once by the aforementioned literary oriented classicist, Christina Kraus. Forsythe seeks to refute Miles' claim that presenting a contemporary ruler as a refounder of Rome was Livy's original creation, but offers no decisive arguments.²⁵³ The reviewer deplores 'the inordinate amount of attention devoted to trying to detect Augustan themes or ideology in Livy's narrative' as a common 'shortcoming in much of the modern literary-critical approach to Livy'. Kraus, conversely, is sympathetic to such an approach, and acknowledges Miles' conclusions with deference. Miles' ideas were, however, reviewed with severe criticism by Stephen Oakley, who concedes that 'it would be absurd to deny that Livy's Camillus could have put his readers in mind of Octavian/Augustus', but finds Miles' arguments in support of a pattern of viewing Roman history as it was conceived by Livy rather improbable.²⁵⁴ Effectively, Oakley sides with Forsythe in supporting the traditional view of Weinstock and others that much of the political connotations present in Livy's works would not be his original creations, but rather derive from the historical tradition Livy was copying, and originated not in Livy's mind, but in the minds of his early first century BC predecessors. Oakley also points out that Miles' chronological calculations would be invalidated by his omission of the four dictator-years (333, 324, 309 and 301 BC) not counted by Livy. In his monumental commentaries on books VI and VII of Livy's history, Oakley hardly mentions Miles' important work on the resemblances between Camillus and Augustus.²⁵⁵ For Oakley, the idea that Livy's work resonated with Augustan ideas about refoundation seems to be of no interest at all.²⁵⁶

Miles' views, however, were consolidated as academic mainstream by Catherine Edwards in a concise but influential book on literary perceptions of Rome, published in 1996. Edwards fully endorses Miles' reading of Livy's Camillus, but also adds valuable remarks and makes it interact with wider currents of contemporary Augustan culture, especially the *princeps'* policies of religious restoration.²⁵⁷ In the

²⁵². The slightly more than two pages from 'In all this, ...' (Miles (1988) 205) to '... the charismatic leader's role were especially timely' (Miles (1988) 207) have been partially deleted, partially moved to the end of the chapter in the reprint.

²⁵³. Forsythe (1996), basing himself on passages from Ennius, Cicero, and Appian.

²⁵⁴. Oakley (1998b) 283.

²⁵⁵. Oakley (1997) 386 and (1998a) 37 refer only to Weinstock (1971), as if nothing had been published on the subject since 1971; Miles is mentioned only briefly at Oakley (1998a) 737.

²⁵⁶. See especially Oakley (1997) 378-379.

²⁵⁷. Edwards (1996) 45-51.

opening chapter of book VI, Livy refers to Camillus' commitment to the site of Rome, even after the Sack of Rome by the Gauls, and his opposition to the idea of moving the entire city to the site of recently conquered Veii, as a *secunda origo* (VI.1.3), a "second foundation" of Rome.²⁵⁸ Edwards rightly stresses the Augustan overtones of such phrasing. Also in 1996, Karl Galinsky made the general observation that '[w]hat makes Livy an Augustan author (...) is not a fixed ideology, but a constant formulation and reformulation of some of the central ideas of the age, a discussion to which the poets contributed also.'²⁵⁹ This statement may certainly be applied to the specific case of kthic renewal, as one of those 'central ideas'. As we have already seen in the Introduction, Livy's contribution could be quite decisive, e.g. in his interpretation of Augustus' programme of temple restoration as an act of kthic renewal.²⁶⁰ According to Galinsky, this convergence in ideas was not the product of coercion or political control – Livy and Augustus could indeed disagree, openly and publicly, on important issues, such as the evaluation of the qualities and achievements of crucial historical figures like Rome's founder, Romulus.²⁶¹

It would perhaps be possible to develop these ideas further, comparing Livy's treatment of Camillus more closely with the role of this particular hero (represented by a statue and an *elogium*, just like Romulus) in the complex ideology expressed in the Forum of Augustus, dating to the later part of Augustus' reign,²⁶² or Camillus' list of sacred temples, objects and priesthoods in V.52 with the similar rhetoric of Augustus' *Res Gestae*.²⁶³ Even though it has not found universal acceptance,²⁶⁴ the main point of Miles' thesis about Romulus, Camillus and Augustus in Livy, has not been substantially challenged, altered or updated by later scholars.²⁶⁵ In his commitment to the site of Rome, his victory over nearly fatal enemies and his resulting role as

^{258.} *Ibid.* 48, mentioned only in passing by Miles (1986) 14 = (1995) 89. Cf. Liv. V.51.3, *secunda nostra fortuna*.

^{259.} Galinsky (1996) 283.

^{260.} See p. 20, above.

^{261.} Galinsky (1996) 286.

^{262.} Only brief references to the *elogium* in Miles (1986) 17 n. 41 and Stevenson (2000) 43 n. 9 (cf. 45 n. 59). Cf. Luce (1990).

^{263.} Observe that Camillus mentions a hut of Romulus, in V.53.8, while the *Res Gestae* do not.

^{264.} Gaertner (2008) forcefully revisits the traditional idea that Livy 'has inherited, not invented, the image of Camillus as a saviour and refounder of the Roman state' (p. 39), based on conjectures of what Late Republican annalists, now lost, may have written about Camillus. See especially p. 38 for an unconvincing attempt to date Camillus' role as *conditor alter* back to the Late Republic. His interpretation has found little support, except for Vasaly (2015) 141 n. 13, 166 n. 2, and is contradicted by the facts mentioned in Schettino (2006) 70. See also Singer (2022) 177 n. 769.

^{265.} See Matthes (2000) 40; Mineo (2003); Groves (2013) 59 n. 115; Möller (2014); Luke (2014) 159 n. 78, 223, 245; Mineo (2015); Balmaceda (2017) 97–98; McIntyre (2018); Poletti (2018) 20; and cf. Vasaly (2015) 2–3. Stevenson (2000) has little new to say; von Ungern-Sternberg (2001) largely addresses the discussion on the historical reliability of the legends surrounding Camillus.

second founder, halfway between Romulus and Augustus, Livy's Camillus neatly foreshadows the ktistic qualities of the *princeps*.²⁶⁶

Miles' interpretation is highly compelling, but rests only on a single Augustan source. It should therefore be put to the test by expanding the investigation to contemporary sources beyond the scope of Miles. Most prominent among those sources, certainly, is Vergil's major heroic epic, the *Aeneid*, a work roughly contemporary to Livy's first pentad. Did Vergil employ similar ways of linking Augustus to the founders of Rome, either through intermediate figures like Camillus, or directly? What statements does the *Aeneid* make about the ktistic qualities of Augustus? The next chapter is devoted to these questions.

^{266.} In the later Imperial period, Livy's Camillus-episode remained paradigmatic, e.g. for Suetonius (*Nero*, 39.2) and Tacitus (*Ann.* XV.43.1-5) in their description of the Great Fire of AD 64, under Nero; cf. Edwards (1996) 52.

CHAPTER

2

CASE STUDY

Vergil's Aeneid as a ktistic epic

'Virgil is, in the phrase aptly used of him by Tennyson, a "lord of language." No amount of minute and intensive study is wasted on this side of his poetry.'

(Mackail (1930) 17)

'The passages in which he has treated the theme [the Golden Age] include several of the most famous, and most controversial, of Vergilian loci, involving still unsolved problems and unsettled arguments concerning the poet's philosophical views, political loyalties, and poetic techniques. Yet it is characteristic of the most thoughtful of Latin poets to beguile his readers into perpetually renewed attempts to interpret his meaning.'

(Ryberg (1958) 112)

In the words of Karl Galinsky, one of the foremost experts on Augustan Rome, 'the *Aeneid* is thoroughly woven into the Augustan context', and the poem is 'the epitome of Augustan culture in its combination of tradition with new departures'.²⁶⁷ That is not to say that it was outright Augustan propaganda, but '[n]either propagandistic nor subversive, Virgil's poetry may be read as an open-ended engagement with the defining ideals of the Augustan age'.²⁶⁸ It is to the role of one of those 'defining ideals' in the *Aeneid* that we must now turn. Is there evidence for the idea that the Augustan Principate amounted to a refoundation of Rome in Vergil's monumental epic?

One difficulty in establishing whether Vergil's *Aeneid* presented Augustus as a second founder of Rome, or interpreted the Augustan principate as a refoundation of the city, lies in the fact that the poem does not provide simple and straightforward statements about Augustan ideology (if indeed there is any such thing).²⁶⁹ The best we can do is extract meaning from the words of the poet calls for minute philological analysis; interpreting single phrases and passages within their proper narrative context, and within the complicated structure of the epic poem as a whole. For the purposes of this chapter, it is therefore indispensable to begin with some general observations about the scope and structure of the *Aeneid*, and to proceed by discussing individual passages of the work in considerable detail. After this philological groundwork, it will be possible to draw more general conclusions.

Although this is a dissertation in Ancient History addressing an historical question, rather than a literary or linguistic one, a fair amount of literary and linguistic analysis will be necessary to assess to what extent, according to the *Aeneid*, the Augustan Principate

^{267.} Galinsky (1996) 246, 251.

^{268.} C.F. Noreña s.v. 'Augustan Ideology' in VE I 153.

^{269.} Cf. Galinsky (2008): ' [...] written as it was in 20s, the *Aeneid* [...] reflect[s] the incomplete (if it ever was complete) and still developing ideology of the early principate--Vergil's poem, in fact, needs to be viewed as a component of this process.'

amounted to a refoundation of Rome. Conversely, it is important to stress that what follows is not a full-scale literary or philological treatment: given the complexity of the poem under discussion, such an exhaustive treatment could easily fill a dissertation of its own. The goal of this chapter is, in short, to analyse relevant passages from the *Aeneid* in a literary and philological way as much as is necessary to interpret them properly as evidence for our historical question,²⁷⁰ leaving aside for the moment the issues not directly relevant to the theme of ktistic renewal in the Augustan Age at large.²⁷¹

Another, related, difficulty has to do with the selection of passages relevant for our theme. On a superficial level, the *Aeneid* is not strictly a poem about Augustan Rome, but about a Trojan refugee leading his fellow countrymen to a new and stable home after the fall of Troy. Their destination turns out to be Italy, where they face severe troubles in establishing themselves, and the poem ends before their many sufferings result in the foundation of a new and lasting city. Apart from being the leader of the Trojans, however, Aeneas is also the progenitor of the Roman race, and the ancestor of Augustus' *gens Iulia*. That triple nature, and the fact that Aeneas and his Trojans end up in places where important events in Roman history took place – including the site of Rome itself – allows for many 'previews' into what for Aeneas is the distant future, but what for a Roman audience in the Early Augustan Age constituted the (sometimes very recent) past or present (or even future).

The point is that these two (mythical and historical) realms are not clearly separated, but interact with differing degrees of intensity and explicitness throughout the poem.²⁷² It would be too simplistic, for one thing, to treat only passages that have to do explicitly with Rome or Augustus. Aeneas is not only Augustus' progenitor, but also a city founder himself, and he acts in a way that very likely informs the *Aeneid*'s conceptualisation of the act of founding in general, implicitly reflecting on Augustus. The catch here is that it is often a matter of debate whether, and if so how, Aeneas' exploits reflect on the *princeps*. The most recommendable way to proceed would be not to look at passages in isolation, but to trace whether the same themes reoccur and constitute a specific ktistic 'discourse' throughout the poem.

^{270.} Recent non-literary (or not primarily literary) approaches to the works of Vergil include Nadeau (2004) and Weeda (2015).

^{271.} An issue not addressed here, for example, is how the *Aeneid*'s concern with founding is related to the Hellenistic genre of *ktisis*-literature, about which we sadly know little; for this issue see Cairns (1979) 68-70; Hardie (1998) 63-64; R. Thomas s.v. 'foundation literature' in VE II 500-502; Fletcher (2014) 16-21 (with further references).

^{272.} Cf. e.g. Williams (1983) 132-156 *et passim*. This interaction has a strong intertextual dimension as well, referring to both the Homeric and the Roman epic tradition: see e.g. Hardie (1998) 53-54 on Homer vs. Ennius as models, and studies like Casali (2007).

2.1. The theme of foundation in the scope and structure of the *Aeneid*

In order to assess Vergil's treatment of city-foundation in the *Aeneid* correctly, it is necessary to consider the scope and structure of the work, in which acts of founding figure so prominently. Scholars have variously characterized the overall structure, 'design', 'architecture' or 'plan' of the *Aeneid*. Traditionally, studies focus on the literary design of the epic, divided into two halves in imitation of Homer's *Odyssey* (*Aeneid* books I-VI) and *Iliad* (*Aeneid* books VII-XII) respectively,²⁷³ and on its formal division in 12 individual books, each characterized by a specific subject matter or emphasis.²⁷⁴ That is still a common framework to organize thematic studies of the *Aeneid*,²⁷⁵ but literary and formal structures are only of secondary interest to our inquiry. What concerns us is the structure within which the *Aeneid*'s concern with Rome, Roman history and the Augustan present is articulated. It has long been recognized that Vergil blended his mythical and historical material into a coherent whole.²⁷⁶ The important point is that this structural characteristic of the *Aeneid* is, in itself, already very much in tune with wider aspects of Augustan culture and the whole idea that the rule of the *princeps* implied a re-foundation of Rome. Intensively connecting 'Urzeit' to 'Endzeit', the primordial past to the present,²⁷⁷ Vergil created a literary framework particularly congenial to ideas about ktistic renewal.

Through this innovative framework Vergil created a strikingly new variant of the traditional epic poem.²⁷⁸ Yet Vergil's Augustan present, at the far end of the work's historical spectrum, is not the only focus blended into the mythological superstructure. Rome's origins and genesis also constitute a major, perhaps even central, theme in the poem.²⁷⁹ This theme is conspicuously present in many pivotal passages, such as the opening movement of the whole work, the great prophetic

^{273.} E.g. Williams (1987) 28; differently K. Büchner, s.v. 'Vergilius, 5.5', KP V (1975) 1196-8. On the implications of this imitation see Hardie (1998) 53-57.

^{274.} E.g. Williams (1987) 29-30; cf. Conte (1994) 276: 'The twelve books are conceived primarily as a response to the forty-eight books of the two Homeric poems.'

^{275.} E.g. Fletcher (2014).

^{276.} E.g. Schanz and Hosius (1935⁴) 69; Brisson (1971) 56; Suerbaum, s.v. '[4] Vergilius (Maro, P.)', DNP XII.2 (2002) 51-52 (= BNP XV (2010) 305). See also Klingner (1943), Paratore (1970) (= 1976), Buchheit (1973), Girod (1978), Rieks (1981), Binder (1988) 259-261, Binder (1990), Suerbaum (1993) 435. I have not been able to consult W.P. Basson, 'Virgil, Roman History, and the Roman's Destiny: Notes on Aen. VI.836-53', *Akroterion* 20 (1975) 83-92.

^{277.} Klingner (1967) 378 on 'Urzeit' and 'Endzeit'; cf. Nelis (2001) 228-229.

^{278.} Cf. Pöschl (1950) 65 (= 1962) 39; Büchner s.v. 'P. Vergilius Maro, II. D' in RE VIII A.2 (1958) 1455 = Büchner (1959) 433; Binder (1990); Suerbaum (1993) 433-434; Galinsky (1996) 20. See Hardie (1986) 25 for a similarly innovative measure through which Vergil made the traditional ktisis-poem, local in outlook, into a universal variant of that genre.

^{279.} Syme (1939) 462; McGushin (1965) 411; Hunt (1973) 5; Hardie (1998) 64; James (1995) 623; Lowrie (2009) 169 ('the *Aeneid*'s driving plot, the foundation of Rome'); Fletcher (2014) 8 (but contrast 18).

scenes of books I, VI, VIII and XII, and Aeneas' visit to the site of Rome in book VIII. Apart from these explicit instances, it lurks in the background during many other episodes.²⁸⁰ Rome's coming into being is not only addressed in prophecies, allusions and authorial comments, but also mirrored in the progressive development of the poem's protagonist, Aeneas, and his Trojan companions – in other words, in the plot. That plot has rightly been characterized as 'highly complex', and not only because – as we have seen – '[f]lashbacks, prophecies, and embedded set pieces expand the plot's temporal scope'.²⁸¹ What we have observed above in terms of framework and structure also occurs in terms of plot. The epic narrates how, slowly and painstakingly, renewed hope for a better future arises out of the Trojans' suffering and despair – and this future culminates in the establishment of Rome.²⁸² As Breed puts it: 'Seen in light of its literary and historical contexts, the poem both reiterates the plots of the Homeric epics and establishes a completely new trajectory leading toward the ultimate end of the foundation of Rome'.²⁸³ Within this teleological thrust of the poem, Rome's primordial foundation is often coupled to the pinnacle of imperial destiny that Rome reaches during the rule of Augustus.²⁸⁴ Aeneas' foundational acts – functioning as a prefiguration of the *princeps'* exploits and developing Aeneas into Augustus' typological predecessor – also foreshadow Rome's origins.²⁸⁵ Accordingly, the Augustan theme is present in many of the same instances where Rome's origins come to the surface.²⁸⁶

These two historical dimensions are intricately connected both amongst themselves and with the epic plot as a whole. That makes Vergil's *Aeneid* the ktistic poem of the Augustan Age par *excellence*. The epic plot is characterized by two main directions,²⁸⁷ set in distinct spheres but intertwined at important junctions in the narrative:

^{280.} See Horsfall (1990) 204-205.

^{281.} B.W. Breed s.v. 'narrative and narratology' in VE II 883.

^{282.} See Hardie (1998) 53 for a forceful description of perhaps the most intense episode in the poem where these dimensions are all present, i.e. the underworld scene of book VI.

^{283.} B.W. Breed s.v. 'narrative and narratology' in VE II 883.

^{284.} B.W. Boyd s.v. 'Rome, myth and history of' in VE III 1097; cf. Syme (1939) 462-463, Williams (1983) viii. For a critique of this widely held view, see Toll (1997), who wants to see an opposition between these in fact unitary themes and assumes Vergil would have chosen Aeneas as 'an alternative to Romulus' (*ibid.* 34).

^{285.} On the typological interpretation of the *Aeneid*, developed in Binder (1971), see briefly Schauer (2007) 29.

^{286.} See Griffin (1985) 183-197.

^{287.} Cf. Breed s.v. 'narrative and narratology' in VE II 883: 'As seen within the poem itself, the development of the plot looks like a negotiation among various possible plots. Jupiter and Juno vie for different outcomes; Aeneas and other human characters have incomplete knowledge of the plot and are at times actively misled.' See also Hunt (1973) xi on 'the role of the gods as a super-plot'.

- A. the “terrestrial” or human course of action, describing the wanderings and suffering of the protagonist, who sets out from Troy in search of a new homeland and starts to secure it in Italy, through perseverance and prolonged warfare. For Aeneas, Rome plays only an unspecified role in his actions or thoughts, although the reader is constantly aware of the momentous consequences of his actions and the way they foreshadow Rome’s history.
- B. the “celestial” or divine course of action, describing the origins of Aeneas’ sufferings (Juno’s anger) and the ultimate goal to which they are directed: the foundation of the Roman race and its subsequent world dominion under Caesar Augustus, ushering in a new Golden Age. This also includes how the Fates ordained this destiny to be fulfilled. Rome is the goal envisaged by Jupiter and as such is promised to Aeneas’ divine mother, Venus; Juno opposes their will until Jupiter and Juno settle for a compromise.

‘A’ evolves partially as a result of decisions made and actions taken in ‘B’, largely by Juno, the Trojans’ main enemy, Venus, their benefactor and protector, and Jupiter, who mediates between the two and guarantees the fulfillment of destiny.²⁸⁸ Although the intricacies of B are generally unknown in A,²⁸⁹ crucial information is gradually revealed through prophecy, epiphany and divine intervention. This gradual revelation reaches its climax in the underworld ‘Parade of Heroes’ in book VI and the tour of the site of Rome in book VIII. The special nature of the *Aeneid*’s concern with Rome is due in large part to the fact that Rome dominates ‘B’, but figures only casually and indirectly in ‘A’.

Our discussion will treat passages embedded in B more extensively than what happens in A, simply because the subject of this study is more explicitly present there. Nevertheless, what happens in B should not be seen in isolation. The ‘subversive’ interpretation of many modern Anglo-Saxon critics rests on the premise that morally disputable events in ‘A’ cast a long and dark shadow on the lofty claims set out in ‘B’, subverting their imperialist meaning, rather than that events in ‘B’ justify the questionable episodes in ‘A’ by recourse to a higher cause. One may wonder whether such a contamination of the celestial sphere of action is in accordance with the poem’s own conception of fate and divine intervention.²⁹⁰ The question, however, is not whether Vergil or his readers cherished an idea of a divine sphere exempt from corruption, the fate-ordained dominion of Rome remaining untouched by human immoral behavior, but whether such immoral behavior by Aeneas may be excused by plausible deniability. After all, it is Juno’s wrath, in the end, which determined the

^{288.} Cf. F. Graf s.v. ‘myth and religion’ in VE II 870.

^{289.} See Hardie (1998) 78, referring to Block (1981).

^{290.} Primmer (1980) 85–86.

brutal slaughter and loss of life, as she stirred up the parties to war in the first place, turning peace-loving (cf. VII.47) and war-weary peoples into bloodthirsty opponents. That does not exonerate Aeneas in terms of moral conduct, of course. It would, however, be circular reasoning to see his divinely fired dark side as a corrupting agent of divine favor for Rome: if the gods make him rage in fury, that can hardly subvert and invalidate those gods' own predictions about Rome.

Prospective views into the history of Rome are fully embedded in the narrative in terms of plot.²⁹¹ Aeneas is, however, unaware of the many hints of Roman destiny presented to him.²⁹² Even after seeing the revelation of Roman history in the Parade of the Heroes, Aeneas shoulders his shield (made for him by Vulcan, prophetically depicting scenes of Roman history) *rerum ignarus* ("unaware of things [depicted on the shield]", VIII.730).²⁹³ Aeneas, although presented by Vergil as the founder of the Roman race and hence a 'symbolic' founder of Rome, is not a straightforward and self-conscious founder of Rome in the sense of Livy's Romulus. Much of the significance of his foundational activities eludes him, it seems, and it is by way of the gods' revelations, the poet's hints and our (and the ancient readers') knowledge of subsequent events in Roman history that we manage to grasp the higher purpose of his actions. That makes the *Aeneid* such an interesting text. Through the presentation of a hero that in some ways is, and in many ways is not, a founder of Rome, it addresses the question, albeit implicitly, what the concept of foundation actually means. How do Aeneas' ktistic acts relate to the founding of Rome by Romulus? How do both relate to Augustus? These are the questions which the remainder of this chapter sets out to answer.

Naturally, this thesis is not the first work of scholarship to address the *Aeneid*'s concern with founding.²⁹⁴ Various epithets have been used to describe this characteristic of the work. Scholars have pointed out that the *Aeneid* is a 'ktistic' epic, concerned with

^{291.} Primmer (1980) 84-85; cf. Suerbaum, s.v. '[4] Vergilius (Maro, P.)', DNP XII.2 (2002), 51-52 = BNP XV (2010) 305, cited above (n. 265).

^{292.} Holt (1982) 304-307.

^{293.} See Horsfall (1995) 146-147 and (2013) 612-620, and cf. Most (2001) 169-170.

^{294.} Nikolopoulos (2006) 71-72 cites most of the recent literature. Omitted items include Brinkman (1958), Harrison (1985), Horsfall (1991), Franchi (1995), Nelis (2001) and Cancik (2004). Older literature in Suerbaum (1967) 176 n. 2; see now Connolly (2010), Castelletti (2012), Fletcher (2014) and Castelletti (2015). I have not been able to consult S.R. Nakata, *Dum Conderet Urbem: Colonization Narratives in the Aeneid* (diss. Irvine, 2004). A different but closely related topic is the role of the cities in the epic: see briefly Hornsby (1970) 113-117 and further Hardie (1986) 190, 336-375; Morwood (1991); Nelis (2015a); VE has no lemma on cities or anything that comes near. Undeservedly, the two articles by Francesco Sini (2002, 2004) have aroused little attention outside Italy.

the foundation of cities and peoples, and with the foundation of Rome in particular.²⁹⁵ In the words of Philip Hardie, the *Aeneid* is 'a ktistic epic whose meaning is governed by constant reference forward to the 'altae moenia Romae'.²⁹⁶ In the opening words of Patrick McGushin's important but scarcely cited article, the poet himself is the explicit agent in professing the ktistic quality of his work: 'Virgil makes it quite clear that the foundation of Rome – of the Roman race – is the center of his whole epic'.²⁹⁷ Interpretations along these lines often link the ktistic character of Vergil's epic to the role of Augustus. It has occasionally been acknowledged that the *Aeneid* is not only concerned with the foundation of Rome in the past, but that it is also one of the most powerful expressions of the ideology according to which the *princeps* could be seen as a second founder of Rome in the present.²⁹⁸ The matter is phrased well by Ganiban:²⁹⁹

(...) the *Aeneid* is about more than the Trojan war and its aftermath. It is also about the foundation of Rome and its flourishing under Augustus. To incorporate these themes into his epic, Vergil connects mythological and historical time by associating three leaders and city foundations: the founding of Lavinium by Aeneas, the actual founding of Rome by Romulus, and the "re-founding" of Rome by Augustus. These events are prominent in the most important prophecies of the epic: Jupiter's speech to Venus (1.257-96) and Anchises' revelation to his son Aeneas (6.756-853). Together these passages provide what may be called an Augustan reading of Roman history, one that is shaped by the deeds of these three men and that views Augustus as the culmination of the processes of fate and history.

Notwithstanding the ample recognition of the *Aeneid*'s ktistic quality, little attention has been devoted to its particulars, to the poetic discourse expressing this ktistic quality or to the way such a discourse develops in the course of the poem. Such is the centrality of the epic's ktistic theme and its self-evident familiarity to modern

^{295.} Apart from 'ktistic' and the related 'ktisis poem' (Fletcher (2014) 18, 41), terms to characterize the *Aeneid*'s concern with foundations abound. The work has been described as 'foundational': Lowrie (2009) 142; Kallendorf (2007) 212, albeit referring mostly to its literary exemplarity; as 'foundation story' or 'poem': Formicola (2007) 154, Nicastri (2006) 390, Miles (1999), Horsfall (1989) 25, Hardie (1998) 68; as 'aetiological' or 'aetiology': Suerbaum in DNP XII.2 (2002) 52, Nelis (2001), Hardie (1998) 63, Franchi (1995), Binder (1988); as 'an epic of urban settlement and colonization': (Horsfall (1989) 8; and as 'a sort of colonization narrative': Fletcher (2014) vii, or 'a narrative of colonization and city-founding': Pearcy (2015).

^{296.} Hardie (1990) 224; cf. Cancik (2004) 309, Hardie (1994) 11-12, Hardie (1998) 64, Carney (1986) 422, .

^{297.} McGushin (1965) 411. Cf. Schiesaro (1993) 262-263: 'one of the fundamental ideological goals of the whole poem, namely the aetiological explanation of the origin of Rome from a very different ancestor [i.e., Troy].'

^{298.} Cf. West (1974) 24, Nelis (2001) 224.

^{299.} Ganiban (2008) 9-10, reprinted in the introduction to all editions of the 'Focus Commentaries Series' on Vergil's *Aeneid*, aimed at undergraduate students.

scholarship that critics tend to take it for granted.³⁰⁰ Only a modest number of detailed studies is devoted to it,³⁰¹ none of them with the length of a book.³⁰² The recent *The Virgil Encyclopedia*,³⁰³ as well as the far more voluminous *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*,³⁰⁴ treat the topic only in a dispersed manner. The same is true for the crucial verb *condere*.³⁰⁵ In many ways, this chapter picks up and develops existing ideas about and interpretations of the *Aeneid*, but it attempts to combine them into a coherent, overall analysis of the epic's ktistic character in a double sense: the *Aeneid* is an epic both concerned with the foundation of Rome, and itself foundational to the new order of Augustan Rome, in which the foundation of the city played such a prominent role.³⁰⁶

Given the considerations set out above, this chapter aims to look at the presence and role of ktistic discourse in the *Aeneid*. To do so, it will first discuss the opening lines and the end of the poem, which are obvious points for the theme to be addressed. The next paragraphs will each discuss a major episode in which both Rome and Augustus figure prominently: the Prophecy of Jupiter in book I, and the Parade of Heroes during Aeneas' visit to the Underworld in book VI. These two episodes are singled out

^{300.} E.g. Hardie (1986) 68 ('the *Aeneid* is indeed a poem of foundation, a *ktisis*'), 190 ('[Virgil] is, after all, writing a *ktisis*').

^{301.} Cf. G. Maddoli s.v. 'Romolo' in *EV* IV (1988) 570-574, observing that, amidst a huge bibliography on Romulus in general, scholarship on Romulus in Vergil specifically is almost non-existent (*ibid.* 574). For the slightly more limited issue of the typological correspondences in the *Aeneid* between Augustus, on the one hand, and Romulus and Aeneas, on the other, see e.g. Binder (1971) 31-38, 118-122, 137-141, 157-169, with note 285, above. Horsfall (1989) is concerned with the equally neglected but important issue of colony-foundation in the *Aeneid*, providing useful textual appendices on 'Urban Foundations' and 'Elements involved in an Urban Foundation' in the *Aeneid*. See also Morwood (1991) and Carney (1986).

^{302.} Apart from Buchheit (1963), described as a 'landmark study' by Galinsky (2008) n. 5, Wifstrand Schiebe (1997), Schauer (2007) and Fletcher (2014) only partially address some of the issues. Grimal (1985) is not primarily concerned with tracing the topic in the *Aeneid* in spite of the book's suggestive title (*Virgile, ou la seconde naissance de Rome*), but p. 11-13 contain useful remarks about *Ecl.* IX.

^{303.} A dedicated lemma is absent; some very brief notes under the headings R. Pogorzelski s.v. 'colonies and colonization' in *VE* I 283-284; R. Thomas s.v. 'foundation literature' in *VE* II 500-502; E. Dench s.v. 'Romulus and Remus' in *VE* III 1104.

^{304.} See M. Pavan s.v. 'Roma. – Storia' in *EV* IV (1988) 518-544, especially at 543, and G. Maddoli s.v. 'Romolo', *ibid.* 570-574, especially at 572-573.

^{305.} James (1995) focusses on other uses of *condere*, notably for stabbing a sword into an enemy; the approach of Rimell (2015) 39-62 differs considerably from the one adopted here. There is a brief but informative lemma on *condere* in the *EV* (De Rosalia, s.v. 'do' in *EV* II (1985) 117), unknown to Fratantuono & Smith (2022) 339 ('a favorite verb of the poet (regrettably untreated in *EV*)'). *VE* omits it, like 'almost all Latin words' (*VE* I lxvi). See also Hexter (1992) 359 and Hunt (1973) 5; the development of Hexter's argument in the work announced at Hexter (1992) 384 n. 147 (cf. 363 n. 16, 364 n. 21, 376 n. 92) seems never to have been published.

^{306.} Fletcher (2014), e.g., stresses the former but seems to underestimate the importance of the latter; he refers only in passing to 'the topos of Augustus as second founder of Rome' (*ibid.* 211, citing Getty (1950) 2) and glosses over it in his discussion of the ktistic theme of the epic (*ibid.* 18).

for a simple reason: they not only include some of the most noteworthy treatments in the poem of Rome's foundation and the reign of Augustus, but they also feature conspicuous uses of *condere*. That sets these two episodes apart from a lot of other interesting passages, where either Rome and Augustus, or occurrences of *condere* are prominent, but not both. One may think of the tour of Evander during Aeneas' visit to the site of Rome in book VIII and the description of the Shield of Aeneas crafted by Vulcan, in the same book, or Aeneas' ktistic activity and his visits to significant sites of Augustan ktistic activity, such as Carthage and Nicopolis, in books I, III, IV, V and VII. The present author would be the first to acknowledge the value of casting the net a little wider, and many of these passages have indeed been studied intensively during the research on which this chapter is based, but they have necessarily been left out for reasons of space and focus. I hope to return to this material in a separate publication, and refer to previously published articles for my own interpretation of, especially, the ktistic associations of Aeneas' visit to Carthage, in book I,³⁰⁷ and the important episode in book VIII where the Greek exile king Evander is strikingly termed a *conditor* (VIII.313), with the only occurrence of that noun in the entire *Aeneid*.³⁰⁸ There, it was already argued that Vergil consciously stretches the semantical limits of what *condere* can signify, and who can be named a *conditor* of Rome – both before Romulus, and long after him. Let us now see how that idea is developed in the *Aeneid*.

2.2. From Troy to Rome: the prologue and the end of the *Aeneid* (I.1-33, XII.950-952)

The *Aeneid* begins with a 'prologue' of 33 lines before the narrative proper starts *in medias res*.³⁰⁹ Such an authorial introduction to the poem as a whole was a common feature of ancient epic, and in particular of the Homeric epics that served as Vergil's primary model. The introduction to the *Aeneid* echoes those of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in some ways, but also differs significantly in many respects. Most crucial for the current investigation is that, contrary to the Homeric model, the theme of foundation figures prominently in Vergil's prologue, clearly establishing the ktistic character of the *Aeneid* from the outset. *Arma virumque*, the famous first words, characterize the main

^{307.} For the scholarly discussion about young Caesar's refoundation of Carthage as a contemporary, historical background to Vergil's description of Dido's foundation of Carthage, see briefly Singer (2022) 186-187. Vergil's description was recently treated by e.g. Singer (2022) 246-250; Goldschmidt (2017) 375-379; Modrow (2017) 246-279.

^{308.} See Hunsucker (2015) and (2018b) 363-364, of which the latter article also contains an overview of some of the material discussed more extensively below. For Aeneas implicitly described as founder with the nouns *pater* and *origo*, see note 371, below.

^{309.} I use the neutral term 'prologue' to avoid confusion with other current designations more pregnant in sense such as 'proem': see below.

hero and his enterprise in Iliadic and Odyssean terms.³¹⁰ In Vergil's epic, however, things are different. Unlike those of Odysseus, Aeneas' wanderings are directed by fate towards new horizons rather than a place left behind long ago, and unlike that of the *Iliad*, the war he fights is not about the destruction or the rescue of an old city, but about the foundation of a new one (I.1-33):³¹¹

2

*Arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
 Italiam fato profugus Lauinaque uenit
 litora – multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
 ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
 multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
 inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
 Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.
 Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso
 quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere casus
 insignem pietate uirum, tot adire labores
 impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae?
 Vrbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
 Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
 ostia, diues opum studiisque asperrima belli;
 quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
 posthabita coluisse Samo. hic illius arma,
 hic currus fuit; hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
 si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fouetque.
 progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
 audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces;
 hinc populum late regem belloque superbum
 uenturum excidio Libyae: sic uoluere Parcas.
 id metuens ueterisque memor Saturnia belli,
 prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis
 – neclum etiam causae irarum saeuique dolores
 exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
 iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae*

5

10

15

20

25

^{310.} For a succinct history of the comparison with Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and its limitations, see Cairns (1989) 177-178. For the resemblances and differences between the proem of the *Aeneid* and those of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, see *ibid.* 190-193 and 202-203 respectively.

^{311.} The Latin text quoted here is the one edited by Conte (2009), including his (historically correct) use of *u* instead of *v* and his omission of capital letters for the first words of a sentence; capital letters mark only names and new paragraphs in the text. The translations are my attempt to make the Latin text accessible and understandable, while conveying my interpretation of its meaning.

*et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores:
his accensa super iactatos aequore toto
Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli,
arcebant longe Latio, multosque per annos
errabant acti fatis maria omnia circum.
tanta molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

30

I sing of arms and the man, who from Troy's coast,
exiled by fate, first came to Italy and Lavinian
shores, much tossed about on land and sea
by the force of the gods, through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath,
and having suffered much in war as well, until he would found a city
and bring his gods to Latium, out of which came the Latin race,
the Alban fathers, and the walls of lofty Rome.

5

Muse, tell me the causes, because of what affront to her divinity
or because of which grief did the queen of the gods
drive a man famous for his sense of duty to endure so many misfortunes, 10
to face so many labors. Do heavenly spirits harbor such enormous wrath?

There has been an ancient city, inhabited by Tyrian settlers,
Carthage, opposite Italy and the Tiber's mouths
by far, rich in wealth and very stern in war's pursuit;
Juno is said to have loved only this city more than all other places, 15
more even than Samos. Here was her armor,
here her chariot; that this should be the ruling power among peoples,
if by any means the fates allowed it, was even then the goddess's aim and her
[cherished plan.

15

Yet in fact she had heard that an offspring was being derived from
[Trojan blood

that would one day overthrow the Tyrian strongholds; 21
that from it a nation, ruling widely and proud in war,
would come forth for Libya's downfall: thus the Fates ordained.

Saturnian Juno, fearful of this and mindful of the old war
which long before she had fought at Troy for her beloved Argives
– not yet, too, had the cause of her wrath and her bitter sorrows
faded from her mind: deep in her heart remained 25
the judgment of Paris and the outrage to her slighted beauty,
both the hated race and the honors paid to raped Ganymede –
inflamed hereby yet more, she tossed on the entire stretch of the sea the
Trojans, whatever was left of them by the Greeks and pitiless Achilles,

30

and she kept them far from Latium; and many years
 they wandered, driven by fate over all the seas.
 So weighty a task was it to found the Roman people.

One of the most important actions of the poem's protagonist, Aeneas, is that he will found a city (*conderet urbem*, 5). That city is in some way connected to Rome (*Romae*, 7). The theme of foundation and the role of Rome return in the line that monumentally rounds off the prologue and mentions the founding of the Roman race (*Romanam condere gentem*, 33) as a crowning achievement of the epic's action. Read as a 'statement of purpose' for the *Aeneid*, the prologue announces both how vast the span of the poem's subject matter is, reaching all the way from Troy to Rome, and how important ktistic concepts are in the trajectory between the two. Since the prologue is crucial to any understanding of the whole *Aeneid* and the theme of foundation plays such a prominent role in it, the passage as a whole merits closer scrutiny before we proceed with our analysis of the end of the epic. Our detailed investigation of the prologue will proceed section by section.

2.2.1. *The structure of the prologue*

The internal structure of the poem's opening lines is a point of discussion. Scholars do not apply uniform labels to any given part or the whole of the prologue,³¹² usually referred to as 'proem' in some way or another. The following analysis will argue that it can be divided roughly into three structural units of 11 lines each.³¹³ I will refer to them as the three 'couplets' of the prologue. Admittedly such divisions often seem arbitrary, but they are not without significance; if one emphasizes the significant position of a word at the start or end of some unit, it is important to define what that unit is and why it starts or ends where it does. In the case of the prologue, there is an asyndetic

³¹² Rijser in Putnam (2011) 138 refers to I.11 as 'the culmination of the proem'; also Horsfall (1995) 101-104 analyses the 'prooemium' is such a way that it probably refers to 1-11 only (see however 102 n. 8). Cairns (1989) 190-193 treats 1-11 as the 'prologue', but on p. 113 also includes line 13 in that term. V. D'Antò, s.v. 'proemi' in *EV IV* (1988) 299, takes lines 1-11 as the 'proemio', 1-7 as the 'protasi'. Paratore I (1978) 126, 130-131 and 135 employs a loose definition of the term 'proemio' which in the end means the whole of lines 1-33; he refers to lines 1-7 as 'la più tipica sezione del proemio' and the 'protasi vera e propria' (126). Williams I (1972) 161 calls 1-33 'the preliminary section' and refers to 1-7 as 'Virgil's statement of the theme of the poem' (155), avoiding the term 'proem' altogether. Austin (1971) refers to 1-33 as the 'exordium' (p. ix) and to 1-7 as the 'opening period' (26) or the 'prooemium' (27), but also as an 'exordium' (26). Büchner s.v. 'P. Vergilius Maro, II. D' in *RE VIII A.2* (1958) 1339 = Büchner (1959) 317 takes 1-33 as the 'Prooemium'. Galinsky (1996) 246 refers to lines 1-296 as 'the extended proem', while Fletcher (2014) 18 confusingly calls I.33 'the end of the second proem'.

³¹³ Büchner s.v. 'P. Vergilius Maro, II. D' in *RE VIII A.2* (1958) 1339 = Büchner (1959) 317, tacitly followed by Horsfall (1995) 102 n. 8, argues for a division of the prologue in two parts, 1-11 and 12-33; the determining factor adduced by both is not a feature inherent in the text, but a 1:2 ratio in the proportions of the two parts. Schauer (2007) 42-43 sees three parts in 1-7, 8-11 and 12-33 respectively.

full stop coinciding with verse end at the end of every 11th line.³¹⁴ This notable structural feature overlaps with more subjective divisions in contents and tone.

The prologue starts with what one may define as an epic *proœmium*, presenting the hero's main enterprise closely followed by an invocation of the Muses (lines 1-11). The first couplet is characterized by an extra syntactically marked subdivision after line 7, also featuring an asyndetic full stop at the verse end.³¹⁵ The first 7 lines, which I will refer to as the 'proœmium proper', again constitute a distinct unit with regard to structure, content and theme. This 'proœmium proper' addresses Aeneas' sufferings, achievements and the ultimate goal towards which they are directed, whilst the invocation of the Muses inquires into their causes. Phrased in the traditional epic language of divine intervention, this is a very effective way of drawing not only the future results of Aeneas' exploits, but also their mythological origins, into the poem. In such a way, the temporal scope of the work extends from the Trojan war to Roman history, long before and after the actions of Aeneas that form the poem's narrative core.³¹⁶

The second couplet further extends the scope of the work, this time geographically (lines 12-22). It consists of a small *ecphrasis* about Rome's historical rival Carthage,³¹⁷ a city which makes a somewhat unexpected appearance at this point in the prologue. It turns out that the cause of Juno's anger is not only her time-old hatred for Troy, but also the fact that in the future a Trojan people, i.e. the Romans, will destroy her beloved Carthage. Again, we are confronted with Roman history: Rome is not only the ultimate result of Aeneas' wanderings, but its destiny as world power has already caused the Trojans to suffer. The division between the second and third couplet (after line 22) is demarcated by the anaphoric, summarizing use of *id*, and forms a clear break with regard to its structure and content.³¹⁸ The *clausula*-like ending *sic volvere*

^{314.} All modern editors of the *Aeneid* (Ribbeck, Hirtzel, Mynors, Williams, Paratore, Fairclough and Goold, Geymonat, Conte) mark two of these divisions by indenting the text at line 12 and 34, while none of them indents at line 23.

^{315.} Most editors of the *Aeneid* mark this extra division by indenting the text also at line 8 (Hirtzel, Williams, Paratore, Fairclough and Goold, Geymonat), while others indent at 12 and 34 only (Ribbeck, Mynors, Conte).

^{316.} Büchner s.v. 'P. Vergilius Maro, II.D' in *RE* VIII A.2 (1958) 1339 = Büchner (1959) 317 stresses this point: 'So ist das Epos schon von Anfang an einspannt zwischen griechischem Mythos und naher historischer Vergangenheit.'

^{317.} For this use of the term *ecphrasis*, see Austin (1971) 34.

^{318.} The division at lines 22-23 is considered to be weaker than the others and never marked by indentation in modern editions, even though line 23 clearly opens a new syntactical unit spanning from the subject *Saturnia* (23) to the verb *arcebat* (31). Most commentators treat lines 12-33 as a whole, e.g. Austin (1971) 39, *ad 'arcebat'*, where he refers to lines 12-33 as 'the whole passage'. Line 18 also ends with a full stop (in all standard modern editions of the text, at least) but not one that creates an asyndeton with the next line; in fact *sed enim* (19) provides a strong structural link.

Parcas ('thus the Fates ordained', 22) is a momentous phrase, sealing the destiny of Carthage with vigor and determination.³¹⁹

The third couplet is linked to the second couplet thematically, but treats matters from a different perspective (lines 23–33). It further explains Juno's anger at the Trojans on their way to Latium by referring to her old grudges from the Trojan war and before. Bringing the Trojans led by Aeneas into focus again, it develops into a 'narrative prelude' of the events treated subsequently in book I.³²⁰ There would have been a very smooth transition to the narrative proper if it were not for the final sentence of this couplet about the founding of the Roman race. This stands somewhat apart from the rest and 'add[s] a summarizing reflection to round off [the] narrative prelude'.³²¹ The content of that summarizing reflection is telling: at the end of the prologue Rome and the theme of foundation again take center stage.³²²

Now that the overall structure of the prologue is clear, let us proceed with a detailed analysis of its specific content.

2.2.2. *The proœmium proper and the first couplet: Troy, Lavinium, Rome*

The opening lines of the *Aeneid* constitute a single sentence spanning seven lines.³²³ Right from the outset, these lines make it very clear that, apart from the main hero and his divine antagonist, cities play a major role in the epic:

*Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
Italiam fato profugus Lavinaque uenit*

^{319.} Its sense of closure will be retrospectively reinforced through intratextual links to e.g. I.283 (*Sic placitum*), on which see Enenkel (2005) 183 n. 48.

^{320.} For the term 'narrative prelude', see Austin (1971) 39, *ad 33*.

^{321.} *Ibid.* Also line 32 ends with an asyndetical full stop coinciding with the verse end: the only other instance in the prologue, apart from line 7 and the last lines of the couplets. Whether deliberate or a slip, Austin (1971) 34 lists the remainder of the prologue after lines 1–11 under the heading '12–32', instead of 12–33.

^{322.} Much has been said about this line and many scholars rely on it (explicitly or implicitly) to support their statements on the 'ktistic' nature of the *Aeneid*, or Aeneas' role as 'founder of the Roman community' (Connolly (2010) 416). Explicitly: Reed (2010) 73, Cairns (1989) 192, Hardie (1986) 135, Carney (1986) 430. Implicitly: Putnam (2011) 14, Cairns (1989) 114, Hardie (1986) 68, 190; Camps (1969) 146 n. 11.

^{323.} Cf. Feeney in Powell (2015) ix: 'The poem's first sentence already charts the historical plot, taking us in one sweep of seven lines from Homer's Troy to Augustus' Rome.' The lines are printed as a single sentence in Conte (2009), who places a dash between *litera* and *multum* (3) and a semicolon after *Latium* (6); Geymonat (2008), who places only commas; Fairclough and Goold (1999); Paratore I (1978); Perret (1977); Austin (1971); Mynors (1969); Ianell (1930); Hirtzel (1900); *pace* Quint. XI.3.37, who seems to mean that a new semantical unit begins (*ubi iam erit distinctio, quia inde alias incipit sensus*) after *Lavinaque venit litora*. See also Goold (1992) 115.

*litora – multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
 ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
 multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
 inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
 Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.*

5

I sing of arms and the man, who from Troy's coast,
 exiled by fate, first came to Italy and Lavinian
 shores, much tossed about on land and sea
 by the force of the gods, through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath,
 and having suffered much in war as well, until he would found a city 5
 and bring his gods to Latium, out of which came the Latin race,
 the Alban fathers, and the walls of lofty Rome.

The sentence is crafted in such a way that the spatial dimensions of the epic receive full stress. Geographical terms are very prominent (*oris, litora, terris, alto, urbem, moenia*) and the lines are littered with toponyms (*Troiae, Italiam, Lavina, Latio, Latinum, Albani, Romae*). After the very concise opening formula *arma virumque cano* (the main clause of the sentence in terms of syntax), the remainder of the *proœmium* proper starts with *Troiae*, emphatically placed before the relative *qui* (1), and ends with *Romae*.³²⁴ Both cities mark the start and end of a trajectory that is both geographical, ideological and poetical: as the action take us from Troy to Rome, the hero develops from failure to success. An exiled Trojan prince becomes the progenitor of the Roman race, and the fall of one great city leads to the establishment of an even greater successor. At the same time, the transfer of the center of gravity from Troy to Rome is also a transfer of poetical prominence from Homer to Vergil. In a broad sense, these lines thus convey transformation, movement, development, growth.

Apart from the words *Troiae* and *Romae* at beginning and end, the phrasing of the subordinate clause (*qui ... litora, 1-3*) after *virum* also reinforces the urban character of the framework in which the hero's actions are to take place. Aeneas is hailed as the first to have come 'from Troy's coast... to Italy' (*Troiae ... ab oris / Italiam, 1-2*), after which the poet adds: 'and [to the] Lavinian shores' (*Lavinaque ... / litora, 2-3*). The *-que* is best taken as explicative: the general geographical indication of the hero's destination (*Italiam*) is specified further in urban terms, creating parallelism between (the coastal city of) Troy and (the coast of) future Lavinium. The adjective *Lavina* is somewhat unorthodox and must be proleptic, as it describes the shores of Latium not

^{324.} Fuchs (1947) 191 n. 114, followed by Buchheit (1963) 15 n. 16 and Austin (1968) 113. Independently Suerbaum (1967) 176, following Halter (1963). Cf. Feeney in Powell (2015) ix-x.

in geographical terms but by way of the city (Lavinium) that Aeneas will eventually found there.³²⁵ The designation of the landscape in Latium where Aeneas is to settle is overdetermined by the urban character of Lavinium as a future goal.³²⁶ *Lavinaque venit*, moreover, occupies the exact same metrical position as *dum conderet urbem* three lines down. An epic voyage from Troy to a fate-ordained land has thus already started to become a passage from one city to another.

The urban character of Aeneas' destination is made explicit by *dum conderet urbem* (5). Aeneas has come from Troy to the Lavinian shores to found a city, but not before he has undergone a great deal of suffering. The progressive trajectory from Troy to Rome, almost complete with Aeneas' fated passage from Trojan to Lavinian shores, is put on hold after *litora* by a little over two lines marking not progress but obstruction. What defines Aeneas is not only that he is the man who first came from Troy to Latium, on an epic and fate-ordained journey, but also that he had done so only after facing severe, epic troubles. *Dum conderet urbem* comes after a double participle clause governed by *iactatus* (3) and *passus* (5), both passive perfect participles in the nominative having Aeneas as their subject. The participle clauses vividly evoke the hero's sufferings, as well as their divine cause (the *ira Iunonis*), and link them to the Iliadic and Odyssean terms of the opening line (*arma virumque*) in a chiastic arrangement: *virum* is picked up by *terris iactatus et alto* (3), *arma* by *bello passus* (5).³²⁷ The emphasis is on the intensity and extent of Aeneas' wanderings and sufferings in war, *multum* (3) and *multa* (5) standing in initial position in each clause.³²⁸

An end to the hero's ordeals, which start at the fall of Troy, is brought about by the foundation of a new city: Aeneas has suffered much in war *dum conderet urbem*

^{325.} L. Fratantuono s.v. 'Lavinium' in VE II 736; see also *Aen.* IV.236 (*Lavinia ... arva*) and note 529, below.

^{326.} Cf. Cairns (1989) 156 for the opinion that 'whenever in Books 1-6 the city of Lavinium, Rome's predecessor named after her [Lavinia], is mentioned (1.2, 258, 270; 4.236, 6.84) Lavinia is implicitly present (...).'

^{327.} Cf. Pöschl (1950) 41 = (1962) 24-25. *Ira*, "anger", the uniting cause of both the *Iliad*'s sufferings and those of the *Odyssey*, stands between them. Cf. Austin (1971) 30, *ad 'memorem ... iram'*: 'the words recall both *Il.* 1.1 μῆνιν ἀειδε and *Od.* 1.20 f. (of Poseidon) ὁ δ' ἀσπερχές μενέωνεν / ἀντιθέω Όδυσσηι πάρος ἦν γαῖαν ἵκεσθαι.' Horsfall (1995) 102 notes only the chiasmus between *arma virumque* and the arrangement of the 'Odyssean' and 'Iliadic' hexads of the poem, books I-VI and VII-XII respectively.

^{328.} Cf. *Od.* I.1-4 πολλὰ / ... / πολλῶν δ' ... / πολλὰ δ', the last two in verse- and clause-initial position. On this resemblance, see Cairns (1989) 192 and Hardie (1986) 303, also referring to the proem of the *Iliad*.

(5).³²⁹ There are multiple ways to interpret these crucial words. The Late Antique commentary on the *Aeneid* by Servius already distinguished three readings, each depending on a different understanding of *dum* and an identification of *urbem* with different cities (the fortified camp Aeneas builds in *Aen.* VII.159, Lavinium or Rome). Even if it is clear that the city should be identified as Lavinium, *dum* could carry different nuances. Although the use of the subjunctive makes this less likely, *dum* could express the contemporaneous circumstances (OLD 1): Aeneas suffered much in war while he was founding his city. The trajectory would then be that he came to Latium to found a city, and had to wage war as long as was needed to do so.³³⁰ *Dum* would then be comparable to *cum* (OLD 8, 11). Most commentators prefer a different reading, according to which *dum* carries a meaning (OLD 5b) comparable to *ut* (OLD 28) introducing a final clause.³³¹ *Dum* then expresses the aim to which Aeneas' wanderings and sufferings were directed, a sense that is also read into the subjunctive mode of *conderet*,³³² *dum* meaning the same as *donec*, 'until' (OLD 1, 2).³³³ The very presence of these ambiguities is likely to enact the aspect of unfulfilledness so important in the Vergilian concept of foundation.

These different readings may imply different relationships between the events described by *iactatus*, *passus* and *conderet*, but it is evident that the foundation of a city marks the end of the wars that Aeneas will wage in Italy. We will see that Aeneas' kthic act in Latium is associated with peace. The name of the city, Lavinium, also implies that Aeneas has first won the war in which his new wife Lavinia, after whom the new city will be named, was one of the bones of contention. Nevertheless, the possibility that *dum conderet urbem* describes an ongoing process accompanied by long struggle, rather than one final act at the end of it, is interesting in the light of the rest of our analysis. Even if *conderet urbem* denotes a momentary action, it is not the final and enduring result of the trajectory from Troy to Rome described here, but rather a

^{329.} As Conington & Nettleship II (1884) 4 remark *ad loc.*, '[t]he clause belongs to 'multa bello passus' rather than to 'iactatus.' One should however keep in mind Vergil's inversion of the Odyssean model in particular: Aeneas suffers until he will found a city, whereas Odysseus suffers after having destroyed Troy (δε μάλα πολλά / πλάγχθη, ἐπει Τροίης ιερὸν πτολεθρον ἔπερσεν, *Od.* I.1-2) and while wandering across many cities (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἔδει ἀστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, *Od.* I.3). *Urbem* (5) is thus also Vergil's correction of the initial omission of the cities (ἀστεα) in the Odyssean intertext.

^{330.} Henry I (1873) 142 takes the whole phrase to mean 'neither more nor less than: while bringing his gods into Latium and there founding a city.' The OLD itself classes *Aen.* I.5 under sense 1d, 'for as long as is needed (for), while'.

^{331.} Paratore I (1978) 129, *ad loc.* See Hofmann-Szantyr (1972) 617, §330.IV Zus. β.

^{332.} Austin (1971) 30, *ad loc.*; cf. Williams I (1972) 158 and Heyne-Wagner II (1832) 64.

^{333.} Hofmann-Szantyr (1972) 615-616, §330.III. Cf. *Aen.* I.273 for *donec* in a very similar setting, but with a different tense – we will return to this passage below.

crucial phase in that (still ongoing) trajectory. In the development from lost Troy to lofty Rome, the foundation of a city in Latium is the most important junction.

Also dependent on *dum* and on a par with *conderet urbem* (5) is the following clause, *inferretque deos Latio* (6). Aeneas' settlement on the Lavinian shores is invested with the establishment in Latium of the ancient religious rites brought from Troy, notably the cult of the *dei Penates* (as *deos* [6] is to be understood).³³⁴ The new city and the ancient Trojan gods combined form a final safe haven for the Trojan exiles. *-Que* (6) is almost explicative and the one cannot do without the other.³³⁵ the *urbs* founded by Aeneas is the necessary condition for Troy's ancient city-gods to settle down in rustic Latium, but the gods also provide the newly founded city with legitimacy and protection, like any other colonial foundation in distant lands.³³⁶ While the setting of Aeneas' arrival was previously phrased as *Lavinaque ... / litora* (1-2) it is now, as the foundation of Lavinium itself is discussed, expressed with the word *Latio*, further specifying *Italiam* (2).

The foundation of Aeneas' city marks not only the end of Aeneas' wars and suffering, but also the beginning of something new and grander. The final part of the sentence starts with *dum conderet urbem* (5) and closes majestically with *altae moenia Romae* (7). *Urbem* (5) and *Romae* (7), both occupying the last metrical foot, are linked syntactically by *unde* (6), an important word. Most commentators take it to refer to Aeneas,³³⁷ but its proper sense ('from what place, whence', indicating a spatial relation), the immediate context and the logic of the passage all favor a literal translation: it is Lavinium, the city founded by Aeneas combined with the Trojan gods in Latium, out of which the *genus ... Latinum* (6), the *Albani patres* (7) and lofty Rome itself have come forth.

The consequences of Aeneas' coming to Italy are thus characterized specifically by urban images: Lavinium, Alba Longa, Rome – cities inhabited by a Latin people venerating Trojan gods. Stress on urban character, however, is not equally distributed. The phrasing shows a special link between Aeneas' act of city foundation and Rome. After *unde* the list continues in other than urban terms, with a *genus* (6) and *patres* (7). *Latinum* (6), the epithet of the combined Latin people (*genus*) uniting Trojans and indigenous populations in Italy, picks up on *Latio* (6), the region where Aeneas brought the Trojan gods to safeguard this amalgamate race. Both words imply

^{334.} Heyne-Wagner II (1832) 65; Austin (1971) 30; Williams (1972) 158; Paratore I (1978) 129. See also Cancik (2006).

^{335.} 'an extension of *conderet*', as Austin (1971) 30 remarks *ad 'inferretque... Latio'*.

^{336.} Henry I (1873) 141-142 and to a lesser extent Austin (1971) 30 stress the importance of the unity between city and gods.

^{337.} Henry I (1873) 145-147, Conington & Nettleship II (1884) 4, Conway (1935) 23, Austin (1971) 30-31, Paratore I (1978) 130, Ganiban (2008) 17.

the broader outlook of region and people, not confined to city walls. Alba Longa is glossed over by way of the *Albani patres*, again focusing on the genealogical dimension of Aeneas' legacy rather than the urban one. Urban character splendidly returns to close the list, as Rome is evoked by way of its *moenia*, a key term to denote the concept of 'citiness'. While Lavinium (apart from the implication in *Lavina ... / litora*) had remained unnamed and was described generically as *urbem*, the urban character of Rome now takes center stage in the discourse as the city of seven hills is elaborately characterized by her proper name, a generic term and an epithet: *altae moenia Romae* (7). The climax is marked linguistically by *atque*, used later on to introduce 'a dramatic new turn of events'.³³⁸ Aeneas' city in Latium has generated the Latin race and the Alban 'fathers', but also the city to supersede all others, Lavinium and Alba included.

Seven lines into the poem, it is thus clear that the *Aeneid* is an epic about a succession of cities, stretching from Troy to Rome, between which Aeneas is the binding link as founder of a city in Latium. Although the nature of the connection is still unclear, there is a strong link between Aeneas' city-foundation in Latium and Rome. The main obstruction in the trajectory from Troy to Rome, and the cause of Aeneas' sufferings, has briefly been identified as the wrath of Juno. Why, then, did Juno, who would become one of the main gods venerated by the Romans, as part of the Capitoline triad and in many separate cults, obstruct Aeneas' coming to Italy? That is exactly the question voiced by the poet in the last four lines of the first couplet. As is expounded in the second couplet of the prologue, the unexpected answer also has to do with a city: Carthage.³³⁹

2.2.3. Aen. I.12-22: Carthage and Roman history

The second couplet opens with the word *Urbs*, emphatically relocating to center-stage the theme of cities evoked in the *proæmium* proper. The *proæmium* focused on the passage from Troy to Lavinium and thence to Alba Longa and Rome. Because of this, and because of the allusive phrasing *Urbs antiqua fuit* ('there has been an ancient city', 12), one might expect that Vergil's answer to the question posed in lines 8-11 would be 'Troy', the symbol of the Trojan War in which Juno suffered so great an injustice and offence. Troy is the prototypical *urbs antiqua* that was but is no more (the nuance in the perfect tense of *fuit*), especially in the *Aeneid*.³⁴⁰ Line 12, however, makes clear that the *urbs antiqua* is not epic Troy but historical Carthage:³⁴¹ (I.12-22)

^{338.} Austin (1971) 88 ad I.227.

^{339.} Cf. Nelis (2001) 225.

^{340.} Cf. I.375, II.363 (*urbs antiqua fuit*) and IV.312 with Austin (1971) 34; also II.324 (*fuit Ilium*).

^{341.} 'si misuri l'energia della posizione del nome della città, in tanta evidenza, all'inizio del verso.' (Paratore I (1978) 132, ad 'Karthago')

Vrbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
ostia, diues opum studiisque asperrima belli;
quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
posthabita coluisse Samo. hic illius arma,
hic currus fuit; hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fuetque.
progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces;
hinc populum late regem belloque superbum
uenturum excidio Libyae: sic uoluere Parcas.

15

20

2

There has been an ancient city, inhabited by Tyrian settlers,
 Carthage, opposite Italy and the Tiber's mouths
 by far, rich in wealth and very stern in war's pursuit;
 Juno is said to have loved only this city more than all other places, 15
 more even than Samos. Here was her armor,
 here her chariot; that this should be the ruling power among peoples,
 if by any means the fates allowed it, was even then the goddess's aim
 [and her cherished plan].

Yet in fact she had heard that an offspring was being derived from
 [Trojan blood]

that would one day overthrow the Tyrian strongholds; 21
 that from it a nation, ruling widely and proud in war,
 would come forth for Libya's downfall: thus the Fates ordained.

The introduction of Carthage in this unexpected way,³⁴² as an ancient city, significantly alters the chronological perspective from which the story is told. With the perfect *fuit*, events are regarded from a Roman point of view: Carthage was an *urbs antiqua* to Vergil's Roman audience, as the city had been destroyed in 146 BC. The contrast with later descriptions of Carthage as new, from Aeneas' point of view,³⁴³ is striking. By introducing Carthage in this remarkable way, Vergil has suddenly introduced the perspective of Roman history into his epic.³⁴⁴ Carthage is set in a historical framework that was absent from the *proæmium* proper focusing on Troy, Lavinium and *alta Roma* (the epithet of the latter conveying novelty nor antiquity, but a timeless quality). At the same time, Carthage belongs to the realm of long lost cities like Troy

^{342.} See Jones (2011) 14: 'But there was, perhaps, something of a shock value to 1.12.'

^{343.} Cf. I.298, 366 with Servius *ad* 366; Austin (1971) 114 and Williams (1972) 183 *ad* 298.

^{344.} Cf. Paduano (2016) xxiv-xxv, noting 'una dislocazione temporale fortissima' (*ibid.* xxiv).

and, as McGushin remarks, is described in terms reminiscent of what Priam's ancient city stood for: being *dives opum* ("rich in wealth"), it is a model of civilization no longer viable.³⁴⁵ Interestingly, there is not even a single hint of young Caesar's refoundation of Carthage as a Roman colony in this passage – in sharp contrast to the description of Carthage in books I and IV.

After Vergil's 'little vignette of Carthage', introduced abruptly by the opening formula with a form of *esse* so typical of descriptive *ecphrasis*,³⁴⁶ the focus shifts back to Juno (15-21). Now, the reader learns that Carthage used to be the city most favored (*coluisse*, 16, also in the perfect tense)³⁴⁷ by Juno, while the authorial present *fertur* (15) retains the point of view of Vergil's own time. That point of view is retained even after the repeated deictic pronomina (*hic*, 16; *hic, hoc*, 17) that drag the reader back into the narrative on Carthage and Juno's patronage of the city, set in the remote past explicitly by *fuit* (17) and *iam tum* (18). Then the poet switches to the goddess' perspective, already apparent in the present tenses of *tenditque* *fovetque* (18). As the poet reports what Juno had heard (*audierat*, 20, the pluperfect marking events prior to the development of her anger at Aeneas and his Trojan exiles), the destruction of Carthage becomes an event in the distant future (*olim verteret*, 20; *venturum*, 22).³⁴⁸ The enmity between Carthage and Rome and the destruction of the former thus come to be regarded from two points of view, chronologically speaking the furthest possible apart: that of Juno and that of Vergil, long before and long after the Punic Wars. The stress in both is on Carthage's destruction rather than foundation, linking the city to Troy and contrasting it sharply with Lavinium and Rome. It is the Roman people (*populum late regem belloque superbum*, 21, occupying almost an entire line) that will destroy Carthage. Accordingly, the cycle represented in the *proæmium* proper as a passage from the destruction of Troy to the foundation of Lavinium and, thence, Rome, is extended to the destruction of yet another city: Carthage. In 22 lines, the wheel of fate has turned from an *urbs capta*, Troy, through the *urbes condendae* of Lavinium and Rome, to the *urbs antiqua* that is no more, Carthage. That is the momentous series of events brought to the foreground in lines 1-22, extending the trajectory from the fall of Troy to the foundation of Rome by an extra seven centuries of Roman history. The second couplet of the prologue thus does more than answer the question in lines 8-11. Through the destruction of Carthage, it evokes the historical Rome as the dominating world power of Vergil's own day, obliquely present as the epic begins.

^{345.} McGushin (1965) 416 and *passim*.

^{346.} Austin (1971) 34-35.

^{347.} Paratore I (1978) 132.

^{348.} Cf. X.11-14 for a similar perspective on the Punic Wars from the point of view of the gods.

2.2.4. Aen. I.33 and the prologue: Carthage, Troy, Rome

The story of Carthage's destruction provides an answer to the poet's question in lines 8-11, drawn from Roman history, which for Juno and Aeneas still lies in the distant future. The last couplet of the prologue tells us that Juno caused the Trojans to wander all across the sea out of fear for Carthage's destruction, but also because of the painful memory of the Trojan War, fought to avenge the grief inflicted upon her by that 'hated race':

2

25

*id metuens ueterisque memor Saturnia belli,
 prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis
 – neclum etiam causae irarum saeuique dolores
 exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
 iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
 et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores:
 his accensa super iactatos aequore toto
 Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli,
 arcebat longe Latio, multosque per annos
 errabant acti fatis maria omnia circum.
 tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

30

25

Saturnian Juno, fearful of this and mindful of the old war
 which long before she had fought at Troy for her beloved Argives
 – not yet, too, had the cause of her wrath and her bitter sorrows
 faded from her mind: deep in her heart remained
 the judgment of Paris and the outrage to her slighted beauty,
 both the hated race and the honors paid to raped Ganymede –
 inflamed hereby yet more, she tossed on the entire stretch of the sea the
 Trojans, whatever was left of them by the Greeks and pitiless Achilles, 30
 and she kept them far from Latium; and many years
 they wandered, driven by fate over all the seas.
 So weighty a task was it to found the Roman people.

The irony of destiny is, then, that the fate Juno had inflicted upon Troy will ultimately lead to a similar fate inflicted upon her beloved Carthage by a race stemming from Trojan blood (19).³⁴⁹ Juno had successfully opposed Troy, causing its destruction; her opposition against the remaining Trojans, and against Rome, will not be successful. Vergil then directs the view back to the Trojans *iactatos aequore toto* (29), collectively suffering the fate ascribed to Aeneas alone in line 3. First, we were smoothly drawn into the chronological perspective of Vergil's own day, now we are transported back

³⁴⁹. Cf. Giusti (2018) 210-211.

to the perspective of the Trojan exiles. At the same time, there is a shift from the personal and particular to the plural and the collective: from the *vir* struck by Juno's hatred to the *genus invisum* ('hated race', 28) of the 'Trojans' (*Troas*, 30), from the *fato profugus* (3) to the *acti fatis* ('those driven by fate', 32).³⁵⁰ In the very same vein, Aeneas is now out of sight, with the prologue culminating in a collective foundation: *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* (33, 'so weighty a task was it to found the Roman people'). Juno, in spite of her attempts, cannot halt the course of fate and prevent a new race from coming into being *Troiano a sanguine* ('from Trojan blood', 19) and by another act of *condere*. Aeneas had come from Troy to found Lavinium; the Trojans (*Troas*, 30), whom Juno initially managed to keep away from Latium (*arcebant longe Latio*, 31), would eventually get there to found the Roman race. Vergil deviates markedly from the Homeric model he so closely followed otherwise:³⁵¹ instead of an epic about just one man (*ἄνδρα*, *Od.* I.1) or one man's wrath (*Il.* I.1), the *Aeneid* is an epic about a hero who fights not for himself, but for his people.³⁵²

The phrasing of I.33 demands close attention. It is a magnificent closing line,³⁵³ *tantae* picking up *tantaene* (11) at the end of the first couplet. *Molis* (33) adumbrates the previously mentioned forms of suffering (*iactatos*, 29; *errabant acti fatis*, 32) and the vastness and magnitude of the ensuing accomplishment. *Erat* is interesting: the imperfect tense accentuates the extended timeframe of the foundation of the Roman race and situates the statement within the epic action that is now to unfold. It is connected to the imperfect *arcebant* (31) and the timeframe of the last couplet rather than the present *cano* (1) or the perfect *fuit* (12), determining the time-frames of the first and second couplets. The process resulting in the foundation of the *Romana gens* is thus fully in motion when the epic begins. That is why *Romanam* (33) is such a striking expression: the *Aeneid* is about the fusion of the Trojans and the indigenous Latins in a single *genus Latinum* (6) – not *Romanum*. The final line of the prologue thus combines the various perspectives of the earlier couplets in an overarching, coherent whole. As Austin remarks, 'Virgil has added a summarizing reflection to round off his narrative prelude, once more leading eye and ear and thought to Rome'.³⁵⁴ Just like *tantae* (33) referred back to *tantaene* (11), *Romanam* (33) refers back to *Romae*, the last word of lines 1-7.

^{350.} Cf. other reminiscences in the description of Juno and her anger: *memor* (23) ~ *memorem* (4); *saevi* (25) ~ *saevae* (4).

^{351.} Paratore I (1978) 126.

^{352.} Williams (1972) xxiii: 'a social type of heroism, concerned with the group rather than the individual (how much we admire Odysseus, man of many resources, for getting safely back to Ithaca – but he did not succeed in bringing any of his comrades safely back with him).' Cf. Cairns (1989) 192, 206.

^{353.} Cf. Williams (1972) 161; Jones (2011) 67.

^{354.} Austin (1971) 39.

Noticeably, it is not just Rome that is being founded, but also the *gens Romana*. That prominent feature of the *Aeneid* rests on the foundation of the city of Rome in an unconditional manner. *Moenia Romae* and *gens Romana* are intrinsically connected, rather than contradictory or mutually exclusive concepts.³⁵⁵ *Condere* is the crucial term. The verb occurs twice in this prologue with an interval of only 27 lines.³⁵⁶ After *dum conderet urbem* (5), picked up by *condere* in line 33, and *altae moenia Romae*, picked up by *Romanam*, one might have expected this final phrase to combine both ideas into a formula mentioning the foundation of the city of Rome, e.g. *Romanam condere urbem*. Many readers and commentators of the *Aeneid* have indeed felt the need for such an expression, seeking it in either *dum conderet urbem* (5) or *Romanam condere gentem* (33), as Austin does.³⁵⁷ Galinsky articulates the point rather well: 'Condere is another example of the polysemy on which Servius remarked in connection with the very first verb in the *Aeneid*. It conveys the sense of "joining together" (the Latins and the Trojans) and it implies the founding of the city (*urbem condere*). That event, however, will not be told in the epic'.³⁵⁸ Vergil, on the contrary, brings in something quite new in the last line before the narrative proper. While *condere urbem* was a regular idiom, being the appropriate technical term for city foundation from Ennius onwards, *condere gentem* is a highly innovative use of the verb.³⁵⁹ It is true that *Romanam* implies Rome, and thus city-foundation. It is nevertheless beyond doubt that Vergil, in this momentous line, made a conscious choice for *gentem* rather than *urbem*. Why?

The *genus Latinum* (6) was the logical outcome of interwoven Trojan-Latin genealogies, the new population of Latium resulting from (*unde*, 6) the *urbs* founded by Aeneas. *Gens Romana* seems to denote a different kind of conglomerate. In line 21, the Romans in Juno's thoughts had been described as *populum late regem*. That expression stressed the Romans' character as a political and military body, but only after they had been characterized as *progeniem ... Troiano a sanguine* (19). *Gens Romana* is neither purely genealogical (as *genus Latinum*) nor purely political (as *populum late regem*). It denotes a race that is a social and a political unity, stemming from a common origin, but not necessarily homogenous from a genealogical point of view. Moreover, it precedes the foundation of Rome, starting with the Trojans' *errores*, but also postdates it, as there

^{355.} Contra Fletcher (2014) 18-19.

^{356.} By far the smallest interval in books I-VI; only between VIII.48-66, IX.32-39 and XII.886-893 the interval between two occurrences of *condere* is smaller.

^{357.} Austin (1971) 39: 'Formally the reference is only to the founding of the *city*; but it inevitably brings to mind also the long, gradual, difficult but inexorable process by which Roman supremacy was established' (my italics). See also *ibid.*, p. x.

^{358.} Galinsky (1996) 246.

^{359.} For a very brief survey of *condere* and its meanings in Livy, see Miles (1988) 194 n. 41. Cf. Hexter (1992) 359 on I.33 and I.5 as 'seemingly synonymous'.

can be no *Romana gens* without Rome.³⁶⁰ The phrase thus combines the historical perspectives identified above, and an act of *condere* again links Troy to Rome.

Even if Vergil chose *gentem* rather than *urbem* as the object and the last word of the final line of his prologue, the poet did use *condere*. He could certainly have used a different word to describe the establishment of the Roman people, but did not. That makes this instance of *condere* with *gentem* all the more important and significant: there was, undoubtedly, a reason behind this particular use of the verb in such a momentous expression. By making Aeneas' Trojans, now caught up in the wandering that resulted from Juno's anger, *already* partake in the foundation of the Roman race, Vergil looks forward once more, before beginning his main narrative about Aeneas and the Trojans. The poet links the Trojans directly to their Roman offspring, making their wanderings into an act of *condere*. The expression *Romanam condere gentem* pointedly and succinctly describes a complex process, not limited to building city walls, but rather constituted by the outcome of a long and difficult, fate-ordained struggle. The phrase, bold in its sweep and semantics, sets the scene for the epic about Aeneas' exploits *dum conderet urbem* to unfold itself. From the outset the reader may thus be aware of what is at stake, and what the ultimate goal is of the burden Aeneas and his fellow Trojans have to bear for so long. It is the foundation of a city in Latium from which Rome will spring forth, and the foundation of the people who will extend its rule over the world. The ktistic verb *condere*, twice in these important 33 lines, marks both of these crucial stages in the trajectory set out in the *Aeneid*'s prologue.

2.2.5. The end of the *Aeneid*

The two conspicuous references to city-foundation in the 33 lines of the prologue are clearly marked (and connected amongst each other) by the use of the ktistic verb *condere*. Interestingly, this word is not only prominently present at the beginning of the epic, but also at its very end, when Aeneas cold-bloodedly kills his enemy Turnus:³⁶¹ (XII:950-952)

*hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
feruidus; ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.*

950

^{360.} Cf. Fletcher (2014) 18-19.

^{361.} The quantitative explosion of studies about the end of the *Aeneid* in recent decades makes it impossible to cite all relevant literature. Apart from the commentary by Tarrant (2012), I have mainly consulted Horsfall (1995) 192-216, Putnam (2011) and Stahl (2016) 1-107.

2

As he tells him this, Aeneas buries his sword beneath the
 [opposing breast,
 in burning rage. As for Turnus, his limbs are loosened by a fatal frost,
 and life fled from him with a groan, resenting, down to the
 [shades below.

Out of many possible ways to describe this killing, Vergil chose to use the verb *condere*,³⁶² even though the verb was not used in that way in Latin before the *Aeneid*.³⁶³ It seems clear, therefore, that the occurrence of *condere* in the epic's much-debated finale is a deliberate evocation of its beginning. It is likely that this has something to do with the acts of founding that *condere* describes twice in the prologue. In 1995, James made this claim at the start of what is to date the only dedicated article about *condere* in the *Aeneid*:³⁶⁴

It is, in Jane Austen's words, a truth universally acknowledged that the Aeneid is concerned with the founding of Rome, an event commonly described by the verb condere. This word is so crucial to the poem that it appears conspicuously at both beginning and end: dum conderet urbem (1.5) and ferrum adverso sub pectore condit (12.950).

A conspicuous pattern indeed: Vergil employs the same word both for the initial announcement of Aeneas' everlasting legacy in Latium, and for the hero's final act, inflicting the fatal blow on his supplicant enemy, Turnus. At first sight, the killing of Turnus may seem to have little to do with founding, other perhaps than being its perverse opposite: while founding is about construction, brutal killing is the epic epitome of destruction.³⁶⁵ On closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that there is an important connection between Turnus' death and Aeneas' role as founder of Lavinium, the action described by *condere urbem* in the prologue.³⁶⁶ In order to understand that connection, it is imperative that we look at the end of the epic in its wider context.³⁶⁷

^{362.} The splendid 5th century AD *codex Mediceus* (MS Laur. lat. Plut. 39.1) reads *sumpto recondit* instead of *sub pectore condit*, but that interesting error was promptly corrected by the consul of 494, Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius, apparently on 21 April – a great way to celebrate *Roma condita*.

^{363.} James (1995) 623, 625–627.

^{364.} James (1995) 623.

^{365.} James (1995) 623–624, who observes a contrast between the slow process of founding and the swift act of killing.

^{366.} Cf. e.g. Hunt (1973) 5.

^{367.} Cf., briefly, Gransden (1991) 1–5.

The first half of the *Aeneid*, comprising books I-VI, recounted the wandering of the Trojans. The second half (books VII to XII) starts with their long-awaited arrival in Latium. Since the local population of Latins is stirred up in hatred against them by Juno, their arrival soon leads to the outbreak of a violent war. The *casus belli* revolves around the fact that the daughter of the local king Latinus, Lavinia, is promised to Aeneas in fulfilment of an oracle, enraging Turnus, the prince of the neighboring Rutulians, who had wanted to marry Lavinia himself. Turnus, used by Juno as an instrument of her anger, gathers an army to fight the Trojans, branded as foreign invaders. Organizing himself militarily, Aeneas enters into an alliance with the Arcadians of Pallanteum, a Greek town on the later site of Rome, ruled by king Evander. The Arcadian army is led by Evander's son Pallas, entrusted to Aeneas' care. At a certain point, Turnus manages to kill Pallas, stripping him of his baldric and wearing it as spoil of war. Aeneas, infuriated with rage, unleashes himself in an indiscriminate killing-spree among the Rutulians by way of retaliation, seeking to strike Turnus in revenge. He fails to do so, however, because the gods intervene: Jupiter allows Juno to withdraw her favorite, Turnus, to safety, even if it is established that his fate-ordained death can only be temporarily postponed. Turnus must die (X.617, cf. VII.596-7).³⁶⁸ The delay of his death allows the poet to prepare it more elaborately, adding much to the impact and effect when it finally occurs.³⁶⁹

Part of the narrative preparation for Turnus' demise is a returning focus on the theme of city-foundation. One of the aspects that clearly play a role in the post-war scenario – when Aeneas will have defeated Turnus and, with him, the Latin resistance against the Trojans – is the city which Aeneas will then finally found. Negotiating a truce, the ambassador of king Latinus affirms to Aeneas: (XI.130-1)

‘... *quin et fatalis murorum attollere moles*
saxaque subiectare umeris Troiana iuuabit.’

‘... It will rather be our delight to rear those massive walls which your destiny ordains, and to bear on our shoulders the stones of Troy.’

The king himself, pleading for a peace treaty with the Trojans in a council of all Latins gathered during the truce, suggests offering them a sizeable territory within his realm where the Trojans can found a city: (XI.320-23)

^{368.} Tarrant (2012) 339 ad XII.949; see Di Benedetto (1995).

^{369.} Cf. Stahl (2016) 1: ‘the poet early on sets (and continually reinforces) the parameters for weighing the eventual outcome.’

*haec omnis regio et celsi plaga pinea montis
cedat amicitiae Teucrorum, et foederis aequas
dicamus leges sociosque in regna uocemus:
considant, si tantus amor, et moenia condant.*

Let all this tract, with a pine-clad belt of mountain height,
pass to the Trojans in friendship; let us name just terms of treaty,
and invite them to share our realm.

Let them settle, if their desire is so strong, and build their city.

It is clear to all that Aeneas has come to found a new city in Latium, and that Turnus is the main obstacle that stands in his way.³⁷⁰ Before the final battle begins, Aeneas pledges in a solemn gathering of both armies that he will not, when he turns out to be the winner, subdue the Latins and rule over them, but rather will bind Trojans and Latins together in an ever-lasting alliance. He only wants to found a city for himself, named after Lavinia: (XII.189-194)

*'... non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo
nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae
inuictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.
sacra deosque dabo; sacer arma Latinus habeto,
imperium sollempne sacer; mihi moenia Teucri
constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen.'*

190

'... I will not bid the Italians be subject to Teucrians,
nor do I seek the realm for mine; under equal terms
let both nations, unconquered, enter upon an everlasting compact.
I will give gods and their rites; Latinus, my father-in-law, is to keep
[the sword;
my father-in-law is to keep his wonted command. The Teucrians shall
[raise walls
for me, and Lavinia give the city her name.'

The city to be founded constitutes the climactical end of Aeneas' oath. That this city is the one from which Rome will come forth has been a prominent theme of the poem since the prologue in Book 1, and is again emphasized by the narrator before Aeneas' speech. As Aeneas approaches the altar for his oath, the hero is described as *pater Aeneas, Romanae stirpis origo* ("father Aeneas, the origin of the Roman stock", XII.166),

^{370.} Cairns (1989) 118-119.

and his son Ascanius, who accompanies him, as *magnae spes altera Romae* (“the second hope of a great Rome”, XII.168).³⁷¹

The developments preceding the death of Turnus thus position him as the incarnation of Juno’s attempts to prevent the establishment of Rome and its destiny as a world power. At the same time, Aeneas and Ascanius already represent the result of the epic’s trajectory as announced in the prologue. As her last resort, Juno manages to disrupt the truce, in the context of which Aeneas and Turnus would have decided the war in a duel from man to man. The death of Turnus is again postponed, and Turnus is allowed one last moment of glory. When he strikes down the Trojan Eumedes, Turnus himself also acknowledges to be aware that the Trojans’ principal goal is to found a city in Latium. Boasting about Eumedes’ defeat, he observes ironically: (XII.359-361)

‘en agros et, quam bello, Troiane, petisti,
Hesperiam metire iacens: haec praemia, qui me
ferro ausi temptare, ferunt, sic moenia condunt.’

360

‘See, Trojan, the fields and that Hesperia that you sought in war:
lie there and measure them out! This is the reward of those who
dare to tempt me with the sword; so do they establish their walls!’

As Tilly notes, Turnus is sneering at Aeneas’ statement at the end of his oath:³⁷² instead of founding a city, the Trojans lie dead on the battlefield. Ironically transferring the act of founding cities on the lethal downfall of his Trojan opponent, Turnus himself creates a link between death in battle and city-foundation. He thereby provides the tragical climax of earlier statements about the ktistic act that would be the result of Aeneas’ victory: just like Turnus sees the death of Eumedes in terms of city-foundation, so his own death can be seen in that same sense at the epic’s very end.

When the final blow comes, we are well prepared to regard the killing of Turnus as an act connected to Aeneas’ ktistic program. That thematic expectancy is fulfilled through verbal means by the use of *condere* for Aeneas’ act of stabbing. In the series of references to a Trojan city-foundation in the last books of the *Aeneid*, the conspicuous

^{371.} Stahl (2016) 19. That contemporaries considered this epithet of Ascanius (and hence the passage) highly significant is borne out by Servius *ad Ecl. VI.11*. Tarrant (2012) 134 remarks that *pater* alludes to Aeneas’ role as ‘a Roman proto-founder’ and interestingly translates *origo* as ‘founder’ (OLD 5a), pointing to later instances of its use for an individual (seemingly a Vergilian innovation) in Tacitus, especially *Ann. IV.9.2*. Tarrant and Williams (1973) 449 also point to the parallel between Aeneas, here, and Augustus at VI.680-681.

^{372.} Tilly (1969) 155.

use of the verb primarily picks up the instances in XI.323 and XII.361, where it was used to denote city-foundation in connection with the conflict between Turnus and Aeneas. It is also as the last word of those lines. In the wider context of the epic, however, the use of the verb also refers to the occurrences of *condere* at the very beginning. As the last action of Aeneas in the poem, *condere ferrum* strongly conjures up the act of *condere* that, according to the *proœmium* proper, would signal the end of Aeneas' suffering in war: *multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem* ("and having suffered much in war as well, until he would found a city", I.5). As the final books of the poem make abundantly clear, the death of Turnus is the end of the war between Trojans and Latins: by using *condere* to mark that end, Vergil refers proleptically to the first act that would follow the end of that war: the foundation of a new city in Latium where the Trojans would create a new home for themselves and their gods.³⁷³

This is, at the same time, a way to alleviate the 'open-endedness' of the *Aeneid* that has often been commented upon:³⁷⁴ the use of *condere* implies that, after its seemingly abrupt ending, the act of *condere* announced in the *proœmium* proper is in fact to follow suit. Although, as many readers of the *Aeneid* over the centuries have noted, the *Aeneid* does not formally end where the prologue implied it would end, i.e. with the foundation of Lavinium, the use of *condere* makes clear that such an implied ending is in fact near now that Turnus, the main obstacle for its fulfilment, dramatically recedes to the shades of the underworld. The point is well stated in Tarrant's commentary:³⁷⁵

'In a different sense condere figured prominently at the opening of the poem, in relation to the founding of A[eneas]’s city and later of Rome (I.5 dum condere urbem, 33 Romanam condere gentem, 276-7 Mauortia condet | moenia); its appearance here underscores the point that T[urnus]’s killing is a necessary precondition of those foundations.'

As Tarrant has furthermore demonstrated, Vergil's description of Turnus' slaying has intertextual and associative links to Ennius' epic description of Romulus killing Remus, an equally important precondition for the ensuing foundation of Rome in the story as Vergil's epic predecessor told it.³⁷⁶ The *Aeneid*, accordingly, does not end with the literal description of the foundation of Lavinium and the ktistic trajectory,

^{373.} At a verbal level, rather than the structural, the forceful enjambement of *condit / fervidus* (XII.950-951) rather recalls *Mavortia condet / moenia* (I.276-267) and *aurea condet / saecula* (VI.792-793), thus pointing not only to the foundation of Lavinium by Aeneas, but also to the foundation of Rome by Romulus and its refoundation by Augustus; see further below, p. 128.

^{374.} See e.g. Horsfall (1995) 195.

^{375.} Tarrant (2012) 340; cf. e.g. Fowler (1997) 261.

^{376.} Tarrant (2012) 340 *ad* XII.949.

leading to Rome, of which it was the first step, but with the fulfilment of the one necessary condition to finally set that trajectory in motion. On Hector's and Venus' command, Aeneas had rescued the Penates of Troy and fled the burning city. Guided by divine revelations, overcoming both suffering and mistakes, he made his way to Italy.³⁷⁷ During a bloody war, he had created the necessary preconditions for both the settlement of a lasting city and – through his marriage to Lavinia and the pact struck with Latinus – the amalgamation of Trojans and Latins into one united people. In a divine tête-à-tête just before the final scene of the *Aeneid* (XII.791-842), Jupiter and Juno had settled the details of that ethnogenesis: Juno would allow the Trojans to settle down in Latium, but their name would have to perish, and apart from the Trojan gods the determining elements of the new, amalgamated people would all derive from the Latins. Jupiter concedes to Juno that the Trojan influences on the newly created Latin people will be strictly limited. What is not at stake, however, is the fundamental double influence of the Trojans that was already pointed out by the poet in the *proæmium* proper: the institution of religious rites and Roman *pietas*, on the one hand, and the foundation of a city from which Rome itself would come forth, on the other.³⁷⁸ The *Aeneid* does not end with the practical realization of the future agreed upon by Jupiter and Juno, but with the removal of the main obstacle standing in its way. Accordingly, the epic emphasizes that the envisaged foundation of Rome is still, and perhaps perpetually, work-in-progress.³⁷⁹

The repeated use of *condere* signals closure in terms of the ktistic trajectory described in the prologue. It also encodes a wider set of messages in the poetic economy of the *Aeneid* as a whole. How does the final act of *condere* relate to the poem's opening in that respect? In a way, the crucial phrase *dum conderet urbem* (5) does not only relate to Aeneas himself and the end of his suffering in war. Since Aeneas' suffering in war, together with the ordeals he faced at sea, also represent the (Odyssean and Iliadic)

^{377.} Building on the brilliant, but largely overlooked observations of Di Benedetto (1996) 169-171 on the similitudes between Aeneas vs. Dido and Aeneas vs. Turnus, one could argue that the occurrence of *condere* in XII.950, in comparison to its near absence in book IV (and in the episode of Aeneas' and Dido's last encounter, in particular), highlights how Aeneas was very far from founding a lasting city, back in Carthage, but is now a lot closer to fulfilling his ktistic goals. In fact, *cunctantem* (IV.390) seems to be mirrored by *condit* (XII.950), and the striking, contrasting parallel between *dicens* (XII.950) and (*parantem* /) *dicere* (IV.391), not noted by Di Benedetto, strengthens the argument, as well as the homoeoteleuton *cunctantem ... parantem* in IV.390, referring back to *fundantem ... novantem* in IV.260 (Fratantuono & Smith (2022) 584), and the repetition of *sub umbras* (IV.660) in *sub umbras* (XII.952), noted by Tarrant (2012) 341. Turnus is like a second Dido, but Aeneas has moved on.

^{378.} Cf. Williams (1983) 143-144.

^{379.} Cf. Galinsky (1996) 20: '[Vergil] shifted the emphasis to endeavor and process rather than achievement and therefore wrote an epic about the beginnings of Rome and the journey ahead rather than looking back at the formation of the Roman people from the pinnacle of his own time.'

subject matter of the *Aeneid*, *dum* also relates to the scope of Vergil's epic as a whole, to the extension of his poetic creation, to the words *arma virumque cano* (1). The poet will sing of the hero's exploits *up until* the moment he founds a city. That was how Vergil presented the matter in the prologue.

After 12 books, it has become clear that this imagined result is anything but a simple matter of putting a plow in the ground. Through Juno's bitter anger and the many obstacles she has put in Aeneas' and the Trojans' way, the realization of the acts announced in the *proœmium* proper has involved massive suffering and loss of life. Only in the very end does Juno give in and is the plan of destiny fulfilled. The foundation of Aeneas' city has come at the cost of a tragic and brutal war between peoples destined to become one – a pointed poetical prefiguration of the civil wars that had been the scourge of Rome in Vergil's own lifetime,³⁸⁰ and that the *princeps*, it seemed, had finally begun to put to an end as Vergil was writing. The envisaged ktistic act of Aeneas at the end of the epic's trajectory turns out to be a deserved, but still brutal act of slaughter. This is perhaps the strongest way to indicate that Augustus' alleged refoundation of Rome was also preceded by, necessitated by, and valued notwithstanding, the immense toll of Roman lives that the civil wars had taken. On a more abstract level, the poignantly repeated use of *condere* thus encodes that 'founding' is more than merely building walls, and involves an array of activities that are part of a larger, ktistic process.

Although the narrative of the epic in the strict sense ends with the death of Turnus, a series of prophetic episodes throughout the poem had already treated events far exceeding the chronological scope of the plot, up to the Roman present of Vergil and Augustus. By way of these prospective scenes, the *Aeneid* also discusses what was announced by Vergil in the last lines of the *proœmium* proper (I.5-7) and implied by the second couplet of the prologue about Carthage and its demise at the hands of the Romans (I.12-22). Now that we have seen how the narrative end of the *Aeneid* relates to the ktistic discourse of its opening, it is time to look at those prophetic passages that further develop the ktistic discourse and take us, chronologically speaking, from the start of the epic's ktistic trajectory, symbolized by Aeneas' final act of *condere*, to its further fulfilment, embodied by the foundation of Rome and its refoundation under Augustus. The most important of those prophetic episodes will be treated in the following paragraphs.

^{380.} Cf. XII.503-4 with Stahl (2016) 23.

2.3. From Aeneas to Augustus: the prophecy of Jupiter (I.223-304)

After the prologue, the first book of the *Aeneid* starts in *medias res*. The Trojans cheerfully set sail from Sicily for the last stage in their fate-ordained journey to Italy.³⁸¹ Juno, looking down from above upon the Trojans getting so close to their goal, flies into a rage and is more determined than ever to stop them. Due to her machinations the Trojan ships are hit by a violent storm that scatters them, wrecks one ship and would have wrecked others, if Neptune had not intervened and calmed the seas.³⁸² Adrift and off course, the Trojans make landfall at the shores of Libya. In a way, this course of events takes us back to the prologue: instead of arriving, as announced and planned, at the *Lavina...litora* of lines 2-3, the Trojans end up in *Italianam contra Tiberinaque longe / ostia* (13-14), to quote the prologue's description of the setting of Carthage. This connection with the prologue is important for what follows, and for its analysis in terms of plot. To some extent, one could say that part of the narration, seen from Juno's point of view, starts in line 12,³⁸³ while from Aeneas' and the Trojans' point of view it begins with line 34. That is a bit of a false start, however, as action is immediately resumed by the avengeful Juno. The difference is that she operates on the terrestrial rather than the celestial level: the opening movement is a typical example of direct divine intervention in the *Aeneid*'s action.

The action then shifts to the celestial sphere.³⁸⁴ As marked by the prominent verticality of the vocabulary describing Jupiter (*aethere summo / despiciens*, 223-224; *iacentis*, 224; *vertice caeli*, 225; *defixit*, 226), we are on a level high above the tumultuous affairs on earth. This verticality was absent from the description of Juno and, as we will soon discover, marks a switch to what we have earlier identified as the celestial course of action in the plot, marked 'B' (p. 66, above). A fundamentally different dynamic is revealed to take place here, driven by more than momentary concerns. That the Trojans are once more the target of Juno's hatred does not escape the attention of Venus, Aeneas' divine mother. In tears about the Trojan's sufferings, she complains to Jupiter about their fate. Venus' lamentation reveals that the dominion of the Romans, feared by Juno and presented in the prologue through Carthage's demise (19-22) is in fact a promise made to her by the father of the gods: (I.234-237)

*certe hinc Romanos olim uoluentibus annis,
hinc fore ductores reuocato a sanguine Teucri,*

^{381.} Austin (1971) 40, *ad* 34-49; Paratore I (1978) 135, *ad* 34. There is, however, a strong and significant intratextual connection with the *proœmium* proper, as *in altum* (34) picks up *in alto* (3): where line 4 announces Aeneas' suffering at sea through the wrath of Juno, that suffering is now about to begin.

^{382.} On this much discussed episode, see recently Nelis (2015b) and Perkell (1999b) 33-42.

^{383.} Jones (2011) 14 on Vergil 'plunging straight into the story' at I.12.

^{384.} On this 'radical change of direction', see Jones (2011) 105-106.

*qui mare, qui terras omnis dicione tenerent,
pollicitus: quae te, genitor, sententia uertit?*

Surely it was your promise that from them some time, as the years
 [rolled on,
 the Romans were to arise; from them, even from Teucer's restored line,
 should come rulers to hold the sea and all lands beneath their sway.
 What thought, father, has turned you?

Given the distressful position of the Trojans on earth at this very moment, Venus wonders whethers Jupiter may have withdrawn his promise. In reaction, Jupiter reveals the future of the Trojan race to her in a far-ranging prophecy involving the foundation of Lavinium, Alba Longa and Rome. In that context, which significantly echoes the *proœmium* proper and the last line of the prologue, the ktistic verb *condere* makes its next appearance.³⁸⁵ The prophecy of Jupiter is a dense and complex passage.³⁸⁶ It start with a four-line introduction in direct response to Venus' complaints (I.257-260):

*'parce metu, Cytherea: manent immota tuorum
fata tibi; cernes urbem et promissa Lavinii
moenia sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli
magnanimum Aenean; neque me sententia uertit. (...)'*

'Spare your fears, Lady of Cythera; your children's fates
 [abide unmoved.
 You will see Lavinium's city and its promised walls;
 and great-souled Aeneas you will raise on high to the
 starry heaven. No thought has turned me. (...)'
 2

Jupiter's prophetic answer, insisting on the city that Aeneas will found, reveals Venus' implicit complaint about the lack of ktistic prospects for her son in Italy: Lavinium turns out to be a city 'promised' to Venus by Jupiter or Fate. Significantly, however, the prophecy does not end with Aeneas' deification in lines 259-260. After Jupiter has

^{385.} In the lines between the prologue and the prophecy of Jupiter the foundation of a Trojan city in Italy was paraphrased as *Ilium in Italiam portare* (I.68), *regna resurgere Troiae* (I.206) and *urbem locare* (I.247), just before in Venus' complaint, rendering *condere*'s reoccurrence here more significant. Cf below.

^{386.} There is anything but consensus on its meaning; here I can only outline structural themes relevant in the present context. For a good taste of the debate, see O'Hara (1990) 132-163 and Schiesaro (1993). The most recent complete treatments are those by Enenkel (2005) and Hejduk (2009) 283-292, the latter of whom has sadly overlooked the former.

addressed Venus' most immediate concerns, he extends his answer into an exposition of the hidden plans of Fate, as indicated by a statement on the prophetic nature of his words (261-262). Reaching up to the Augustan present of Vergil and his contemporary audience, Jupiter discloses the future of Aeneas and his Trojan race in Latium, Rome and the world at large (263-296). The first 21 lines elaborate upon the trajectory already laid out in the *proæmium* proper: (263-283)

bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis
contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet,
tertia dum Latio regnantem viderit aetas 265
ternaque transierint Rutulis hiberna subactis.
at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo
additur (Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno),
triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbis
imperio explebit, regnumque ab sede Lavini 270
transferet, et Longam multa vi muniet Albam.
hic iam ter centum totos regnabitur annos
gente sub Hectorea, donec regina sacerdos
Marte gravis geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem.
inde lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine laetus 275
Romulus excipiet gentem et Mavortia condet
moenia Romanosque suo de nomine dicet.
his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:
imperium sine fine dedi. Quin aspera Iuno,
quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat, 280
consilia in melius referet mecumque fouebit
Romanos, rerum dominos gentemque togatam.
sic placitum. (...)

'He (Aeneas) will wage a massive war in Italy, will crush ferocious nations, and for the people will set up institutions and city walls, until the third summer will have seen him reigning in Latium and three winters will have passed after the defeat of the Rutulians. But then the boy Ascanius, to whom the surname Julius is now added (Ilus he was, while the Ilian state stood firm in royal power), will fulfil with his empire thirty vast circles of revolving months, will transfer the kingdom from Lavinium's seat, and will fortify Alba Longa with great force.'

Here then there will be kingly rule for a full span of three
 [hundred years]
 under Hector's race, until Ilia, a royal priestess,
 pregnant by Mars, will give birth to her twin offspring.
 Then Romulus, delighting in the red-brown skin of the she-wolf,
 his nurse, will take up the line, and found the city-walls
 of Mars, and he will call his people Romans after his own name.
 For these I set no bounds to their rule, in space nor time:
 I have given them empire without end. And what is more, cruel Juno,
 who now in fear exhausts sea and earth and heaven,
 will change to better counsels and together with me will favour
 the Romans, lords of the world, and the nation of the toga.
 Thus it is decreed.'

The connection with the *proæmium* proper and the final line of the prologue is apparent in the verbal reminiscences,³⁸⁷ the trajectory from the city founded by Aeneas in Latium to mighty Rome, and the repeated stress on the Trojan origin of the Roman race as an ethnical entity. As we saw earlier, the emphasis in the *proæmium* was on the foundation of Lavinium as an important turning point. That emphasis is recalled by similar expressions here. The *mores et moenia* Aeneas will establish in Latium (*Latio*, 265, echoing *Latio*, 6) recall the act of city-foundation in line 5 and the establishment of the Trojan cults in line 6. Aeneas' *bellum ingens* of line 263, followed by a city-foundation, echoes the suffering in war (*bello passus*) of line 5 that equally preceded the foundation of Aeneas' city.

Given these similarities, the differences between the prologue and the prophecy of Jupiter gain extra relief. One important difference is that the stress on the foundation of Lavinium in the *proæmium* proper is transformed into an emphasis on a series of city-foundations, devoting far more attention to the ktistic process. Framed by highly symbolic chronological indications,³⁸⁸ Jupiter foretells the rule of the Trojan race in Latium, as connected to the foundation of Lavinium, Alba Longa and Rome by Aeneas, Ascanius and Romulus respectively. There is a strong sense of succession and *translatio imperii* in the list, of expansion in both space and time, which presents itself as a climax clearly culminating in Rome.³⁸⁹ Aeneas will rule for three years after the foundation of Lavinium (265-266). Ascanius will rule for 30 years (269), and will move the seat of kingdom (*regnum*, 270) to the newly founded city of Alba Longa. The Trojan

^{387.} Cf. Rogerson (2017) 42-43, with note 21.

^{388.} See Horsfall (1974).

^{389.} On *translatio imperii*, see Fabbrini (1983) and Landucci (2018).

kings of Alba, in turn, will reign for 300 years, until (*donec*, 273) prodigal twins will be born of Mars and a royal priestess. Nursed by a she-wolf, Romulus will finally found the city walls of Rome devoted to Mars. Unlike the establishments of Trojan (royal) power in Italy, the rule of Rome is not characterised by a duration. As Jupiter states in the lines immediately following the foundation by Romulus, Rome's reign will be an *imperium sine fine* (279) not bound by time or space (278). Rome, thus, presents itself as the culmination of a series of cities in Latium founded by the divine offspring of Venus and Mars. When Juno lays down her rage, the Romans will truly establish themselves as the masters of the world, fulfilling their pre-established fate.

The idea of Rome as the culmination of a process of *translatio imperii* and expansion of rule is underlined by the corresponding use of *condere* for Rome alone. Aeneas' foundation of Lavinium, which was described by *condere* in I.5, is now rendered as *mores et moenia ponere* (264). The foundation of Alba Longa by Ascanius, not explicitly mentioned before but alluded to in the phrase *Albanique patres* (I.7), is described with the verb *munire* (271), emphasizing the military and strategic, rather than the civic aspect. The heightened importance of Rome, its foundation described by *condere*, resonates well with the other epochal aspects of Romulus' act of foundation. One aspect is particularly interesting in connection with the prologue. Rome's founding involves the continuation of a pre-existing *gens* and its assumption into the newly named people of the Romans. *Gentem* (276) undoubtedly picks up *gens Hectorea*, "the stock of Hector" (273).³⁹⁰ Rome's founding thus effects the transformation of a Trojan *gens* into the newly named 'Romans'. This links the current phrase to the earlier instance of *condere* in I.33, where it governed *Romanam ... gentem* as its object. The shift from the individual to the collective, from Romulus as founder to the Romans as a people, is organically achieved within line 277, linking the *moenia* founded by Romulus, which echo those of I.7, to the *Romana gens* of I.33.

This passage and the prologue together reveal something of the special importance of *condere*. In the *proæmium* proper, *condere* marked Aeneas' city-foundation in Latium, the important pivotal point in the process of transition from Troy to Rome. In the prophecy of Jupiter, Troy is no longer the point of departure – that role has already been taken over by Lavinium, with which the prophecy begins. The focal point shifts to the foundation of Rome, the ultimate goal of Aeneas' Trojan descendants and the culmination of their power. The foundation of Rome by Romulus, described here for the first time in the poem, is invested with the full divine authority of Jupiter as supreme deity and guarantor of fate. As stated above, the story does not end there, even though the use of the perfect tense in *dedi* (279) and the closing

³⁹⁰ Rogerson (2017) 44. Cf. O'Hara (1990) 145 n. 45, with Schiesaro (1993) 262.

formula *sic placitum* (283) might have implied an ending. Jupiter's prophecy goes on to link the climactical moment of Rome's foundation by Romulus to the rule of Augustus:(291-296)

2

295

*aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis:
cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus
iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis
claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus
saeua sedens super arma et centum uinctus aenis
post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento.'*

'... Then wars shall cease and savage ages soften;
hoary Faith and Vesta, Quirinus with his brother Remus,
shall give laws. The gates of war, grim with iron and close-fitting bars,
shall be closed; within, impious Rage, sitting on savage arms,
his hands fast bound behind with a hundred brazen knots,
shall roar in the ghastliness of blood-stained lips.'

There is a distinctive difference in tone between this part of the prophecy and the preceding part: now that Rome's hegemony has been established as ever-lasting, further chronological indications are lacking. Rather than indicating timespans, Jupiter speaks of a *lustris labentibus aetas* (283) and *olim* (289), merging the whole of what a contemporary audience of the *Aeneid* would know as Roman history *ab urbe condita* into one prophetic whole. The striking effect of this compression is that the Augustan present is closely linked to what came before in the first part of the prophecy.

The many intricacies of the passage can only be treated cursorily, but some aspects should not be left aside. Lines 283-285 continue the prophetic overview of Rome's destiny after the foundation of the city described in lines 275-277, but highlight only one very specific episode: the Roman conquest of Greece in the first half of the second century BC. Portrayed as a reversal of the result of the Trojan War, it is painted in thick Homeric brush strokes (284-285) focussing on the cities of Achilles, Agamemnon and Diomedes and presenting the Roman conquerors as the offspring of the Trojan prince Assaracus, Aeneas' grandfather.³⁹¹ This is notably the only event in Roman history between the city's foundation and the birth of a 'Trojan Caesar' that Jupiter subsequently mentions. He glosses over Carthage and the Punic Wars in

^{391.} Cf. Paratore (1970) 161 n. 119 = (1976) 172 n. 119 on the 'omerismo a roverscio' in VI.837-840, which is in fact not properly 'singolare'.

particular,³⁹² which were so important in the prologue. There is thus a strong contrast between this prophecy and its narrative surroundings in book I, intensively focussed on the Punic city of Dido. The absence of Carthage should, certainly in this overall interpretation of Roman history, also be seen in the light of the role played by the fall of that city in other, more pessimistic overall interpretations of Roman history: especially in Sallust, it marks the beginning of Rome's cultural and political decline.³⁹³

That throws the Trojan element into sharp relief, which develops into a mechanism for linking the Julian house of Caesar and Augustus closely to Aeneas and Ascanius. Much ink has been spilled in the scholarly debate about the precise identity of the 'Trojan Caesar' of line 286, called *Iulus* in line 288: does it refer to the dictator Gaius Julius Caesar or to his homonymous adopted son, Augustus?³⁹⁴ Austin, after reviewing the arguments for both positions in 1971, prudently concluded that Vergil 'composed this passage with oracular ambiguous expression, leaving it to his readers to interpret his two-way lines as they wished'.³⁹⁵ This highly convincing reading, blurring the distinction between the deceased and deified father and his adoptive son, is perhaps reinforced by the fact that the description of the Trojan Caesar refers back to both Aeneas and Ascanius, also a deified father who ruled for only a short time (lines 265-266) and a son clothed with an ominous cognomen (267-268), who would reign decisively longer.³⁹⁶ Like Aeneas (259-260), the Trojan Caesar will join Venus in heaven (289-290);³⁹⁷ his name *Iulus* is directly derived from 'the great *Julus*', as Ascanius had been named earlier in the prophecy.³⁹⁸ In a way, this stress on naming resonates more with Augustus, who received both his very name and his honorary cognomen at a later moment in life, than with Julius Caesar senior, who was born bearing the name he wore until his death. Also the fact that Vergil's (or Jupiter's) description blurs the distinction between the two reminds us of Augustus, who subsumed the identity of his adoptive father into his own name quite deliberately, consciously blurring the distinction between himself and the deified dictator.³⁹⁹

^{392.} Cf. Williams (1983) 140.

^{393.} See now Biesinger (2016), with p. 93-99 on Sallust. Steffensen (2018) 186 rightly emphasizes that the 'Sallustian' perspective is absent from the *Aeneid* in general, but does not signal its particular relevance in the context of Jupiter's prophecy.

^{394.} O'Hara (1990) 155-163, Kraggerud (1992), Schiesaro (1993) , O'Hara (1994), Kraggerud (1994), Dobbin (1995), Harrison (1996), Enenkel (2005) Hejduk (2009) 290.

^{395.} Austin (1971) 110, based on a suggestion by Kenney (1968) 106; cf. Austin (1977) 243.

^{396.} Cf. Rogerson (2017) 54.

^{397.} Cf. *quoque*, 290, with Austin (1971) 111, *ad loc.*

^{398.} On *Julus* as a significant other name for Ascanius in the *Aeneid*, see Rogerson (2017) 9-11, 21, 37-56, and Casali (2007) 123-124 on Vergil's innovative accordance of prominence to the boy within the Latin epic tradition.

^{399.} See Syme (1958) = (1979).

Apart from these connections between the 'Trojan Caesar' and Aeneas and Ascanius, there is also a link with Romulus and Remus. The first event mentioned in the life of this 'Trojan Caesar' is, interestingly enough, his birth. He will be born as a Trojan 'of noble lineage' (286), the words *pulchra* and *origine* literally enveloping his identification as *Troianus*, because of that lineage stretching back to Aeneas. Just like the Trojan Caesar's deification recalls that of Aeneas, earlier in the prophecy, so his Trojan birth recalls the only other scene of child-birth in the prophecy: the birth of Romulus and his twin brother from *Ilia* (274), aptly described with her Trojanizing name rather than the Alban variant Rhea Silvia.⁴⁰⁰ The literal meaning 'beautiful' of *pulchra* (286) is a nod to the lineage leading back to Venus, as a parallel to Mars' divine parentage of the twins. Both of these births occur as decisive steps in Jupiter's grand revelation, after he has largely left aside events in the immediately preceding period.⁴⁰¹ Moreover, Paratore rightly notes that there is 'un brusco salto da Romolo ad Augusto, considerati i due piloni su cui poggiano l'inizio e la triomfale conclusione della storia e del destino di Roma'.⁴⁰² Highlighted from their surroundings and linked amongst each other, the lines about Romulus and the Trojan Caesar create an implicit link between the founder of Rome and Augustus for the first time in the poem, at the instance where the *princeps* first appears.

Although Augustus is not mentioned explicitly, the connection with Romulus receives added emphasis in the subsequent description of Augustus' most prominent achievement, i.e. an era of peace and prosperity. The Augustan peace is described, quite appropriately in a prophecy centred on the foundation of Rome, as the celestial reconciliation of Romulus and Remus (292-293). Romulus appears in his deified guise as Quirinus, reinforcing the link with both of the two to-be-deified figures mentioned earlier, Aeneas and the Trojan Caesar. The most striking feature, however, is the explicit occurrence of Remus. His disputed role in the foundation of Rome was absent from the description earlier in the prophecy, as was the fratricidal strife that counted as an aetiology for the Roman civil wars in Vergil's days. The joint occurrence of Remus and deified Romulus here, as symbolical divine lawgivers together with the goddesses Fides and Vesta, implies their reconciliation before their conflict has even been mentioned.⁴⁰³ This reconciliation comes about at the moment in the prophecy where the fledgling peace of the Augustan settlement is addressed, of which the reconciliation between the opposing parties was an important element. Deified Romulus is thus depicted in specifically Augustan terms, strengthening

^{400.} Paratore I (1978) 172; Horsfall (2013) 532 *ad* VI.777; cf. Rogerson (2017) 40-41.

^{401.} Cf. Austin (1971) 105 *ad* I.273.

^{402.} Paratore I (1978) 174 *ad* I.283-296.

^{403.} Austin (1971) 112; Paratore I (1978) 177.

his connection with the *princeps*. Moreover, verbal parallels between lines 292-293 and passages in the *Georgics* referring to the *princeps* (III.27, *victorisque arma Quirini*; IV.560-562, *Caesar ... / ... victorque volentis / per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo*) reinforce the connection. On his first implicit appearance in the poem, therefore, Augustus is closely linked to all three of the founders described earlier in the prophecy.

To sum up, the prophecy of Jupiter is the first passage in the poem that establishes a strong link between the successive founders of cities in Latium (Aeneas, Ascanius, Romulus) and the *princeps*, and between the foundation of Rome and the achievements of the Augustan principate. At the same time, it brings the teleological trajectory set out in the prologue a decisive step further, leading up to the Augustan present. All this may seem misleadingly obvious if we look at it with the benefit of hindsight and our knowledge of how, during and after the composition of the *Aeneid*, the Augustan principate developed and of the way it was represented in art, architecture and urban design up to the Ara Pacis and the Forum of Augustus.⁴⁰⁴ If we zoom out, however, and view these lines of the *Aeneid* in light of the historical circumstances at the time of their composition, what happens here is quite striking. Although we only have a fragmentary picture of the legends and traditions about Aeneas and his son in Latium, and about their connection to Rome and Romulus, the indications are very strong that the connection between these figures was mostly a genealogical one.⁴⁰⁵ As Zetzel has remarked, Vergil's picture of early Italy 'involved invention as well as selection', and the selection 'is clearly and deliberately shaped'.⁴⁰⁶ In the prophecy of Jupiter, Vergil mentions the genealogical connection between Aeneas and Romulus (significantly extending it to the Trojan Caesar), but on top of that he creates an unmistakable typological connection between Aeneas, Ascanius and Romulus as city-founders in particular. Even if the general idea that Aeneas and Ascanius had founded cities that were important forerunners of Rome was not new, to single out this aspect as such a prominent characteristic of the prophecy was indeed remarkable.

Just like the foundation of Lavinium, in the *proæmium* proper, was the cardinal event out of which (*unde*, 6) lofty Rome would eventually grow, the foundation of Rome, in the prophecy of Jupiter, is the cardinal event out of which the global dominion of the Roman people and universal peace under Augustus spring forth. Both events, as well as the formation of that Roman people in line 33, are marked by the ktistic verb *condere*. Its progressive use (first for Lavinium, then for the *gens Romana*, now for Rome) is indicative of a significant shift in emphasis in the gradual revelation of the

^{404.} Cf. briefly Erskine (2001) 18.

^{405.} Horsfall (1995); Galinsky (1992) *passim*, e.g. 98, 102; Erskine (2001) 15-16, 23-43.

^{406.} Zetzel (1997) 194.

course of Fate and Roman history as the poem progresses. Less than 300 lines into the first book, the future foundation of Rome by Romulus has taken centre stage as an important moment in the chain of events initiated by Aeneas' arrival in Italy and the foundation of his city in Latium. That makes it interesting to see how the ktistic discourse develops in the remainder of the poem, as the revelation of Roman history proceeds. We will turn, therefore, to the next major prophetic revelation about Rome in the poem, the so-called Parade of Heroes at the end of book VI.

2.4. *Augustus Caesar ... aurea condet saecula: the Parade of Heroes (VI.751-892)*

The prophecy of Jupiter in book I brought the revelation of Roman history to the chronological present of Vergil's audience, and to a majestic climax with its description of the Augustan peace. Notwithstanding its sweeping overview of the Roman future of Aeneas' descendants, Jupiter's prophecy had glossed over many particulars, and presented some crucial events in the shrouds of oracular ambiguity. Most of all, it presented an almost seamless continuation of the authorial previews of Roman destiny in the prologue, and of the role of both Aeneas' Trojan stock and the goddess Juno in that destiny. Maintaining and expanding the prologue's focus on the ktistic trajectory initiated by Aeneas with the foundation of Lavinium, the prophecy of Jupiter featured an explicit narrative of subsequent city-foundations in a rhetorical climax leading up to the foundation of Rome, by Romulus.

The ktistic verb *condere*, used only for that climactic act, indicated the shift of focus from Lavinium to Rome, and from Aeneas to Romulus: the stress was no longer on Rome's pre-history in Latium, but on its primordial entry into history at the site of the *Mavortia moenia* themselves. The *Aeneid*, in other words, first came to speak explicitly about what a Roman audience of Vergil's day knew as its own historical beginnings in the grand prophecy of book I. Even more so, and ranging far beyond the prologue in that respect, the prophecy of Jupiter first presented such an audience with a picture of the *princeps* and his achievements, linking Augustus to the series of earlier Julians active as founders, and to the ktistic initiator of the city and the people of Rome, named after him.

This train of thought, and many of the details singled out here, are in turn continued and expanded in the next of the three major prophetic revelations of Rome's history, the so-called Parade of Heroes, or (with a traditional German term) *Heldenschau*, at the end of book VI. It is longer and far more detailed than the prophecy of Jupiter, but most of all occurs in an entirely different setting. Before discussing its particulars,

it is important to sketch the position of this crucial episode within the structure and context of both book VI and the *Aeneid* as a whole.⁴⁰⁷

Book VI occupies, literally and figuratively, a central position in the epic; it looks both backward, to Troy and Dido's Carthage, and forward, to Rome.⁴⁰⁸ Most of it is set in and around the Underworld, into which Aeneas is guided by the Sibyl of Cumae, a prophetess of Apollo and priestess of Hecate. It is a book dense with prophetic scenes and imagery, featuring references to Roman history and the Augustan present on many occasions. In a way, it marks the decisive shift from an orientation on Troy and how to regain what Aeneas and his fellow countrymen have lost, to a new orientation on a future in Italy and what will originate from it.⁴⁰⁹ Apart from a significant first instance in book IV (for which see below) Aeneas hears about Rome and the Romans only now,⁴¹⁰ when vague references to Italy, Latium or the Tiber give way to detailed and precise information about Rome and Italy in the narrative proper (plot A), rather than in divine tête-à-tête encounters and authorial statements, as before (in plot B). If we read book VI in view of the condensed summary of events in the *proemium* proper, we are right between the two parts of the 'epexegetic' phrase *Italiām ... Lavinaque venit / litora* (I.2-3), and between the phrases *multum ille et terris iactatus et alto* (I.3) and *multa quoque et bello passus* (I.5). Aeneas has arrived in Italy, but not just yet at the shores of what will be Lavinium, and his suffering at sea is practically over, but war on land has yet to start: the words with which the Sibyl greets Aeneas speak for themselves (IV.83-86). Book VI is, in other words, a liminal book, appropriately set in the liminal atmosphere of the spaces that separate the living from the dead – and, as we will see, those about to be born. This liminality is reflected in the shift from Trojan past to Roman future, from *Troiae ab oris* (1) to *altae moenia Romae* (7).⁴¹¹

At the same time, the war to come is paradoxically framed by the Sibyl as a repetition of the Trojan war, making the progress of the plot not only linear but also cyclical.⁴¹² The particulars of that paradox will be discussed later, but the key observation here is

^{407.} Cf. Fletcher (2014) 206: 'because Anchises' parade of heroes in Book 6 is so famous, it is easy to overlook how it fits into the basic plot of the *Aeneid*'.

^{408.} T. Ziolkowsky s.v. 'underworld' in VE III 1316.

^{409.} Cf. Fletcher (2014) 194-197: this shift is informed and accompanied by many others: the suffering of Aeneas (as announced in the proem) will shift from sea to land, toponymy changes from Greek and Trojan to Roman, and Anchises disappears from the main action. See also Thomas (2004-2005) 129 on the 'foundational language' in what 'is clearly a foundational moment', i.e. the Trojans' arrival at Italian shores described in the opening lines of book VI.

^{410.} Fletcher (2014) 195.

^{411.} There is also a literary-historical shift from Homer to Ennius as a model: see note 272, with Horsfall (2013) xvi-xvii.

^{412.} Cf. Fletcher (2014) 199.

that the great prophecy of book VI, just like that of book I, follows a trajectory quite different from the narrative of the book surrounding it. The discrepancy between action in plot A and plot B, in other words, is continued, but the unique quality of the Parade of Heroes in book VI is that this prophecy, contrary to that of Jupiter, is fully embedded in plot A.⁴¹³ Aeneas is its primary addressee, and it is a token of both the prophecy's importance and the progress Aeneas has made towards his Roman destiny that the main hero is entirely involved: that, also, is an emblem of the liminal space of the Underworld in which it is delivered, and of the central position of book VI.

Aeneas' descent into the Underworld allows Vergil to reevaluate significant moments of the hero's past: Aeneas encounters those of his fellow Trojan exiles who had not survived (VI.333-346), the deceased Dido (450-476), his fallen countrymen and enemies from the Trojan war (481-508), and finally, his father Anchises (697-898), who had died during the journey (see *Aeneid* III.708-714). Such descents and encounters were a well-known feature of ancient myths and epics, but in Vergil's *Aeneid* the scene acquires an entirely new dimension and meaning.⁴¹⁴ As Aeneas proceeds from the dark depths of the Hades to the pleasant fields of Elysium, where Anchises dwells, the population of the Underworld changes character: apart from the blessed souls among the dead, Elysium – in a striking inversion of the traditional pattern – also hosts the souls of those still to be born. What Aeneas encounters here, in other words, is not only his past, but also his future.

Vergil wastes no time to point this out: when Aeneas and the Sibyl close in on Anchises, they find him checking out the souls about to make the move to the light of the upper world, and, 'as it happened' (*forte*, 682),⁴¹⁵ counting 'the entire stock of his descendants and his dear offspring, the destinies and fortunes of these men, their behaviour and deeds' (*omnemque suorum / forte recensebat numerum, carosque nepotes / fataque fortunasque uirum moresque manusque*, 681-683). This elaborate description hints at the extent of what is to come. Likewise, Anchises' admonition to his son in book V, as a ghost, to come and find him in the Underworld had hinted at the nature of the revelation: 'Then you will learn about your entire race and what city-walls are granted' (*Tum genus omne tuum et quae dentur moenia disces*, V.737).

It is important that Aeneas will now hear about men as well as *moenia*, 'city-walls'. It links this passage thematically to the prophecy of Jupiter in book I, which focusses so strongly on the cities founded by Aeneas' descendants. A further hint that cities and

^{413.} Cf. Williams (1964) 58 = (1990) 202.

^{414.} Cf. Austin (1977) 212-213; Horsfall (2013) xxii.

^{415.} Cf. Austin (1977) 213; Casali (2007) 125.

founders are important in the Parade of Heroes is provided by the fact that, among the few specific inhabitants of Elysium listed before Anchises, Vergil mentions 'Ilus, Assaracus and Dardanus, the founder of Troy' (*Ilusque Assaracusque et Troiae Dardanus auctor*, 650).⁴¹⁶ Ilus and Assaracus already featured in the prophecy of Jupiter (I.268, as a name of Ascanius; I.284) as genealogical pedigrees of the Romans, which is up to now also the role attributed to Dardanus (III.167, 503; IV.365). Here, however, Dardanus suddenly appears in a ktistic quality: as founder of Troy,⁴¹⁷ allegedly originating from Italy, he ideally ties together the history of Troy with the ktistic mission that now brings Aeneas 'back' to Italy.⁴¹⁸

These are just some examples relevant to our argument of what Horsfall has rightly identified as 'the increasingly strong element in the narrative of thematic preparation for the Parade of Heroes'.⁴¹⁹ This programmatic introduction to Elysium and the meeting between Aeneas and Anchises is followed by a moment of warm greeting between father and son, again an occasion to evaluate the recent past. Right after that, Aeneas inquires about what he sees, and we approach Anchises' exposition of the future. The old man starts by explaining that Aeneas sees the purified souls ready for reincarnation gathering around the Lethe, the river of forgetfulness, as the last stage of a giant eschatological cycle of creation, birth, death, purification and rebirth. This opening to a new cycle of life completely changes Aeneas' and the audience's experience of the Underworld:⁴²⁰ from a static place where the souls are eternally to be contained in either misery or bliss, it becomes a vibrant, dynamic and exciting antechamber of a glorious future.

We may observe how Anchises' exposition of the eschatological cycle of life is presented to Aeneas at exactly the point in the story where Aeneas himself (perhaps unknowingly) is halfway across another cycle of death, purification and rebirth. After the 'death' or fall of Troy, and followed by the suffering that is meant to cleanse the

^{416.} Casali (2007) 112 remarks that they are named 'strangely enough' among Orpheus and Musaeus, and calls their presence 'one of the many problems of Virgil's underworld' (*ibid.* 113). In a ktistic reading, the problem gently dissolves.

^{417.} See Casali (2007) 113 for Vergil's striking inter- and intratextual adaptation of key lines from Homer's *Iliad* (XX.232) and his own *Georgics* (III.36); both of them strongly support the Vergilian emphasis on Dardanus' ktistic guise. The presence of Dardanus as founder of Troy also lessens the contrast between Vergil's Elysium and the Parade of Heroes observed by Hardie (1986) 75-76; cf. Horsfall (2013) 510 on the genealogical link.

^{418.} Cf. Williams (1964) 55 = (1990) 199. Dardanus is, again, emphatically *Iliaca primus pater urbis et auctor* (VIII.134) in the relevant context of Aeneas' first address to Evander.

^{419.} Horsfall (2013) 437-438; cf. 479 *ad VI.710* for the (unsubstantiated) suggestion that another detail anticipates the foundation of Rome.

^{420.} Austin (1977) 220.

Trojan exiles of their unfitting elements, Aeneas and his companions are getting ready to launch the 'rebirth' of a purified Troy in Italy, where Trojan and Italic qualities will merge to create Rome. The cosmological doctrine of metempsychosis 'makes it possible for V[irgil] to reveal to us the pageant of great, unborn Romans',⁴²¹ but it is more than that: transposed from the fate of individual humans to the larger entities of communities, cities and peoples, it poetically underpins the idea of a teleological trajectory from a fallen Troy to a rising Rome.⁴²² Now that the supreme power of Roman victory and conquest is about to be addressed, as the culmination of a giant historical process, the eschatological cycle is certainly a relevant background.⁴²³ Even more so, one may observe how a setting sprawling with ideas of rebirth is particularly congenial to a presentation of the Augustan principate as a ktistic renewal and programmatic 'rebirth' of Rome itself, concomitant with the incarnation of Augustus.

With the ground well prepared for the revelation of Roman history to come, Vergil, after only a few lines marking the transition,⁴²⁴ has Anchises describe, in a long speech to Aeneas and the Sibyl, the heroes of Roman history that move past them in a sort of parade. The whole speech runs for almost 100 lines (756-853),⁴²⁵ after which the scene continues with an exchange about the Marcelli and a couple of closing remarks (854-892). Most relevant to our current investigation is the first half: (VI.752-807)

*dixerat Anchises natumque unaque Sibyllam
 conuentus trahit in medios turbamque sonantem,
 et tumulum capit unde omnis longo ordine posset
 aduersos legere et uenientum discere uultus.
 "nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur
 gloria, qui maneant Itala de gente nepotes,
 illustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras,
 expediam dictis, et te tua fata docebo.
 ille, uides, pura iuuenis qui nititur hasta,
 proxima sorte tenet lucis loca, primus ad auras
 aetherias Italo commixtus sanguine surget,
 Siluius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles,
 quem tibi longaeuo serum Lauinia coniunx
 educet siluis regem regumque parentem,*

755

760

765

^{421.} Horsfall (2013) 486; cf. Hardie (1986) 69, Austin (1977) 220.

^{422.} Cf. Hardie (1986) 196.

^{423.} Cf. Hardie (1986) 69-71; Horsfall (2013) 486, with further references.

^{424.} Austin (1977) 232; Horsfall (2013) 508.

^{425.} Apart from Aeneas' embedded narrative of books II-III, this is the longest speech in the poem (*pace* Hight (1972) 44 on XI.378-444).

unde genus Longa nostrum dominabitur Alba. 770
proximus ille Procas, Troiana gloria gentis,
et Capys et Numitor et qui te nomine reddet
Siluius Aeneas, pariter pietate uel armis
egregius, si umquam regnandam acceperit Albam.
qui iuuenes! quantas ostentant, aspice, uiris
atque umbrata gerunt ciuili tempora queru!
hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam,
hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces,
Pometios Castrumque Inui Bolamque Coramque. 775
haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae.
quin et auo comitem sese Mauortius addet
Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater
educet. uiden, ut geminae stant uertice cristae
et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore? 780
en huius, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma
imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo,
septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces,
felix prole uirum: qualis Berecyntia mater
inuehitur curru Phrygias turrita per urbes 785
laeta deum partu, centum complexa nepotes,
omnis caelicolas, omnis supera alta tenentis.
huc geminas nunc flecte acies, hanc aspice gentem
Romanosque tuos. hic Caesar et omnis Iuli
progenies magnum caeli uentura sub axem. 790
hic uir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar, diui genus, aurea condet
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arua
Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos
proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus, 795
extra anni solisque uias, ubi caelifer Atlas
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.
huius in aduentum iam nunc et Caspia regna
responsis horrent diuum et Maeotia tellus,
et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili. 800
nec uero Alcides tantum telluris obiuit,
fixerit aeripedem ceruam licet, aut Erymanthi
pacarit nemora et Lernam tremefecerit arcu;
nec qui pampineis uictor iuga flectit habenis

*Liber, agens celso Nysae de uertice tigris.
et dubitamus adhuc uirtute extendere uires,
aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?*

805

Anchises finished speaking and draws his son and the Sibyl with him into the middle of the assembly and noisy gathering, and mounts a hillock from which he could scan all those who faced him in their long procession and learn their countenances as they came.

755

"Now then, what glory in due course will attend upon the offspring
[of Dardanus

and what descendants of Italian stock are held in store by fate, illustrious souls and future heirs of our name and fame, this I will reveal in words, and I will teach you your destiny.

That one, you see him, the young man who leans on his pointless spear, he occupies the place allotted nearest to daylight: he will first rise into the upper air with Italian blood in his veins, Silvius of Alban name, last-born of your children, whom late in your life your wife Lavinia will rear in the woods, a king and father of kings, whence our stock will reign in Alba Longa.

765

He there, the next one, is Procas, the glory of the Trojan race; and Capys and Numitor and he who will recall you by his name, Aeneas Silvius, no less eminent in devotion and in arms, if ever he will receive Alba to be ruled by him.

770

What young men! Look, what strength they display; they wear the civic oak that shades their brows!

These, for your sake, will establish Nomentum and Gabii and the city

[of Fidena,

they will establish the citadels of Collatia on the mountains, and Pometii, Castrum Inui, Bola and Cora; these will then be their names, now they are nameless places.

775

Yes, also a son of Mars will join his grandfather as a companion, Romulus, whom his mother Ilia, from Assaracus' blood, will raise up. Do you see how twin plumes stand upright on his head and how the father of the gods himself already marks him out with his

[own majesty?

Behold, my son, under his auspices that renowned Rome will equate her empire with the earth and her valour with Olympus, and, as a single city, will enclose seven citadels for herself with a wall,

blessed in progeny of men; just like the Berecyntian mother
 rides in her chariot through Phrygian cities with her turreted crown, 785
 rejoicing in an offspring of gods, embracing a hundred descendants,
 all dwelling in heaven, all occupying the heights above.
 Now bend your twin-eyed gaze to here, and look at this race
 and your own Romans. Here Caesar and all Iulus'
 posterity that will pass below the great axis of heaven. 790
 Here he is, this is the man, whom you so often hear being promised to you:
 Augustus Caesar, offspring of the deified, who will again found
 golden ages in Latium amid fields once ruled
 by Saturn, and will carry his empire beyond the Garamants
 and Indians. There lies a land outside of the stars, 795
 outside of the paths of the year and the sun, where heaven-bearing Atlas
 spins upon his shoulders the axis of heaven, fitted with glittering stars.
 At the arrival of this man, even now both the Caspian kingdoms
 and realms and the Maeotic land shudder at the oracles of the gods,
 and the trembling mouths of sevenfold Nile are in turmoil. 800
 Not even Hercules traversed so much land,
 for all that he pierced the brazen-footed deer, pacified the woods
 of Erymanthus, and made Lerna tremble at his bow;
 nor he who bends his yoked chariot with vine-leaf reins, Liber
 the conqueror, driving his tigers down from Nysa's lofty peak. 805
 And do we still hesitate to make known our worth by exploits
 or does fear prohibit to settle on Ausonian soil?

In a striking juxtaposition disrupting the otherwise chronological sequence of figures, the description of Romulus, as has often been observed, is followed by Julius Caesar and Augustus, after which the sequence is picked up with Numa and the other Roman kings (808-817). Fletcher's comment nicely reflects the *communis opinio*: 'By placing Augustus right after Romulus and before Numa (...), Vergil employs the *topos* of Augustus as second founder of Rome.'⁴²⁶ This notable structural feature, linking Augustus closely to Romulus, exemplifies how the Parade of Heroes elevates the connections between Rome's founder and the *princeps* – already apparent in the prophecy of Jupiter – to the highest level of narrative and ideological prominence.

^{426.} Fletcher (2014) 211, citing Getty (1950) 2. Cf. Norden (1957⁴) 322; Fletcher (1941) 89; Anderson (1969) 61; Williams I (1972) 505, 508 *ad* 789; Austin (1977) 242 *ad* 788ff.; Porte (1981) 337 n. 201; Horsfall (1982) 13-14; Williams (1983) 145; Cairns (1989) 61; critical Horsfall (2013) 540 *ad* 792. Feeney (1986) 9 glosses over the matter.

There is even more than these connections that links the Parade of Heroes to the prophecy of Jupiter. As Hardie notes about the two passages, 'Jupiter's rapid survey for Venus' benefit of the whole of Roman history ends with a hint of the coming of a new Golden Age (1. 291) that is made explicit in Anchises' prophecy of the career of Augustus at 6. 792-4.⁴²⁷ This is not the only aspect that is made explicit: Augustus, described with potential ambiguity in I.286-288 as a *Caesar Iulus*, is now unambiguously hailed as *Augustus Caesar, Divi genus* (VI.792). Already in these immediately apparent ways, the Parade of Heroes develops, expands, monumentalizes and renders explicit relevant strands of the prophecy of Jupiter – and of ktistic elements in contemporary Augustan ideology.

Let us now study the passage in more detail to further scrutinize its meaning and investigate how it continues the ktistic discourse inaugurated in book I. As we will see, Vergil does a lot more than only 'employ the *topos* of Augustus as second founder of Rome':⁴²⁸ this passage is, in fact, one of the key cornerstones in the construction of that *topos*.

As Anchises announces right away, his descendants will be both of Trojan (*Dardaniam prolem*, 756) and of Italian (*Italia de gente*, 757) stock. While his prophetic expression *te tua fata docebo* (759) recalls the prophecy of Jupiter, his treatment of Alba Longa and its kings is decidedly different. In book I, Jupiter stressed the Trojan nature of Aeneas' offspring in Alba as a *gens Hectorea* (I.273), which would be blended with indigenous elements only at the climactic moment of Rome's foundation (*Romulus excipiet gentem*, I.276), and only implicitly. Here, however, Anchises explicitly presents the fusion of Trojan and Italic races as a dominant feature from the very beginning, already present in Silvius (*Italo commixtus sanguine*, 762), the first of the Alban kings in this list, also known as Silvius Postumus.⁴²⁹

The apparent inconsistency has been known and discussed since Antiquity,⁴³⁰ but could very well be explained by the differences in the setting and context of the two prophecies: they are inconsistent rather than contradictory. Here, markedly, Silvius does not *replace* Ascanius, who, as a living human being on earth, is obviously absent from the Underworld:⁴³¹ while Ascanius will *found* Alba Longa, with the stress on his ktistic action, Silvius will be king, and father the kings to rule the city after him. The focus in this prophecy is much more on the genealogy of the Alban kings, which is

^{427.} Hardie (1998) 69.

^{428.} Fletcher (2014) 211.

^{429.} Cf. Fletcher (2014) 206-207.

^{430.} See Horsfall (2013) 521, with references.

^{431.} Austin (1977) 236 *ad* 766.

why many of them are named in succession, while Jupiter's focus in book I was on the pivotal moment of the city's foundation by Ascanius. Lines 760-772 do not contradict I.267-271; they rather elaborate upon the 300 years of rule mentioned in I.272-273. This shows how the two prophecies can (and should) profitably be read in conjunction, rather than against one another. In fact, the Trojan element is foregrounded also here, by Anchises describing Procas as *Troiana gloria gentis* (767). Austin sees that as 'an epic flourish; nothing', he argues, 'is known to suggest that Procas has any special distinction'.⁴³² Other commentators have likewise been troubled by the epithet,⁴³³ while Brugnoli even proposes to attribute it to Capys rather than Procas, emending away the comma after *gentis* (767).⁴³⁴ In my opinion, this entirely misses the point, also acknowledged by Brugnoli,⁴³⁵ that Procas figures here because he is the father of Numitor and thus Romulus' great-grandfather: as last of the twelve legitimate kings of Alba Longa, he provides a solid link between Aeneas' Trojan offspring in Alba and the founder of Rome, Romulus. That also explains why the other Alban kings mentioned are Capys (a Trojan in name), Numitor and Silvius Aeneas: they all link Aeneas to Alba and Rome. Also here, therefore, the Trojan genealogy of Romulus' ancestors is stressed at an important junction in the prophecy.⁴³⁶

A ktistic element, however, soon surfaces in this prophecy as well, to alternate and complement the genealogical focus prominent so far. In an unexpected excursion from what is, until now, clearly a description of the human souls that Anchises, Aeneas and the Sibyl can see passing by,⁴³⁷ Anchises proceeds to list, in a similar catalogical fashion, a series of towns that will be founded by these kings. This is more than antiquarian flourish. Nor is it, primarily, intended to 'stress the military abilities' of Anchises' descendants.⁴³⁸ It paves the way for the crucial step in the ktistic trajectory of the Italo-Trojans in Latium that will come next: the foundation of Rome by Romulus. That probably also explains the dative *tibi* (773), glossed over by commentators, and the repeated deictic references (*hi ... hi*, 773-774) to the Alban kings identified as founders: they follow Aeneas and Ascanius in their ktistic activity, further expanding the realm of cities founded in Latium by Trojan descendants of Aeneas. Note, at the same time, that these lines feature only one verbal expression

^{432.} Austin (1977) 236 ad 767.

^{433.} Conington-Nettleship II (1884) 527-528; Paratore III (1979) 340-341; cf. Horsfall (2013) 527: 'no necessary indication of *descent* from the Trojan Aen[eas], though some sense of kinship or shared origin is present' (his italics).

^{434.} Brugnoli (1983) 179-183; cf. Brugnoli in EV IV (1988) 287.

^{435.} *Ibid.*, 287-288.

^{436.} Cf. *genus nostrum* (766), *Dardaniam prolem* (756) and *hanc prolem meorum* (717).

^{437.} Cf. Hardie (1986) 337 on the 'predominantly prosopographical bias of book six'.

^{438.} Fletcher (2014) 208.

of ktistic activity, of a rather periphrastic nature (*imponent montibus arces*, 774; an expression not necessarily fit for all the towns mentioned, since some do not lie on mountain tops at all. It seems, in other words, that there is a clear ellipsis of a verb like *condere*.

Anchises then moves on to Romulus, singling him out in a lively way (*quin et*, 777; *viden*, 779; *en*, 781) before Aeneas' eyes, and through Romulus moves on to Rome. The connection with the preceding lines is clear: after many kings and their many small cities comes the one great founder of Rome. Romulus is described, however, with great stress on genealogy and divine favour. Anchises refers to his maternal grandfather (Numitor), his divine father (Mars), his distant Trojan ancestor (Assaracus) and his mother, again named Ilia (cf. I.274, discussed above); Vergil thus stresses the Trojanness of Rome's founder, even more than in the prophecy of Jupiter. While the focus in book I was on Romulus' ktistic act, described by *condere*, that now fades into the background: Romulus is of divine descent and singled out by divine honour, in such a way that his appearance here, ready to depart from Elysium to the upper world, seems already to prefigure his divinization.⁴³⁹

The only explicit reference to Romulus' ktistic role would be *huius ... auspiciis* (781), 'under his auspices', which commentators take as a reference to the *augurium augustum* of the twelve vultures.⁴⁴⁰ The words *inclusa Roma* (781) indeed echo Ennius' famous line on the foundation-omen, *augusto augurio postquam inclusa condita Roma est* ('after by augury august illustrious Rome had been founded'),⁴⁴¹ an intertext perhaps signalled here by *illa* (781) as a marker. If Vergil's *auspiciis* picks up Ennius' *augurio*, the two crucial terms in Ennius' line not echoed by Vergil in his description of Romulus here are *augusto* and *condita est* – precisely the adjective and the verb Vergil uses, a dozen lines later, in his description of Augustus (see below).

Under Romulus' auspices, Anchises recounts, Rome will achieve universal power and valour (782). That achievement depends on the city's providential foundation, surely a connection already made explicit in Jupiter's prophecy in book I (276-279, discussed above).⁴⁴² Rather than evoking Jupiter's description of Romulus, Anchises' presentation of Rome's founder is reminiscent of Jupiter's description of Augustus in I.287.⁴⁴³ Moreover, in Anchises' words, Rome herself will encircle her seven hills with a wall, pointedly diverting attention away from the ktistic activity of the founder,

^{439.} Austin (1977) 239 ad 780.

^{440.} Austin (1977) 240; Horsfall (2013) 534; differently Paratore III (1979) 344.

^{441.} Enn. Ann. IV.155 Skutsch, quoted in Suet. Aug. 7.2.

^{442.} See Binder (1971) 154; Hardie (1986) 364-365.

^{443.} Austin (1977) 240; Williams (1983) 145; Horsfall (2013) 534-535.

whose prerogative and iconic deed usually reside in exactly that action. The mention of seven hills enclosed by a wall (rather than the circuit enclosing only the Palatine) also dissociates this line from Romulus, who is traditionally associated with the fortification of only a single hill.⁴⁴⁴ The line is a nearly exact self-quote from the finale of book II of the *Georgics* (II.535),⁴⁴⁵ where it also refers to the creation of Rome, like here, and not in a strict relation to Romulus' ktistic act either. The context in both poems is roughly similar: in the *Georgics* Vergil sings of the virtues of the simple, rustic life of old, in the *Aeneid* Anchises points out the virtues of Rome's ancient heroes. Romulus features also in the passage of the *Georgics* where this line occurs first, but in an even less prominent connection to the foundation of Rome: (G. II.532-535)

*Hanc olim ueteres uitam coluere Sabini,
Hanc Remus et frater, sic fortis Etruria creuit
Scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma,
Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces.*

This is the life that once the Sabines of old cultivated,
as well as Remus and his brother; thus Etruria grew strong,
and, undoubtedly, Rome was made the most beautiful of all things,
and, as a single city, has enclosed seven citadels for herself with a wall.

These lines are about Italian strength, exemplified by Sabines and Etruria, and although Romulus is indicated by the words *Remus et frater* (G. II.533), he is not named. The evocation of a life of rustic simplicity led by Remus and Romulus, i.e. before Remus' death, clearly points to a setting before Rome's foundation.⁴⁴⁶ In *Aeneid* VI, the same concusion follows from the remark that Romulus 'will join his grandfather as a companion' (*avo comitem sese ... addet*, 777): this represents his reunion with Numitor, before Rome's foundation.⁴⁴⁷ Thus in both instances, *Georgics* II and *Aeneid* VI, the phrase is not about the foundation of Rome, but about the city's expansion and growth in strength and power. Anchises vividly points out Romulus, but portrays him as a hero of divine birth ready for deification and as a visionary

^{444.} Cf. Paratore III (1979) 344-345.

^{445.} Observe, however, that it is actually Vergil's character Anchises who quotes Vergil's didactic narrator. On the surprising paucity of Vergil's self-quotes in *Aeneid* VI, making this instance all the more significant, see Niehl (2002) 137-138.

^{446.} Putnam (1975) 180 = (2008) 150; cf. Putnam (1979) 9, 159-260. *Contra Miles* (1980) 163, who argues that 'we are told that Rome was founded not by Romulus and Remus but by *Remus et frater*' (my italics). Equally, O'Hara (1990) 153 is tendentious, if not wrong, in his argument that *muro* (533, the wall around the seven hills) is 'a reference to the wall that Remus leapt over before being killed'.

^{447.} Paratore III (1979) 343.

initiator of Rome's imperial power – not as a city-founder *per se*. The idea of Rome's foundation is certainly in the background, but it is not made explicit, and certainly not particularly stressed.

The simile that follows directly upon Anchises' presentation of Romulus corroborates this observation. Anchises compares Rome's blessed progeny of men to the 'offspring of gods' in which the Phrygian Great Mother of the gods, Cybele, rejoices. This daring choice of a goddess also associated with extravagant, 'Oriental' ritual,⁴⁴⁸ is remarkably fit for the context. Anchises elucidates the future progeny of Rome by comparison with a goddess close to his and Aeneas' Trojan background: according to Austin, 'Virgil clearly thought of the *Magna Mater* as a tutelary deity of the Trojans'.⁴⁴⁹ Vergil's Roman audiences must also have had some mental bells ringing: the cult of Cybele in Rome was associated with the Trojan legend, and the goddess *Roma*, popular in the Asian heartlands of Cybele, was assimilated to the *Magna Mater* through an iconography which included the turreted crown as headgear, precisely the visual detail mentioned here.⁴⁵⁰ Moreover, there is also a strong connection with Augustus, who established his own residence in close proximity to the mid-Republican temple of *Magna Mater* on the Palatine and restored the temple after a fire in 3 BC.⁴⁵¹ Commentators have seen many links between the simile and the surrounding vignettes on Romulus and Augustus: the walled crown of Cybele corresponds to the wall of Rome,⁴⁵² her embrace of her divine offspring would compare to the wall embracing Rome's seven hills,⁴⁵³ her tour through the cities of Phrygia would compare to Rome's vast imperium,⁴⁵⁴ and the gods she embraces would point also to Caesar and Augustus.⁴⁵⁵

One could add that there is a strong connection between the phrases *Berecyntia mater* (784), of Cybele, and *Ilia mater* (778), of Romulus' mother – both at verse end – and that there is a sort of topographical overlay of this passage, linking Romulus, *Magna Mater* and Augustus, with the physical situation on the Palatine Hill in Rome, where the Lupercal and the 'hut of Romulus', the temple of *Magna Mater* and the house of Augustus all stood in close proximity to each other. All this can be taken to support Norden's interpretation that this simile 'leitet (...) mit wahrhaft großartiger

^{448.} Horsfall (2013) 536; Austin (1977) 241; cf. *Aen.* IX.590–620.

^{449.} Austin (1977) 241.

^{450.} Norden (1957¹) 321–322; Austin (1977) 242.

^{451.} F. Graf s.v. 'Cybele' in *VE* I 325; cf. Aug., *RGDA* 19.1 with Cooley (2010) 191.

^{452.} Norden (1957¹) 321; West (1969) 46 = (1990) 439; Williams I (1972) 508; Paratore III (1979) 345; Horsfall (2013) 536–537.

^{453.} West (1969) 46 = (1990) 439; Horsfall (2013) 537 *ad* 786.

^{454.} West (1969) 46 = (1990) 439; Paratore III (1979) 345; Horsfall (2013) 536 *ad* 785.

^{455.} Norden (1957¹) 322.

Wirkung von Romulus und Rom auf den ‘alter Romulus’ über’.⁴⁵⁶ Still, it appears that the references to Rome in Cybele’s portrayal are not very prominent: she is described in her Phrygian setting, without explicitly evoking Rome’s origins or her Palatine temple. Also in this case Rome’s foundation is somewhere in our head, but it is not particularly foregrounded. The stress is on divine acknowledgement of Rome’s imperial mission and the city’s great heroes.

In relation to Alba Longa and Romulus, then, the Parade of Heroes evokes earlier passages (such as the prophecy of Jupiter) with a strong ktistic component, but initially stresses other aspects of Rome’s origins, rather than re-iterating the ktistic discourse. This temporary suppression of ktistic overtones builds up the tension that unleashes itself when Augustus, not Romulus, turns out to be the one who is described in an unmistakably ktistic appearance.

Augustus is the first member of a new group who Anchises introduces after the *genus nostrum* (766) of the Alban kings and Romulus. Aeneas has to direct his view to another *gens* and to his very own Romans (*hanc aspice gentem / Romanosque tuos*, 788-789). In this group Anchises points out a Caesar (789) as one of all the descendants of Julius who will ‘come beneath the great axis of heaven.’ It is unclear what exactly these lines mean, and commentators have been troubled by points of detail: does the group Anchises introduces here contain only the Julian *gens* and Aeneas’ own ‘descendants among the Romans’, or the Roman people in its entirety?⁴⁵⁷ Is the first mention of a *Caesar* in line 789 a reference to the deceased dictator,⁴⁵⁸ or does it already indicate Augustus?⁴⁵⁹ Does the ‘axis of heaven’ refer simply to the upper world where these Julians are about to be born,⁴⁶⁰ or does it already imply future divination, as ancient commentators thought?⁴⁶¹ It may not be possible to answer these questions completely, but, more importantly, the striking effect of these three lines (788-790) is clear. They forcibly set apart what follows as a new section in the Parade of Heroes, which, rather than proceeding chronologically from Romulus onwards, affords centre stage to Caesar (whether the dictator or Augustus) first.

This is also, as Paratore points out well, the well-chosen moment when Julius, or Ascanius, re-appears after being glossed over at the start of the list of Alban kings

^{456.} Norden (1957⁴) 322.

^{457.} Horsfall (2013) 538 (my italics), acknowledging the possibility of the latter (supported by Henry III (1889) 415-416) but strongly in favor of the former, like Conington-Nettleship II (1884) 530.

^{458.} Horsfall (2013) 538.

^{459.} Mackail (1930) 246-247; Williams I (1972) 508; Austin (1977) 243; Paratore III (1979) 345-346.

^{460.} Paratore III (1979) 346; Fletcher (1941) 89; Henry III (1889) 416-417.

^{461.} Williams (1983) 146. See Paratore III (1979) 346.

(760-766, see above). He now figures as the forefather of the Julian house, just like in the prophecy of Jupiter in book I.⁴⁶² The mention of Julius in this role, connected to Caesar, by itself evokes the prophecy of book I as a relevant subtext. In a way, after the expansive digression on the Alban kings and a different view of Romulus and Rome's foundation, we are now back in tune with the revelations of Jupiter. The phrase *Romanosque* (789) occurs only here and in I.277 in the whole of the *Aeneid*, while *Romanos*, without enclitical *-que*, had occurred last in I.282, also in the prophecy of Jupiter, and does not re-occur after the Parade of Heroes. Also the name Caesar occurs here for the first time since I.286, and will re-occur only in VI.792, three lines down, and in VIII.678 and 714, in the description of the Shield of Aeneas. The vocabulary thus takes us back to Jupiter's prophecy, and picks up the story from its chronological ending with the peace of Augustus.

In a context that evokes the prophecy of Jupiter but has so far largely suppressed that prophecy's ktistic focus, Augustus appears on the stage. After the deictic pronouns *huc* (788) and *hic* (789) the double *hic ... hic* of line 791 signals a sort of climax in Anchises' presentation of Roman souls. The climax is heightened even further by the entirely unambiguous reference to the *princeps* as *Augustus Caesar, divi genus*, making for a magnificent incipit of line 792. Both the name Augustus and the Latin adjective *augustus* first occur here in the *Aeneid*; the word had only appeared once before in Vergil's works (*Georgics* IV.228), and while it recurs twice more in the *Aeneid* as adjective (VII.153 and 170, in the highly relevant context of the Trojans' first approach to Latinus' city and palace), the name 'Augustus' only re-occurs once, in VIII.678 – again, like 'Caesar', on the prophetic Shield of Aeneas.⁴⁶³

There is thus a striking contrast between the first occurrence of the name 'Augustus' and Anchises' remark that Aeneas now hears this person 'promised' to him so often (*tibi quem promitti saepius audis*, 791).⁴⁶⁴ The *Aeneid* so far does not include a passage in which a promise was made to Aeneas about 'hearing' Augustus, but rather than explaining away his remark,⁴⁶⁵ I think a more cogent explanation is possible. The verb *audis* ('you hear') is in the present tense; the *tibi promitti saepius*, 'being promised to you so often' is therefore occurring right now – this prophecy is the promise, and the promise is made 'more often' (*saepius*), i.e. 'repeatedly', because a lot of what Anchises reveals can already be related to Augustus. That goes for his opening reference to the Trojan offspring who will one day win glory in his name (756-760), but also for what

^{462.} Cf. Cucchiarelli (2018) 250 on Vergil's programmatic use of *progenies*, already in the relevant context of *Ecl. IV.7*.

^{463.} Cf. Galinsky (2005) 247, counting also I.291, since he takes the *troianus Caesar* as Augustus.

^{464.} Austin (1977) 243 calls the remark 'curiously circumstantial'.

^{465.} Horsfall (2013) 539-540; Paratore III (1979) 346.

follows. As Anchises reveals 7 lines later in a clause whose verse-initial *huius* (798) picks up *hic* (791),⁴⁶⁶ distant regions beyond the Roman Empire and Egypt already fear Augustus' military conquest, foretold by oracles (798-800).⁴⁶⁷ We are thus drawn into a temporal blurring of narrative and historical present (*iam nunc*, 798) or, as Williams puts it when referring to the Parade's famous finale: 'Anchises addressing Aeneas is also a trope for the poet addressing the reader'.⁴⁶⁸

It is the reader addressed by Vergil to whom Augustus is repeatedly being 'promised': first in the prophecy of Jupiter, then on many other subtle occasions, and now, climactically, in the Parade of Heroes. Line 791, in other words, is strongly metapoetic, precisely at the point where the chronology of the narrative touches on the historical present of Vergil's audience. In contrast to Aeneas, who now seems to hear the name Augustus for the first time, this audience, hearing the *Aeneid* being read out loud in private, in public or in school, must have heard the name Augustus almost continually since its official proclamation in the Senate meeting of January 27 BC.

To name the ruler of Rome *Augustus Caesar, divi genus* is a further nicety. The name Caesar and the genealogical apposition *divi genus* both recall the *princeps'* official nomenclature, *Imperator Caesar Divi Filius Augustus*. While the inverted sequence *Augustus Caesar*, as Syme noted, 'throws the word 'Augustus' into sharp relief',⁴⁶⁹ the metrical pause after *divi genus* emphasizes the filiation.⁴⁷⁰ Every word seems to receive its proper prominence and stress in the elegant architecture of the line, reinforced by the syntactical composition of the relative clause governed by *condet*. The relative pronoun *qui* (793) is postponed, as well as the adverb *rursus* (793), making the object-clause and verb stand out particularly.⁴⁷¹ Through this unusual arrangement, the verb *condet* prominently stands at the end of the line that begins with *Augustus*. In line of the observation above, on *inclusa Roma* (781), that Vergil quoted Ennius' famous line on the foundation of Rome except for the adjective *augusto* and the verb *condita est*,⁴⁷² it is extremely significant that both words occur here in verse-initial and -final position. In a number of ways, both subtle and explicit, our poet draws a picture of Augustus in a ktistic role, closely comparable to that of Romulus in his role as founder of Rome.

^{466.} A clue picked up by Ovid, who used the words *huius augurium* (*Fasti* I.611) to refer to the name Augustus.

^{467.} Cf. Williams (1983) 146.

^{468.} *Ibid.* 149.

^{469.} Syme (1958) 183 = I (1979) 373, quoted by Horsfall (2013) 540.

^{470.} Austin (1977) 243; Horsfall (2013) 540.

^{471.} Norden (1957¹) 324; Austin (1977) 244; Horsfall (2013) 542.

^{472.} Enn. *Ann.* IV.155 Skutsch; see p. 113, above.

According to Anchises, Augustus will do two things: he will 'found' again golden ages in Latium amid fields that were once ruled by Saturn, and he will expand his empire beyond the Garamantes (a population in what is now the Fezzan, in southern Libya, at the southern border of the Roman empire) and Indians. The prophetic description thus stretches from the primordial days of Saturn to the global future of Roman conquest, from rustic Latium to the ends of the known world, and strongly links conquest and military hegemony to a condition of peace associated with the golden age. The aspect of global conquest is further developed in the following lines, while the golden ages founded by Augustus receive no elaboration: the power of the *princeps* is already felt at the shores of the Caspian Sea, on Crimea and in Egypt (798-800), while the wide scope of his empire even outdoes the distances covered by Hercules and Bacchus (801-805), the two stock examples of worldwide dominion in classical mythology. Lines 794-805 thus expand what was said to be the result of Rome's foundation both in this prophecy and the prophecy of Jupiter: Romulus' city will achieve *imperium sine fine* (I.279) and will equate its empire with the earth (VI.782). Exactly this connection between conquest and the foundation of Rome by Romulus ties the two tiers of Anchises' description of Augustus together, since also the first statement about the refounding of golden ages has a lot to do with Romulus' foundation of Rome.

As set out above, there are many reasons to interpret this passage about Augustus in the Parade of Heroes in line with earlier passages about Romulus and Rome's foundation. It therefore makes sense to interpret Augustus' act of *condere* in VI.792 on a par with earlier programmatic instances of the verb describing ktistic acts, especially in I.7, I.33 and I.276 about Lavinium, the Roman people and the city of Rome, respectively. Nevertheless, the foundation of a city is not the same as the foundation of a more abstract entity, such as the golden ages mentioned in this passage.

While *condere urbem* may be considered regular idiom, *condere saecula* – again, after *condere gentem* in I.33 – constitutes an innovative use of the verb. The phrase *condere saecula* occurs only two more times in extant Ancient Latin poetry in this sense: once before the *Aeneid* (in Lucretius' *de rerum natura*, III.1090), once after its publication (in Statius' *Silvae*, IV.1.37).⁴⁷³ Vergil could certainly have used different words to describe the establishment of Augustus' golden age, but he emphatically did not. That makes this instance of *condere*, once again, important and significant: there must have been a reason for Vergil's particular use of the verb in this momentous expression. Vergil's use of *condere* in VI.729 has been variously explained and has given rise to an interesting debate between 'optimistic' and 'pessimistic', or 'Augustan' and 'ambivalent' schools of interpretation (see Introduction, above). I will begin with the former.

⁴⁷³ The phrase *saecula condita chartis* in Auson. *Epist.* VIII.23 has a different meaning altogether.

Horsfall speaks of a 'rich, complex, evocative choice of verb' and compares some instances of the verb used for city-founding in the *Aeneid* (I.5, 276, 522, 447, VII.145, and VIII.48, 313, 357), but unfortunately offers no interpretation of these parallels.⁴⁷⁴ He notes that the instance in I.33 is 'comparable', but 'above all' the phrase should be compared to the expression *saeculum condere*, 'traditionally the *closing* of an old *saeculum* (...), but here in V[irgil] clearly (...) the *opening* of a new one'.⁴⁷⁵ In support Horsfall points to the passage in Statius' *Silvae* IV.1, a panegyrical poem celebrating the inauguration of the 17th consulate of emperor Domitian, on 1 January AD 95.⁴⁷⁶ The poem is all about new beginnings (e.g. *insignemque aperit Germanicus annum*, 'Germanicus [= Domitian] opens an illustrious year', IV.1.2) and features a long speech of praise spoken by the god Janus, 'the mighty renewer of immeasurable ages' (*immensi reparator maximus aevi*, IV.1.11). Janus addresses Domitian as 'great father of the world, [you] who are preparing to inaugurate centuries with me' (*magne parens mundi, qui saecula tecum / instaurare paras*, IV.1.17-18). This thought is picked up a bit later in the passage referred to by Horsfall, where Janus discusses Domitian's future: *mecum altera saecula condes, / et tibi longaevo renovabitur ara Tarenti* ('You will found another age with me and inaugurate afresh the altar of the venerable Tarentum', IV.1.37-38). The repetition of both *mecum* and *saecula* clearly links this utterance to Janus' earlier address,⁴⁷⁷ and the adjective *altera* – a clever allusion to Vergil's *aurea* – means that *saecula condes* (IV.1.37) is a reiteration of *saecula .../ instaurare paras* (IV.1.17-18). In a poem that is all about new beginnings, Statius' Janus uses *condere* to signify the inauguration of yet another age.⁴⁷⁸ The reference to the 'altar of Tarentum', associated with the *Ludi Saeculares*,⁴⁷⁹ makes clear what this is about: after Domitian's celebration of the *Ludi Saeculares* in AD 88, Janus now expresses the hyperbolic hope that Domitian will live and reign long enough to inaugurate a second (*altera*) cycle of *saecula* after the prescribed 110-year period (i.e. in AD 198).⁴⁸⁰ Why did Statius chose to use *condere* as a synonym for *instaurare*? The answer is surely that he did so in imitation of *Aen.* VI.792-3.⁴⁸¹ *Silvae* IV.1 explicitly compares Domitian to Augustus (31-32) just before line 37, with the words *labentibus annis* (31) quoting *Aen.*

^{474.} Horsfall (2013) 541, *ad VI.792*. Cf. Nicastri (2006) 319, connecting *condere* in I.5, I.33, I.276 and VI.792, optimistically characterized by Formicola (2007) 154 as an exposition of textual testimonies for *condere* as 'key-word'.

^{475.} *Ibid.* (his italics).

^{476.} See Coleman (1988) xx, whose translations are quoted below.

^{477.} Cf. Geyssen (1996) 74.

^{478.} Coleman (1988) 7 in fact translates 'found', as do the Loeb translation of Shackleton Bailey (2003) 249 = (2015²) 233 and Nagle (2004) 124. Contrast Thomas (2001) 4-5.

^{479.} Coleman (1988) 77-78.

^{480.} On Domitian's link to Janus, see further Turcan (1981) 386-387.

^{481.} Geyssen (1996) 75. Cf. Hardie (1983) 239 n. 69; Geyssen (1996) 58-59 n. 17. On other instances where Statius 'appropriates Virgil's lexicon of founding', see White (2016) 56-57.

II.14 and referring to *Aen.* I.283 more loosely.⁴⁸² Moreover, this is not the only instance where Statius reflects (rather than subverts) Vergil's use of *condere* in the *Silvae*.⁴⁸³ Statius' *altera saecula condet*, referring to Domitian, thus echoes Vergil's *aurea condet saecula*, directed at Domitian's predecessor Augustus.

Horsfall's interpretation of *condere* in *Aen.* VI.792 was preceded by Conington, who noted that here 'it can only mean to establish, like "condere urbem," &c. though the analogy is not very close'.⁴⁸⁴ Similarly, Norden argues that "the phrase is used by Vergil in a way opposite to its original meaning, i.e. 'to bury a time-period', and this change of meaning can be easily explained by the idea that Augustus, as he buried the past, is the 'founder' of a new era in a sacral way".⁴⁸⁵ The supposed original meaning of *condere saecula*, indicated by all these commentators, is extant in only one occurrence: the passage, already mentioned above, in the didactic poem on natural philosophy by Vergil's predecessor Lucretius, active a generation earlier. At the end of book III of his *de rerum natura*, 'on the nature of things', Lucretius remarks that everlasting death will come upon us regardless of whether we live long or short lives: *proindelicet quot uis uiuendo condere saecla; / mors aeterna tamen nilo minus illa manebit* ('Therefore you may live to complete as many generations as you will: nevertheless that everlasting death will still be waiting', *Lucr. de r.n.* III.1090-1091).⁴⁸⁶ The sense of *condere* in this passage is 'live through', 'see out', 'see through to its end'; earlier in the same work, Lucretius used the verb *vincere* in a very similar setting (*de r.n.* I.202, III.948), where the translation is 'to outlive, survive'. That much is also implied by an important variant in the textual transmission: while the 'Oblongus' (*Codex Leidensis Vossianus* 30, early ninth century) reads *condere*, the 'Quadratus' (*Codex Leidensis Vossianus* 94, late ninth century) reads *ducere*, 'to extend; to pass, spend, enjoy'. There is thus no active agency involved in 'ending', as the commentary on Lucretius' passage by Kenney makes clear. He interprets *condere saecla* as an idiomatic expression following the frequent tendency in Latin to say 'do' for 'allow to be done':⁴⁸⁷ *condere saecla* does not

^{482.} Cf. Hardie (1983) 192-193 and Geyssen (1996) 74-75 for other connections to both Augustus and the *Aeneid*.

^{483.} See White (2016) 57 on *conditum* in *Silvae* IV.3.140, also in a very Vergilian context, and cf. the extremely similar phrasing in the praise directed at Domitian by Statius' contemporary and colleague Martial, *Ep.* VIII.80.7.

^{484.} Conington-Nettleship II (1884) 531.

^{485.} Norden (1957) 324: 'Die Formel *condere saecla* (so Lucrez 3, 1090 am Versschluß) wird hier in einem Sinn gebraucht, der dem ursprünglichen ('ein Zeitalter b e g r a b e n') entgegengesetzt ist (Usener, Rh. Mus. XXX 1875, 206). Der Bedeutungsübergang erklärt sich leicht aus der Vorstellung, daß Augustus, indem er die Vergangenheit zu Grabe trägt, in sakralem Sinn der 'G r ü n d e r' einer neuen ist' (Augustus als zweiter *conditor urbis*: Suet. Aug. 7)'.

^{486.} Translation quoted from Rouse/Smith (1992) 275.

^{487.} Kenney (2014²) 141.

mean 'end ages', but rather 'allow ages to pass by'. According to Kenney, Lucretius also plays on *condere*'s sense 'to bury' (OLD 4A) and *saeculum*'s sense 'the body of individuals born at a particular time' (OLD 1A): who lives long may live to bury many defunct generations.⁴⁸⁸ Lucretius' expression *condere saecla* is thus very contextually specific and idiomatic, and one may wonder whether it is indeed about actively ending or 'burying' a period of time, as Kenney and Norden imply.⁴⁸⁹ Although it may seem comparable to Vergil's use in VI.792 at first sight, it rather turns out not to be at closer inspection.⁴⁹⁰

Lexicographically, Lucretius' *condere* in III.1090 is subsumed under the headings 'to bring to a close, end' (OLD 13B) and *certum tempus finire* (TLL I.C). The rarity of this use is shown by the small number of instances, that often have a smaller unit of time as its object, such as a single day. Moreover, these are classed under a different heading in the OLD as '*diem* (etc.) *condere*, to see the day out' (OLD 8). It is important to note that, in the known early cases, the situation indicates that the 'bringing to a close' is not the product of human agency, but rather the inevitable, natural passing of time witnessed by the human subject.⁴⁹¹ The two instances of *condere* in this sense between Lucretius' use and *Aen.* VI. 729 are telling, and they are Vergil's own. In *Ecl.* IX.52, *condere soles* is used to translate a Callimachean model in which two friends talk until the end of the day, and so proverbially 'sent down the sun', (ἀλιον ... κατεδύσαμεν, Call. *epigr.* 2.2-3 Pf. = 34.2-3 G.-P. = AP VII.80).⁴⁹² The days (*soles* here stands for *dies*) do not end because Callimachus' friends or Vergil's shepherds do something, but rather in spite of that: they keep talking or singing, but the sun goes down regardless. In *Georg.* I.458, in fact, it is the sun itself that ends (*condetque*) the day. Human agency is clearly present only in one specific context. As a technical term, *condere* is used in the expression *lustrum condere* to mark the end of the census that occurred every five years and was combined with a purification ceremony known as the *lustrum* (see I.1.4, with n. 173, above).

This leads us to the 'pessimistic' or 'ambivalent' reading of *Aen.* VI.792. Based on the sense of *condere* in *lustrum condere* and leaning heavily on a specific interpretation of the passage in Lucretius, Thomas has proposed an entirely different interpretation of *condere* in *Aeneid* VI. In the programmatic opening pages of a study of Vergil's

^{488.} Kenney (2014²) 228-229.

^{489.} Norden (1957⁴) 324: 'ein Zeitalter b e g r a b e n'; 'aus der Vorstellung, daß Augustus, indem er die Vergangenheit zu Grabe trägt (...)'

^{490.} Cf. Kifsel (2003) 733-734.

^{491.} *Lucr. de r.n.* III.1090, *Verg. Ecl.* IX.52, *Hor. Carm.* IV.5.29.

^{492.} See Lipka (2001) 102, Cucchiarelli (2012) 474 and Rimell (2015) 58-59, who stresses the aspect of repetition and return.

oeuvre and its reception, Thomas argues that *condet* does not mean 'to found', i.e. Augustus 'will again found ages of gold', but may also be taken to mean what he sees as the exact opposite: not to found, but to bring golden eras to a close.⁴⁹³ This reading is both lexically preferable, he argues, and supported by the Lucretian and Statian intertexts treated above. Nevertheless, according to Thomas, the resulting ambiguous meaning has consistently been explained away, disregarded, denied or even 'suppressed' by commentators and students of Vergil's *Aeneid*.⁴⁹⁴ In Thomas' view, previous commentators simply could not cope with such troubling ambiguity in this passage, which has always been hailed as one of the most magnificent manifestations of Vergil's pro-Augustan sentiments. According to Thomas,

the most certain Augustan utterance of the Aeneid is deeply ambiguous, capable of signifying the termination, not the foundation, of the golden age by Augustus. And Virgil could, with any of us, have excluded that ambiguity by writing reddet for condet, since this "founding" of Augustus' is to be a restoration (cf. quondam).⁴⁹⁵

The wording *aurea condet / saecula*, then, would have enabled the phrase to pass as a description of a glorifying act, while at the same time offering a deeper, darker layer of meaning.⁴⁹⁶

Thomas' interpretation has met with some opposition, already in the reviews of the thought-provoking book in which it was published.⁴⁹⁷ Harrison concedes that Thomas 'makes a good point of Latinity' since '*condere* with *saecula* is certainly anomalous', but challenges Thomas' interpretation of that anomaly:⁴⁹⁸

^{493.} Thomas (2001) 3-7.

^{494.} For the idea of 'suppressing', see e.g. Thomas (2001) 5 ('for the commentaries of Williams and Austin simply suppress any reference to Lucretius').

^{495.} Thomas (2001) 4. Note the strong rhetorical opposition between 'the most certain' and 'deeply ambiguous'.

^{496.} Thomas and his adherents have developed a special phraseology to describe such deliberate attempts to render laudatory statements ambiguous and speak, e.g., of Vergil 'sowing the seeds of subversion' into his text (see e.g. Thomas (2001) 19, O'Hara (1990)). For the obsession with ambiguity in Vergil among many 20th and 21st century critics, see Martindale (1993), and Hardie (1995) 270 on their methodological forerunners in late 19th century Germany.

^{497.} Positive evaluations, in other reviews, do not add to Thomas' argument, deemed convincing by itself. Thomas briefly restates his position in Thomas (2004-2005) 121-122, without reacting or referring to criticism. His interpretation pervades also the *VE*, co-edited by Thomas himself: see L. Fratantuono s.v. 'Golden Age', II (2015) 565; J. Henkel s.v. 'Ages of the world, metallic', I (2015) 38.

^{498.} Harrison (2002) 293.

it seems more convincing for the linguistic innovation to be explained by the ktistic context (Augustus is, of course, here out of chronological order after Romulus to justify their pairing as founding figures; cf. Suet. Aug. 7.2), and the attribution of the Golden Age to the Augustan period is common elsewhere (...) and (...) clearly expressed at Aeneid 1.291.

This is exactly the point argued above: the ktistic context leading up to *Aen.* VI.792 determines the interpretation of what Harrison rightly calls a ‘linguistic innovation’. We will further touch upon this issue below, but it is crucial to observe that Harrison also proposes a ‘ktistic’ explanation for Vergil’s evocative use of *condere*.

Galinsky is less dismissive of Thomas’ argument that *condet* in VI.792 is potentially ambiguous (and thus tacitly acknowledges his interpretation),⁴⁹⁹ but rather takes issue with Thomas’ assumption that ambiguity is necessarily subversive, and therefore was suppressed and eliminated as an interpretive possibility by what Thomas sees as a dominant critical tradition that safeguarded Vergil as a pro-Augustan poet. As Galinsky points out, ambiguity is not only a well-established and widely acknowledged characteristic of Vergil’s poetry, but also of Augustan culture, and even a cultural phenomenon ‘typical of the Roman mentality’.⁵⁰⁰ The ambiguity of *condere saecula* in VI.792-793 is not in any way as alarming and potentially subversive as Thomas takes it to be.⁵⁰¹ According to Kifsel, Thomas’ ‘ambivalent’ reading of *condere* would not produce a statement of refined ambivalence, but rather a meaningless utterance: what could Vergil have meant by saying that Augustus would end golden ages, after decades of bloody civil war that ended at Actium?⁵⁰² Indeed, if Augustus could be said to have *ended* something, that would be the opposite of a Golden Age.

These three different objections against Thomas’ interpretation lay bare some of its shortcomings. It is certainly Thomas’ merit to have focussed attention on Vergil’s conspicuous and daring use of *condere* in this passage. His discussion of this important passage underlines how Vergil’s choice of verb was undoubtedly intentional and indeed of pivotal importance to the message of the poem as a whole, albeit probably in a sense different from Thomas’ interpretation. First of all, his detailed philological and lexicographical interpretation of *condere* may make us forget – and indeed fails to account for – the very important context in which Anchises’ utterance is made: an

^{499.} Galinsky (2003) 152-153.

^{500.} Galinsky (2003) 149-151, with the quoted words on p. 149, paraphrasing the work of W. Neuhauser.

^{501.} Cf. Luke (2014) 222-223 for a similar interpretation, and Rimell (2015) 57-62 for other objections to Thomas’ interpretation.

^{502.} Kifsel (2003) 734. Cf. Thomas’ own dismissive anticipation of this ‘hyperlogical response’ at Thomas (2001) 7: ‘in political life one man’s golden age will be another’s age of iron.’

Underworld parade of future heroes waiting for rebirth, i.e. a place teeming with new beginnings. How could such a context sensibly stimulate an interpretation of *condere* as signalling an end rather than a new beginning? The daring use of *condere* to signify the inauguration of something new, or rather the reinauguration of something that had already existed before, is completely in line with the thematic context of the passage in which it occurs.

Moreover, both the philological and the lexicographical analysis of the passage by Thomas reveals itself to be tendentious and highly selective. The phrasing *aurea condet / saecula* would have enabled the phrase to pass as a description of a glorifying act, according to Thomas, while at the same time offering a deeper, darker layer of meaning. Thomas argues that, if Vergil had wanted to exclude any of the ambiguity of the present expression, he could simply have used *reddet* instead of *condet*. That misses the point. *Reddet*, together with *rursus* in the same sentence, would provide an utterly banal substitute for *condere*. Apart from being pleonastic, *reddere* fails to convey what this passage is all about. Augustus' Golden Age is not an identical reiteration of that of Saturn. Saturn was ruling only in the fields of Latium, while Augustus will rule the entire world. The Augustan Golden Age is one of peace through conquest – *parta victoriis pax*, as the *princeps* himself would phrase it in his *Res gestae*.⁵⁰³ *Quondam* (794) not only implies a restoration, as Thomas concludes, but also distance, irrevocability – the adverb modifies *regnata* (793) rather than *aurea saecula*. It is the word *rursus* (793), really, that makes *condet* describe re-foundation rather than a new creation. This adverb, strikingly postponed, makes this instance of *condere* the only one in the epic that explicitly refers to a re-foundation.⁵⁰⁴

That is one explanation of Vergil's poignant use of *condere*: with *rursus*, it affords the poet a unique opportunity to cast Augustus' restoration in the guise of a ktistic renewal. What *condere* conveys, in other words, is that the Golden Age founded by Augustus is both old and new, a new instantiation of an old idea, but updated to new circumstances. *Redeunt Saturnia regna*, Vergil had famously written in the fourth *Eclogue*, 'the reigns of Saturn return' (Ecl. IV.6), a circumstance accompanied by the rise of a 'golden people' (*surget gens aurea*, IV.9). In the fourth *Eclogue*, these are both signs of a renewal of the great series of ages: *magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo* ('a great order of the ages is born anew', IV.5). 'A return' (*redeunt- rursus*), 'Saturn's reign' (*Saturnia regna ~ regnata*

^{503.} Aug., RGDA 13, with Cooley (2010) on this expression being omitted from the Greek version ; cf. Galinsky (2003) 153 on 'the typical juxtaposition, in *Aeneid* 6.791-95, of *aurea saecula* with Alexander-style conquest.'

^{504.} Cf. note 598 for what seems to be an intertextual allusion to Vergil's phrasing in *Pan. Lat.* VIII(5) 21.2.

... *Saturno*), 'ages' (*saeclorum ~ saecula*), 'gold' (*aurea ~ aurea*):⁵⁰⁵ all the crucial concepts of Augustus' restored Golden Age in *Aeneid* VI are present in *Eclogue* IV. Similarities, in more or less detail, have been noted by e.g. Cucchiarelli,⁵⁰⁶ except for the ktistic conceptual framework implied by *condere*.⁵⁰⁷ The Golden Ages of *Eclogue* IV began with a birth (*nascitur*, 5; *nascenti*, 8)⁵⁰⁸ and were manifest in new generations (*progenies*, 7; *gens*, 9) – a related, but crucially different conceptual framework,⁵⁰⁹ that all the same provides an extra indication that *condere* in *Aen.* VI.792 also signals a new beginning.⁵¹⁰ The birth of a boy, in *Eclogue* IV, is the harbinger of divine favour descending from heaven; there is no human agency involved in the return of a golden age. In the prophecy of Jupiter, it was also the birth of a Trojan Caesar (I.286-288) that would lead to the peaceful ages of Augustan rule. In *Aeneid* VI, on the other hand, it is clearly and self-consciously Augustus, *divi genus*, who inaugurates a new period of prosperity.⁵¹¹ To describe that period more explicitly as *aurea saecula* is completely in line with the tendency of this prophecy to make explicit some of the notions that were already present in the prophecy of Jupiter, where such a golden age is hinted at (I.291-296).⁵¹²

Similarly, Vergil's use of *condere* in VI.792 should be seen in conjunction with his earlier use of the verb at key moments in the poem. Vergil's own subtle and significant use of *condere* in the passages from book I, discussed above, creates a lexical and semantic edifice that supports the interpretation of the verb in this passage, so similar in many respects. Rather than only looking back to Lucretius (III.1090) or forward to Statius' *Silvae* (IV.1.37) in order to establish what *condere* means here,⁵¹³ we should first consider the other occurrences in the *Aeneid* where Vergil uses the word to elucidate its contested meaning here. It is quite significant that the ambivalence read into Vergil's *condere* by Thomas is not picked up by a poet such as Ovid, who treated the theme of the Golden Age on various occasions (*Met.* I.89-112; XV.96-102; *Ars. Am.* II.277-278), some

^{505.} Cf. *toto ... mundo ~super et Garamantas et Indos / proferet imperium.*

^{506.} Cucchiarelli (2012) 237. While he notes the relevance of *Ecl.* IV as a subtext for our passage in *Aen.* VI (cf. also *ibid.* 250), as well as the relevance of *Lucr. de r.n.* II.1153-1154 as a subtext for *Ecl.* IV.7, it would be very productive to further scrutinize the relevance of this Lucretian passage also for *Aen.* VI, given the close verbal similarities. Note that the verb *condere* does not occur in *Ecl.* IV, nor in the Lucretian passage.

^{507.} It is hard to see how a series of similarities, like those indicated here, can support the observation that 'Eclogue 4 is an exception whose utopian phantasy finds little confirmation in Virgil's subsequent cultural poetics' (Thomas (2004-2005) 132 n. 24).

^{508.} Cf. Clausen (1994) 121.

^{509.} Cf. Ryberg (1958) 114 n. 10; Barchiesi (2005) 168 *ad Ov. Met.* I.89-90.

^{510.} Cf. Cucchiarelli (2018) 237 on *venit* (*Ecl.* IV.4) vs. *nascitur* (5).

^{511.} Contrast *Hor. Carm.* IV.2.33-40, reworking the terminology of *Ecl.* IV for Augustus: cf. Zanker (2010) 508-509 *et passim*.

^{512.} Cf. Harrison (1996) 129, 131, reaffirmed at Harrison (2002) 293 (see above) against Thomas (2001) 7 n. 16.

^{513.} Cf. Hardie (2007) on 'the density of Lucretian echoes, often without apparent intertextual point'.

of them ironical, but did not tap into Vergil's allegedly ambivalent use – although he did play with other uses of Vergil's *condere*.⁵¹⁴ Vergil's use of *condere saecula*, therefore, needs to be understood and evaluated on its own terms, and within its own context.

Thomas only compares *aurea condet / saecula* briefly with the very similar phrasing in the prophecy of Jupiter in book I. There, Jupiter prophesized that Romulus 'will found the city-walls of Mars', *Mavortia condet / moenia* (I.276-277), with *condere* governing an object that is not temporal in nature (such as *saecula*) but spatial: *moenia*, 'city-walls', or, by extension, the city as a whole. As Thomas rightly signals, the words of Jupiter provide a compelling intratext to *aurea condet / saecula* in book VI (792-793). In his view, there is only one thing to be learnt from the comparison: it would lay bare a hint of the incompatibility of 'centuries of gold', on the one hand, and 'martial walls' on the other. According to Thomas, '[t]he golden age of Eclogue 4 had excluded war and walls'.⁵¹⁵ This implies that the intratext with *Aeneid* I would show the paradox of a 'foundation' of a true (messianic) Golden Age by Augustus seen as the culmination of the process started by Romulus' foundation of 'martial walls', since these imply war rather than peace.

There is no reason to suppose, though, that Augustus' Golden Age would be messianic, or that the 'martial' overtones in *Mavortia ... / moenia* (I.276-277) are the most important ones. As every commentary and even most translations point out, *Mavortia* refers to Mars as Romulus' father, the divine dedicatee and protector of the city newly founded by his prodigious offspring, and hence of its city walls.⁵¹⁶ If *Mavortia* were to refer to the martial qualities of Rome, rather than to the genealogical or religious connection,⁵¹⁷ then these would be a precondition for eventual peace, rather than a preclusion of it. The *Mavortia ... moenia* are not 'martial walls' (whatever that means) in contradiction with the idea of peace implicit in a Golden Age. As the prophecy of Jupiter shows, Vergil portrays *moenia* as a necessary prerequisite for peace and the rule of law, and city-foundation as a development that signals an end to wars and bloodshed (see I.263-266 on Aeneas' *bellum ingens* followed by his ktistic activity, *moresque viris et moenia ponet*, treated above). Rome's *Mavortia ... moenia* are not devices of warfare, but symbols of civic identity. The intratextual connections

^{514.} *Met.* XV.56-57 with Hardie (2015) 485-486. See also Galasso (2006) and Chandler (2017).

^{515.} Thomas (2001) 3.

^{516.} Cf. *Aen.* VI.778 where Romulus is *Mavortius* and VI.872 *magnam Mavortis ... urbem*, with Horsfall (2013) 531 and 600. In the same vein Vergil speaks of e.g. the Lupercal, depicted on the Shield of Aeneas (VIII.630), as *Mavortis ... antrum* (see Eden (1975) 166, Gransden (1976) 163-164, Fantham (2009) 58-59 and F. Castagnoli s.v. 'Lupercale (*Lupercal*)', in EV III (1987) 284) and Horace refers to Romulus as *Iliae Mavortisque puer* (C. IV.8.23).

^{517.} Austin (1971) 106, citing *AP* IX.90.3-4, where Rome is *Ἄρεος ... /... πόλιν*.

between *Mavortia condet / moenia* (I.276-277) and *aurea condet / saecula* (VI.792-793) thus reinforce rather than contradict the idea of Augustus' golden ages.

What about *condere* in these two passages? The strongest link between the passages is the parallel use of the verb in the prophetic future tense, governing an object of great thematic importance: *Mavortia moenia* (Rome) and *aurea saecula* (the Augustan golden ages). Note the parallel structure: the qualitative adjective, marked out by hyperbaton, stands before the verb and the object noun follows the verb in an effective enjambment. The suspense is maintained until after the verse ending.⁵¹⁸ The subjects of *condet* are Romulus and Augustus Caesar, both named explicitly for the first time in the poem at their respective occurrences. Thomas only sees a parallel between 'Anchises' words on his descendant, Augustus' and 'those of Jupiter on his descendant, Romulus'.⁵¹⁹ More importantly, Anchises and Jupiter figure as prophetic authorities, while the genealogical importance is invested by the addressees of their prophecies: Venus, not Jupiter, in book I, and Aeneas in book VI. They form the genealogical pedigrees of Romulus and Augustus. Where Romulus will 'found the walls of Mars and call the people Romans after his own name' (I.276-277), Augustus will 'again set up the Golden Age' and 'spread his empire past Garamant and Indian' (VI.791-795) – a wider ranging and more ambitious task.

Yet apart from all other similarities and subtle differences, the most important resemblance, at least for the present investigation, is that both are styled as *conditores*. Where all other words vary, *condet* is an identical component of both passages and enables the intratextual link in the first place. By using the verb *condet* for both Romulus and Augustus in an identical way, despite the widely differing contexts, Vergil invites comparison of the two in terms of their activity as founders. Disregarding the otherwise chronological progression in Anchises' exposition of Roman history in the Parade of Heroes, Vergil structurally linked Augustus to Romulus by having him come right after the city founder. Amongst the many links between the two that we have discussed, the most verbally prominent is the one implied by *condet*, significantly repeated from the prophecy of Jupiter and imbued with symbolic and programmatic value as a key word in the epic.

What does *aurea condet saecula* mean? This is not the place to discuss the meaning of the concept of the Golden Age in the Augustan era,⁵²⁰ but it is clear what Vergil's striking choice of verb means for his portrayal of the *princeps*. *Condere* conveys that,

^{518.} For this device cf. Austin (1971) 33-34 ad 'impulerit' (11), Westreicher (1946) and Burgersdijk (2003).

^{519.} Thomas (2001) 3.

^{520.} See e.g. Rimell (2015) 61 n. 95, with references.

instead of a return, Augustus' Golden Age is a ktistic renewal of a paradise long lost, a renewed and updated version of Saturn's primordial reign as much as Rome is a renewed but fundamentally updated version of the Trojan cities in Latium, whose sequential foundations were described in the prophecy of Jupiter. The wheel of fate keeps turning, and in the prophecy of book VI it is not Romulus or the foundation of Rome, but Augustus, and the reign of peace and prosperity he established, that constitutes the climax of Rome's historical development. It was Vergil's daring choice to present this achievement as an act of foundation, comparable to the city foundations of Aeneas and Romulus, and the establishment of the *gens Romana*.

The above analysis has attempted to lay bare some of the intricate ways in which Augustan concepts of city foundation and ktistic renewal are reflected in the *Aeneid*. It has been shown that many of the issues treated in chapter 1 of this thesis are indeed present in Vergil's epic, even if it sometimes requires closer scrutiny to reveal such correspondences. The *Aeneid* stands out for the way in which the foundation of Rome is omnipresent as an overarching theme of the work. The epic is a crucial text precisely because it dwells on the historical complexity and multi-layered nature of the process of Rome's foundation, rather than presenting it as a single event. This is done within a narrative that, because of its scope and scale, encompasses a wide variety of other issues (moral, cultural, political, etc.) with which the pivotal process of Rome's coming-into-being interacts and upon which it reflects.

Above all, the programmatic use (and sometimes absence) of *condere* and its cognates at crucial junctures in the teleological thrust of the poem is a conspicuous phenomenon. Vergil made *condere* into an important 'keyword' of his ktistic epic,⁵²¹ and his use of the verb is indeed foundational to the ktistic quality of the poem in its double sense. In my view, the *Aeneid* has played a great part in the semantic reconfiguration of the term, making it a suitable verb with which to describe not only Rome's original foundations, but also the Augustan project of restoration. In employing the verb in new and striking ways, Vergil contributed to the idea that or created the conditions under which the *princeps* could also be seen as a *conditor* of Rome. The poet's choice to focus on Rome's foundations and to present the Augustan settlement as a conceptual rehearsal of city foundation was a brilliant way to find a broad base of acceptance for it.

⁵²¹ Cf. Fratantuono and Smith (2015) 155, *ad Aen.* V.48; Horsfall (2003) 175 *ad Aen.* XI.247, 210 (*ad XI.*323); Horsfall (1995) 116. See also Mackail (1912) on *ingens*, a classic example of one of Vergil's keywords; McGushin (1965) 414 on *durus*, *durare* and *patiens*; Toll (1997) 42-43 on *pater* and *nepotes*, Cairns (1989) 3-4 on *rex*; Adler (2003) 318 n. 18 on *Saturnia*.

Inviting comparison between the *princeps* and heroic founders like Aeneas and Romulus, the *Aeneid* plays a considerable role in the ideology that presented Augustus as their ktistic successor. The epic thus functions in accordance with Hardie's more general view of 'Virgil's poems not as comments, whether of support or protest, from the sidelines of Roman history, but as themselves an important element in the various discourses and cultural practices that were central to the making of Augustan Rome'.⁵²² As our interpretation of book VI shows, Vergil's Underworld, in particular, was not only a cosmological incubator of souls destined for Roman greatness, but also a highly appropriate poetical playground to nurture and develop ideas about ktistic renewal and the Augustan principate's presentation as such. In many ways, the *Aeneid* is (or functioned as) the 'Great Ideas'-generator of the Augustan Age, and the seminal idiosyncratic concept of ktistic renewal is no exception.

Our close reading of some crucial episodes in the *Aeneid* might offer a base for further investigation of the role of *condere* and the concept of ktistic renewal in Augustan literature. As announced in the Introduction, the analysis will be complemented by one other example: we happen to possess an extraordinary testimony of a reaction to the ktistic character of the *Aeneid* in the works of the Umbrian poet Propertius. That is the subject of the final paragraph of this chapter.

2.5. Echoing ktistic Vergil: Propertius II.34

The importance of city-foundation in the *Aeneid* was already recognised in Vergil's own time, even while he was still composing the poem.⁵²³ Propertius singled it out as an important element in the final poem of his second book of *Elegies*, dedicated to Maecenas. About 60 lines into the poem, he playfully refers to Vergil's near-finished composition with the following words (II.34.59-66):⁵²⁴

Me iuuet hesternis positum languere corollis,
quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus; 60
Actia Vergiliu<m> custodis litora Phoebi,
Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis,
qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma
iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.

^{522.} Hardie (1998) 2.

^{523.} The relative chronology is indicated in the text itself by *nunc* (II.34.63, see below) and Propertius' reference to Gallus' suicide as recent (*modo*, II.34.91) and, in second instance, by the remark in the *Vita Vergilii* of Suetonius/Donatus that Propertius reacted to *Aeneidos vixdum coptae... fama* (VSD 100-105 Hardie). See further Enk (1946) 17-18 and Lyne (1998) 522-524.

^{524.} I follow the text of the Teubner edition of Fedeli (1984). For a minor textual problem in these lines see note 555, below.

Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai!

65

Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.

Let it be my pleasure is to chill out amongst yesterday's garlands,
for the god secure in his aim has pierced me to the bone;
that of Vergil is to be able to sing of the Actian shores watched over by Apollo,
and of the brave fleet of Caesar;
even now wages weapons of Trojan Aeneas
and raises up city walls, founded on Lavinian shores
Make way, Roman writers, make way, Greeks!
Something greater than the Iliad is being born.

2

Up to *arma* (63), Propertius' statement follows the typical scheme of an Augustan *recusatio*, as far as the content of the *recusanda* is concerned.⁵²⁵ The elegiac poet distances himself from, as Vergil had phrased it, *canere reges et proelia* ("to sing of kings and battles", *Ecl.* VI.3) and *dicere laudes...et tristia condere bella* ("to praise ... and to compose poems on sorrowful wars", *Ecl.* VI.6-7).⁵²⁶ He also typically indicates another poet who is far more equipped to do the job. In line 64, however, Propertius adds an unexpected dimension to the characteristic definition of the epic poetry which he renounces: the foundation of cities. The (partially 'new') definition of epic subject matter in lines 63-64 is phrased in accordance with Vergil's own terms by way of specific intertexts. *Troiani* (63), *arma* (63), *iacta* (64), *Lavinis* (64), *moenia* (64), and *litoribus* (64) all echo the wording of the *proæmium* of the *Aeneid*. Scholars have rightly remarked that Propertius composed these lines in direct reference to the opening words of his friend's epic.⁵²⁷ They have, however, so far only partially explored the potential of the intertextual comparison. Propertius cleverly rearranges Vergil's words instead of copying them directly; his evocation is more than a simple echo. *Iacta* picks up *iactatus* (*Aen.* I.3), there used not of Lavinium but of Aeneas. *Moenia* picks up

^{525.} See Cameron (1995) 454-483 and Freudenburg (2014).

^{526.} Cf. Horace's definition of epic in the *Ars poetica* (73-74), *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella / quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus* ('The metre for handling the exploits of captains and kings and grim wars has been shown by Homer', transl. Kilpatrick (1990) 74) and Hor. *Ep.* II.1.250-254. See further Gazich (1997) 293-296, Thomas (1985) and Fedeli (2005) 988.

^{527.} First signalized by Rothstein I (1920) 447, in the case of *arma* (63), *Lavinis* (64), and *litoribus* (64). Goold (1990) 244 also detected an echo of *virumque* and *Troiae* (*Aen.* I.1) in *Aeneae Troiani* (63). Heyworth (2007b) 275 added *iacta* (64). O'Rourke (2011) 468 was the first to see *moenia* (64) as an allusion to *moenia* (*Aen.* I.7). Both Heyworth (*ibid.*) and Fedeli (2005) 990, the latter referring to Tränkle (1971) 63, see *moenia* (64) as an allusion not to *Aen.* I.7 but to I.258-259, *cernes urbem et promissa Lauini / moenia*.

moenia (*Aen.* I.7), there referring to Rome, not Lavinium.⁵²⁸ Only *litoribus* and *Lavinis* are used analogous to Vergil's *litora* (*Aen.* I.3) and *Lavinaque* (*Aen.* I.2).⁵²⁹ Propertius thus combines elements of Vergil's *proœmium* referring to Troy (*Troiae*), Aeneas' wanderings (*iactatus*), Lavinium, and Rome into a single line on the foundation of Lavinium. In doing so, he inscribes that single event with poetic resonances of the broader teleological spectrum of the *Aeneid*. The line thus refers directly to the foundation of Lavinium, but indirectly encompasses also the historical trajectory leading from Troy to Rome that is such a prominent feature of Vergil's *proœmium*. Using the *proœmium*, Propertius singles out Aeneas' role as founder as an important element of the poem at large. By itself, according these ktistic elements such a prominent place already does a great deal to stress the ktistic quality of the *Aeneid*. Propertius, however, goes beyond Vergil's own words in two important respects.

2.5.1. From ktistic poetry to ktistic poets

In the *proœmium* of the *Aeneid*, Vergil had claimed that he would sing of Aeneas, his *arma* and his many sufferings in war until the foundation of Lavinium (*dum conderet urbem*, I. 5). In his imitation of this programmatic passage, Propertius changes the agents. He turns Vergil into the active agent responsible for the actions previously attributed to Aeneas, including the foundation of Lavinium. In Propertius' evocation of the *Aeneid*, it is not Aeneas but Vergil who *suscitat arma / iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus*, "wages weapons and raises up city walls, founded on Lavinian shores". In a familiar rhetorical trope,⁵³⁰ Vergil comes to symbolize the effect and subject matter of his poems; accordingly, his writing *about* Aeneas' wars and the foundation of Lavinium is itself described as an act of warfare and city-foundation.

Goold's translation ('is stirring to life the arms of Trojan Aeneas') is quite restrained, taking *suscitat* in the sense of 'To rouse from sleep or unconsciousness', 'To rouse (something) from a dormant or latent state, awaken, call forth'.⁵³¹ As commentators from Rothstein onwards have pointed out, however, there is a strong intertextual connection between *suscitat arma* here and comparable phrases in the *Aeneid* itself, where the meaning

^{528.} On the significant adaptation of *iactatus* (eschewing the preoccupation in the *Aeneid* with human suffering) and *moenia*, see O'Rourke (2011) 468-469, who observes that the focus is shifted from suffering to the more triumphant theme of city-foundation.

^{529.} Mynors (1969) reads *Lauinaque*, Conte (2009) *Lauinaque*, both manuscript readings – Propertius' echo of Vergil is considered to be so close that the text of Propertius here is indeed relevant for the constitution of the text of the *Aeneid* and the choice between the attested *variae lectio[n]es*: see Fedeli (2005) 989.

^{530.} Quintilian (VIII.6.26) lists the use of 'Vergilium' for 'carmina Vergili' as an example of metonymy (*μετωνυμία*).

^{531.} Goold (1999²). *OLD* 3a & 4; so too Barchiesi (1992) 35 n.2 and, following him, Fedeli (2005) 989-990. Cf. Camps' downplaying paraphrase 'rouses to arms the warrior Aeneas' (Camps (1967) *ad loc.*, 231).

of the verb is far more poignant.⁵³² In those instances, *suscitat* is used to denote an active involvement in battle of both Turnus and Aeneas. To the present author, that meaning of *suscitat* is likely to play a role in the way Propertius uses the verb in his evocation of the *Aeneid*. The instance in book XII of the *Aeneid* is especially significant, since Aeneas there is the subject of the action and uses his *arma* shortly before.⁵³³ Just before the narrative breaks off for an authorial reflection (XII.500-504), Aeneas *terribilis saeuam nullo discrimine caedem / suscitat* ('terribly awakes grim indiscriminate carnage', XII.498-499). Echoing phrases like these, Propertius presents Vergil's lively description of Aeneas' wars, through an *enargeia*-like metapoetical device, as an act of warfare itself.⁵³⁴ It is not Aeneas, but Vergil who 'stirs up weapons'.⁵³⁵

This well-known metapoetical device is also in play, I think, in the next line. It is Vergil, again, who becomes an agent involved in the foundation of Lavinium. As Camps remarks,⁵³⁶ the value of *suscitat* here can be compared to Lucretius V.1165-7, *horror / qui delubra deum nova toto suscitat orbe / terrarum* ('the fear that raises up new shrines to the Gods the world over', transl. Gale (2009) 91). Much later, Frontinus would speak of *suscitandi festinanter muri* in his *Strategemata* (I.1.10); before the *Aeneid*, Vergil had used the word in *Georgics* I.97 to describe the ridges of earth thrown up by plowing, i.e. the exact same action as performed in the traditional Roman foundation ritual. Aeneas himself performs the ritual in *Aeneid* V.755 (*urbem designat arato*; see Servius *ad loc.* for the traditional ritual), in an act of foundation preceded by an offering (*sopitos suscitat ignis*, V.743) and a plea for *muros iacere* (V.631). Taken together, these instances of *suscitat*, in the latter case combined with *muros iacere* (cf. *iactaque ... moenia*, II.34.64), seem to make clear that *suscitare* can be deliberately chosen by Propertius as a verb that fits a ktistic context. Just like *suscitare arma* can be understood as an act of warfare, *suscitare moenia* can be understood as an act of city-foundation. In a way, then, Propertius presents Vergil as a founder of Lavinium, the poet himself fulfilling the momentous deed that his poem could be seen to culminate in (*dum conderet urbem*, *Aen.* I.5). By composing his ktistic epic, Vergil thus becomes a founder himself, as well as a warrior – just like Aeneas.⁵³⁷

^{532.} Notably IX.462-3 (Fedeli (2005) 990) and XII.498-9 (Rothstein, Enk (1962), Fedeli (2005) 990).

^{533.} *se collegit in arma*, XII.491 ('he gathered himself behind his shield', transl. Fairclough and Goold (2000) 335).

^{534.} For the device see Lieberg (1982), and for a metapoetical reading of the *Aeneid* in which Aeneas stands for Vergil himself, Kofler (2003).

^{535.} Gazich (1997) 302 paraphrases 'Virgilio "fa sorgere" *arma e moenia*' and notes (302 n. 5) that 'suscitare *arma* ha un senseo anche proprio: "iniziate una guerra"'.

^{536.} Camps (1967) 231 (*ad 64*), accepted by Fedeli (2005) 990.

^{537.} As Richardson (1977) 315 (*ad 64*) remarked, '[w]e may take *moenia* as a metonymy and translate: "the city founded ..." or take it literally and translate: "the walls built..." The slight zeugma here: *suscitat arma / iactaque ... moenia* is very effective, as one gets a mental image of the walls raised out of the earth by the power of the poet.'

A final element of the transposition of focus from the heroic (in the *Aeneid*) to the poetic (in Propertius' vignette) resides in lines 65-66, perhaps the most famous lines of this well-known vignette.⁵³⁸ Propertius' exclamation, claiming that a sort of poetic *translatio studii* from Homer to Vergil is taking place, comes right after his mention of the foundation of Lavinium in line 64. In the original scheme of Vergil's *proœmium*, lines 65-66 thus take the place of the *translatio imperii* from Lavinium to Rome through Alba Longa (*genus unde Latinum / Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae*, I.6-7). That historical *translatio*, from Aeneas to Romulus and ultimately to Augustus, is replaced by a *translatio* from Homer through other Greek and Roman authors to Vergil, whose poem *about* Rome takes the place of Rome itself as a destination and culmination of the *translatio*. While Vergil's *proœmium* had presented a ktistic poem, Propertius presents us with a ktistic poet, instead, almost foreshadowing his own poetic pose in his fourth book of *Elegies*.⁵³⁹

2.5.2. Actian and Lavinian shores intertwined

So far, we have looked at the second and third couplet of Propertius' six-line evocation of the *Aeneid*, where the ktistic overtones of Vergil's epic are evoked most prominently. The first couplet (61-62) seems devoted to an equally important but wholly different matter: the Battle of Actium. Scholars have often isolated these two lines from the following four to the extent that the allusion they contain is, according to Richardson, 'clearly to a separate poem Vergil is to write celebrating the victory of Octavian over Antony and Cleopatra in the naval battle of Actium, not to the description of the shield of Aeneas in which the battle appears (...)'.⁵⁴⁰ To my mind, however, there is not only an intimate connection between the couplets in Propertius' vignette, but the ktistic quality evoked in lines 63-64 is also present in the first distich. Let us focus first on *Actia*, the first word of Propertius' vignette.

As we have seen before, also in this case Propertius' evocation of the forthcoming *Aeneid* surpasses Vergil's own poem. What is striking in these lines is the strong link it construes between the battle of Actium and the foundation of Lavinium. Scholars have noted the significant repetition of *litora* in lines 61 (on Actium) and 64 (on

^{538.} On the provenance of these lines see Butrica (1997) 201, Fedeli (2005) 991-992, Cairns (2006) 34 and Heyworth (2007b) 275. For references to recent appraisals and the link between these lines and the second *proœmium* of the *Aeneid* in book VII, see O'Rourke (2011) 469-470.

^{539.} I cannot treat here the relation between the (ktistic quality of the) *Aeneid* and Propertius' later aetiological elegies in book IV. For a comparison between II.34.61-64 and IV.1.1-4 see DeBrohun (2003) 38-39.

^{540.} Richardson (1977) 315 (*ad* 61-2). So too Rothstein; *contra* Fedeli (2005) 989, Heyworth (2007b) 275; see O'Rourke (2011) 466-467 and Cairns (2006) 313 with n. 69.

Lavinium).⁵⁴¹ Both coastlines are the stage of events of epochal importance in the distant mythical past, on the one hand, and the recent historical past, on the other.

Significant overlaps between the mythical topography of Aeneas' distant age and the contemporary topography of the Augustan Empire are, of course, a well-known feature of the *Aeneid*. Not only the tour through Evander's Pallanteum in book VIII, but also the vicissitudes during Aeneas' landing on Sicily (in book V) and Actium (in book III) constitute important examples. In book III, Vergil attributes an important mythical past to Actium, making Aeneas perform sacrifice there to Jupiter and celebrate games (III.279-80). Before the Trojans continue their journey, Aeneas dedicates to the temple of Apollo a bronze shield from the booty taken from the Greeks.⁵⁴² In the fictional world of the *Aeneid*, he commemorates his dedication with an inscription that is quoted in full: *AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIS VICTORIBUS ARMA* ('AENEAS [dedicates] THESE WEAPONS, FROM GREEK VICTORS', III.288).⁵⁴³ The site of Actium is thus invested with heroic significance. As Williams notes, the passage 'stands out as an Augustan episode in the midst of the Aeneas' voyage'.⁵⁴⁴ Moreover, Vergil quite uniquely has Aeneas present himself as a poet, as the hero introduces his quote of the inscription with the words *rem carmine signo* ('I mark the occasion with an epigram', III.287). If anything, a poetical detail as poignant as this one would hardly have been lost on a poet like Propertius.⁵⁴⁵ So it seems beyond doubt that Propertius' *Actia ... litora* (61) is a direct reference to Vergil's *Actiaque litora* (III.280), as both words occupy the exact same metrical position in both lines.⁵⁴⁶ Moreover, the word *Iliacis* (III.280), which comes right after *Actiaque* in Vergil, seems too close a parallel to Propertius' last word in his six line vignette of the *Aeneid*, *Iliade* (66), to be coincidental.

What Vergil hadn't done but Propertius does, then, is to symbolically link Actium to Lavinium. In the famous depiction of the battle of Actium on the shield of Aeneas

^{541.} Gazich (1997) 302.

^{542.} For this temple, known from Thucydides I.29.3, see Propertius IV.6.67-68 and Suetonius, *Augustus* 18.2.

^{543.} Fascinatingly, we have *AENEAS* and *ARMA* at both ends of the verse. In I.248-249, where Venus had described to Jupiter the foundation of Patavium by Antenor, *arma figere* seems to be equivalent to *urbem condere* (although there Antenor's own Trojan *arma* are being fastened, instead of Greek spoils). There also seems to be a distant link between *clipeum ... postibus adversis figo*, here, and *ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit* (XII.950), as in both cases weapons are being fastened/stored/buried by Aeneas in relation to his main foes, Abas prefiguring Turnus. See also Heyworth & Morwood (2017) 160 on 'Aeneas as the founder of Roman poetry (epigram, and perhaps also epic) as well as the Roman state'.

^{544.} Williams I (1972) 292.

^{545.} See Putnam (1995) 55f, Barchiesi (1997) 7, and Horsfall (2006) 229 (*ad* 288), who writes: 'Aeneas' poetry may be thought to look forward to Vergil's, as his trophy does to Augustus'. One may add that Aeneas' shield (and poetry about it) in Actium looks forward to Vergil's poetical shield about Actium, shouldered by Aeneas.

^{546.} Cf. Brugnoli & Stock (1991) 135; [Brugnoli] and O'Rourke (2011) 466.

in book VIII of the *Aeneid*, Lavinium was absent – indeed, Vulcan began with the *genus omne futurae / stirpis ab Ascanio pugnataque in ordine bella* (“all the generations of the future stock from Ascanius and the wars fought in chronological sequence”, VIII.628-629) and then jumped to Romulus and Remus (630-634). Propertius, on the contrary, creates a close link between the *Actia ...litora* (61) of Augustus and the *Lavinis ... litoribus* (64) of Aeneas, leaving out the foundation of Rome or everything in between. Augustus is named in the line after *Actia ... litora* (*Caesaris*, 62), Aeneas (*Aeneae*, 63) in the line before the ones about Lavinium: both names stand at or near the opening of the line as anticipated genitives governed by nouns that come last (*rates*, 62, and *arma*, 63). In a skilful chiastic arrangement (*Actia, Caesaris: Aeneae, Lavinis*) Actium and Lavinium, together with their protagonists Augustus and Aeneas, stand out as the prime subjects and protagonists of the *Aeneid*. There could hardly be a more poignant allusion to the ktistic quality of the *Aeneid* than to equate Augustus, whose Principate was founded on the victory at Actium, with Aeneas as founder of Lavinium.⁵⁴⁷

It was at the *Actia litora*, last but not least, that Augustus himself had most prominently founded a city of his own, Nicopolis. Vergil’s treatment of Actium (*Aen.* III.276-289) does not refer to this episode. Could Propertius have had Augustus’ own ktistic activity in mind when he paired the *Actia* and *Lavina litora*?⁵⁴⁸ In light of an overall emphasis on the ktistic aspect of the *Aeneid*, that may seem likely. In both realms (the mythical and the historical) city-foundation can be seen to mark the end of protracted and repetitive sufferings. In David Quint’s analyses, ‘[t]here is an evident analogy to be drawn between the defeated, war-weary Trojan remnant in search of a new beginning and Virgil’s readers, the survivors of the recent civil wars, who are offered a fresh start in the new Augustan state’.⁵⁴⁹ At the end of both trajectories stands the foundation of a city: Lavinium, in the case of Aeneas and his war-weary Trojans, and Nicopolis, young Caesar’s Victory City, in the case of Vergil’s contemporary war-weary Romans.

In his invocation of Vergil’s *nescio quid maius ... Iliade* (66) it is not Venus, not Juno, not Dido, not Turnus nor Lavinia whom Propertius chooses to bring to the fore,

^{547.} As Paratore II (1978) 141 (*ad* 288) acutely remarks, “of enormous ideological profundity is the testimony Vergil imagined Aeneas to have left in exactly the place – thereby bringing to a close a millennial enterprise – where Augustus would have defeated the Queen of the last Hellenistic kingdom opposed to Rome, in other words the last descendent of those Greeks who fraudulently had destroyed Troy.”

^{548.} For another possible play on *litora* on a crucial junction in Vergil’s *Aeneid* itself, see Horsfall (2000) 46-47 (*ad* VII.1).

^{549.} Quint (1982) 36 = (1989) 17 = (1999) 123.

although they would have fitted the general context and subject of II.34 far better.⁵⁵⁰ Even to a poet who professes to be so ultimately unfit for and uninterested in epic poetry as Propertius, the ktistic and political elements of the *Aeneid* exemplified Vergil's achievement far better than any other elements.⁵⁵¹ Those elements are the ones that truly made Vergil's epic poem [*nescio quid*] *maius Iliade*: the description of a war (concluded at Actium) and the coming into being of the city (Augustan Rome) far greater than the long gone Trojan war and the Troy of the *Iliad*.⁵⁵² That Propertius was able to read the epic in this way further suggests that the theme of city foundation was an important issue in Augustan culture, and not just in Vergil's work.

2.5.3. *Inscribing ktistic character*

Apart from using verbal references, Propertius also seems to highlight more sophisticated poetical devices that Vergil used to bring out the ktistic quality of his epic. As Hartmut Froesch has pointed out, Vergil himself may have wanted to begin the *Aeneid* with a programmatic hint.⁵⁵³ The opening words *arma virumque cano*, when read as an acrostic, produce the well-known abbreviation A.V.C. (*ab Vrbe condita* – the letters *u* and *v* are interchangeable in Latin), as a sort of cipher or sigil programmatically sealing the opening of the poem.⁵⁵⁴ The famous opening, then, would not only be a concise summary of Vergil's Homeric models, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but also provide a subtle hint to its Roman subject matter. In exactly the same way, it seems, Propertius opens his own evocation of the inchoate *Aeneid* with the words *Actia Vergilium custodis*, echoing Vergil's A.V.C.-acrostic.⁵⁵⁵ The ktistic character of Vergil's epic is thus not

^{550.} See O'Rourke (2011) 472 (on this passage), 479-80 and 482 (on similar omissions of expected content in the vignettes on the *Elegies* and *Georgics* in the remainder of II.34), 484 and 487 (on the device in general); contrast Sullivan (1993) 147-148. For a similar breach of thematic unity to bring in 'Augustan' themes, see Cairns (2006) 324 on II.1. For 'Propertius' tongue-in-cheek claim that all Vergil's works are acceptable to lovers' (Cairns (2006) 314, see lines 81-82).

^{551.} Rothstein (1920) 448 (ad *moenia*, 63) still seems to have grasped this best: 'Bis zur Gründung von Lavinium hat Virgil [sic] sein Epos nicht fortgeführt (...), aber Properz will keinen genauen Inhaltsberichte geben, sondern mit einem Worte [*moenia*] zusammenfassen, was Ziel und Gegenstand der *Äneis* erzählten kämpfe ist.' (my italics).

^{552.} This is not to say that *nescio quid maius ... Iliade* cannot point to Aeneas' (not Augustus') war in *Aeneid* VII-XII, which is in fact backed up by a verbal allusion to *maius opus* (VII.45); simply that the context of II.34 favors a comparison between the *Iliad* and Augustus rather than Aeneas, given the stress on Actium and Caesar in 61-62.

^{553.} Froesch (1991).

^{554.} *Ibid.* 310.

^{555.} *Ibid.* 310-311. Froesch pays no attention to a possible textual problem here. Heyworth's 2007 OCT-edition (2007b) 98) reads *Actia Vergilio est custodis ...*, ruining the correspondence. *Vergilio <est>* is Baehrens' conjecture based on the reading *Vergilio* of the older manuscripts, while the *recentiores* (e.g. Groninganus bibl. Universitatis 159, saec. XV) read *Vergilium*, the text used by Froesch and printed by Fedeli (2005) 947 (and in his earlier Teuber editions) as *Vergiliu<m>*. Apart from Heyworth, most modern editors and scholars follow Fedeli.

only spelled out explicitly in lines 63-64 of Propertius' vignette, but also incorporated in it through more sophisticated allusion.⁵⁵⁶ Such intertextual play can in fact also be detected in the rest of Propertius' poem.⁵⁵⁷

As Froesch rightly notes in passing,⁵⁵⁸ Vergil's *virum* corresponds to Propertius' *Vergilium* – an extremely fitting substitution, one may add, just like *Actia* for *Arma*. We have discussed the importance of *Actia* above. The substitution of *virum* with *Vergilium* seems further evidence for the point made before, namely that Propertius' evocation of the *Aeneid* replaces Aeneas, in the original, with Vergil himself as the main agent of the summarized poem.⁵⁵⁹ In Vergil's original, the opening lines of the poem consisted mainly of a subordinate clause dependent on Aeneas: *virum, ... qui*. In Propertius' meticulous evocation, we have a similar scheme, albeit with *Vergilium ..., qui* (61, 63). The poet Vergil, thus, becomes the main protagonist of Propertius' *Aeneis parva* also through this structural echo. Vergil himself would then have highlighted the *Aeneid*'s ktistic quality from the very first words onwards and Propertius, reacting to his friend's major epic-under-construction, would have picked up on that in the opening words of his couplet devoted to the *Aeneid*.⁵⁶⁰

One important question remains. If Propertius consciously evoked the ktistic quality of the nascent *Aeneid*, why did he not do so by using the very word that best

^{556.} Froesch points at another interesting echo in the *Vita Vergilli* of Suetonius/Donatus (c. 45), where the treatment of this Propertian passage begins with the words *Aeneidos vixdum coepiae*, forming a similar A.V.C. -acrostic. His other parallels (*Annales Volusi, cacata ...*, Catul. 36.1; *Annales O cives ...*, Cic. *Tusc. I.34*) appear to me to be less convincing.

^{557.} Thomas (1999) 263-266 = Thomas (1996) 241-246 observes the intricacy of the number of lines devoted by Propertius to Vergil's works: 'the twelve books of the *Aeneid* receive six lines (61-66[...]) which is in proportion to the two lines devoted to the four books of the *Georgics* (77-78); but the ten *Elegies*, Virgil's "elegiac" work, receive ten lines (67-76) – one line per poem.' If lines 61-66 are Propertius miniature *Aeneid*, *Actia Vergilium custodis* is logically his *arma virumque cano*. On the possibly disputable provenance of lines 67-84, however, see Butrica (2006) 34. Castelletti (2015) 216-218 sees a double boustrophedonic acrostic in lines 63-66, in imitation of Vergil's *proæmium* of the *Aeneid*.

^{558.} Froesch (1991) 311.

^{559.} See note 534, above.

^{560.} Froesch (1991) 311-312 takes his interpretation even further, speculating that the letters AVC could also be taken as a reference to the name Augustus, often abbreviated AVG on coins and sometimes spelled AVC (as the Latin letter C was more often used to denote a 'g'). Although this would certainly underpin my point about the double ktistic value of the *Aeneid*, presenting the *princeps* as a second founder of Rome, in the present, I see too many problems to accept this suggestion. Most importantly, the correspondence *arma virumque cano* ≈ *ab Urbe condita* is convincing because of the form (three words forming a sort of catch-phrase whose initials overlap), the content (the beginning of the *Aeneid* vs. the beginning of Rome) and the setting (the opening words of a ktistic poem referring to the foundation of the city with which the *proæmium* ends) – all these factors are absent in a comparison between *arma virumque cano* and the name Augustus.

encapsulates that ktistic quality, *condere*? It does not occur in our passage, although he could certainly have used forms of *condere* instead of *dicere* (62), *iactaque* (64) and *nascitur* (66), since *condere*, *condita* and *conditum* are metrical equivalents of the words mentioned. One might even add *suscitat* (63) to this list: although there is no metrically equivalent form of *condere* in the present tense, *condere arma* (or more exactly, *condere ferrum*) is precisely what the *Aeneid* ends with.

The answer, I think, is to be sought in Propertius' poetical style. We have already seen to what extent Propertius is capable of omitting, in his evocation of Vergil, some of the most salient features of Vergil's own work. Propertius, for example, entirely glosses over the erotic quality of Vergil's oeuvre. 'In his way', writes Donncha O'Rourke, 'the elegy's strategy of tendentious exclusion and misrepresentation constructs Virgil as a poet both like and unlike Propertius.'⁵⁶¹ A similar motive, I think, lies behind the conspicuous absence of *condere*. As we have seen, Propertius' evocation of Vergil is often characterised by giving an elegant twist to the original. Not Aeneas, but Vergil himself is the one who 'even now is stirring to life the arms of Trojan Aeneas and the walls he founded on Lavine shores' (63-64). Significantly, the word used to denote the foundation of Lavinium is not the 'typical' Vergilian *condere* but *iacere* (*moenia*), adapted from *iactatus* in *Aeneid* I.3. *Condere*, the obvious word, is thus replaced by another word, also a Vergilian echo, but one that is cleverly adapted and adds extra meaning both to the echo itself and to the word echoed. The same goes for *suscitat arma*, which is almost the exact opposite of *condere ferrum*.

A brief glance at the Propertian corpus shows that the Umbrian poet employed *condere* with a poetic creativity equal to that of Vergil. In one poem – to take just an example – Propertius uses the verb both in a metapoetical (II.1.14) and in a ktistic (II.1.42) sense. The intricacies of Propertian concepts of poetical reflection of city-foundation have been well set out by Gazich, and will therefore not be treated any further here.⁵⁶² The important point this brief analysis has been trying to make is that Vergil's creative manipulations of *condere* and the concept of foundation were recognized by his fellow poet. Propertius even builds on them to take Vergil's move further, foregrounding the role of both Augustus and Vergil himself in the process. That brings us back full circle to the role of Augustus as *alter conditor*, with which we started part I, and leads us to an intermediate conclusion.

^{561.} O'Rourke (2011) 488.

^{562.} Gazich (1997).

PART A

The Augustan Age – CONCLUSION

The adopted son of Julius Caesar surpassed his former great uncle in many respects, and the subtlety and care with which he represented himself in not too outspokenly monarchical ways was certainly one of them. In his evocations of Romulus he took great care to emphasize the ktistic aspects of Rome's first king, rather than the monarchical (and fratricidal) ones.⁵⁶³ As we have seen in chapter 1, there are many reasons to believe that the Augustan Principate was viewed and interpreted as an act of ktistic renewal. In a refoundation of Rome, the *princeps* performed the role of a new Romulus, an *alter conditor*. From the works of Suetonius, it has appeared that Augustus took care not to make this role too explicit, while nevertheless suggesting it in a myriad of ways. The name 'Augustus' itself is probably the best example. Also, it has become clear that the ktistic endeavors of the *princeps* outside Rome, most notably in his Victory City on the shores of Actium, Nicopolis, likely tapped into (and contributed to) the idea that his actions at Rome amounted to an act of ktistic renewal.

That set of suggestions is supported and confirmed to a very large extent by our analysis of Vergil's *Aeneid*, arguably the most influential literary work of the period. Although it is hard to establish the direction of causality in this case, it is clear that Vergil endorsed the (popular and/or imperial) view of the Augustan Principate as a refoundation of Rome, or - in case of a more personal involvement - actively promoted it, perhaps even making significant contributions of his own. One such contribution was most probably Vergil's programmatic use of the verb *condere* for actions not formerly associated with founding. By thus widening the semantic range of this ktistic verb *par excellence*, Vergil opened up opportunities to describe and interpret the actions of Augustus in terms of ktistic renewal, also for others. On a single occasion, in the famous Parade of Heroes in book VI, Vergil explicitly offered such a description, styling Augustus' establishment of peace and prosperity as the refoundation of a long-lost Golden Age. In many more instances, however, the poet operated - like the *princeps* - with the power of suggestion.

In all these ways, Vergil stands out as one of the most active contemporary contributors to the idea that the *princeps* was responsible for a ktistic renewal of Rome, partially through his city foundations outside the capital on the Tiber. The *Aeneid* thus became part of a political ideology that presented the Augustan 'revolution' as the culmination of a historical process harking back all the way to the fall of Troy and earlier foundations of Rome.⁵⁶⁴ The novelty of Vergil's approach in this respect is not always fully appreciated by scholars. As an example of the statement that '[m]ost

^{563.} See e.g. Hunsucker (2014).

^{564.} On the use of the term 'revolution' for the Augustan Age, see Osborne & Vout (2010) 241.

of the emphases in Virgil's account of pre-Augustan Roman history are traditional', Zetzel includes the claim that 'the emphasis on Aeneas, Romulus, Camillus and Augustus as successive founders or saviours of Rome is found in Livy'.⁵⁶⁵ While Livy was certainly an important author in this respect, and the claim is admittedly valid for Romulus and Camillus, we are not sure about Livy's precise characterization of Augustus in the lost books, and Aeneas' presence in Zetzel's list can certainly not be justified. The only connection between Aeneas and Rome, in Livy, is the (in fact traditional) genealogical one. Vergil's strong emphasis on the foundation of Lavinium is nowhere to be found in Livy's *Ab urbe condita* as we have it, let alone Aeneas' wider ktistic activity as a fundamental precedent for Rome's foundation by Romulus and its refoundation by Augustus.⁵⁶⁶ Vergil significantly supplements Livy's conceptualization of Roman history and emphasizes different aspects of a similar ktistic discourse, further widening the scope of Augustus' ktistic achievement. Zetzel is certainly right in claiming that '[w]here Virgil differs most significantly from earlier historiography and epic in his account is his teleology' – we may add that the *Aeneid*'s ktistic discourse is a fundamental building block of that teleology.⁵⁶⁷

By investigating the role of the verb *condere* and the discourse of foundation it expresses, chapter 2 has aimed to demonstrate the complex variety of ways in which that discourse functions not only in the *Aeneid*, but also in the Early Augustan Age at large. As Feeney states: 'The power of the *Aeneid* to impose its meaning and shape upon history is an image of Augustus's power to impose his meaning and shape upon history'.⁵⁶⁸ In that respect, the poetic treatment of Rome's ktistic trajectory by Vergil seems even more congenial to Augustan ideas than the traditional annalistic method, followed by Livy. The *Aeneid* sings of the Trojan hero from the demise of Troy to the rise of a new city, envisioning Rome's great history as a prophetic project, with an open end towards the future. Contrary to Naevius and Ennius, his great epic predecessors, and Livy, his contemporary in prose, Vergil did not present the history of Rome *ab urbe condita*, but rather the other way around – exemplified in the words (*Aeneas*) *dum conderet urbem* (*Aen.* I.5).

^{565.} Zetzel (1997) 199–200.

^{566.} It is to be hoped that comparative studies of Livy and Vergil will offer a more comprehensive understanding of the general relation between the works of both authors, superseding the idea that creative interaction between them was 'in the highest degree improbable' (Ogilvie (1965) 3, still quoted as current by Green (2009) 153 n. 18).

^{567.} Zetzel (1997) 200. Cf. Feeney in Powell (2015) xi: '(...) the poem participates in both of the dominant ways of constructing history, the etiological (...) and the teleological (...)'.^{568.}

Feeney in Powell (2015) xi.

The contribution of Vergil, then, is in many ways a conceptual one, opening up avenues of thought eagerly followed through by the *princeps* and his contemporaries. Propertius offers perhaps the best example, among many others, of an application of Vergil's ideas. Uniquely, however, the Umbrian poet articulated his application in a direct reaction to Vergil's epic. Propertius' literary evocation of the ktistic subject matter and character of the *Aeneid* highlights both Vergil's own creativity in achieving and amalgam of ktistic form and content, and the application of this amalgam to the actions of Augustus Caesar. The *princeps'* actions in Rome (the "content") were, in other words, readily interpreted as a refoundation of the city, partially because Augustus had explicitly taken the role of city founder (the "form") elsewhere around the Mediterranean. The same had been, in a way, true of Aeneas in the *Aeneid*: he was not literally the founder of Rome, but his many ktistic endeavors and acts of *condere* created the preconditions for Rome to be founded by Romulus (and, one may add, to be refounded by Augustus). The role of Lavinium is especially important in this respect, as is emphasized not only in the proem of the *Aeneid*, but also by Propertius, who draws a close connection between Aeneas' ktistic actions on the shores of Lavinium, and young Caesar's actions on the shores of Actium. Like Suetonius in the early second century AD, Augustan authors and other actors had their own discursive ways of dealing with the Augustan regime and presenting it as a ktistic renewal of Rome.

Such literary underpinnings of the claims (made explicit only later) that Augustus refounded Rome must have paved the way for a further consolidation of the idea that the *princeps'* actions were an act of ktistic renewal. There is, of course, much more to say about the Augustan Age, but hopefully the preceding chapters have sufficiently stressed the importance of ktistic renewal in this revolutionary period. A more pressing matter now demands our attention. Was the notion of ktistic renewal also prominently present in a period that is often, and rightfully so, seen as equally revolutionary as the Augustan Age: the transition to what is commonly described as Late Antiquity? That is the subject of the second part of this thesis.

PART B

Late Antiquity

In Late Antiquity, the concept of ktistic renewal was applied in new ways to a series of new contexts, not only extending the meaning of the term ‘foundation’ (as we saw in the Augustan Age), but even redefining the meaning of ‘Rome’. Even if, between roughly 284 and 450, many characteristics of the city changed quite dramatically (its political importance, religious practices, urban fabric, artistic culture, military dominance and relation to the outside world chief among them), the foundation of Rome continued to provide a mental framework to reflect on those changes or consolidate them. More than once, new developments concerning Rome were presented or interpreted as instances of ktistic renewal, extending the application of this concept to previously unimagined contexts.⁵⁶⁹

This second part will survey these applications following a double trajectory. In the first place, it will trace the evolution of ktistic renewals related to Rome as an imperial capital up to the point that Constantinople, founded by Constantine on the Bosphorus, started to take over the role of imperial capital, and became known as a ‘new Rome’. Constantine’s ktistic endeavor, and the way his contemporaries reacted to it, should be seen in the context of his attitude towards the old city on the Tiber. The Rome Constantine dealt with was heavily conditioned by the reigns of his predecessors, i.e. the Tetrarchs and Maxentius. Chapter 3 will survey how one Tetrarch in particular, Maximian, and his son Maxentius, who broke with the Tetrarchy, used the traditions about Rome’s foundation to bolster their control over the Eternal City, and how their reigns were presented as ktistic renewals in the process. That mode of representation was not lost on Constantine, as he triumphed over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in 312 and conquered Rome. His relation to Rome in the ensuing decades had a great role to play in the development of his newly founded eponymous city on the Bosphorus, which is the subject of chapter 4.

Secondly, chapter 5 will add another trajectory by looking at the development of specifically Christian ideas about city foundation. The biblical canon has a fair bit to say about the subject, as the Greek (and Latin) translations of the Hebrew Bible used the word for ‘founding’ to describe God’s act of Creation. The idea of human city-founders, accordingly, came to be seen as an intolerable infringement on the divine monopoly, a diametrical tension with classical traditions on city foundation that was resolved only in the later fourth century. Around the episcopal tenure of Damasus, classically versed Christian authors first started to claim that Rome had been founded as a Christian city by the Roman martyrdom of Peter and Paul. This occurred, strikingly, around the same time when Constantinople was increasingly seen as a Christian city, purposefully founded by

^{569.} On a more traditional application of the concept of ktistic renewal in this period, revolving around the emperor Gratian in AD 366, see Doignon (1966).

a Christian emperor as an alternative to Rome. This probably prompted the reaction by western Christians now looking to Rome as their spiritual centre. The tension between Constantinople and Rome was complemented by the tension between classical ideas about city foundation and ktistic renewal, employed by Christian authors to redefine Rome as a Christian foundation, and Christian notions of God's ktistic monopoly. This tension culminated, after the Sack of Rome in 410, in Augustine's *De civitate Dei*. Bypassing both the Christian ideas about the foundation of Constantinople and those about Rome as a Christian City, he built on the classical traditions about Rome's foundation to describe the Heavenly City of God as the only truly Christian instance of ktistic renewal.

CHAPTER

3

CASE STUDY

**Maxentius and the AETERNAE VRBIS SVAE CONDITORES:
Rome's founders from Maximian to Constantine (289-313)⁵⁷⁰**

⁵⁷⁰ An earlier version of this chapter was published as Hunsucker (2018a). I am grateful to Ignazio Tantillo and the Koninklijk Nederlands Instituut in Rome (KNIR), as well as its former director Harald Hendrix, for stimulating comments and discussion at the presentation of the volume, and to Muriël Moser for her evaluation in Moser (2019): the valuable contributions in McEvoy and Moser's special issue of *AntTard* 25 (2017) have now been referenced in the footnotes.

On 21 April, less than a dozen years into the fourth century AD, a special ceremony took place in the imperial capital of the Western Emperor, celebrating the foundation of the Eternal City. The citizens and dignitaries present at the occasion would probably not have missed their emperor's desire to connect his own rule to Rome's primordial beginnings. Even more so, and perhaps surpassing their expectations, they witnessed how their ruler was addressed in terms that presented him as the new founder of the *Urbs*. Three centuries after Augustus, during which the urban fabric, status and role of Rome had changed extensively, kthic renewal still determined how Roman emperors presented themselves to their subjects.⁵⁷¹

This chapter is about political rhetoric and monuments connecting Late Antique Roman Emperors to the founders of Rome. During the reign of Maxentius (306-312), who reaffirmed the political centrality of Rome, ideological references to the city's founders were particularly conspicuous and high in number.⁵⁷² That is perhaps unsurprising, but it will be argued that the founders of Rome were surprisingly prominent also in the political rhetoric surrounding Maxentius' predecessors and successors, who were less dependent on the city of Rome in their exercise of power. While Maximian and Constantine based themselves in cities like Augusta Treverorum (modern Trier, Germany) and Constantinople, but connected themselves to Rome's foundation nonetheless, Maxentius combined rhetoric and reality at Rome. His ideological efforts culminated, in all probability, in the year 308,⁵⁷³ when the Emperor dedicated a monument on the Forum Romanum to Mars and 'the founders of his own Eternal City'.⁵⁷⁴

What makes Maxentius such an interesting ruler to study when it comes to political rhetoric and ideological imagery, is that his very image, conveyed in the sources that have come down to us, is almost entirely built up from the slander produced by his (contemporary and posthumous) opponents:⁵⁷⁵ his 'hetero-image' completely overshadows his 'auto-image'.⁵⁷⁶ Although, sadly, almost all literary sources favourable

^{571.} On the striking continuities in imperial strategies of representation and the 'constraints of tradition' during six centuries of Roman emperorship, see now Hekster (2022).

^{572.} Cullhed (1994) 63-64.

^{573.} Wrede (1981) 141; his dating, presented as new but actually preceded by Gatti (1899) 217 (see Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2459, who remained critical), has now found almost universal acceptance – Machado (2019) 100 strangely glosses over it.

^{574.} *Marti invicta patri / et aeternae urbis suae / conditoribus / dominus noster / [[imp(erator) Maxentius p(ius) f(elix)]] / invictus Aug(ustus) (CIL VI.33856a = ILS 8935). See further below.*

^{575.} See Drijvers (2007).

^{576.} For these notions see Leerssen (2007) 27.



Figure 2: Front side of a reused Antonine statue base with an inscription (CIL VI.33856 a) mentioning the emperor Maxentius as dedicant of a monument to Mars and "the founders of his own Eternal City". The base was excavated in the Comitium-area at the Roman Forum by Giacomo Boni in 1899, where it can still be seen. Photo: H.-G. Kolbe (CIL-Archiv, Inv.-Nr. PH0003220)

It is the aim of this chapter to analyse and contextualize Maxentian evocations of the city's founders by looking at Tetrarchic and earlier precedents for such evocations, as well as their fortune under Maxentius' successors. Where did Maxentian ideas originate? Now, we must first turn to their plausible origins in the Tetrarchic period. We have considerable evidence that he drew inspiration from the emperor that preceded him almost directly: his father Maximian.

^{577.} On the author of the *Historia Augusta*'s unfulfilled desire to treat the reign of Maxentius (HA, Heliogab. 35.6) see Straub (1972) 304; traces of such apparently favorable sources (given the interest that the author of the HA shows in co-rulers, usurpers and other imperial figures) may very well be preserved by the late-fifth century *Historia Nova* of Zosimus, for which see briefly Lieu and Montserrat (1996) 12-15. See also Zinsli (2014) 866 ad Hel. 35.6 (K662).

3.1. The celebration of Rome's foundation during the reign of Maximian and Diocletian: Dyarchic Emperors as *alteri conditores*

After three decades of steadily increasing scholarly investigation,⁵⁷⁸ it remains a point open for discussion whether Maxentius, who was the son of one Tetrarch and the son-in-law and grandson-in-law of two others, tried to legitimize his rule by associating himself with the Tetrarchs, by distancing himself from the Tetrarchs, or by doing both in ways that shifted over time and according to the circumstances. The role of Rome, the old imperial capital that allegedly suffered from neglect and loss of prestige during the Tetrarchy,⁵⁷⁹ is clearly central to this issue. In fact, Maxentius' political focus on Rome is seen as his major breach with Tetrarchic policies. Were Maxentius' appropriation of Rome's distant founders and his enactments of ktistic renewal also without Tetrarchic precedent? It will be argued that the current scholarly interpretation of Maxentian celebrations of Rome's foundation as 'anti-Tetrarchic' is problematic and incomplete.⁵⁸⁰

As a matter of fact, the founders of Rome were not at all absent from Tetrarchic imperial ideology. The opening paragraph of this chapter, describing a ceremony on 21 April, could in fact be equally applicable to the reign of Maxentius' father, Maximian (286-305). In the year 289 a panegyric was delivered to Maximian in the imperial palace at Trier (*Pan. Lat. X[2]*) by an orator who perhaps bore the name Mamertinus.⁵⁸¹ The occasion was the 'most solemn (...) day'⁵⁸² of the *Natalis Romae*, Rome's birthday, as the panegyrist misses no chance to mention repeatedly.⁵⁸³ In the presence of 'this glittering crowd of courtiers' (*haec obsequiorum stipatio et fulgor*, 3.2),

^{578.} Rollins' bibliographical overview of 20th-century scholarship in English listed only two contributions on Maxentius (Rollins (1991) 89, 160). Since then, Maxentius has been studied intensively by Cullhed (1994), Hekster (1999), Curran (2000), Dumser (2005), Oenbrink (2006), Drijvers (2007), Leppin and Ziemssen (2007), Marlowe (2010), Ziemssen (2011), Panella (2011), Donciu (2012), Drost (2013), Sahotsky (2016) and Corcoran (2017), to name only the most important contributions.

^{579.} Dulière (1979) 176-177; Portmann (1988) 21; Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 41; Sahotsky (2016) 8, 17. Cf. however Rees (2004b) 29.

^{580.} Oenbrink (2006). See also Cullhed (1994) 94; Curran (2000) 54; and cf. Coarelli (1999) 33.

^{581.} See de Trizio (2009) 11-12. On the date, see Nixon and Rodgers (1994), 42-43.

^{582.} *celeberrimo isto et imperantibus vobis laetissimo die* (*Pan. Lat. X(2) 1.1*).

^{583.} The term *Natalis Romae* is first used explicitly at 1.4 (*natalem Romae diem*), but the occasion was already paraphrased twice, right at the start of the speech in 1.1 (*solemni sacrae urbis religione*) and earlier in 1.4 (*hoc die quo immortalis ortus dominae gentium ciuitatis uestra pietate celebratur*). It is described again in 1.5 (*illi urbi natalis dies*) and hinted at in 2.1 (*nunc Romae omnes magistratus et pontifices et sacerdotes iuxta parentes urbis et statores deos Herculis templa uenerantur*). After these five instances in the opening chapters of the speech, the occasion is again highlighted towards the end, in 13.4 (*hunc natalem suum diem*) and 14.3 (*natalem tuum diem*). Contrast *Pan. Lat. VI(7)*, delivered on the occasion of the anniversary of Trier's (re-)foundation, where the occasion is mentioned only in passing (1.1, 22.4).

referred to deictically in the speech itself (*haec*),⁵⁸⁴ the Emperor Maximian was addressed in terms of praise closely related to and inspired by the foundation of Rome. That is all the more striking, since the speech was held by a local orator for an emperor who had never been to Rome⁵⁸⁵ and an audience of courtiers in Trier that was arguably anxious to see their city take over as much of the power and prestige of the old *Urbs* as was fitting and feasible (cf. 14.3). In spite of this, the Gallic orator celebrated the foundation of the ‘sacred city’ of Rome (*sacrae urbis*, 1.1) in a way that is difficult to reconcile with imperial neglect.⁵⁸⁶

The most striking aspect of the whole speech with regard to the foundation of Rome, however, is the creative manipulation and re-elaboration of the concept of foundation itself. The panegyrist presented his audience with an array of foundational heroes, from Evander, who remains unnamed (*regem advenam*, 1.2), and Hercules, who figures most prominently (1.2; 1.3; 2.1; 13.5), to Romulus and Remus (*parentes urbis*, 2.1;⁵⁸⁷ ‘*Remo et Romulo tuis*’, 13.1). This is not for mere display of erudition. The panegyrist did so, namely, to link these ktistic heroes closely to the descent, virtues and imperial office of his addressee.

Hercules, Maximian’s patron deity, is an obvious point of departure, and is therefore given pride of place. Actually, the rhetorical scheme that enabled the panegyrist to celebrate Maximian’s military exploits in Gaul and Germania (in the middle part of the speech) on Rome’s birthday (2.1) is entirely built upon the comparison of these military exploits with Hercules’ pristine ktistic deeds involving Geryon and Cacus, centred around the Forum Boarium in Rome. The orator’s treatment of those legendary episodes harks back to Vergil’s *Aeneid* (VIII.184-305, 362-365), where the

^{584.} MacCormack (2012) 245 (p. 181 in the 1975 original) translates *haec* neutrally as ‘the glorious display of your subjects’ allegiance’ (my italics), implying distance from the location of the speech; a literal translation like the those of Galletier 1949, 26 (‘ce cortège éclatant de courtisans’) and Nixon and Rodgers (quoted above), implying a visible presence, seems to be the more probable interpretation of the orator’s use of *haec*. Cf. Rees (2004b) 32.

^{585.} *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) 8.7 (*primo ingressu tuo*). See Nixon (1981) 75-76; Barnes (1982) 56-60; Kolb (1987) 145-148; Marlowe (2010) 199; cf. Rebiffat (1992) 372 n. 12.

^{586.} See also Machado (2019) 5 for a brief overview of imperial patronage in Tetrarchic Rome.

^{587.} Cf. de Trizio (2009) 63. She advocates a broader understanding of the term comprising Hercules, whose inclusion would, however, be superfluous, as the veneration of the *parentes urbis* is compared to that of the *Herculis templum*. The plural (*parentes*) more likely refers to Romulus and Remus, prominently presented in the last paragraphs of the speech. For the term, see e.g. Liv. V.24.11, *Romulo (...) parente et auctore urbis Romae*, Quint. III.7.26 and below, note 691.

story is recounted to Aeneas by Evander.⁵⁸⁸ In fact, the panegyrist transplants to Hercules (as a prefiguration of Maximian) much of the prophetic importance that was attached to Aeneas' coming to Rome in the Vergilian original.⁵⁸⁹ In the *Aeneid*, Vergil had presented Aeneas as the (ktistic) precursor of Augustus – our panegyrist uses Vergil's example to present Maximian as a (ktistic) successor of Hercules, completely glossing over Aeneas.⁵⁹⁰ Hercules is of course an obvious mythological example for Maximian, but the orator goes beyond the obvious in creatively adapting that bit of central imperial ideology to the occasion of the speech, namely the foundation of Rome. Although Aeneas is left out, that does not mean that Rome's traditional foundation myth is entirely subordinated to contemporary political concerns. As Marlowe observes on Hercules and Jupiter in this speech, they 'are honoured not in their generic or universal guises as the Tetrarchic *comites* but rather in the very particular form of their metropolitan Roman cults, Jupiter Stator and Hercules Victor.'⁵⁹¹ Even more so, these cults had strong ktistic associations.⁵⁹² Hercules thus figures as a specifically Roman model for Maximian's concern with that city and its foundation in particular.

Apart from Hercules, Rome's traditional founder also makes a prominent appearance. Towards the end of the speech, in the grand apostrophe to Roma that heralds the panegyric's *peroratio*, the panegyrist, again, displays considerable creativity in intertwining Rome's ktistic traditions with contemporary concerns: (*Pan. Lat. X[2] 13.1-3*)⁵⁹³

Felix igitur talibus, Roma, principibus (fas est enim ut hoc dicendi munus pium unde coepimus terminemus); felix, inquam, et multo nunc felicior quam

^{588.} Cf. Liv. I.7. Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 54 n. 4, trace some antiquarian details back to Servius Auctus and 'a chain of earlier Virgilian commentators', but in fact much can be found in Vergil directly. Compare *Herculei sacri custos familia Pinaria* (1.3) with *domus Herculei custos Pinaria sacri* (Aen. VIII.270), and *Pallantea moenia adisse victorem et, parua tunc licet regia* (1.3) with 'haec inquit limina *victor*/ Alcides subiit, haec illum *regia* cepit' (Aen. VIII.362-363, Evander speaking about Hercules' visit to his Palatine abode).

^{589.} Compare e.g. *principem illum tui generis ac nominis (...) futurae maiestatis dedisse primordia, ut esse posset domus Caesarum quae Herculis fuisse hospitium* (2.1, on Hercules prefiguring Maximian's greatness) with *nymphae priscum Carmentis honorem, / vatis fatidicae, cecinit quae prima futuros / Aeneadas magnos et nobile Pallanteum* (Aen. VIII.339-341, on Aeneas prefiguring Roman/Augustan greatness). On the role of Hercules (and Aeneas) in the *Aeneid*, see briefly Hekster (2004) 240-241, with further bibliography.

^{590.} Note that the Constantinian panegyrist of 313 begins with Aeneas (*Pan. Lat. XII(9) 18.1*): see further below.

^{591.} Marlowe (2010) 200, referring to §13.4 of the speech.

^{592.} Cf. Liv. I.12.3-6; Tac. *Ann. XV.41*; not appreciated by de Trizio (2009) 63; Bruggisser (1999) 78; cf. Marlowe (2010) 200.

^{593.} All translations of the Latin Panegyrics are adapted from those by Nixon and Rodgers (1994) and the Latin text quoted is that of Mynors (1964), as reprinted by Nixon and Rodgers (1994).

sub Remo et Romulo tuis. (2) Illi enim, quamuis fratres geminique essent, certauerunt tamen uter suum tibi nomen imponeret, diuersosque montes et auspicia ceperunt. Hi uero conseruatores tui (sit licet nunc tuum tanto maius imperium quanto latius est ueterem pomerio, quidquid homines colunt) nullo circa te liuore contendunt. Hi, cum primum ad te redeant triumphantes, uno cupiunt inuehi curru, simul adire Capitolium, simul habitare Palatum. (3) Vtere, quaeso, tuorum principum utroque cognomine, cum non cogaris eligere: licet nunc simul et Herculia dicaris et Iouia.

Fortunate Rome, under leaders such as these (for it is right that we finish this pious duty of speechmaking where we commenced): fortunate, I say, and much more fortunate than under your Remus and Romulus. (2) For they, although they were brothers and twins, quarreled nonetheless as to which would give you his name, and took separate hills and auspices. But these preservers of yours, Rome (although your Empire is now greater by as much as the inhabited world is more extensive than the old *pomerium*) vie for you with no jealousy. These rulers, as soon as they return to you in triumph, wish to be conveyed in the one chariot, to ascend the Capitol together, to dwell on the Palatine together. (3) Use, I beseech you, the cognomen of each of your Emperors, since you are not compelled to make a choice. Now you may be called at the same time both Herculia and Iovia.

The orator profitably compares the Dyarchic Emperors, Maximian and Diocletian, to the twin founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus. Although Romulus and Remus are of course twins, it is by no means a given that Remus, here even named first (13.1), was also seen as a founder of Rome, on a par with Romulus – Remus' role is notoriously ambiguous.⁵⁹⁴ That difficulty is suppressed, however, to create a forceful simile between both pairs.⁵⁹⁵ In the process, Remus is implicitly rehabilitated as co-founder of Rome.

Unsurprisingly, the pair of Romulus and Remus is mostly presented to be outdone by Rome's current rulers: the latter's commitment to Rome is even greater than that of the city's founders. Some of the resulting rhetorical hyperboles have erroneously been interpreted as reflecting negatively on Rome. The expression '*multo nunc felicior quam sub Remo et Romulo tuis*' (13.1) would allegedly convey disdain for Rome's

^{594.} See the classic treatment by Wiseman (1995) and, for Late Antiquity, Bruggisser (2002a).

^{595.} On Maximian and Diocletian as brothers, see Leadbetter (2004) and Hekster (2015) 304-306. *Pan. Lat.* XI(3) 6.3 compares them explicitly to *geminis fratres*, outdoing even the harmony of twins.

traditional founders.⁵⁹⁶ Does the well-known invocation *felicior Augusto, melior Traiano* (Eutr., *Brev.* 8.5), then, imply disdain for Augustus and Trajan? These are mostly stock ingredients of *Herrscherlob*, working to the benefit of the *laudandus* rather than the detriment of the *comparandum*. Maximian and Diocletian are simply bigger and better than Romulus and Remus, as is the realm over which they rule. Rather than belittling Romulus and Remus, described affectively as Rome's own (*tuis*), the comparison casts Maximian and Diocletian in the role of '*alteri conditores*'.⁵⁹⁷ The panegyrist tapped into traditional Augustan ideology here, according to which the *princeps* was an *alter conditor* of Rome.⁵⁹⁸ Maximian and Diocletian, however, also outdo that example. As the realm over which they rule is bigger than the city of Romulus (and Remus), so is their title: instead of refounding just Rome, they have become '*Romani imperii conditores*' (1.5). The Hadrianic author Florus had used the conjunction before to describe Augustus, who would have been called Romulus '*quia condidisset imperium*' (II.34/IV.12.66).⁵⁹⁹ Our Late Antique panegyrist thus adapted an Imperial view of Augustus' refoundation of Rome and its empire to present the reign of his imperial overlords as the culmination of Rome's history. Contrary to de Trizio's view that *conditor* (1.5) is 'a synonym of *aedificator*',⁶⁰⁰ the choice of words is highly significant, presenting Maximian and Diocletian as ktistic successors to Romulus and Remus as well as Augustus. As such, the statement in the opening sentence of the speech that Maximian should be venerated on this *dies festus* (1.1) is no hollow phrase – as *conditor*, Maximian is rightly venerated on the *Natalis Urbis*.⁶⁰¹

Our orator has a keen eye for the intricacies of the traditional foundation myth, and knows how to exploit them, rather than doing away with them as altogether outdated, as has been argued in the past.⁶⁰² The grand apostrophe to *Roma* shows

^{596.} Dulière (1997) 176; cf. Ziemssen (2011) 67–68. Disdain would come a century later, when Pope Leo I preached to Rome, on 29 June 441, that the apostles Peter and Paul *multo melius multoque felicius condiderunt, quam illi [quorum studio prima moenia tuorum fundamenta locata sunt] ex quibus is qui tibi nomen dedit fraterna te caede foedavit*, 'founded you far better and much more happily than those men, [by whose zeal the first foundations of your walls were laid: and] of whom the one who gave you his name defiled you with fratricide' (*Serm.* 82.1, translation by Neil (2009) 115). The parts between square brackets were added in a later recension by Leo himself. See further below, p. 304.

^{597.} Brandt (1998) 68; Ziemssen (2011), 67–68.

^{598.} Cf. Liv. IV.20.7, V.49.7 (with Miles (1988) 194–195, 199–200); Suet. *Aug.* 7.2. Compare how a later panegyrist uses a phrase reminiscent of Vergil's description of Augustus, in *Aeneid* VI, to describe Constantius I as second founder of Autun: *cum te rursus habeat conditorem* ('since it [Autun] has in you [Constantius] a second founder', *Pan. Lat.* VIII(5) 21.2).

^{599.} Cf. Plin. *N.H.* XV.77 on Romulus and Remus as *conditores imperii*.

^{600.} de Trizio (2009) 62.

^{601.} *Ibid.* 53; there is a nice parallelism between *sacratissime imperator* and *sacrae urbis* (1.1), a conjunction first used here (de Trizio (2009) 56).

^{602.} Dulière (1979) 177; cf. Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2459; Mayer (2002) 126.

this clearly. Whereas Romulus and Remus 'took separate hills and auspices' (*diversos montes et auspicia ceperunt*, 13.2), Maximian and Diocletian, here dubbed *conservatores tui*⁶⁰³ and presented as the apogees of Dyarchic *concordia*, 'wish to dwell on the Palatine together' (*cupiunt ... simul habitare Palatium*, 13.2). They do, in other words, precisely what was denied to Remus in Tibullus' famous vignette (*Romulus aeternae nondum formaverat urbis / moenia consorti non habitanda Remo*, II.5.23-24),⁶⁰⁴ the first known instance of the conjunction *urbs aeterna*. A clever allusion.⁶⁰⁵ At the same time, Rome, site of the original imperial palace, can also bring two rulers who normally resided in different palaces throughout the empire together in one place. Compared to Romulus and Remus, Diocletian and Maximian overcome both the discord of the founders and what was seen as a contemporary problem: the absence of the emperor from Rome. Here, perhaps, the rhetoric is optimistic rather than realistic, but it may also build on a sincere expectation – we will return to this below.

Another key feature of Romulus and Remus' discord, immortalized by Ennius' pounding hexameter *certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent* (*Ann. I.77*, fr. 47 Skutsch),⁶⁰⁶ is '[who] would give you [Rome] his name' (*uter suum tibi nomen imponeret*, 13.2), as the panegyrist paraphrases the matter. The Dyarchic solution is that Rome can freely use both Emperors' nicknames, *Herculia ... et Iovia* (13.3),⁶⁰⁷ without the need to choose. This is no scorn of Rome's majesty, as has been argued:⁶⁰⁸ it is a matter of adopting a *cognomen* (13.3), just like the *tui principes* have both adopted one.⁶⁰⁹ We need thus not think of the type of slander, according to which Nero or Commodus would have wanted to rename Rome after themselves.⁶¹⁰ Instead, Maximian celebrated the *Natalis Romae* 'with that customary magnificence which is your [Rome's] due' (14.3), even if absent from the capital itself. It is to the issue of that absence that we must now turn.

^{603.} I.e. *Romae*. The term is familiar from contemporary coinage, where it is applied to Jupiter and Hercules as *conservator(es) Augusti/-orum*: see Rodríguez Gérvás (1991) 85-87.

^{604.} 'Not yet had Romulus traced the walls of the Eternal City wherein was no abiding for his brother Remus.' (translation by Postgate/Goold (1995²)).

^{605.} Cf. *inuocando Statorem Iouem* (13.4), another Romulean nicety, not appreciated by de Trizio (2009) 63. See Bruggisser (1999) 78 and cf. Marlowe (2010) 200, who recognize the local, Roman importance of the epithet but misinterpret its function in this context.

^{606.} 'They were competing about whether to call the city Roma of Remora.' (translation by Wiseman (1995) 6-7).

^{607.} On Tetrarchic *cognomina*, see Roels (2013).

^{608.} Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 41, cf. Portmann (1988) 23, 230 n. 3.

^{609.} On the context of this remark see Kolb (1987) 63-64.

^{610.} See note 68, above.

3.2. Rome under the Tetrarchic Emperors: a reappraisal?

Rather than a break with traditional imperial patronage of Rome and with appropriations of the city's foundation, the panegyric of 289 presents Dyarchic devotion to Rome as the culmination of imperial tradition. That Maximian and Diocletian adapted the foundation of the city to their own political agenda and casted themselves in a ktistic role for the purpose need not arouse surprise, nor suspicion as to their dedication to the Eternal City. Augustus (or Vergil) tampered with Rome's ktistic traditions a great deal more than Maximian (or our panegyrist), and was never accused of neglecting Rome. It is more than anything else a compliment to Rome that Maximian 'is so generous in honouring Rome's birthday that he celebrates that city, already founded, to such an extent, that he would seem to have founded it himself' (*ad honorandum natalem Romae diem tam liberalem facit, ut urbem illam sic colas conditam, quasi ipse condideris*, 1.4; my paraphrase). A clearer and more forceful statement regarding Maximian's devotion to Rome and the celebration of its foundation would be hard to conceive.⁶¹¹ It is thus difficult to accept Ziemssen's contention, that Rome 'hardly plays any role' in this Panegyric, and that the fact that it was delivered in Trier, not Rome, would be indicative of imperial neglect of the Eternal City.⁶¹² It is rather the other way round. Had the oration been held at Rome, or by an orator from Rome, the praise of the old *Urbs* could be explained away as wishful thinking or hollow rhetoric.⁶¹³ The fact that 21 April, in Trier, was celebrated at all, and that Rome figured so prominently in the celebratory speech, both indicate how important Rome was for Maximian.⁶¹⁴

Other circumstances add to the impression of Rome's contemporary importance. As far as we can infer from the statement that the ornate panegyric was delivered in a packed hall at court (3.2), 21 April must have been celebrated quite lavishly (14.3) and with full imperial ceremony. The birthday of Rome was thus seen as an important annual feast, also in the years not marked by centennial or secular celebration.⁶¹⁵ Even more so, it appears that the *Natalis Urbis*, not (the anniversary of) Maximian's consular

^{611.} Cf. Kolb (1987) 123–124.

^{612.} Ziemssen (2011) 113 ('*Roma Aeterna* spielt in dieser im höchsten Huldigungston an den *sacratissime imperator* gehaltenen Rede kaum eine Rolle'). Cf. Mayer (2002) 126; Leppin and Ziemssen (2007), 41.

^{613.} Confusingly, Marlowe ((2010) 200) makes the panegyrist 'reveal the city's [Rome's] displeasure with its Tetrarchic rulers' as a spokesman for Rome 'offer[ing] a glimpse of the tension brewing in Rome in the late-third and early-fourth centuries over the city's relations with distant emperors', thereby 'confirm[ing] the general impression of a humiliated and angry ancient capital'.

^{614.} Cf. Körfer (2020) 173.

^{615.} On the possibility of such celebrations held by Maximian, see Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 193.

election or *dies imperii* (referred to in the speech: ‘*vestri imperii primi dies*’, 1.5),⁶¹⁶ was chosen as the occasion for a panegyric celebrating the last odd years of Maximian’s military exploits in Gaul and Germania. That is how important Rome’s birthday was in 289. Furthermore, there are reasons to believe that this speech was connected to contemporary expectations. If Barnes’ hypothetical reconstruction of the Emperor’s movements (based on Julian) is correct, the panegyric’s references and allusions to a visit to Rome by Maximian, as well as the prominence awarded to Rome, may be explained by the circumstance that the Emperor’s first journey to the Eternal City was imminent and indeed took place between April 289 and early 290.⁶¹⁷

However representative all this is for Maximian’s later years in office, let alone for his Tetrarchic colleagues to come, one thing should be absolutely clear: to Maxentius’ father in 289, Rome and its foundation mattered a great deal.⁶¹⁸ The central role of Rome seems to be reaffirmed two years afterwards, in the final words of the related oration celebrating not Rome’s, but Maximian’s own birthday (*Pan. Lat.* XI(3) 19.4-5).⁶¹⁹ Maximian possibly visited Rome again in 294, and almost certainly did so in 298/299, returning from Africa.⁶²⁰ It is also telling that Maximian and Diocletian chose Rome as the city to celebrate their *vicennalia*, as well as the triumphs they had saved up, in 303.⁶²¹ While Diocletian, famously, left Rome very soon, Maximian probably stayed, perhaps even until 305.⁶²² He was associated with the city of Rome in panegyric even after he stepped down from the imperial office.⁶²³ During Maximian’s absences from

^{616.} *Pan. Lat.* VIII(4) celebrates Constantius Chlorus’ *dies imperii* (in 297?), XI(3) Maximian’s own birthday in 291, V(8) and IV(10) the *quinquennalia* of Constantine and his sons in 311 and 321. *Pan. Lat.* III(11), for Julian, was delivered on 1 January 362, but does not make so much of the date as the term ‘Neujahrssrede’ (Gutzwiller (1942)) suggests: see III(11) 28.1 (cf. 2.4) and further Mause (1994) 37-38. Millar (1977) 46 n. 54 seems to have misunderstood X(2) as a celebration of Maximian’s own birthday.

^{617.} Barnes (1982) 57-58; Hillner (2017) 78; contrast note 585.

^{618.} In a way, my argument ties in with the revisionist approach to the Constantinian and later periods of McEvoy and Moser (2017) 16, who ask ‘whether the physical absence of the emperor himself should in fact be considered to constitute a genuine *imperial* absence from the city as has frequently been argued, when many varied forms of asserting imperial presence in, and influence over, Rome can be discerned.’ (their emphasis)

^{619.} See Machado (2019) 95, and 100-101 for statues dedicated to Maximian at Rome in the years after. Cf. also note 595.

^{620.} Van Dam (2018) 19 (certain about 299); Barnes (1982) 59; cf. Rebuffat (1992) 372-374, 379 n. 56.

^{621.} Van Dam (2018) 26; Mayer (2002) 175, and 183 on the often quoted passage of Lactantius (*De mort. pers.* 17.1-3) concerning Diocletian’s reaction to the Roman populace’s behavior; cf. Chastagnol (1982); Kolb (1987) 126, 149; Bond (2014) 91-92; Van Dam (2018) 31.

^{622.} Hillner (2017) 78-79. Maximian possibly was in Rome to celebrate 21 April in 304: see Barnes (1982) 60; Kolb (1987) 145 (with the wrong Latin date in note 434) and Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 193 n. 5 on *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) 2.5.

^{623.} *Pan. Lat.* VII(6) 10; see Körfer (2020) 173.

Rome, female members of the imperial family were certainly present.⁶²⁴ It is true that Maximian's coinage may tell a different story of his devotion to Rome,⁶²⁵ but instead of adapting our interpretation of the panegyric of 289 to suit that kind of evidence, we ought to consider it as a piece of evidence on its own. In the culminating phrases of the speech, Rome is hailed as '*gentium domina*' (14.3) and '*illa imperii vestri mater*' (14.4), powerful epithets for a city allegedly without power. Furthermore, the orator gives pride of place to his concern, in his last words, that Rome will retain Maximian for too long, or prevent him from returning to Gaul altogether. Apparently, Rome still had such powers, at least in the eyes of the orator (and his local audience). They may have been naïve or traditional; indeed, the whole show may have been a farce. Yet on the other hand – taking this elaborate display of political rhetoric seriously – it may very well be that Rome was simply not as marginalized as modern scholars sometimes tend to believe. Taking the properly interpreted evidence of this speech seriously, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Maximian, who would become the most influential Tetrarch of the West, publicly honoured Rome and the city's foundation for his own political purposes.

Maximian, accordingly, seems the likely precursor of Maxentius in his appropriation of Rome's foundation. Whatever his age was at the time (either about 10 or about 6), it is far from unlikely that the elaborate performance in 289 made a lasting impression on Maxentius. He was (perhaps for the first time?) addressed in public by the orator himself (14.1-2).⁶²⁶ The orator clearly mentions him in his capacity of future Emperor of Rome: the words '*imperatoriae institutionis*' (14.2) reveal what young Maxentius' education is about.⁶²⁷ Little did the panegyrist know that his vivid picture of the *dies natalis*-celebrations in Rome itself, evoked before the eyes of the audience in Trier through his skilful words (2.1; 13.4),⁶²⁸ would become such an integral part of the little boy's quest for imperial legitimacy and power, less than 20 years later.

^{624.} Hillner (2017) 78-79.

^{625.} Cullhed (1994) 62; Hekster (1999) 722; Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 43. Cf., however, Kolb (1987) 123-124, who interprets the Tetrarchic monument on the Forum and Tetrarchic coinage as part of a political program connected to Romulus.

^{626.} As Nixon and Kolb note, Maxentius is not mentioned in *Pan. Lat.* III(11), held in 291 (Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 75; cf. Kolb (1987) 140-141).

^{627.} Cf. Hekster (2015) 306, on the 'clear expectancy of dynastic succession' expressed here, and Kolb (1987) 140 on a possible reference to Maxentius' presence in an envisaged triumph.

^{628.} The latter passage is not, as Marlowe ((2010) 200) has it, a 'direct complaint about the emperors' failure to put in an appearance at Rome on the city's birthday.'

3.3. Maxentius and the founders of Rome: urban topography and kistic renewal

Young Maxentius, described as 'born with every endowment of talent for a study of the liberal arts' (*ad honestissimas artes omnibus ingenii bonis natum*, 14.1) by the panegyrist of 289, indeed studied his father's example well. In his own policy of imperial legitimization, which seems sometimes to relate as directly as possible to the ideology laid out in the Panegyric of 289, he gave pride of place to the *dies natalis* of Rome. As a fortunate exception to our meagre historical record for Maxentian policies, we happen to possess not only an extraordinary epigraphical testimony to his appropriation of Rome's founders, but also solid evidence for its prominent setting in time and space, including a connection with 21 April. The Maxentian monument on the Roman Forum, already mentioned at the start of this chapter, provides reliable indications that the day was more than just an antiquarian's party. I will first discuss the text of the dedicatory inscription, and then address its ritual, topographical and political context.



Figure 3: Right side of a reused Antonine statue base in the Comitium-area with an inscription (CIL VI.33856 b) mentioning the dedication date of the Maxentian monument to Mars and the founders of Rome. Photo: H.-G. Kolbe (CIL-Archiv, Inv.-Nr. PH0003221)

The main part of the inscription, still present in the Comitium area today, reads as follows: (*CIL VI.33856a = ILS 8935*)⁶²⁹

*Marti invicto patri / et aeternae urbis suae / conditoribus / dominus noster /
[[imp(erator) Maxentius p(ius) f(elix)]] / invictus Aug(ustus)*

To Mars the unconquered, the father, and to the founders of his own
Eternal City, our lord, the Emperor Maxentius, pious, fortunate, the
unconquered Augustus [dedicated this].⁶³⁰

A second, less monumental inscription on the right side of the same stone informs us that the (reused) monument was dedicated on 21 April, the *Natalis Romae*: (*CIL VI.33856b*)⁶³¹

*[[magistri quinq(ennales) co[l]l(egii) f[a]bru[m]]] / dedicata die XI Kal(endas)
Maias / per Furium Octavianum v(irum) c(larissimum) / cur(atorem)
aed(ium) sacr(arum)*

^{629.} The transcription offered here is my own; for a reason unknown to me all corpora and databases (*CIL VI.33856a* [Hülsen], *ILS 8935* [Dessau], *EDH HD028258* [Feraudi], *LSA-1388* [Machado], *EDR071738* [Grossi]) print *Maxent[iu]s* instead of *Maxentius*, although the supposedly illegible letters *iu* are as legible as the others in this erased line, as was in fact recognized by Alföldy in 1987 (drawing in *EDH F026825*© G. Alföldy [retrieved 5 December 2016, 2:32 PM]), and printed in the *editio princeps* by Gatti (1899) 213.

^{630.} Cf. the slightly different translations by Curran (2000) 61 ('To unconquered Mars, Father, and to the founders of his eternal city, our Lord Imperator Maxentius Pius Felix, unconquered Augustus [dedicated this]') and Carlos Machado in the entry of the Last Statues of Antiquity database ('To unconquered Mars, [our] father, and the founders of his eternal City, our lord, the em[[peror Maxentius, pious, fortunate]], unconquered Augustus'), online at <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk/database/discussion.php?id=1762> [retrieved 29 October 2016, 6:11 PM], and repeated in Machado (2019) 100. The translation by Harries (2012) 107 n. 9 is inaccurate.

^{631.} Transcription from *EDR071738* and *EDR144328* (both by I. Grossi), online at http://www.edr-edr.it/edr_programmi/res_complex_new.php?Bibliografia=HD028258 [retrieved 5 December 2016, 2:32 PM]; the reading *die(s)* by Machado (<http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk>, *LSA-1388* [retrieved 29 October 2016, 6:11 PM], repeated in Machado (2019) 100) is faulty. Traces of the original inscription from the Antonine period (transcribed in the first line) still survive on this side of the stone, while it is preserved entirely on its left side and on the back. Furius Octavianus was known from this inscription only, but a fascinating new inscription *M(atri) d(eum) M(agna) I(daee) et deo sancto Atti* from the *Phrygianum*, dedicated by *Furius Octavianus* (!) *v(ir) c(larissimus) pater sacrorum dei Solis Invicti* (cf. *EDR150917*, online at http://www.edr-edr.it/edr_programmi/res_complex_comune.php?do=book&id_nr=EDR150917 [retrieved 17 August 2017, 11:52 AM], wrongly identifying the dedicant as *Attius Furius Octavianus*) has now turned up in a 15th century Catalan sylloge: see Carbonell Manils (2015) 264-265. On the office of *curator aedium sacrarum*, see Grossi (2016).

[[The five-year magistrates of the college of the craftsmen.]] Dedicated on the eleventh day before the Kalends of May by Furius Octavianus, of clarissimus rank, the *curator* of the sacred temples.⁶³²

The dedicatory inscription and the holes on top of the base make it extremely likely that the base supported some sort of sculptural representation of Mars and the city founders. It thus constitutes a prominent public monument to both the founders of Rome and an emperor conspicuously commemorating them together with the god Mars, their divine father.⁶³³ Although the ktistic connection seems clear enough, the monument has previously been interpreted as furthering mostly dynastic claims.⁶³⁴ These interpretations will now be discussed first, before proceeding to the ktistic connections of the monument.

Just like Maxentian coinage, the inscription creates a close link between Maxentius and Mars.⁶³⁵ Here, both receive the epithet *invictus*, and the inscription is emphatically framed by *Mars invictus pater* at the beginning and *Maxentius invictus Augustus* at the end. The difference between the two unconquered resides in Mars' second title, *pater*, on the basis of which previous interpreters have championed a dynastic interpretation of the monument. That sounds attractive, as Maxentius had overtly dynastic ambitions focusing on his son Valerius Romulus – ambitions sharply at odds with the Tetrarchic ideal of emperorship.⁶³⁶ There are, however, reasons to be sceptical about the anti-Tetrarchic, dynastic claims Mars' role as father here would entail. Mars' son Romulus was no hereditary king by virtue of his descent, nor did he pass his realm on to a son. Rather, the election of Romulus' successor Numa would even remind one of Tetrarchic succession based on fitness to rule. Also, if Mars' paternity had been presented as a model for Maxentius and his son Romulus, why

^{632.} Translation (slightly adapted) from the Last Statues of Antiquity database, <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk>, LSA-1388 (C. Machado) [retrieved 29 October 2016, 6:11 PM]. The translation at <http://inscriptions.etc.ucla.edu/index.php/inscription-database/?statueID=55> [retrieved 29 October 2016, 6:15 PM] is faulty.

^{633.} On Mars in the century preceding Maxentius, see Manders (2012) 115–121, with ample bibliography, and 121 in particular on *Mars pater*, for which see Hekster (2015) 261–266 (cf. Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2451; Coarelli (1986) 401 n. 95). For a sacrifice to Mars Pater Victor on the third century *Feriale Duranum*, see Degrassi (1963) 417. Interestingly, *Mars pater* also featured on gold coinage minted for Maxentius' later enemy, Severus, in 305: see Kolb (1987) 156.

^{634.} Wrede (1981) 142; Bauer (1996) 104. See further below.

^{635.} Apart from the fact that Mars featured on Maxentian coinage to an unprecedented extent (Hekster (1999) 731; (2015) 294), there is also a structural parallel between Maxentius as *CONSERVATOR VRBIS SVAE* on his most common type of bronze coinage and Mars accompanied by the legend *MARTI CONSERV. AUGG. ET CAESS. N. on aurei* (RIC VI, Rome 140, 148) and bronze (RIC VI, Rome 266–267). I owe this point to Taylor Grace Fitzgerald. On the issues with Mars-legends, see Wienand (2012) 237.

^{636.} Oenbrink (2006) 198.

does the inscription then fail to explicitly mention Romulus the founder in the first place, referring generically to (plural!) *conditores* instead? Apart from the word *pater*, the inscription contains no hint of a dynastic message. A dynastic interpretation, furthermore, rests on the assumption that another, accompanying monument erected not by but for Maxentius (*CIL VI.33857b*) would in fact be a statue of him in his capacity of father, allegedly featuring *his* son Romulus,⁶³⁷ or, as Hekster supposed, that the monument to Mars 'figured two reliefs: one showing Mars and his sons Romulus and Remus, the other Maxentius and his son Romulus'.⁶³⁸

More likely, Mars is hailed as *pater* to stress his relation to the other dedicatees, the *conditores* Romulus and Remus, whom he fathered.⁶³⁹ Without this specification of Mars' relation to the *conditores*, the connection between the dedicatees would have remained implicit – and we might even have wondered which *conditores* would have been meant, as the statue on top has not survived. Mars' ktistic paternity was also part of the Maxentian numismatic programme: a scene with Rhea Silvia, the she-wolf and the twins is known from contemporary coins.⁶⁴⁰ Although further research is necessary to corroborate this idea, it seems that the monument to Rome's founders is also dedicated to Mars because his roles as both Maxentius' patron deity and father of the city's founders proved an irresistibly appropriate combination⁶⁴¹ – just like Hercules for Maximian's panegyrist. This will become clearer as our analysis proceeds.

More striking even than the link to Mars is the salient appropriation of the city of Rome by the dedicating Emperor. Honouring Mars and the founders of the Eternal City places Maxentius in a tradition that harks back to the founder of the Principate, Augustus, if not even further back to the generals of the late Republic. Maxentius, however, goes further than all his predecessors by claiming, with that most common

^{637.} Oenbrink (2006) 197, 201; Bruggisser (2002a) 145-146; Bruggisser (2002b) 83. No evidence in support of this claim is cited. Cf. the confusion in Lenski (2008) 208 n. 17 ('a large statue of Mars, father of his idol Romulus').

^{638.} Hekster (1999) 726 (repeated in Hekster (2011) 48-49 and (2015) 294), based on Wrede (1981) 141. In Wrede's phrasing, however, ('eine programmatische Gegenüberstellung zwischen Mars pater und seinen Söhnen Romulus und Remus auf der einen Seite und Maxentius mit seinem Sohn Romulus auf der anderen') the German expressions 'auf der einen Seite' ('on the one side') and 'auf der anderen' ('on the other') are meant rhetorically rather than referring to (relief sculptures on) the physical left and right sides of the monument.

^{639.} Marcone (2000) 26 ('a Marte invitto, loro padre'). Cf. Ov. *Fast.* V.465. Brandt (1998) 72 n. 201 synthesizes the phrase as 'Mars als den Vater des ewigen Rom'.

^{640.} Drost (2013) 79-81; Coarelli (1986) 21; Wrede (1981) 141.

^{641.} A more detailed investigation of the monumental connection between Mars and the city's founders might begin with the Augustan temple complex of Mars Ultor on the Forum Augustum, also featuring a statue of Romulus. On Mars and Romulus in the period before the Tetrarchy, see Hekster (2015) 261-265.

of Tetrarchic adjectives,⁶⁴² that the founders of Rome are ‘*aeternae urbis suae conditores*’, ‘the founders of *his own* Eternal City’. As the monument is not (as often in the case of honorary statue bases)⁶⁴³ dedicated *to* the emperor but *by* him, and Maxentius is the subject of the dedicatory formula of the inscription, *suae* closely links the emperor to the Eternal City and its founders. This inscription thus expands Maxentius’ famous coin legend **CONSERVATOR VRBIS SVAE** (displaying his patronage of Rome in the present)⁶⁴⁴ to the city’s eternity and foundation.

It is important to stress that the idea was only partially new: in 289 the panegyrist had already hailed Maximian and Diocletian as *conservatores [Romae]* (13.2) and new founders.⁶⁴⁵ The use of the possessive adjective with *aeterna urbs*, however, certainly was new and striking, and can convey a strong political message depending on our reading and interpretation of the text.⁶⁴⁶ Was it merely a factual statement meaning ‘the Eternal City that is now in his possession or control? It seems likely, as will become clear below, that the phrase carries teleological overtones, implying a meaning like ‘*his own* Eternal City’ (that is: eternally his?).⁶⁴⁷ Appropriating the powerful symbol of the *aeterna urbs* as his own with reference to the founders of the city, Maxentius’ dedication creates an impressive temporal framework that encompasses, within the realm of eternity, both the distant origins of the city and his own reign, thus projecting the latter into eternity. Such a projection into the future would perhaps imply claims of a new dynasty, of which the emperor’s own son Romulus was obviously an integral part. In this way, dynastic considerations could have played a role in, but were certainly not the main reason for, the monument’s erection.⁶⁴⁸

^{642.} For Tetrarchic *suus* in a similar context, see e.g. *CIL VI.1130 = 31242 = ILS 646* (dedication of the Baths of Diocletian and Maximian *Romanis suis*), with Hekster (2015) 286-287. Hekster (2011) 48 interestingly suggests that Maxentius, before becoming emperor, may already have been involved in their construction.

^{643.} Cf. Bauer (1996) 76.

^{644.} Cf. Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 44-45; Pietri (1961) 316 n. 1. See Wienand (2012) 238 for a comparison between appropriations of Rome in this inscription and on contemporary coinage, and the interesting observation that Maxentius actually upturned the traditions associated with Romulus’ *pomerium*, while Constantine brought them back into force; cf. the doubtful observations of Bravi (2012) 460-461.

^{645.} See note 603.

^{646.} The closest identifiable precedent is perhaps an inscription from Rome referring to Trajan and *aeternitati Italiae suae* (*CIL VI.1492 = ILS 6106*); cf. also *AE* (1928) 39, a dedication to Maximian from Mauretania.

^{647.} Cf. Gatti (1899) 217: ‘... gloriosi ricordi dell’ eterna città, che considerava come sua e che intendeva conservare eternamente quale sempre era stata.’ On Maxentius styling himself as **CONSERVATOR AFRICAE SVAE** after defeating the rebellious Domitius Alexander, see Wienand (2012) 211.

^{648.} For a compelling discussion of Maxentius’ dynastic messages in the context of the Third Tetrarchy, see Hekster (2015) 295-296.

Rather than primarily promoting dynastic ambitions, further evidence indicates that the monument functioned mainly within a setting of ktistic celebration. The word *conditoribus*, prominently indented and centred, takes up a full line. This term is used instead of spelling out the names Romulus and Remus (or Romulus alone), which would have been far more suitable for dynastic purposes. While their identical epithets and their initial and final positions in the inscription created a connection between Mars and Maxentius, the layout of the text rather connects Maxentius to the *conditores*, as they are set next to each other and centred on both the horizontal and the vertical axis. Lines three and four (*conditoribus / dominus noster*) stand out as a central unit, linking the founders (preceded by the possessive *suae*) to the Emperor, indicated by the usual, but unusually spelled out formula *dominus noster*. That formula also features a possessive adjective, creating a chiastic arrangement. Moreover, the visual prominence of the *conditores* is echoed by the dedication date recorded in the inscription on the right side of the stone, cited above. On Rome's birthday, 21 April, a magistrate responsible for sacred buildings dedicated what we assume must be our inscribed base with the accompanying statuary.⁶⁴⁹ The explicit mention of the date implies a ritual occurrence. We may begin to see how the dedication on that highly appropriate day might have involved a ceremony not unlike the one during which the Panegyric of 289 was delivered. In a way, the repeated imperial attention for this festive occasion implies continuity between Maxentius and his father.

Unlike the palace in Trier, however, the location of this celebration in Rome may have carried extra significance in terms of ritual space and memorial topography, apart from occupying significant ritual time. The Comitium, after all, where the Maxentian monument was excavated, was a focal point of Roman historical awareness and traditions thought to stretch back to the regal period and the foundation of the city. Although it is likely that the monument's location ties in with the historical character of its surroundings, it is hard to say what specific historical connotations it may have been associated with. The site is interpreted as an appropriate and highly significant setting for a dedication to Rome's founders because of its proximity to the *Niger lapis*.⁶⁵⁰ This monument, known from the literary record to be in some way connected to the death of Romulus, was 'discovered' in 1899 some 20 metres from where our statue base

^{649.} The participle *dedicata* refers to an implied noun, either a feminine one in the singular (like *statua*, *imago*), or a neutral one in the plural (like *simulacra*). In the latter case, this may support the hypothesis that our base was originally dedicated together with an accompanying monument for Maxentius (*CIL VI.33857b*).

^{650.} Coarelli (2000) 74 (= (2007) 59); Curran (2000) 60; Oenbrink (2006) 194-195; Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 43. More cautious Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE XIV.2* (1930) 2459; Machado (2006) 168. Bauer (1996) alternates between 'wahrscheinlich' (18) and 'vielleicht' (402).

was found around the same time.⁶⁵¹ As the pavement of the *Niger lapis* was thought to be Maxentian in date, the base and the *Niger lapis*-monument would be contemporary and thus perhaps part of the same ensemble. That obviously makes the plot thicker: by linking the new monument for the founders topographically to the *Niger lapis*, an old Romulean *lieu de mémoire* would have been consciously reactivated under Maxentius.⁶⁵²

Appealing as this theory sounds, the evidence on which it rests is scanty at best. Although the so-called *Niger lapis*-monument is quite famous in modern times due to the fuss surrounding its discovery and interpretation, it was a rather marginal phenomenon in the ancient sources we have.⁶⁵³ The name itself is recorded only by Festus (p. 177 Lindsay), who uses the words *niger lapis*, not (as it is often called in modern scholarship) *lapis niger*. There is a considerable degree of doubt as to what the monument actually marked: to sum up, the often-repeated contention that it was believed by 'the Romans' to be the tomb of Romulus is only very partially true.⁶⁵⁴ Also, the Maxentian dating of the *Niger lapis*-pavement appears to be based on the dating of our inscription.⁶⁵⁵ The theory that the Maxentian monument reactivated the *Niger lapis* is thus built on a circular argument and should be dismissed. Lacking solid evidence for a connection to Romulus, the *Niger lapis* is linked to the Maxentian monument for Rome's founders mainly by topographical proximity and the circumstances of discovery. Moreover: why would Maxentius, who had a living son called Romulus, have wanted to reactivate the (disputable and disputed) grave of Romulus, rather than one of the many topographical markers of the city founder's ktistic activity?⁶⁵⁶ If the *Niger lapis* did mark the tomb of Romulus, it must have conjured up the anti-monarchical

^{651.} See *apud CIL VI. 33856* (Hülsen), Hülsen (1900) 3-4; cf. Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in RE XIV.2 (1930) 2459; Gantz (1974); Coarelli (1996). The *editio princeps* of the Maxentian inscription is in Gatti (1899) 213-220; the archaic inscription below the black pavement was first published in Boni et al. (1899).

^{652.} Bauer (1996) 104; Oenbrink (2006) 194.

^{653.} See already Hülsen (1900) 3.

^{654.} See Coarelli (1996) for the interpretative variants and problems. A telling example of where the reasoning can go wrong is the claim that 'the Romans burned Julius' Caesar's body and buried his ashes near Romulus' tomb in the Roman Forum, a conspicuous public act that answered the dictator's own apparent interest in sharing the title and honors of Rome's legendary founder' (McGlew (1993) 15).

^{655.} Bauer (1996) 18.

^{656.} The only viable reason was suggested shortly after its discovery by Hülsen (1900) 4: 'Man könnte sogar denken, dass das Heroon für den jung verstorbenen Kaisersohn am einen Ende und das wiederhergestellte Romulusgrab am anderen Ende des Forums resp. der Sacra via einen inneren Zusammenhang hätten.' Obviously, this connection would apply only to later circumstances, when Maxentius' son Romulus had died and received his mausoleum, rather than being inaugurated as consul on the spot.

tradition of the founder's violent death at the hands of the senators, rather than his glorious deification – which took place in the Campus Martius.⁶⁵⁷

Other considerations, therefore, probably determined the location of the Maxentian monument. Apart from the *Niger lapis*, the Comitium could lay claim to at least two other ktistic associations. It was one of the two attested sites of the *ficus Ruminalis*, a fig-tree associated with the twins Romulus and Remus washing ashore and being suckled by the she-wolf.⁶⁵⁸ The *ficus* in the Comitium is prominently depicted on the Hadrianic *anaglypha Traiani*, and was possibly still known in Maxentius' day (perhaps through these very reliefs).⁶⁵⁹ Also, the Comitium was probably the site of the oldest documented statue group of the *lupa* with the twins, erected by the Ogulnii brothers in 296 BC, commemorated both by Livy (X.23.12) and on early Roman coins.⁶⁶⁰ More likely and more suitable than the *Niger lapis* as a historical precedent for the Maxentian monument to build on, the visible presence or memory of the statue(s) set up by the Ogulnii could have influenced the choice for the Comitium-area in the Maxentian era.⁶⁶¹ But perhaps even this is pushing things too far. As Carlos Machado has observed, 'constant works in this area had certainly made the topography of the Comitium very different, in the early fourth century AD, from what it had been in earlier periods.'⁶⁶²

Given the state of the evidence, it is hard to say whether the location of the Maxentian monument was determined by the ktistic connotations of the site. It could very well be that its contemporary relevance, rather, influenced Maxentian desire to appropriate the Comitium-area. The monument stood between the newly rebuilt Curia,⁶⁶³ where the Senate assembled (to which Maxentius himself, uniquely among Tetrarchic emperors, belonged, already before becoming emperor in 306),⁶⁶⁴ and the Forum square proper, adorned with brand new architectural and

^{657.} For the vicissitudes of the legend connected to the *Niger lapis*, see Gantz (1974); for the Campus Martius, La Rocca (2013) 98, 102.

^{658.} See Coarelli (1995a) and (1995b).

^{659.} See further Torelli (1982) 89–118, with Smith (1983) 227, and Brown (2020).

^{660.} Papi (1999).

^{661.} In 1899 the excavator, Boni, enthusiastically hypothesized that the Maxentian base might have carried a column with the Capitoline she-wolf on top (Boni (1900) 304–305; see further Gatti (1899) 217; Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in RE XIV.2 (1930) 2459; Bauer (1996) 19), but even though that hypothesis can no longer hold, it could still be worth considering the ancient Ogulnian statue(s), also mentioned by Boni, as a candidate. See Kluczek (2018) 119–124.

^{662.} Machado (2006) 168.

^{663.} See Bond (2014) 91–92.

^{664.} Davenport (2017) 34–35. For this location as a possible insult to the senatorial aristocracy, see Wienand (2012) 238.

sculptural celebrations of the Tetrarchic system and imperial power.⁶⁶⁵ To add some counterweight to the Tetrarchic dominance of the area, or even to appropriate the Tetrarchic legacy,⁶⁶⁶ Maxentius or his agents cunningly came up with a dedication to Mars and the *aeternae urbis suae conditores* on this Tetrarchic hotspot.⁶⁶⁷ That must have rearranged the contemporary political significance of the site (with or without its ktistic connotations) and reactivated traditional Roman ritual time, celebrating the *Natalis Urbis* with a lasting monument prominently visible to all.

The contemporary relevance of the monument for the Maxentian regime is likely, however, to have stretched further than that. In 308, Maxentius and his son Romulus were inaugurated as consuls,⁶⁶⁸ independent of the consuls already nominated by the reigning Tetrarchs. The event constituted a major rupture with the ongoing Tetrarchic system and marks Maxentius' newly envisaged independence more than anything else. As Drost rightly phrases it, it is 'l'événement fondateur de son régime solitaire'.⁶⁶⁹ It was marked also by a 'crucial turning point in Maxentian minting',⁶⁷⁰ apparently, as emphasis shifted completely from Hercules, the patron deity of the Herculean partners in crime that had until then been Maxentius' imperial allies, to Mars, his new personal patron god. Interestingly, this unilateral consular inauguration occurred not on 1 January, as Roman tradition dictated, but on 20 (not 21) April.⁶⁷¹ Wrede has brilliantly suggested that the festivities connected to the dedication of the monument in the Comitium, on 21 April, should also be dated to 308 and were thus preceded by the consular inauguration on the day before.⁶⁷² That must have created a ritual connection between the two events that would have been hard to miss. Ziemssen well formulates the consequences of Maxentius' choice of

^{665.} On the so-called *Fünfsäulendenkmal* and the surviving *decennalia*-base, see extensively Wrede (1981); succinctly Brandt (1998) 64–68.

^{666.} Cf. Cullhed (1994) 54; Coarelli (1986).

^{667.} Apart from the famous Tetrarchic *decennalia*-base, the topography of the site may be conditioned by its particular position on the triumphal route, marked by the arch of Septimius Severus. Cf. Kolb (1987) 140 on a possible reference in *Pan. Lat.* X(2) 14.1 to Maxentius' presence in the envisaged triumph of Maximian in Rome and *ibid.* 126, 147 for Septimius Severus as a possible example for the Tetrarchic triumph: if correct, the present monument's location next to the *Via Sacra* could carry extra significance for contemporary Roman audiences and Maxentius himself. See further Van Dam (2018) 26–29.

^{668.} Perhaps modelled on the joint consulship of the emperors Carus and his son Carinus in January 283.

^{669.} Drost (2013) 21.

^{670.} Hekster (1999) 731.

^{671.} *Chronographus anni 354* (ed. Mommsen, *MGH, Chron. Min.* I (1892)) 67, with Mommsen in *MGH, Chron. Min.* III (1898) 517; Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2437; Barnes (1982) 94. The correct date has wrongly been assimilated to 21 April (e.g. by Dulière (1979) 178, 182; Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 42–43), a suggestion apparently going back to Dante Vagliari (see Vagliari (1903) 136–137, citing his own work from late 1899).

^{672.} Wrede (1981) 141. See note 573.

date for taking up the consulship: 'Daß dieses Ereignis auf den 21. April [sic]⁶⁷³ gesetzt wurde, nicht, wie üblich, auf den 1. Januar, läßt an der bewußten, symbolischen Verbindung des Konsulats mit dem Gründungsmythos der Stadt keinen Zweifel.'⁶⁷⁴ In 308, it would have been clear that Rome (whatever neglect it had suffered during the Tetrarchy) and its foundation were again in the centre of the political stage. The Maxentian mints, particularly the newly established one at Ostia, produced numerous issues featuring motives related to Rome's foundation, mostly dated to the year(s) following 308.⁶⁷⁵

Combining the evidence treated so far, it is now possible to reconstruct how the ktistic dedication in the Comitium interacted with the political agenda of the Maxentian regime. Maxentius (who can here surely be pinpointed as the agent responsible) single-handedly declared himself consul together with his son and took office on the unusual and specially chosen date of 20 April (rather than 1 January). The day after, Rome celebrated the *Natalis Urbis* with the dedication of a monument to Mars and the founders of Maxentius' Eternal City in the Comitium, possibly accompanied by a monument dedicated to the Emperor himself (*CIL VI.33857b*, see above), perhaps set up by the Senate.⁶⁷⁶ The renewed and conspicuous celebration of the city's founders on the day after Maxentius' first inauguration as consul was probably designed to present the Emperor's outspoken new style of rule, independent of the Tetrarchic Emperors (including his father), as a symbolic refoundation of Rome. The Maxentian monument and the circumstances of its dedication thus fit the long imperial tradition of ktistic renewal, and uniquely provide a non-literary set of evidence for that phenomenon.

^{673.} As said, the date should be 20 (not 21) April.

^{674.} Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 43.

^{675.} On the Ostian mint, see Albertson (1985) and Drost (2014). There is some (perhaps intentional) irony in Constantine's decision to move this mint and its personnel to Arles, where it started to produce coins with an 'unusually high number of Christian symbols' (Lenski (2016) 140).

^{676.} The hypothesis that the monument for Mars was dedicated together with an accompanying monument for Maxentius himself (*CIL VI.33857*) is not only corroborated by the fact that both bases were reused from two earlier dedications by the same college of craftsmen (*collegium fabrum tignuariorum*), but also by the way they were reused. The original, Antonine inscription from AD 154 still survives intact on the left and back sides of the base for Mars, while it was (almost totally) erased and replaced with Maxentian inscriptions on the front and right sides, which must therefore have been the main part on display during Maxentius' reign. Conversely, the original inscription, probably dating to the reign of Commodus, on the base for Maxentius himself (*CIL VI.33857*) is preserved on the right side rather than the left. That difference suggests that the right side of this accompanying monument was positioned to the left of the monument for Mars, both the original inscriptions looking towards each other and likely obscured from view.

Such a set of bold moves certainly surpassed Maximian's appropriation of the *dies natalis* in 289. The imperial ceremony of Maxentius taking the consulship was, quite uniquely, determined by the ritual recurrence of the city's foundation. That makes for an impressive and innovative celebration-and-inauguration-combined, intertwining ktistic, Republican and Imperial elements and topographies. There may possibly have been more Maxentian appropriations of the city's founders than the monument and ceremony discussed here,⁶⁷⁷ although some of them seem to belong to modern scholarly rather than Maxentian inventiveness.⁶⁷⁸ Yet even if some Late Antique ktistic appropriations are falsely attributed to Maxentius or result from misinterpretation of the evidence (as in the case of the *Niger lapis*), it is clear that the founders of Rome played a considerable role in imperial ideology during his reign. For reasons of space, we have to restrict our treatment to the monument and ceremonial occurrences in the Forum on 20 and 21 April 308. They provide a representative indication, to be sure, of Maxentius' ideological appropriation of Rome's founders.

3.4. Maxentius, Maximian, Augustus: ktistic traditions compared

After treating Maximian's and Maxentius' appropriations of Rome's foundation, it makes sense to compare the two, both amongst themselves and with regard to their earlier models. The ktistic associations of the Palatine are a case in point. Maxentius, it turns out, did things his way. He did not just copy Augustus' appropriation of Romulus, echoing the emperor who was described as *quasi et ipse conditor urbis*, at least by the time of Suetonius.⁶⁷⁹ Maxentius took up residence in the Palatine palace and used the imperial connotations of the place for his own legitimation to such an extent, that a Constantinian panegyrist could equate his abandonment of the palace with the fall of his *imperium*.⁶⁸⁰ Nevertheless, the Romulean monuments traditionally centred on the hill, closely connected to Augustus' image and the coming into being of the imperial palace complex (at least according to most scholarly interpretations), seem not to have played any role in Maxentius' reign. Contrary to the panegyrist of 289,⁶⁸¹ Maxentian invocations of Rome's beginnings, as far as we can tell, do not tap into the renown and standing of the Augustan literary tradition (Vergil and Livy, mostly). One could argue that this is primarily a matter of surviving source material and genre,

^{677.} See e.g. the statue program described by Prud. *C. Symm.* I.215-244 with Gnilka (1994) and Bauer (1996) 60, 104, and the idea that Maxentius' reconstruction of the Temple of Venus and Roma was linked to the celebration of the millennium of Rome's foundation by Philip the Arab in 248, which had used the temple as its centerpiece (Marlowe (2010) 201-202).

^{678.} Santa Maria Scrinari (1991) 98-101, 115-119; see Ziemssen (2011) 24 n. 74.

^{679.} Suet. *Aug.* 7.2; see p. 32, above.

^{680.} *Pan. Lat.* XII(9) 9.6 (see Liverani (2003) 151 n. 64), 14.4 (see Liverani (2003) 158 n. 119); see further Wulf-Rheidt (2017) 131-133.

^{681.} *Pan. Lat.* X(2) 1.2-3, 2.1.

since a literary source (the panegyrist) is far more likely to come up with Vergilian allusions than the surviving Maxentian coins or inscriptions are. Indeed so, but not entirely: the usurper Carausius, in a position not completely dissimilar from Maxentius' and active only two decades earlier, had quite prominently showcased Vergilian allusions on his coinage.⁶⁸² Maxentius seems to have done no such thing, innovating rather than following tradition. Maxentian celebrations of Rome's founders were thus distinctly Late Antique; Augustus' Romulean Palatine and Vergil's Evander seem completely absent from the picture.

Depending on one's stance in the debate about Maxentius as either a would-be-Tetrarchic or an anti-Tetrarchic ruler, his neglect of long-standing tradition in imperial imagery may either be rendered more striking, or conveniently explained, by the notable difference with Maxentius' direct predecessors (the ktistic memories piled up high on the hill by the Panegyric for Maximian in 289). As Rees concludes in his 2002 study *Layers of Loyalty*, with reference to §1.3 of the 289 panegyric, 'the building on the Palatine which offered quarters to Hercules and is now the imperial home provides a physical legacy and link between Hercules and Maximian'.⁶⁸³ The same was true for Augustus, in whose case 'Hercules' could be changed to Evander, Aeneas, Romulus, or all of them together. Even Galerius (Maxentius' father in law) seems to have likened himself to Romulus in a way reminiscent of Augustus.⁶⁸⁴ Although Maxentius could have followed in their and/or his father's footsteps, he apparently wanted to do more than that, to become a new kind of *alter conditor* of Rome. Maxentian invocations of Romulus did not slavishly copy Tetrarchic precedent or the traditions on which that precedent was based. Instead; Maxentius focussed attention on the Comitium, a contemporary hotspot of Tetrarchic Rome.

Although the way in which Maxentius appropriated the founders of Rome was innovative, the fact that he did so at all shows continuity with a much older tradition. Moreover, his focus on the founders of Rome, in the plural, rather than on Romulus alone, might very well have had to do with the Dyarchic rehabilitation of Remus to co-founder of Rome. While the details differ, it is not unlikely that the whole idea was indebted at least partially to Maximian's example. Regarding the veneration for the founders of his eternal city, then, Maxentius' reign was at least not as categorically

^{682.} Rees (2004a) 1-2, 6.

^{683.} Rees (2002) 42.

^{684.} *Exinde insolentissime agere coepit, ut ex Marte se procreatum et videri et dici vellet tamquam alterum Romulum maluitque Romulam matrem stupro infamare, ut ipse diis oriundus videretur* (Lactant. *De mort. pers.* 9.9). See Cullhed (1994) 63; Bruggisser (1999) 77; Hillner (2023) 92; cf. Kolb (2001) 188.

'anti-Tetrarchic' as it is sometimes being considered.⁶⁸⁵ Above all, it is safe to say that he revamped the Tetrarchic hotspot of the Comitium into a showcase of his ktistic appropriations, perhaps building on the precedent of his father's ktistic celebrations. We are unsure what happened to the Romulean monuments on the Palatine or the Augustan showcase of ktistic heroes on the Forum Augustum during Maxentius' reign – or what might have happened, had it not been cut short in October 312 by the victory of his provincial adversary. It is certain, however, that Romulean memories were creatively reconfigured under (and probably by) Maxentius to fit the contemporary needs of this proactive ruler in early fourth century Rome. There, as well, the similarities with Maximian are obvious.

3.5. Maxentius as (false) Romulus

We must now turn to the fortune of Maxentius' appropriation of Romulus under Constantine. In the year 313, an anonymous orator delivered a Panegyric to Constantine in Trier. Constantine's victory over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in 312 had led to Maxentius' death, which the panegyrist presented in a mythologizing fashion: (*Pan. Lat. XII[9] 18.1*)

Sancte Thybri, quondam hospitis monitor Aeneae, mox Romuli conseruator expositi, tu nec falsum Romulum diu uiuere nec parricidam Vrbis passus es enatare. Tu Romae tuae altor copiis subuehendis, tu munitor moenibus ambiendis, merito Constantini uictoriae particeps esse uoluisti, ut ille hostem in te propelleret, tu necares.

Sacred Tiber, once advisor of your guest Aeneas, next savior of the exposed Romulus, you allowed neither the false Romulus to live for long nor the City's murderer to swim away. You who nourished Rome by conveying provision, you who protected her by encircling the walls, rightly wished to partake of Constantine's victory, to have him drive the enemy to you, and you slay him.

The Constantinian panegyrist chose the mythical framework of Rome's foundation to highlight the Tiber's providential role in Maxentius' demise, thereby turning Maxentius' own legitimating efforts against him, as the following analysis hopes to show. There is some discussion about the identity of the *falsus Romulus*. Rodgers argues that it is not Maxentius and could be no other than Maxentius' deceased (first)

^{685.} On Maxentius adhering '(more or less) to the tetrarchic system of representation', see Hekster (2015) 289.

son, Valerius Romulus.⁶⁸⁶ He was, however, already dead and deified for several years, and, as Rodgers herself notes, 'how the Tiber achieved his death is a mystery' – he would then have been killed by the Tiber previously, to which the panegyrist would have referred in an entirely oblique manner.⁶⁸⁷ That is highly unlikely, especially because there is an easy solution at hand. Rodgers over-stresses the adversative value of the double *nec*, which according to her has to signal a change of subject. She states: 'nor does anything explain why Maxentius would be the false Romulus'.⁶⁸⁸ A very straightforward explanation is available, however: Maxentius identified himself with the founder of the city, so the Constantinian panegyrist did the same. Furthermore, there is no problem in taking *nec ... nec* as explicative rather than adversative. As the *falsum Romulum* and the *parricidam Urbis* were in fact one and the same person, there was logically only one corpse to be disgorged later on (18.2).⁶⁸⁹ Therefore, Galletier, Curran, and Oenbrink, among others, rightly take Maxentius as the one intended here by 'the false Romulus', also described as 'the murderer of the city', who was neither allowed to live for long nor to swim away.⁶⁹⁰

In fact, the panegyrist has masterfully conflated Romulean vocabulary in characterizing Maxentius. Other authors described Romulus as *parens urbis*,⁶⁹¹ in his role as founder, and *fratris parricida*,⁶⁹² because of the killing of Remus. Styling Maxentius as *parricidam Urbis* thus makes for a splendid contrast with Romulus' role as founder, while at the same time exploiting the subversive connotations of Romulus' fratricidal behaviour.⁶⁹³ Constantine, in contrast, is working together with the sacred Tiber, which now turns into the murderer of the *falsus Romulus*, again a splendid contrast with its original role as *conservator Romuli*.⁶⁹⁴ Also, that makes the victorious emperor third in a list of 'ktistic' or foundational heroes helped by the Tiber, after

^{686.} *Ibid.* 321. See also Mundt (2012) 175–176.

^{687.} Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 321. Cf. *ibid.* 351 on *omnibus qui statum eius labefactare poterant cum stirpe deletis* in *Pan. Lat.* IV(10) 6.6, taken as evidence for a second son of Maxentius.

^{688.} Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 321.

^{689.} Cf. 4.4, where *falso generi* also refers to Maxentius, in opposition to Constantine's true descent.

^{690.} Groag s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2458; Besnier (1937) 350 n. 33; Galletier (1952) note to page 138. 2*; Duliére (1979) 179; Portmann (1988) 37; Cullhed (1994) 61; Bauer (1996) 104 n. 22; Lippold (1998) 237 n. 35; Bruggisser (1999) 78; Curran (2000) 68 n. 132, 77; Bruggisser (2002a) 132; Oenbrink (2006) 202 n. 85; Harries (2012) 108 n. 9; van Poppel (2013) 63; Bleckmann (2015) 310.

^{691.} Cf. e.g. Cic. *div.* I.3, *principio huius urbis parens Romulus*; Liv. V.24.11, *Romulo (...) parente et auctore urbis Romae* and see *parentes urbis* (*Pan. Lat.* X(2) 2.1), discussed above, with note 587.

^{692.} Hier. *Praefatio ad Dydim. spir.* (PL XXIII, 107). Cf. Min. Fel. *Oct.* 25.2; Cyprian, *Quod idola dii non sint*, 5; August. *De civ.* III.6; Serv. in *Aen.* VI.779; possibly also Tert. *Ad nat.* II.7.7 (see Kolter (2008) 87 n. 428).

^{693.} Cf. Sall. *Cat.* 51.25, *parricidae rei publicae* (on Catiline's associates) and Lactant. *Div. inst.* I.15.29, *patriae parricida* (on Julius Caesar, but in one sentence with Romulus as fratricide).

^{694.} On the Maxentian overtones of the word *conservator*, see note 635.

Aeneas and Romulus.⁶⁹⁵ Accordingly, Constantine is strongly contrasted to Maxentius and presented by the panegyrist as the ‘true Romulus’, to use the words of Salzman.⁶⁹⁶ Turning Maxentian ideology upside down, the panegyric presents the victory at the Milvian Bridge as an act of ktistic renewal.⁶⁹⁷

This neatly composed invective suggests that Maxentian appropriations of Romulus were effective and deployed on such a scale that they influenced even his enemy’s political audience in Trier, which the panegyrist here effectively manipulated.⁶⁹⁸ Also, it shows that Romulus was too important to be done away with together with his imperial propagator. The founder of Rome had to be cleansed of Maxentian stains rather than to go down with him.

3.6. Conclusion: Maxentius and Constantine

Maxentian ideas about the founders of Rome, finally, and the underlying idea of ktistic renewal, proved to be more long-lasting, and loaded with not just contemporary and circumstantial significance. As the Panegyric of 313 with which we ended this chapter shows (together with Constantine’s own coinage and the continuity of the Comitium-monument), Constantine largely adopted the Maxentian stance towards the founders of the city. While Maxentius was characterized as ‘false Romulus’, Constantine, by contrast, became the ‘true Romulus’ of a new Rome, the sacred Tiber partaking in Constantine’s victory. While an accompanying monument for Maxentius himself was obliterated and used as building material in the Basilica Julia, where it has been found by excavators,⁶⁹⁹ the monument for Mars and the city founders remained in place in the Comitium, as one of Maxentius’ few inscriptions

^{695.} The panegyrist’s oblique reference to Vergil’s treatment of Aeneas’ arrival in Latium in *Aeneid* VIII.72–73, observed by Lubbe (1955) 96, intertextually reinforces the connection between Aeneas and Constantine. Ross (2022) 814 interestingly argues for the intertextual presence of Camillus behind *de recuperata urbe* (1.2), but misses the ktistic relevance of this possible reference.

^{696.} Salzman (1990) 110. A similar notion is expressed by Nazarius in *Pan. Lat.* X(10) 6.6, where the destruction of Maxentius is equated with the foundation of Rome for eternity.

^{697.} Likewise Aur. Vict., *Caes.* 41.5 – see Barbero (2016) 691; Nickbakh & Scardino (2021) 336–337 – and *Cod. Theod.* XI.36.14. Ross (2022) 814 suggests the orator’s stance ‘fits neatly with Constantine’s propaganda’ and that Constantine himself, rather than the orator, appropriated Maxentius’ ktistic role. Interestingly, around the same time Eusebius also presented Constantine’s victory in mythological terms, but using a Christian rather than a traditional Roman template: Constantine is a new Moses triumphing over a latter-day Pharaoh (H.E. IX.9.4–8). Cf. Bardill (2012) 93; Bleckmann (2015) 315 n. 22, 317 n. 31, 323 n. 49; Anagnostou-Laoutides (2021) 90; and see also *Pan. Lat.* XII(9) 13.2 on a certain *deus ille mundi creator*, with Wienand (2012) 246–253; Drijvers (2021) 59–60, 62, 66.

^{698.} See Cullhed (1994) 62. Whether Romulean messages on Maxentian coinage affected public opinion in Gaul is a question that remains to be explored: on the circulation of Maxentian coinage in Gaul, see Drost (2013) 60. Maxentian coins from Ostia depicting Romulus are actually found in Gallic hordes: Bastien and Vasselle (1965) 97–98; Bastien and Cothenet (1974) 83.

^{699.} *CIL VI.33857b*; <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk>, LSA-1387 (C. Machado); EDR126954 (G. Crimi).

to survive his total *damnatio memoriae*.⁷⁰⁰ Only Maxentius' name was conspicuously erased.⁷⁰¹ What remained intact, therefore, was the daring formula *aeternae urbis suae conditoribus*, including the possessive pronoun originally referring to the erased dedicator. Should *suae* thereupon have been taken to refer to the new Emperor, hailed as *liberator urbis* and *fundator quietis* on the arch near the Colosseum?⁷⁰²

Constantine was apparently the last emperor to feature Maxentius' recently restored temple of Venus and Roma on his coinage,⁷⁰³ poignantly replacing the Maxentian legend **CONSERVATOR VRBIS SVAE** with his own **LIBERATOR VRBIS SVAE** and **RESTITVTOR VRBIS SVAE**.⁷⁰⁴ Did Maxentius pave the way for his great opponent and successor also with regard to appropriating the city's founders?⁷⁰⁵ It seems so, if Constantine himself, once he had taken control of Rome, spontaneously felt the need to honour the mythic traditions of the *Urbs*. More likely, as Constantine's interest in the old Rome proved to be short-lived, Maxentius did not only pave the way, but rather forced Constantine to go down the same road and position himself vis-à-vis the mythic traditions of Rome's foundation. Constantine's appropriation of Rome's founders seems a clear case of what Hekster describes as the 'constraints of tradition'. Constantine, clearly, could not afford to neglect Maxentian appropriations of Rome's foundation (even if the panegyrist of 313 reverted them back to the Augustan image, the sacred Tiber helping Rome's ktistic heroes).⁷⁰⁶ In a way, the constraints Maxentius' intervention imposed on Constantine thus safeguarded the position of Rome for centuries to come. The boost he gave to the Eternal City's enduring prestige as *caput imperii* still resonated with emperors as late as Honorius and Valentinian III, more than a century later, and even in Constantinople.⁷⁰⁷ Although we sadly lack the literary sources about

^{700.} Mayer (2002) 185; cf. Varner (2004) 215-219.

^{701.} Bauer (1996) 19. On the restrained nature of the *damnatio* here, see also Ziemssen (2011) 130; Drost (2013) 27 n. 148; van Poppel (2013) 28-29; Machado (2019) 100.

^{702.} CIL VI.1139 = ILS 694; cf. Marlowe (2010) 218-219.

^{703.} Coarelli (1986) 22.

^{704.} RIC VI, Rome 303-304, 312, with Sutherland's comments at p. 53, 348. Cf. Coarelli (1986) 22; Behrwald (2009) 38; Marlowe (2010) 217-218. Ross (2022) 810 seems to miss the point that Constantine reacted to a wider landscape of Maxentian appropriations of Rome, stretching beyond coinage.

^{705.} Along similar lines, but focusing on the development of the empire rather than city of Rome, see Cullhed (1994) 94-95; cf. Bleckmann (2015) 318 n. 33 on a possible ktistic reference to Hercules (which would, in that case, pick up the Maximianic theme from *Pan. Lat. X[2]*) on the Arch of Constantine, and 324-327 on RIC VII.364, Ticinum 36, the famous medallion featuring a depiction of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus on Constantine's shield.

^{706.} On 'die augusteische Konnotationen der zeitgenössischen Herrschaftsrepräsentation', see Wienand (2012) 227; Bardill (2012) 94-95; Anagnostou-Laoutides (2021) 85-88; cf. also *Pan. Lat. XII(9) 10.1* on the Victory at Verona as a second Actium.

^{707.} Bauer (1996) 250; Behrwald (2009) 38-40. For Constantius II, Julian and Gratian, see Salzman (1990) 110, with note 243; in general, 154-155. See also Cullhed (1994) 66-67.

Maxentius' appropriation of Rome's founders, which could have been more explicit on its interpretation as ktistic renewal, what we still have attests that these Maxentian appropriations were no literary game, but resulted in prominent monuments in the centre of Rome and coins in Roman pockets. Maxentius' own image hardly survived his tragic defeat and he went down in history as the necessary tyrannical foil to a victorious Constantine, who appropriated Late Antique Rome and continues to do so today. It is, however, fair to say that it was Maxentius who influenced the image of all following emperors more than any of his immediate predecessors or successors. Maxentius is, ultimately, responsible for the enduring Late Antique devotion to the city that fostered an empire that would remain Roman long after its ancient capital's eventual decline and fall.⁷⁰⁸

^{708.} Leppin and Ziemssen (2007) 119, 122; contrast Corcoran (2017). See also Wienand (2012) 229-233, on how Constantine categorically disbanded the city of Rome's proper army units, thereby rendering the city more vulnerable than ever before, and usurping the entire military power of the empire for himself.

CHAPTER

4

CASE STUDY

**Refounding Rome on the Bosphorus?
Ktistic traditions and contemporary politics in Constantinople**

Of all Roman emperors, Constantine is perhaps the one most renowned for a city-foundation. As we have seen, he was already compared to the founders of Rome after his victory over Maxentius, and largely endorsed his adversary's active promotion of Rome's traditional founders. Moreover, the foundation of Constantinople was soon compared to that of Rome, and Constantine's ktistic endeavor came to be viewed as the first instance of Christian city-foundation. For these reasons alone, the foundation of Constantinople cannot be left untouched in this thesis. That said, the near-absolute lack of securely datable contemporary sources on this subject and the extreme bias of extant later accounts make it particularly difficult to say anything about it with certainty. Our analysis must therefore – much like Augustus was discussed in chapter 1 – depart from whatever contemporary circumstantial evidence we can assemble, and confront this with the later sources that make explicit mention of Constantine's foundation. There is, namely, a major pitfall in discussing the foundation of Constantinople with the benefit of hindsight. As the Introduction of a recent volume on the relation between Rome and the new eponymous city of Constantine warns us, we should try to see the foundation of Constantinople *without* the benefit of hindsight, and evaluate it on its own, contemporary terms. Grig and Kelly write:

*'When in the autumn of 324, probably on 8 November, Constantine chose to celebrate his defeat of Licinius, the last of his rivals, by founding a city opposite the site of the naval battle of Chrysopolis, was he doing anything consciously different from what his immediate predecessors had done, Diocletian in Nicomedia, or Galerius in Thessalonica? And if we argue that he was, are we guilty of retrojecting Constantinople's later greatness on to its foundation?'*⁷⁰⁹

Both these questions address, to a large extent, the subject matter of this chapter. What was the original, contemporary meaning and relevance of Constantine's city foundation on the Bosphorus in the 320's AD?

4.1. Introduction: Constantine as founder of cities

If we are to believe Constantine's own imperial pronouncements, founding cities was his core business. Around the year 325, the small town of Orcistus in Phrygia petitioned the emperor asking for independence from a neighboring town. In an

^{709.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 8. On the first question, cf. Davenport (2017) 36.

epigraphically preserved copy of Constantine's letter to a subordinate magistrate replying to the petition, the emperor (using *pluralis maiestatis*) stated that:⁷¹⁰

quibus enim studium est urbes vel n[o]/vas condere vel longaevas erudire vel in/termortuas reparare, id quod petebatur acc[e]/ptissimum fuit

that petition found most ready acceptance from those who have the task of founding new cities, reviving ancient ones, and repairing those that are dying.⁷¹¹

Constantine, in an important side-note, clearly presents himself as an active promoter of cities. Not only does he claim to preserve existing cities, but he even goes so far as to say – and gives this concern pride of place – that his efforts are directed towards founding new cities. The letter is a seemingly unexceptional imperial pronouncement on behalf of a small town in Anatolia dating to the years after his victory over Licinius; its general subject is certainly not city-foundation, as the letter deals with the juridical minutiae of a local conflict. Nevertheless, Constantine explicitly presented himself to his newly conquered Eastern subjects as a founder of cities.⁷¹²

For more than one reason, this must have been anything but a coincidence. Anatolia was a part of the Empire where Roman emperors, as well as Hellenistic monarchs and Republican generals before them, had long manifested themselves as city founders. Claiming that role as his core business placed Constantine in a respectable, regional tradition of ktistic rulers.⁷¹³ Apart from that “regional” or “Eastern” tradition, however, Hellenistic in origin, Constantine also harked back to a specifically “Western” or “Roman” tradition by using the Latin vocabulary typically reminiscent of ancient Roman city foundation: *urbem* (or in this case *urbes*) *condere*.⁷¹⁴ That is significant for several reasons. In comparable cases dating to the earlier Tetrarchy, *augere* is almost

^{710.} *CIL III.352 = ILS 6091 = MAMA VII.305*, with Van Dam (2007) 152–155, 368–372 and Lenski (2016) 96–113. The quotation is from lines 13–16 in Van Dam's presentation of the text, on the front of a pillar holding four documents all pertaining to the dossier concerning this petition. For such inscription dossiers in Asia Minor, see Roels (2018a), Roels (2018b) and Roels (forthcoming).

^{711.} Translation by Mitchell (1998) 52–53. Van Dam (2007) 198, 371 translates slightly differently: ‘[For us] whose desire is either to found new cities or to civilize ancient cities or to revive lifeless cities, this petition was most welcome.’

^{712.} A similar notion is expressed by the orator Nazarius in *Pan. Lat.* IV(10).38.4, addressed to the emperor in his absence in AD 321.

^{713.} Cf. Mitchell (1998) 52 and see Introduction, §2, above.

^{714.} Cf. *Pan. Lat.* IV(10).38.4, where Nazarius praises Constantine for *prope de integro conditae civitates*, not using *urbes* but *civitates*. On Constantine's purposeful use of Latin, see Moser (2018) 78–79.

unanimously favoured as the key term for imperial patronage devoted to urban settlements and communities.⁷¹⁵ The emperor is seen as a promotor of cities, enabling them to grow in number and stature, but not as a proactive founder with ktistic agency. Such seems to have been the paradigm in Constantine's early reign as well, as is nicely illustrated by a panegyric delivered to Constantine himself around AD 310 in Trier. Delivered on the occasion of the anniversary of that city's foundation, it would have been an ideal opportunity to style Constantine as *conditor* – instead, the orator presents Constantine in a way analogous to the role of the Tetrarchic emperors, using *augere* and *consurgere* instead of *condere*:⁷¹⁶ (*Pan. Lat. VI(7) 22.6*; cf. 22.4)

*quaecumque enim loca frequentissime tuum numen illustrat, in his omnia
et hominibus et moenibus et muneribus **augentur**; nec magis Iovi lunonique
recubantibus novos flores terra submisit quam circa tua, Constantine, vestigia
urbes et templa **consurgunt**.*

For in whatever places your divinity distinguishes most frequently with his visits, everything is **increased**—men, walls and favors; nor more abundantly did the earth send forth fresh flowers for Jupiter and Juno to lie on than do cities and temples **spring up** in your footsteps, Constantine.

The letter preserved in Orcistus presents a new, proactively ktistic paradigm, but also breaks new ground in its use of Latin. As Moser notes, referring to the Orcistan petition, from Constantine onwards Latin started to replace Greek as the preferred language of official communication in the Greek-speaking East, which it had been up to the Tetrarchs.⁷¹⁷ Constantine thus seems to have favoured a new way of presenting himself as a ktistic emperor: tapping into Hellenistic traditions, but conspicuously using traditional Latin vocabulary so well-known from Cicero, Vergil and Livy and

^{715.} See the inscription from Tymandus (*CIL III.6866 = ILS 6090 = MAMA IV.236 = AE (2009) 1474*) cited by Kolb (1993) 332 and Mitchell (1998) 53, now dated to AD 297-305, and a decree from Heraclea Sintica (*AE (2002) 1293 = AE (2004) 1331*), dated to around AD 308: both are very similar in contents but utterly distinct in phrasing, not ascribing ktistic acts to the emperors themselves. See also Lenski (2016) 89-92.

^{716.} While the metaphor of flowers springing up for Jupiter and Juno, of course, creates a nice comparison with Constantine and stresses his divine status, similar metaphors revolving around city foundation could have performed the exact same function, e.g. by linking Constantine to Hercules, as the panegyrist of 289 did in Maximian's case – see p. 154, above.

^{717.} Moser (2018) 80. Cf. *ibid.* 79-80, on Constantine's choice to replace the traditional Greek title *sebastos* with the Latinized variant *augustos* in the Greek-speaking East, and Lenski (2016) 38.

their accounts of the foundation of that other eminent city on the Tiber.⁷¹⁸ In what could be a fascinating case of cross-medial intertextuality, with an imperial letter on a provincial inscription in Anatolia referring to a literary masterpiece of the hallowed Roman tradition, the emperor even seems to allude to a passage from Cicero's *De re publica* (I.12), i.e. in a treatise devoted to the foundation of Rome.⁷¹⁹ Constantine's imperial letter of around 325, therefore, hints at two important things: that the emperor wanted to present himself as actively involved in the foundation of cities, in general, and that such ktistic activity was rhetorically linked to the long-standing literary tradition concerning the foundation of Rome, in particular. Constantine is putting himself into gear to follow in the footsteps of ktistic rulers, both Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors – Augustus' example obviously looming large among the latter.

Conventional rhetoric apart, however, the emperor's statement was no hollow claim. Constantine founded various cities during his career.⁷²⁰ Moreover, he would become most famous as founder of the city that would ultimately change the political geography of the Roman Empire and become known as a 'new Rome': Constantinople. In all likelihood, the citizens of Orcistus filed their petition not long after this initial ktistic act in the East.⁷²¹ It is likely that the emperor implicitly referred to this event in his opening statement, connecting his favorable reply to the Orcistans' petition to his own recent actions. While Orcistus obtained its renewed status as an

^{718.} Unfortunately, the letter quoted by Eusebius at VC II.46 is preserved in Greek, but nevertheless presents an interesting contemporary parallel to the Orcistan inscription in a Christian context, employing a similar tricolon: Constantine urges church officials like Eusebius to actively promote church-building, *η ἐπανορθοῦσθαι τὰ ὄντα ή εἰς μείζονα αὔξειν ή ἐνθα ἀν χρεῖα ἀπαιτή καινὰ ποιεῖν* (II.46.3, 'either by restoring the existing ones, or by enlarging them so as to become bigger, or, where this would be necessary, to make new ones'). See also note 697, above.

^{719.} *Neque enim est ulla res in qua propius ad deorum numen virtus accedat humana, quam civitates aut condere novas aut conservare iam conditas* (Indeed, there is not a single matter in which human virtue approaches more closely the divine quality of the gods than either founding new cities/states or preserving those already founded; cf. VI.13). The passage, in turn alluding to Plato's *Laws* (708d7-8), occurs in the final section of Cicero's authorial preface (in his own voice) to his fictional dialogue. Ciceronian commentators, epigraphical editors and Constantinian scholars have little to say about Constantine's allusion; it is noted only by Mócsy (1962) 379-380 and Cracco Ruggini (1989) 220 n. 49. Further research is required to properly evaluate Constantine's intention in alluding to Cicero, apart from the obvious point that it subtly makes the emperor aspire to the highest level of virtue; cf. Hall (1998) for a comparable connection between Ciceronian phrases and Constantinian epigraphy.

^{720.} The most famous examples are the refoundation of Drepanum, close to Byzantium, as Helenopolis and that of Cirta, in Numidia, as Constantina. See e.g. Mitchell (1998) 52, Paribeni (2013), with references (add Marcos (2016); Lenski (2016) 131-164, with useful maps at 136 and 151; Moreno Resano (2006-2007)).

^{721.} As the petition was addressed to both Constantine and his three sons Crispus, Constantine II, and Constantius II as Caesars, it should be dated after the latter's elevation to Caesar in 324 and before Crispus' death in 326; see further below.

independent *civitas*, as an example of the emperor's concern to 'revive ancient cities and repair those that are dying',⁷²² the emperor's newly founded city tacitly figured as the example *par excellence* of his concern to 'found new cities'.⁷²³ Arguably, his new imperial foundation had a role to play in making clear to the inhabitants of the Eastern Roman Empire that Constantine was there to stay as their new ruler. Also in this respect his actions tied in with important historical precedents. By founding a city after his decisive battle, he provided the newly conquered East with a lasting memorial of his victory, just like Augustus had done in Nicopolis, three and a half centuries before him.

This chapter discusses Constantine's role as founder of cities. It does so by focusing on what would become his most important foundation, his eponymous city on the site of Byzantium. The foundation of Constantinople, in the third decade of the fourth century AD, has long given rise to a highly complex and partially ongoing debate about its nature and purpose. Very general and basic questions remain heavily debated. Why did Constantine found a new city, with so many existing imperial residences to choose from – most of them known to him from personal experience? Did Constantine actually found a *new* city, or did he rather expand and rename the existing Greco-Roman city of Byzantium?⁷²⁴ Why did he choose (the site of) Byzantium to build the city that would bear his name? How did he go about in founding the city and when did he do so? Was it a manifestly Christian foundation?⁷²⁵ Was it intended as a new imperial capital? And, most relevant for the current investigation: what was its relation to the old imperial capital, Rome?

In Late Antique and early Byzantine accounts, as well as in modern scholarship, the foundation of Constantinople is often seen in relation to the city on the Tiber. Constantine – we are told – would have intended Constantinople as a new Rome, and that intention would have manifested itself already at the moment of the new city's foundation.⁷²⁶ That makes Constantine's actions an extremely interesting case in our investigation of rulers presented as refounders of Rome: rather than refounding

^{722.} Cracco Ruggini (1989) 221 and Van Dam (2007) 198–199, both citing many comparable examples.

^{723.} Cf. Van Dam (2007) 198–199, Chastagnol (1981=1994) 122 and already Mommsen *ad CIL III.352* (*CIL III.1: Inscriptiones Aegypti et Asiae, Inscriptiones provinciarum Europae Graecarum, Inscriptionum Illyrici Partes I–V* (1873) p. 66: '... *quae Constantinus* (1, 13) *scribit de studio suo urbium novarum condendarum recte referuntur ad novam Romam ...*'), although the latter took 330 as the year of Constantinople's foundation.

^{724.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 8–9.

^{725.} *Ibid.* 10–11.

^{726.} E.g. *ibid.* 11; Brandt (1998) 30. Vanderspoel (1995), discussing 'the general modern view that the emperor wanted to create a new capital in the East' (52), states that '[t]here is no need to rehearse the bibliography of scholars who adopt this view, since almost every treatment of Constantine or Constantinople does so.' (52 n. 6) For Vanderspoel's critique of that view, see *ibid.* 51, 54.

Rome on the Tiber, he would have actually refounded Rome on the other end of the Mediterranean. That brings us to the main questions of this chapter, already illustrated by the quote from Grig and Kelly at the start of this chapter.⁷²⁷ How was the foundation of Constantinople related to earlier traditions of ktistic renewal involving Rome? This is the most pressing question arising from our investigation of ktistic renewal so far. Another question is of crucial importance for the chapters following this one: did Constantine's supposedly Christian foundation constitute a first Christian example or adaptation of the traditional concept of ktistic renewal?

As we will see, it is impossible to answer these specific questions without rehearsing the general debate about the nature and purpose of Constantinople's foundation. There is no unanimous scholarly consensus about the basic questions spelled out before, on which a more specific analysis could safely build. Nor is there, in my view, much truth in the current *communis opinio* about something as basic as the chronology of Constantinople's foundation. Therefore, the following pages necessarily contain a more general analysis of the historical events, as well as an overview of the sources at our disposal and of how our approach is related to current debates, before the specific questions that concern us most can properly be addressed.

4.2. The source material

In sharp contrast to the importance attributed to Constantine's ktistic act at the site of Byzantium, both by post-Constantinian authors of Late Antiquity and modern scholars, the contemporary historical record is extremely scanty. The Late Antique and Byzantine sources at our disposal are considerable in number but often late and less reliable. Substantial contemporary documentation is mostly lacking, and almost all sources treat the foundation of Constantinople with the benefit of hindsight. That hindsight, and the preponderance of the sources exploiting it, have also had their effect on scholarship about the foundation of Constantinople. Also for modern scholars, it has been overwhelmingly tempting to ascribe what Constantinople would become to the intentions of its founder at the moment of its foundation. This view has attracted revisionist approaches only in recent decades.⁷²⁸

It is interesting in itself to dwell briefly on our lack of reliable evidence, even though the absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence. Whatever Constantine's reasons and ideas concerning the foundation of Constantinople were, it is significant, to begin with, that we know so little about them. Clearly, he could

^{727.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 8.

^{728.} Vanderspoel (1995) 54; Grig and Kelly (2012) v, 3-4. A new book on the subject is announced in Lenski (2016) 164 (cf. p. 403).

have left an account of them to posterity, so authoritative and unambiguous that it would have taken away all subsequent doubts about his intentions. The fact that his motives were and are so open to interpretation, then and now, is in itself perhaps the most revealing bit of evidence we have.⁷²⁹ Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine* (I.11), tantalizingly lists a range of subjects he will not discuss – many of them are now treated only in later sources or by no source that has come down to us. A lot did exist but has indeed been lost,⁷³⁰ or may never have been there in the first place – we have no (trace of a) Constantinian autobiography, no full-blown political testament like Augustus' *Res Gestae*.⁷³¹ As is often noted, there are many similarities between Augustus and Constantine.⁷³² The major difference between the two is perhaps that the latter did not go nearly as far as the former in leaving a personal account of his life and politics to posterity, thereby informing us how he wanted his legacy to be seen.⁷³³ In Augustus' case, we can reliably reconstruct his ideas and intentions from contemporary sources. In the case of Constantine, it is hard to link any of the evidence directly to the emperor himself, apart from the letter to the Orcistans and the famous dedication medallions issued after Constantinople's foundation.⁷³⁴ We mostly have an enormously productive later tradition, testifying to the reception of his deeds in subsequent centuries. The difficulty, then, is to establish to what extent our interpretation of Constantinian city-foundation can be separated from studying the reception of Constantinople's foundation.

Two hypotheses may be set against each other to explain the situation as it is. Given the lack of reliable contemporary sources, it might be tempting to suspend our

^{729.} A similar approach to a comparable Constantinian problem is taken by Marlowe (2010) 199, who, referring to the confusion in the sources and scholarly literature about the attribution of public buildings in early fourth century Rome to either Maxentius or Constantine, offers a way 'not of sorting everything out but of understanding how the messy debates are themselves perhaps the most historically revealing thing'.

^{730.} The complete histories of Praxagoras and Philostorgius, for example, were still available to Photius but have come down to us only in quotations and fragments.

^{731.} Cf. Eusebius' (retrospectively) ironic comment in his *Vita Constantini* that he adds a letter of Constantine to his text ὥσπερ ἐν στήλῃ, "as if on an inscription" (III.16), and Van Dam (2007) 48-49 on the inscription on the Arch of Constantine as 'a miniature *Res Gestae* for Constantine'. For possible traces of an autobiography of Constantine in the sixth century, see Johannes Lydus, *de magistratibus* III.33 (ώς αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ λέγει συγγράμμασιν), judged by Cornell and Rich in Cornell et al. (2013) 10 n. 9 to be 'surely spurious'.

^{732.} E.g. Van Dam (2007) 1-18.

^{733.} Although it is on the whole unfair in its criticism, the most valid point in Barnes' review of Van Dam (2007) is perhaps that: '(...) Van Dam makes two assertions about our knowledge of the Constantinian period that are profoundly mistaken and deeply misleading: "Constantine [he states] is one of the best documented of the Roman emperors, and a political narrative of his life and reign is straightforward enough"(15).' (Barnes (2009) 376)

^{734.} For the medallions, see Ramskold and Lenski (2012); van Poppel (2013) 80-81; cf. Lenksi (2016) 54-55.

judgment on the matter and resort to a postmodern interpretation of deliberate vagueness and intended ambiguity on the part of Constantine. In other instances, he has in fact revealed himself to be a master in navigating through minefields of opposing opinions, sentiments and convictions.⁷³⁵ The fact that Constantine's city foundation at the Eastern edge of Europe is controversial, then, may not only be the product of loss and distortion of information over time. It may be a very real indicator that the nature and goal of his act of foundation were themselves ambiguous, provoking opposite reactions among geographically, religiously and ideologically distinct groups across the Empire. The fact that we have no evidence of Constantine's explicit goal in founding Constantinople and the nature of his foundation would then mean that Constantine was anything but explicit on these matters at the time the events took place.

The alternative for an hypothesis of Late Antique postmodernism is that Constantine's motives and actions were, on the contrary, very much part of an outspoken policy and aimed at making a clear political or ideological statement. The reason testimonies of those motives and such a statement have not been preserved, and have now been shrouded in the mists of history, would in that case be that they became obsolete or even inconvenient as time passed, and were deliberately replaced with other narratives in order to eliminate them from the historical record. A similar course of events can be securely documented in the case of Augustus, whose triumviral exploits were gradually played down and actively erased from memory and public view in the years following the peace after the Battle of Actium. This explanation is supported by the fact that Constantine's ktistic act became invested with enormous significance for later emperors ruling from Constantinople.

The legitimacy of the later 'Byzantine' Empire, indeed, partially depended on a reading of Constantine's ktistic act as the deliberate foundation of a new, Christian capital in the East, outdoing Rome. Also because Rome remained important, or regained its importance, as a capital of Christendom from the late fourth century onwards, there was certainly something at stake for the Christian successors of Constantine in arguing that the first Christian Emperor had transferred to Constantinople the claims to imperial power traditionally attached to Rome. As the foundation of Constantinople was the cardinal and most iconic moment in which this shift and transferral could have taken place, it makes sense if accounts of the foundation of Constantinople dating to the later fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh centuries presented Constantine's ktistic deed in line with the preconceptions and ideological stakes of

⁷³⁵ The prime example is his religious policy, which seems to have kept content both Christians and traditional religious affiliations.

their own time.⁷³⁶ The most telling example is probably a prominent constitution of Justinian dating to 530, known as *Deo auctore*. Preserved in the lawcode of Justinian, it states that old laws should be considered valid (*C. Just. I.17.1.10*).⁷³⁷

(...) *quae vel iudiciorum frequentissimus ordo exercuit vel longa consuetudo huius almae urbis comprobavit, secundum Salvii Iuliani scripturam, quae indicat debere omnes civitates consuetudinem Romae sequi, quae caput est orbis terrarum, non ipsam alias civitates. Romam autem intellegendum est non solum veterem, sed etiam regiam nostram, quae deo propitio cum melioribus condita est auguriis.*

(...) as either the overwhelming number of courts has followed or longstanding practice of This Generous City has approved, in accordance with the writing of Salvius Julian that states that all cities ought to follow the practice of Rome, the head of the world, and not Rome follow other cities. Not only old Rome, though, should be understood, but also Our Royal City, which by the grace of God was founded under better auspices.

In statements such as these, the idea that Constantinople was purposefully founded from the start as a Christian successor of Rome found an eloquent expression, entirely fit to the ideological claims and stakes of (imperial politics in) the Justinianic period.⁷³⁸ This may also explain why the contemporary accounts that existed have not made it down to us on the long run. If their record of Constantine's contemporary motives inconveniently contradicted and undermined later reinterpretations of those

^{736.} Cf. Cameron (1998) 3: 'By the fifth and sixth centuries (...) Constantine himself was firmly established in the Byzantine mind as the saintly Christian founder of the capital (...).'

^{737.} I follow the edition of P. Krüger (ed.), *Corpus Iuris Civilis II* (1914⁹), reprinted in Frier et al. I (2016) 272; the facing translation by Fred H. Blume, edited by John Noël Dillon, is on p. 273.

^{738.} Claiming Christian foundation seems even to have gone out of control around this time. There was something of a boom in church-building under Justinian, apparently motivated by the strong desire on the part of private donors to be able to present themselves as *κτίσται*, against which the emperor found it necessary to regulate in 538: *Nov. 67.2* (Schoell and Kroll (1963⁸) 344, unpublished translation by Fred H. Blume at http://www.uwy.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/_files/docs/novel61-80/novel61-80.htm [accessed 27-01-2021, 14:10]), e.g. ὁνόματος δὲ ἵσως ἐπιθυμῶν τοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς κτίστης ἐκκλησίας καλεῖσθαι ("but perchance want to do this so as to make a name for himself, and that he may be called the founder of the church", l. 13-15), οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται αὐτῷ καὶ ἵεροι οἴκου κτίστην κληθῆναι ("in this way it will come about that he may be called the founder of a holy house", l. 24-25). See Jäggi (2002-2003) 36.

same motives, there was no circumstantial reason to allocate the means necessary to preserve them in plentiful copies, leading to their eventual loss.⁷³⁹

4.3. Approach and *status quaestionis*

Apart from addressing these two possible reasons for the absence or presence of source material, it is also important to discuss the interpretive framework applied to the evidence at our disposal. To shed some new light on the much debated nature of Constantinople's foundation, this study will apply an interpretive framework that has hitherto perhaps not been taken into full account: that of ktistic renewal, traditions of city-foundation in general and the contemporary role of Rome's foundation in particular. In that vein, this study will scrutinize the stories that circulated about the foundation of Constantinople in Late Antiquity, and their connection with earlier traditions and narratives of ancient city foundations, as well as Constantinian and subsequent attitudes towards the foundation of Rome. Rome's foundation is of course a very relevant background anyway, because of Constantine's own dealings with the city on the Tiber. That notwithstanding, an analysis of Constantinople's foundation from the perspective of contemporary attitudes to city-foundation and the foundation of Rome is still lacking.⁷⁴⁰ This subject did not receive full-scale comparative treatment in the groundbreaking 2012 collection of essays that was explicitly meant to provide and promote comparative studies on Rome and Constantinople: Grig and Kelly's *Two Romes* (already quoted from above).⁷⁴¹

It is the intention of the present chapter to fill that gap, and to bring in the largely overlooked perspective of Antiquity's ktistic traditions, with regard to both the act of city foundation and the mythologizing tendencies that characterize most ancient accounts. There was both a long tradition of rulers founding cities and a long tradition of narrative accounts of city foundation, and it seems fruitful to bring these to bear also on the foundation of Constantine's new imperial city on the Bosphorus.

^{739.} There were of course intrinsic reasons to do so, evidenced by the fact that some of these works were still available to Photius (see note 730). Antiquity, literary quality and prestige of the author may be among those reasons.

^{740.} Kornemann (1970) 220 discerns a direct line from the foundation of a new Athens by Hadrian to the foundation of (Constantinople as) a new Rome by Constantine, against the historical background of Alexandria, founded by Alexander. Herrin (2007) mentions Hadrianopolis (Adrianople) and Alexandria as comparative foundations; Brandt (1998) 118 refers to Alexander and the Hellenistic kings in a general sense. These are, however, side notes with explanatory rather than interpretive effect.

^{741.} The foundation of Constantinople is treated in a separate paragraph of the volume's introduction (Grig and Kelly (2012) 6-12); their introductory remark that '[s]ome subjects that are not treated specifically in the rest of the book are given slightly more detailed attention here (for example, the foundation of Constantinople)' (*ibid.* 6) reveals their conscious awareness of the *desideratum*. The often overlooked conference volume edited by Elia (2002-2004) likewise contains no explicit treatment of the subject.

It is perhaps surprising that this approach has not yet been taken, given the immense quantity of scholarship devoted to Constantine and Constantinople.⁷⁴² As Grig and Kelly note, however, 'early Constantinople has often been studied by specialists in later Byzantine history looking backwards' – their interest did not reach back to the ktistic traditions of the ancient world.⁷⁴³ Scholars of Late Antiquity, on the other hand, typically see the foundation of Constantinople in its immediate historical context or as a starting point of a new era, looking forward rather than backwards, while the few existing studies on city foundations in Antiquity at large tend to stop before Late Antiquity (the 1983 RAC-lemma being the lonely exception).⁷⁴⁴ Therefore, it is necessary to take a fresh look at the primary sources. First, however, it may be useful to surmise briefly what we know with reasonable certainty about the foundation of Constantinople and the (geo)political context of this momentous event, and what scholarly opinions currently dominate the debate.⁷⁴⁵

When Constantine founded Constantinople, he did not come to the Eastern half of the empire for the first time. Born in Niš to an army general and a local mother, Constantine probably spent his youth at least partially at the court of Diocletian, then Augustus of the East, and his successor Galerius in Nicomedia.⁷⁴⁶ In 306, however, he was in York when and where his father died, the Tetrarchic emperor Constantius (also known as Constantius Chlorus), then Augustus of the West. Young Constantine was acclaimed Emperor by his father's troops and soon grew to be the most important ruler of the West, mainly residing in Augusta Treverorum (modern Trier). Initially allied with Maxentius, who ruled Italy and Africa, Constantine soon moved against him with extraordinary success. In 312, he defeated Maxentius in the famous battle

^{742.} Recent publications on Constantine alone include Van Dam (2007), Stephenson (2009), Barnes (2011), Bardill (2012), Potter (2013); Constantinople and its foundation have been treated by Preger (1901), Bréhier (1915), Lathoud (1924), Gerland (1934), Frolow (1944), Alföldi (1947), Mazzarino (1974), Cracco Rugini (1980), Follieri (1983), Dagron (1984²), Mango (1985) 23–36, Calderone (1993), La Rocca (1993), Carile (1994), Varvounis (1996), Tondo (1999), Ntantalos (2001) 156–161, Bruggisser (2004), Berger (2006) 441–445, Wilkinson (2010), Tycner-Wolicka (2013), Margutti (2014), Angelova (2015), Olbrich (2015), Russo (2018) and Falcasantos (2020) 46–73; cf. Bleckmann (2015) 318 n. 34. The archaeological material is surveyed by Barsanti (1992).

^{743.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 5.

^{744.} Cornell and Speyer (1983).

^{745.} On the momentous nature see e.g. Wes (1967) 9–10, Brandt (1998) 118 and Barnes (2011) 111: '(...) a decision which was to have consequences almost as great as [Constantine's] conversion to Christianity.' Grig and Kelly (2012) 3 describe the adoption of Christianity by (Constantine and) the Roman state and the foundation of Constantinople as 'two of the most profound changes in world history'. The first edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* ended with the foundation of Constantinople as 'the symbolic act which brings to a close the history of the ancient world' (709; cf. Baynes (1939) 697).

^{746.} See e.g. Praxagoras (*apud Photium*), *FGrH* 219, with Lieu and Montserrat (1996) 7–9; Barnes (2011) 196; Van Dam (2018) 8–9.

near the Milvian Bridge. He subsequently took hold of the city of Rome, which Maxentius – as we have seen – had successfully developed into his ideologically charged power base. Nevertheless, Constantine only stayed in Rome for some three months; although he or his agents appropriated Maxentius' celebrations of Rome's foundation, and an orator styled him as a new Romulus, he returned to Trier soon after his victory.

As his alliance with the by then dominant emperor in the East, Licinius, developed into a conflict, culminating in an armed confrontation in 316, he shifted his attention eastward. Constantine operated from places like Serdica and Sirmium, not far from his birthplace, while Licinius was based in Nicomedia. On 18 September 324, a decisive (naval) battle between the two took place at Chrysopolis on the eastern shore of the Bosphorus. It was decided in favor of Constantine, who thereby became sole ruler of the entire Roman Empire. In the wake of this victory Constantine decided to connect his name to a city on the western shore of the Bosphorus, opposite Chrysopolis, just across the narrow strait where the battle had taken place. That city was known as Byzantium.

What exactly happened at the site of Byzantium in late 324 is unclear, but there are many reasons to suppose that there was some connection between Constantine's celebration of his victory and the founding of a city named after himself. The nature of that city-foundation is heavily debated, however, as the quote from Grig and Kelly at the start of this chapter already illustrated. As our main question – did Constantine found Constantinople as a refoundation of Rome? – heavily depends on the nature of the ktistic acts performed by Constantine, it is necessary to tackle this thorny issue first.

The standard textbook version reads that Constantinople was founded in 324 and dedicated in 330, five and a half years later.⁷⁴⁷ The foundation of Constantinople is thus interpreted as a protected process,⁷⁴⁸ starting with the delineation of the future city walls, in 324, and culminating in the inauguration or dedication of the newly

^{747.} E.g. Mango (1991) 508, Dagron (2000) 230-231, Mango (2002) 2, Harris in Venning (2006) xv, Herrin (2007) 5, Mitchell (2007) 312, Stephenson (2009) 191, Bassett (2010) 292, Berger in *DNP Suppl.* XI (2016) 664. Cf. A. Cameron in *CAH XII*², 94, 96, 101, 103; Harries (2012) 121.

^{748.} For a similar discussion in the case of Megalopolis, see Hornblower (1990) 76.

built city, on 11 May 330.⁷⁴⁹ While this may seem a plausible reconstruction from a modern perspective, the problem is that there is no single ancient or Byzantine source mentioning both these dates, nor the fact that the foundation process would have taken nearly six years. As a matter of fact, the textbook version is not to be found in the sources, but represents a tacitly smoothed-out consensus after fierce debates among scholars in the 20th century.⁷⁵⁰

These debates revolved around the problem of harmonizing in a single scheme the staggering array of different dates at which different foundational acts and ceremonies would have taken place, according to different sources. The problem could only be solved by picking whatever seemed to make sense from one source and combining that with something mentioned in another, even if the two sources thus combined stem from completely different periods or contexts. That process is in itself not objectionable, but we should ask ourselves why the sources present such a fragmented, divergent picture of what was surely seen as a very important event. A modern scholarly reconstruction based on sources which heavily contradict each other is implicitly built on the assumption that there was a straightforward course of events, stretching from the first foundation in 324 to the dedication in 330, which subsequently became obfuscated. Our methodological assumption, then, is that this supposed straightforward course of events can and should be reconstructed from this material through careful exegesis.⁷⁵¹

This is a possibility, but there are more likely alternatives to such an unnecessarily complicated reconstruction of events in a kind of 'jigsaw' historiography.⁷⁵² A hint is offered by Clifford Ando's both amusing and illustrative résumé of the situation:

'As we turn to Constantinople and its conceits in the middle of the fifth century, let me begin with a caution. Byzantine historians, travel writers, and theologians

^{749.} Identifications of different phases during this process differ greatly in modern accounts. While Mango (2002) speaks of a foundation in 324 and an inauguration in 330, others eschew pinpointing a precise moment of foundation by speaking of 324 as the beginning of construction (Herrin (2007) 5; Mitchell (2007) 312; Lenski (2016) 63; cf. Harries (2012) 121) and employing vague language ('the foundation dedication was celebrated (...) on May 11, 330', Mitchell (2007) 312). See further below.

^{750.} Cracco Ruggini (1980) 596: '[una] questione estremamente dibattuta, (...) cioè l'articolarsi delle varie fasi della fondazione di Costantinopoli fra il 324 e il 330 d.C.' This range of dates came to replace an earlier consensus, according to which an important first foundational event took place in 326 or 328; see Oberhummer s.v. 'Constantinopolis' in RE IV.1 (1900) 963.

^{751.} For an excellent analysis of scholarly methodologies in a very similar Constantinian case, i.e. the emperor's religious policy, see the review article by Flower (2012), and Barbero (2016) 12-14 on the similar issue of the date of the Lateran basilica.

^{752.} For the term see Flower (2012) 300.

*articulated their claims to preeminence primarily by retelling the foundation narrative of their city. It might be possible on the basis of their accounts to determine, with greater or lesser certainty, what Constantine actually did on 13 November 324 or 11 May 330 or sometime in 328 or 334 or whenever he did whatever it is he did. But that is not our concern here.*⁷⁵³

Contrary to Ando, it is precisely our concern here to determine whether it is possible to reconstruct what Constantine did on these (or other) dates. Ando's cautionary remark already indicates that it is perhaps hard to do so based on the later sources at our disposal. In addition to that, Ando's ironic enumeration of different dates suggests that these might in fact be the product of Byzantine retelling, and that these sources are not the most trustworthy evidence for reconstructing the historical events of Constantine's city-foundation in the 320's AD.

In this chapter, I would therefore like to advance an alternative hypothesis, arguing that the different dates found in the sources do not refer to various stages or episodes in a single ktistic process that can be reconstructed by combining all these sources in one scheme. In fact, the various deeds of Constantine at various moments need not necessarily be constituent parts of one master plan, but might very well constitute different actions independent of one another. It is certainly possible and, as I will argue, far more likely that Constantine's new city on the site of Byzantium was not programmatically founded as a new imperial residence, but rather developed into his privileged palatial city only in the years up to and after 330, after which the history of the city's foundation was rewritten in accordance with the new circumstances.

4.4. A fresh look at the sources: Themistius and 324

A complete treatment of the evidence for all dates mentioned by Ando would be tedious and contribute little to the point I want to make. I will therefore focus on the two most important dates: that of the 'foundation' in 324 and the 'dedication' in 330.

What evidence do we have? The dating of the first foundational acts to 324 depends almost exclusively on a single, literary source: a mid-fourth century oration of Themistius, delivered some 30 years after the events with the obvious goal of praising Constantius II, Constantine's son and successor. Themistius was a philosopher and politician from Asia Minor documented as being active in Constantinople from about AD 345, although he might have studied there before, or even have been born in the

⁷⁵³ Ando (2001) 398. For references for all these dates, see Dagron (1974) 32-33.

city.⁷⁵⁴ As the other possible evidence is all built on it,⁷⁵⁵ the linchpin of the 324 dating is an allusion in Themistius' 4th *Oration*, in the context of a favourable comparison between Constantius II and Alexander the Great (*Orat. IV.58a-b*):⁷⁵⁶

Καὶ ἐπειδὴ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐμνήσθη μικρῷ πρόσθεν ὁ λόγος, τῆς μὲν Ἀλεξάνδρου εὐτυχίας Πέλλα οὐδὲν συναπώνατο ἢ συναπέλαυσεν, ἀλλὰ τοσαύτην γῆν κτησάμενος [ἐν] ἑαυτῷ πλέθρῳ ἐνὶ μείζῳ οὐκ ἐποίησε τὴν πατρίδα, βασιλεῖ δὲ εἰκότως συναυξάνεται πόλις ἡ τῆς βασιλείας ἡλικιῶτις. πυνθάνομαι γάρ ὡς καὶ ἡμφίασεν ὁμοῦ ὁ γεννήτωρ τὸ τε ἀστυ τῷ κύκλῳ καὶ τὸν νιέα τῇ ἀλονργίδι. ὥστε ἐν δίκῃ τριπλασιάσας τὴν ἀρχὴν πολλαπλασιάζει αὐτῆς τὴν ὁμήλικα, οὐ τὸν περίβολον ἔξαγων, ἀλλὰ τῷ κάλλει προσμηχανώμενος, (...)

But to return to Alexander: Pella derived no benefit or advantage from his good fortune and could not rejoice in it, but although he acquired so much land for himself, he did not expand his father city by an acre. Our city, which is equal in age to the emperor's reign, grows with the emperor for good reason. For I have come to know that the father clothed the city with the wall and the son with the purple at the same time. After he has rightfully tripled his reign, he increases the splendor of the city of the same age many times over, not by extending the city wall, but by beautifying the city: (...)

In three different ways, Themistius seems to imply that the foundation of Constantinople by Constantine took place contemporaneously with an event in the life of his addressee, Constantine's son Constantius II. His first statement is a noun-phrase expanding the word πόλις and describing the city (of Constantinople) as ἡ τῆς βασιλείας ἡλικιῶτις. The feminine Greek noun ἡλικιῶτις, derived from the word ἡλικία, 'time of life; age' (*LSJ 1*), can either mean, in a literal sense, 'equal in age; contemporary', or, more generally, 'comrade'. Accordingly, Themistius is saying that Constantinople is either 'equal in age to Constantius' reign' or 'the comrade of his reign'. In theory, both meanings are possible and would certainly make sense.

^{754.} PLRE I (1971) 889, s.v. 'Themistius 1'; Vanderspoel (1995) 27-49; Heather & Moncur (2001) 1; Vanderspoel (2012). See also Brandt (2004), who quotes the passage discussed below on p. 163 of his interesting paper, but does not discuss it in detail.

^{755.} The numismatic argument made by Alföldi (1947) 11 is disputed by Calderone (1993) 729 n. 28, who rightly states that it is based on the very literary material it aims to corroborate.

^{756.} Although this is the standard reference, Berger (2011) 7 n. 1 does not mention Themistius but refers to the 10th century Constantinopolitan *Patria* instead. See further below. The Greek text quoted here is the one edited by Downey and Schenkl (1965), but with the deletion of ἐν now advocated by Pascale (2022) 194.

Themistius' subsequent statement, however, has understandably led interpreters to opt for the first option.⁷⁵⁷ His second statement is slightly more elaborate and artfully connects Constantine's 'encircling' of Constantinople with walls to his 'clothing' of Constantius II with the purple (*καὶ ἡμφίασεν ὁμοῦ ὁ γεννήτωρ τό τε ἀστυ τῷ κύκλῳ καὶ τὸν νιέα τῇ ἀλουργίδι*). The adverb *ὁμοῦ* expresses contemporaneity, it seems, although it could also, more generally, mean 'together', i.e. 'in the same place'. In order to couple the two actions in a synchronism, Themistius creates a striking zeugma by using *ἀμφιάζειν* both for the city, which is 'clothed' with a *κύκλος*, i.e. encircled by the wall (*LSJ* s.v. *κύκλος*, II.6) around the city, and for Constantine's son, who is 'clothed' with the purple, i.e. dressed in the imperial, purple robes. Although, in theory, the sentence could also mean 'the father, in one place, clothed the city with a circuit and his son with the purple' (i.e. that Constantius was elevated to an imperial position at Constantinople),⁷⁵⁸ it is universally taken to mean that both events took place at the same time.⁷⁵⁹ That interpretation is confirmed by a third statement of Themistius, according to which the emperor will 'multiply the [city] equal in age to his rule, not by further carrying outwards the wall [of the city], but by further providing [the city] with beauty' (*πολλαπλασιάζει αὐτῆς τὴν ὄμηλικα, οὐ τὸν περίβολον ἔξαγων, ἀλλὰ τῷ κάλλει προσμηχανώμενος*). The city, it seems, as intended object, is again described as co-etaneous with the rule of Constantius.⁷⁶⁰ Also, the statement that he will not extend the circuit of the city walls implies that this was what Themistius meant by *κύκλος*, before.⁷⁶¹ All in all, although his language is somewhat ambiguous, Themistius seems to make his point quite clear: the imperial elevation of Constantius II coincided with the building of Constantinople's city walls by Constantine, and thus with the 'birthday' of the city, making Constantius' *βασιλεία* and *ἀρχή* of the same

^{757.} Leppin & Portmann (1998) 94 translate 'die ebenso alt ist wie die Herrschaft des Kaisers', Maisano (1995) 253 'ch'è nata insieme all'impero', Desideri (2002) 173 'ch'è nata insieme all'imperatore', Pascale (2022) 80 'coetanea del regno', Ballériaux & Schamp (2022) 146 'la ville qui a le même âge que l'empereur'. See Heather & Moncur (2001) 96 n. 151 and Vanderspoel (2012) 228 n. 21.

^{758.} As is in fact assumed by Lenski (2016) 63.

^{759.} Leppin & Portmann (1998) 94 ('Mir ist nämlich bekannt, daß der Vater gleichzeitig die Stadt mit einer Mauer und den Sohn mit dem Purpur umgeben hat'); Maisano (1995) 253 ('Io so infatti che il padre avvolse nello stesso tempo la città nella cerchia di mura e il figlio nella porpora'); Pascale (2022) 80 ('apprendo infatti che il genitore rivestì contemporaneamente la città col cerchio delle mura e il figlio con la porpora'); Ballériaux & Schamp (2022) 146 'Car j'apprends que leur père a, en même temps, revêtu la ville d'un cercle de rempart et son fils de la pourpre').

^{760.} Leppin & Portmann (1998) 94 ('die Pracht der gleichaltrigen Stadt'); Maisano (1995) 253 ('alla capitale che di questa autorità è coetanea'); Vanderspoel (1995) 79 ('which is of the same age as his imperial power'); Pascale (2022) 80 ('lei che gli è coetanea'); Ballériaux & Schamp (2022) 146 '<la ville> sa contemporaine'.

^{761.} This is not the occasion to address the fascinating remark in *Jul., Orat. I.33.17-22* (41a), according to which Constantius II would have completed an earlier city wall. The remarks comes right after Constantius is presented as a second founder of Antioch, in a clear case of ktistic renewal. See also Amm. Marc., XVIII.19.1, Theoph. Conf., A.M. 5838, with Henck (2001) 302-303, and Desideri (2002) 195 on an allusion to Themistoclean Athens.

age as Constantinople. Since we happen to know when the imperial elevation of Constantius II took place, that would give us the date of Constantinople's foundation.

This is how Timothy Barnes interprets the passage in his sweeping 2011 biography of Constantine:⁷⁶²

'Praising Constantius thirty years later Themistius reveals the care with which Constantine chose the date for the ceremony [of Constantinople's foundation]. The emperor linked it with the proclamation of his third son as Caesar on 8 November 324. The dies imperii of Constantius is well attested (Descriptio consulum 324.3, cf. Barnes 1982: 8), but it is only Themistius who synchronizes his investiture as Caesar with the foundation of the new city. He states that Constantius' reign is exactly the same age as the city because on the same occasion 'his father clad the town with its circuit and his son with the purple' (...).'

Barnes' statement that *only* Themistius synchronizes Constantius' investiture as Caesar with the foundation of Constantinople is something of an understatement. Barnes clearly considers Constantine's ktistic acts on 8 November 324 as a given, and emphasizes the fact that only Themistius synchronizes them with Constantius' investiture as Caesar. Another conclusion is more alarming: it is *only* Themistius who provides any evidence at all for the foundation of Constantinople on 8 November 324, and this allusion is our best evidence for any date in the year 324.⁷⁶³ All of our chronological year-by-year sources that should have included such an important event do not mention it. All in all, the evidence for a full-blown city foundation in 324 is meagre at most.⁷⁶⁴ Given the presumed importance of Constantine's ktistic act, one

^{762.} Barnes (2011) 111.

^{763.} The date 13 November, as in Ando (2001) 398, quoted above, is based on an inscription from Amiternum: see Alföldi (1947) 11 n. 9. Berger (2011) 7 n. 1 speaks of 26 November as the date when building in newly founded Constantinople first began in 324, a date – he states – found (only) in the 10th century *Patria of Constantinople* (=Pseudo-Codinus), for which see Dagron (1974) 33 n. 6 (with 14 n.2). Dagron (1974) 33 n. 6, and Preger (1901) 338–340, however, interpret this date as belonging to the year 328 in the *Patria*, not 324.

^{764.} On the possibility that a later passage in the *Patria* would refer to 323, see Dagron (1974) 33 n. 6. The other sources known to me to mention a roughly equivalent year (not mentioned by Barnes) are the church history of Eusebius' main continuator, the fifth century Socrates Scholasticus (I.16.1) and Theophanes' *Chronographia* (s.a. 5821, p. 22–23 de Boor), an early ninth century work, which I haven't yet been able to study in depth. Their dating, however, seems to verge towards 325/326: see Cracco Ruggini (1980) 604 n. 32, Dagron (1974) 32 and Preger (1901) 340–341. In 1900, Oberhammer's *RE* lemma mentions 26 September, 4 November and 26 November in the year 326 or 328 as dates of the first foundation, based on Byzantine sources. In fact, the year 324 only appears in mainstream scholarship fairly recently: Herm (1968) 117 still states that the city was founded on 26 November 326.

may wonder why. In theory, three explanations could be offered for there being no other direct evidence for the foundation in 324:

- A. Themistius is either accidentally wrong or deliberately lying.⁷⁶⁵ The foundation of Constantinople did not occur in 324, simultaneously with Constantius' proclamation as Caesar,⁷⁶⁶ to which it is coupled mainly for reasons of flattery or rhetorical effect.
- B. Themistius' allusion to Constantius' assumption of the purple and the start of his reign is wrongly considered to be referring to 324 and him becoming Caesar on 8 November of that year (or the date for the latter, preserved in the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Barnes' *Descriptio consulum*), is wrong or corrupt).⁷⁶⁷ Themistius is correct, and both events occurred simultaneously, but the foundation of Constantinople did not occur in 324.
- C. There was indeed an act of city foundation on 8 November 324, but Themistius is the only source to mention this – in a highly suitable rhetorical context – because it suits him all too well to do so, although the importance of this event was completely outdone by subsequent developments culminating in the dedication ceremony of 11 May 330.

Any solution should, first of all, consider the overtly rhetorical and panegyrical context in which the remark about Constantinople's foundation was made.⁷⁶⁸ One intention of the speech was to praise Constantius, perhaps on the occasion of his

^{765.} For blatantly lying panegyricists, see e.g. Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 297 n. 30.

^{766.} Or one should allow for an approximative rather than precise synchronism: Calderone (1993) 729 n. 28 ('lascia (...) un certo margine di approssimazione (...)'), che può includere parte del primo anno dell'*imperium* cesareo di Costanzo II', following Cracco Ruggini (1980) 605 and Preger (1901) 341, and now also Pascale (2022) 195 ('un'alusione generica all'anno (...), non necessariamente da riferire al giorno preciso').

^{767.} The *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, put together by a Spanish compiler in the late fifth or early sixth century, contain numerous palpable errors (e.g. the death of Cicero is included twice, both for 43 and 34 BC (Burgess (1993) 176)) and is a pretty ramshackle combination of data from very different and disparate sources, increasing the risk of errors. For one thing, the entry for 324 records the name *Constantinus*, not Constantius. The information for the year 324, moreover, seems to stem from a Western, more specifically a Gallic context, largely unaware of affairs in the East (*ibid.* 192-196). See further Kienast (1996²) 314 = (2017⁶) 300. The year 324 seems warranted, however, by the fact that Constantius celebrated his 30th year as emperor in 353 (Amm. Marc. XIV.5.1, with Van Dam (2007) 64). Also the early seventh century *Chronicon Paschale* (see below) mentions 8 November as an imperial proclamation, although wrongly ascribing to it Constans' proclamation as Augustus, and (wrongly) dating it to 325; Kienast (1990) 300 = (2017⁶) 291 hypothesizes 8 November 324 may have been the date for Helena's promotion to Augusta.

^{768.} Calderone (1993) 729 n. 28 ('con evidente auxesis retorica').

consular inauguration, on 1 January 357 in Milan.⁷⁶⁹ Clearly, Themistius is seeking to aggrandize Constantius' youthful investiture as Caesar, three decades before, by pairing it with the foundation of Constantine's new city. Both are connected by the deliberate intention of Constantius' divine father to have the two events occur simultaneously (όμοῦ). Barnes ascribes that connection to Constantine's care, but it may have been Constantius, rather than Constantine, who coupled the start of his own reign to the establishment of Constantinople. Emperors freely manipulated their anniversary dates to suit their contemporary needs for festivities or display.⁷⁷⁰ That would explain why Themistius elaborates on his initial statement that the city was 'contemporary' with Constantius' reign by the noticeable formula πνυθάνομαι γὰρ ώς ('For I have come to know that ...'), an expression hinting at hearsay.⁷⁷¹ He invokes a source that is left implicit: a likely source for this story, then, might be the circle of the emperor himself. The remark would then be Themistius' insider's nod to imperial ideology. Alternatively, Themistius may have come up with the idea himself, but does not want to present it as his own finding.

Of course, Themistius might also have elaborated imperial ideology in his own creative way. In his contemporary *Oration III*, also praising Constantius, Themistius was led to flatter Constantius in such a way that he repeatedly (40c, 47b, perhaps 43b) hints at Constantius being the true founder of Constantinople, rather than his father – a striking case of ktistic renewal.⁷⁷² Also the scheme of presenting two things as 'contemporary' was used by Themistius more often. At the end of his first oration held before the emperor (*Or. I.18a*), he described his speech as a gift by 'philosophy your contemporary' (παρὰ φιλοσοφίας ἡλικιώτιδος). What Themistius exactly meant by that is a matter of debate,⁷⁷³ but its aim is quite clearly to couple himself, as guardian of philosophy, to the emperor, as addressee, through some kind of synchronism. In both cases, vicinity in age is taken to imply an intimate connection in other respects. In *Oration I*, Themistius had to secure the emperor's favour and used audacious means to do so,⁷⁷⁴ among which his remark in §18a may be counted. In *Oration IV*, Themistius had to address the Constantinopolitan senate while Constantius' celebrated his consular inauguration in Milan, or represent that senate at the ceremony in Milan itself. Another intention of the speech could have been

^{769.} See Vanderspoel (1995) 96 n. 114 and Leppin & Portmann (1998) 80-83 for the different opinions on dating and location.

^{770.} Heather & Moncur (2001) 119 n. 223.

^{771.} See note 759, above.

^{772.} See also note 761, above. On Themistius' treatment of history in his orations, in general, see Portmann (1988) 133-138, 149-153 (on *Orat. III & IV*), 157-195; Desideri (2002) 169-171.

^{773.} Heather & Moncur (2001) 96 n. 151.

^{774.} *Ibid.* 74-75.

to safeguard Constantinople's status and privileges and to maintain the emperor's attention for pressing matters in the city.⁷⁷⁵ Thus, the orator would certainly have had his reasons to stress any connections he could come up with between the current emperor and the city founded by his father.

Constantius II, in fact, after burying Constantine there in 337, hardly ever stayed in Constantinople, thus endangering the privileges it was Themistius' job to protect.⁷⁷⁶ From 352/353, in particular, Constantius had continuously been in the West. Themistius, consequently, had a clear reason to mention the foundational act of Constantine in conjunction with Constantius becoming invested with the purple, reminding the son of his father's ktistic intentions. In the alternative view taken by Heather and Moncur, Themistius addressed the Western senators as the Constantinopolitan mouthpiece of an emperor planning to award the senate in Constantinople equal status to that of Rome.⁷⁷⁷ Also in that case, seeking to preemptively disarm Western criticism of such a promotion, it was important to stress any connection between the foundation of Constantinople and the powerful figure of the reigning emperor.

On first view, it is clear that there are many reasons why Themistius may have written what he wrote with other motives in mind than historical accuracy. Based, as it is, only on an allusion by a single author, the secure dating of Constantinople's first foundation in late 324 has little to recommend itself in terms of solid evidence. On top of that, our source for Constantius' contemporaneous investiture as Caesar, the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Barnes' *Descriptio consulum*), does not record a city foundation in 324 next to Constantius' elevation. Admittedly, its information was put together long after the dedication of Constantinople in 330 (which is recorded in the *Consularia*), when, perhaps, the foundational acts of 324 had become obsolete, whereas Constantius' elevation, of course, had not.

We must now proceed by reviewing the chronological evidence for the other date, 11 May 330, and for the years between 324 and 330.

^{775.} Vanderspoel (1995) 103. Heather & Moncur (2001) 121-124 are skeptical and rather assume a premeditated, publicizing effort in close collaboration with Constantius. See also Wintjes (2003) and Balleriaux & Schamp (2022) 124-125.

^{776.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 13; Vanderspoel (1995) 55, 100; this pattern continued during the reign of Valens.

^{777.} Heather & Moncur (2001) 122-124; Vanderspoel (1995) 55. On Constantius' II taking issue with the Constantinopolitan Senate, see Dillon (2015) 56.

4.5. The years 328/330 in the sources: the *Chronicon Paschale*

What evidence do we have for the 'dedication' of Constantinople in 330? The date seems to be confirmed beyond reasonable doubt by an entry in Jerome's fourth century continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicon*.⁷⁷⁸ Jerome's *Chronicle* records for the year 330: *dedicatur Constantinopolis omnium paene urbium nuditate* ('Constantinople is dedicated by denuding almost all the other cities [i.e. of sculptures and precious objects]').⁷⁷⁹ While the passage is mostly famous for its sneering commentary on Constantine's spoliation of other cities and their works of art to the benefit of his new foundation, it actually is our earliest secure reference that specifically dates a ktistic act unambiguously to a precise year.⁷⁸⁰ Like the later *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (just mentioned above), however, Jerome's *Chronicle* does not record an act of city foundation in or around 324 (or, for that matter, in the same year as Constantius' inauguration as Caesar, which it does record).⁷⁸¹ Even though the year 330 is securely attested, these chronographical sources provide little information on what exactly happened in that year. For a narrative account of events, we have to turn to another important source for the date(s) of the foundation of Constantinople, and in fact one of the few sources to mention different dates:⁷⁸² the early seventh century collection of chronographical material known as the *Chronicon Paschale*. Moreover, the *Chronicon Paschale* is the oldest source adduced that allegedly testifies to a distinction between (and chronological development encompassing) the different phases of the foundation of Constantinople.⁷⁸³ For these reasons, and as an excellent example of the type of source on which modern, 'jigsaw'-reconstructions lean so heavily, we must pause at this source a little longer and look at it more closely. In doing so, we will privilege this text over other, roughly contemporary accounts like those of the Antiochene chronographer John Malalas and Hesychius Illustrius of Miletus, but we will return to them briefly below.⁷⁸⁴

The *Chronicon Paschale*'s anonymous compiler put together 'an amalgam of Old and New Testament, Jewish, Christian, and secular material in a mixture that reflects

^{778.} For this source, see briefly Vessey (2010) 268-269.

^{779.} P. 232, lines 24-25 Helm.

^{780.} Cf. *Chronica Gallica* III (ed. Mommsen, *MGH, Chron. Min.* I (1892)) 643.

^{781.} P. 231, lines 2-4 Helm (under the year 323, together with the death of Licinius).

^{782.} For (the possibility of more than) two different dates in Pseudo-Codinus' *Patria of Constantinople*, see Dagron (1974) 33 n. 6. For the possibility of two different dates in Hesychius of Miletus, see Calderone (1993) 736 n. 59. Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 22-23 and 28 de Boor) mentions a (initial) foundation in 325/6 and massive building work later on, incorrectly pinned down to 328 by Cracco Ruggini (1980) 604 n. 32. See also note 763, and further Cracco Ruggini (1980) 600 n. 22.

^{783.} Cracco Ruggini (1980) 600 n. 22.

^{784.} For Malalas, see also Gnoli (2004) 213-214, Cabouret (2006) and Puech (2018) 324-331.

the interests and knowledge of the (...) author',⁷⁸⁵ arranged under yearly headings featuring a variety of dating mechanisms (consular dates, regnal years of emperors, indictions, Olympiads, etc.).⁷⁸⁶ The compiler's interest was probably sparked by the apocalyptic ideas current in and after the crisis through which the Byzantine empire lived in the reign of Heraclius.⁷⁸⁷ Perhaps unhampered by too much historiographical scrutiny, the compiler amassed a considerable amount of disparate material from obviously different sources. The resulting jumble thus contains much potentially valuable material, but should be used with the necessary caution. Contrary to its purpose as a chronological work, especially the *Chronicon Paschale*'s dating of events is, paradoxically enough, often mistaken. It antedates Constantine's proclamation in York to 304 instead of 306,⁷⁸⁸ and his victory over Maxentius at the 'Muluvian Bridge' accordingly to 310 (although it correctly records that Maxentius was proclaimed 306 and reigned for six years). It wrongly dates the proclamations as Caesar of Constantine II (316 instead of 317), Constans (317 instead of 333) and Constantius II (317 instead of, as we saw, 324), as well as the proclamation as Augustus of Constans, which took place in 337, not, as the *Chronicon Paschale* records, both in 325 and in 335. Also, it frequently mixes up consulships and names on which datings are based.⁷⁸⁹ These examples suffice to make clear that the chronology in the *Chronicon Paschale* suffers from considerable confusion, and that whoever compiled or copied it was not too troubled by rather obvious mistakes, internal discrepancies and contradictions.

Unsurprisingly, then, the *Chronicon Paschale* provides at least two, probably three, and possibly four different dates for the foundation of Constantinople.⁷⁹⁰ Tellingly, however, 324 is not one of them.⁷⁹¹ The *Chronicon* mentions no city foundation in the wake of the victory over Licinius, treated under the years 324 and 325. It does, however, mention an imperial proclamation on 8 November in the entry for 325 (p. 525 line 10 Dindorf), although it wrongly ascribes to that date Constans' proclamation

^{785.} Whitby and Whitby (1989) p. ix. For the development of Christian thinking about history and chronology, see Inglebert (2001) 289–391, as well as 463–548 on Christian universal histories in general and 531–533 on the *Chronicon Paschale* in particular.

^{786.} See Whitby and Whitby (1989) p. ix–x. The AD dates found in modern translations are obviously modern additions.

^{787.} See *ibid.*, p. xii; cf. Viermann (2021) 246–247, with 11–12 on the *Chronicon Paschale*.

^{788.} See Whitby and Whitby (1989) 7.

^{789.} See *ibid.* 236 (Index s.v. 'Errors').

^{790.} Two of them (328 and 326) are discussed briefly by Dagron (1974) 32–33; for the others, see below.

^{791.} The entry of the year 360 (p. 544 lines 14–15 Dindorf) might contain a reference to a city foundation in 324 (according to Cracco Ruggini (1980) 604 n. 33), in 326 (according to Dagron (1974) 33), or in 328 (according to Dagron (1974) 398; cf. Cracco Ruggini (1980) 604 n. 33; Whitby and Whitby (1989) 35 n. 110.). I believe, however, that the phrase θεμελίους κατεβάλετο is more likely to refer to the foundations of a church rather than those of a city, which would also fit the narrative context better.

as Augustus (rather than Constantius II's elevation as Caesar), and wrongly dates it to (the consuls of) 325.⁷⁹² Accordingly, the *Chronicon Paschale* seems to have had access to the (same source as the) *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, mentioning one of Constantine's sons' elevation as Caesar, but not the foundation of Constantinople in the year 324 (or thereabouts). Since it is hard to believe that the *Chronicon* did use the *Consularia* as its source but mixed up both the name and year contained therein, it is more likely that both took their information from a common, third source, in which the year was less clearly indicated (e.g. by indiction rather than consuls) and/or the proclaimed Caesar was more loosely identified as one of Constantine's sons.⁷⁹³ That third source did not mention the foundation of Constantinople either, because otherwise the data-hungry *Chronicon* would surely have mentioned it.⁷⁹⁴ Also, the *Chronicon* amassed under one heading for 325 information that belongs to that year, the year before and the year after, creating a medley where the imperial proclamation on 8 November (in 324) could be mentioned in one breath with the celebration of Constantine's *vicennalia* in Rome (in 326).⁷⁹⁵ That is probably due to the fact that the entry triumphantly focuses on Constantine's Christian deeds, most notably his hosting of the Council of Nicaea, and absorbed all kinds of information to aggrandize the importance of the year. A foundation of Constantinople would surely have suited its purpose, but is nevertheless lacking.

The 325 entry ends with an elaborate chronological clausula counting the years up to the 20th anniversary of Constantine's rule ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, 'from the foundation of the world' (p. 526 line 5 Dindorf). In this setting, a foundation of Constantinople around 325 would have made for an appropriate cyclical ending. The passage calibrates biblical/Hebrew with classical/Greco-Roman chronology and is likely taken from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* and *Chronicon*, the final revised editions of which both terminated in Constantine's 20th year (325/6).⁷⁹⁶ Also the Eusebian works do not mention a foundation of Constantinople around 325. Like the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, the *Chronicon Paschale* may have considered the foundational acts of 324 obsolete; more likely, also for Eusebius' works from 325/6, they weren't

^{792.} Since the 13th indiction, in which 8 November 324 falls, largely occupied the (consular) year 325, the error is easily explained.

^{793.} Whitby and Whitby (1989) 13 n. 43 imply the contrary. Since the *Chronicon* transliterated the Latin word 'βικεννάλια' (p. 525 line 12 Dindorf; cf. 'τριακονταετηρίς', p. 531 line 14 Dindorf), this was probably a Latin(izing) source. Note that also the *Consularia* mixed up the name or identified the son wrongly (see note 767).

^{794.} We can thus exclude the possibility that the concise *Consularia Constantinopolitana* did not record a city foundation in 324 next to Constantius' elevation merely for reasons of brevity.

^{795.} Likewise, the entry subsequently mentions the death of Crispus (in 326) right after the victory at Chrysopolis (in 324).

^{796.} Van Dam (2007) 283, with further references; Whitby and Whitby (1989) 14 n. 48.

considered a fitting enough Christian event to be worthy of record. For the same reason, probably, the foundation of Rome is not part of the chronological calculus in the *Chronicon Paschale*, although it was widely considered an epochal historical event and provided the base for at least one popular chronological reckoning in the Roman Empire.

Conspicuous by its absence 324, the foundation of Constantinople is, however, amply described in the remainder of the *Chronicon Paschale*. The first full account falls under the heading for 328:⁷⁹⁷

σοζ' Ὄλυμπιάς.

Ἴνδ. α'. κγ'. ὑπ. Ἰανουαρίου καὶ Ἰούστου. (15)

Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβῆς τὸν Δανοῦβιν πλειστάκις ἐπέρασεν, καὶ γέφυραν αὐτῷ λιθίνην ἐποίησεν.

Ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων ὑπάτων Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ ἀοιδικος βασιλεὺς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἐλθών, καὶ διάγων ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ, μητρόπολει τῆς Βιθυνίας, ποιήσας πρόκεσσα ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἐν τῷ (20) (528.) Βυζαντίῳ, ἀνενέωσε τὸ πρῶτον τεῖχος τῆς Βύζου πόλεως, ποιήσας καὶ προσθήκας τῷ αὐτῷ τείχει οὐκ ὀλίγας, καὶ συνῆψεν τῷ παλαιῷ τείχει τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν, ἀναπληρώσας καὶ τὸ Ἰππικόν, κοσμήσας αὐτὸν χαλκουργήμασι καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ, ποιήσας ἐν αὐτῷ κάθισμα θεωρίου βασιλικοῦ καθ' ὅμοιότητα τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ὄντος. (...) ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς

Κωνσταντῖνος ἀφελών

κρυπτῶς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης τὸ λεγόμενον Παλλάδιον ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτισθέντι φόρῳ ὑποκάτω τοῦ κίονος τῆς στήλης αὐτοῦ, (15) ὡς τινες λέγοντες τῶν Βυζαντίων ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀκούσαντες. τὴν δὲ τύχην τῆς πόλεως τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνανεωθείσης ποιήσας θυσίαν ἀναίμακτον ἐκάλεσεν Ἀνθοῦσαν.

Olympiad 277

328 Indiction 1, year 23, consulship of Januarius and Justus.

Constantine the Pious crossed the Danube very many times, and made a bridge for it in stone.

In the time of the aforementioned consuls, Constantine the celebrated emperor departed from Rome and, while staying at Nicomedia metropolis of Bithynia, made visitations for a long time

^{797.} Text by Dindorf (1832) p. 527 line 14 - p. 528 line 6; p. 528 lines 13-18; translation by Whitby and Whitby (1989) 15-16.

to Byzantium. He renewed the first wall of the city of Byzas, and after making considerable extensions also to the same wall he joined them to the ancient wall of the city and named it Constantinople; he also completed the Hippodrome, adorning it with works in bronze and with every excellence, and made in it a box for imperial viewing in likeness of the one which is in Rome. (...) The same emperor Constantine secretly took away from Rome the Palladium, as it is called, and placed it in the Forum built by him, beneath the column of his monument, as certain of the Byzantines say who have heard it by tradition. And after making bloodless sacrifice, he named the Tyche of the city renewed by him Anthusa.

The second full account follows almost immediately afterwards (separated from the first only by a dateline for the year 329, in which no events are recorded):⁷⁹⁸

Ίνδ. γ'. κε'. ὑπ. Γαλλικανοῦ καὶ Συμμάχου. (10)
 Ἐτους τα' τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κε'
 τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας Κωνσταντίνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος, πατὴρ Κων-
 σταντίνου' νέου Αὐγούστου καὶ Κωνσταντίου καὶ Κώνσταντος
 Καισάρων, πόλιν μεγίστην, λαμπράν, καὶ εὐδαιμονα κτίσας,
 συγχλήτῳ τε τιμήσας, Κωνσταντινούπολιν κέκληκε πρὸ πέντε (15)
 ιδῶν μαῖων, ἡμέρᾳ δευτέρᾳ τῆς ἐβδομάδος, ἵνδικτιῶνος τρίτης,
 τὸ πρότερον καλουμένην Βυζάντιον, Ῥώμην αὐτὴν δευτέραν χρη-
 ματίζειν ἀναγορεύσας, ἐπιτελέσας ἵππικὸν ἀγῶνα πρώτος, φορέ-
 σας πρώτοις διάδημα διὰ μαργαριτῶν καὶ ἐτέρων τιμίων λιθῶν.
 καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑορτὴν μεγάλην, κελεύσας διὰ θείου αὐτοῦ τύπου (20)
 τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὸ γενέθλιον τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ καὶ
 ἀνοίγειν τῇ ια' τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀρτεμισίου μηνὸς τὸ δημόσιον λουτρὸν
 (530.) Ζεύξιππον, πλησίον ὅντα τοῦ Ἰππικοῦ καὶ τῆς Ῥηγίας τοῦ παλατίου,
 ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ ἄλλην στήλην ἀπὸ ξοάνου κεχρυσωμένην βαστά-
 ζουσαν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ τύχην τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, καὶ αὐτὴν κε-
 χρυσωμένην, κελεύσας κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ γενεθλιακοῦ
 ἵππικοῦ εἰσιέναι τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ ξοάνου στήλην διριγενομένην ὑπὸ (5)
 τῶν στρατευμάτων μετὰ χλανιδίων καὶ καμπαγίων, πάντων κα-
 τεχόντων κηροὺς λευκούς, καὶ περιέρχεσθαι τὸ ὅχημα τὸν ἄνω
 καμπτόν, καὶ ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ σκάμμα κατέναντι τοῦ βασιλικοῦ
 καθίσματος, καὶ ἐπεγείρεσθαι τὸν κατὰ καιρὸν βασιλέα καὶ
 προσκυνεῖν τὴν στήλην τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Κωνσταντίου καὶ (10)

^{798.} P. 529 line 10 - p. 530 line 21 Dindorf; translation by Whitby and Whitby (1989) 17-19.

αὐτῆς τῆς τύχης τῆς πόλεως.

Ο αὐτὸς θειότατος βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντίνος ἔμεινεν βασι-
λεύων ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει, ἀφελόμενος αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρ-
χίας Εὐρώπης, ἥγουν τῆς μητροπόλεως αὐτῆς Ἡρακλείας, προ-
βαλόμενος τῇ αὐτῇ Κωνσταντινούπολει ἐπαρχον πραιτωρίων καὶ (15)
ἐπαρχον πόλεως καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς μεγάλους ἀρχοντας.

Εἰσὶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως Ρώμης ἔως οὗ Κωνσταντινούπολις ἐνε-
καινίσθη ἔτη ἀπ'.

Τούτω τῷ ἔτει Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐτε-
λεύτησεν πρὸιδ' καλανδῶν μαῖων, φαρμουθὶ κβ', καὶ ἐχειροτο- (20)
νῆθη ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀθανάσιος ὁ μέγας πατήρ.

330 Indiction 3, year 25, consulship of Gallicanus and Symmachus.

In year 301 from the Ascension to heaven of the Lord and year 25 of his reign, **Constantine the most pious**, father of Constantine II Augustus and of Constantius and Constans Caesars, **after building a very great, illustrious, and blessed city**, and honouring it with a senate, **named it Constantinople, on day five before the Ides of May [11 May], on the second day of the week, in the third indiction, and he proclaimed that the city, formerly named Byzantium, be called second Rome**. He was first to celebrate a chariot-racing content, wearing for the first time a diadem of pearls and other precious stones. And he made a great festival, and commanded by his sacred decree that the anniversary of his city be celebrated on the same day, and that on the 11th of the same month Artemisius [May] the public bath Zeuxippon be opened, which was near the Hippodrome and the Regia of the Palace. He made for himself another gilded monument of wood, bearing in its right hand a Tyche of the same city, itself also gilded, and commanded that on the same day of the anniversary chariot races, the same monument of wood should enter, escorted by the troops in mantles and slippers, all holding white candles; the carriage should proceed around the further turning-post and come to the arena opposite the imperial box; and the emperor of the day should rise and do obeisance to the monument of the same emperor Constantine and this Tyche of the city.

The same most sacred emperor Constantine continued as emperor in Constantinople; he separated it from the province of Europe, that is from its metropolis Heracleia, and appointed for the same Constantinople a praetorian prefect and city prefect and the other major officials.

There are from the foundation of Rome until Constantinople was inaugurated 1,080 years.

In this year Alexander bishop of Alexandria died on day 14 of before Kalends of May [18 April] on Pharmuthi 22, and Athanasius the great father was elected bishop in his place.

While the two accounts can be read as complementary to some extent, it seems that they are not intended as a description of (two phases of) a single, protracted process. The double, but similarly phrased reference to Constantine naming the city Constantinople (*καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν*, p. 528 lines 3-4 Dindorf; *Κωνσταντινούπολιν κέκληκε*, p. 529 line 15 Dindorf) is only one reason why such an interpretation is problematic. It is highly unlikely that the two accounts deliberately narrate different phases of the same ktistic act, spread out over the years 328 and 330. Moreover, we seem to have a clear case meriting Clifford Ando's caution, quoted above, that 'Byzantine historians, travel writers, and theologians articulated their claims to preeminence primarily by retelling the foundation narrative of their city'.⁷⁹⁹ As a matter of fact, why is the foundation of Constantinople described twice, and what do these two accounts tell us?

Preger came up with a philological solution and sees the 328 account as deriving from Malalas' description of events in 330, where it was followed by other information that forms the basis of the *Chronicon Paschale*'s 330 account. The compiler would have split his source material from Malalas over two different headings, Preger argues, based on a presumable 328 entry in the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, now lost.⁸⁰⁰ Rather than postulating a lost entry in an otherwise completely transmitted work, other reasons may be considered to account for the differences between the two entries. The differences in contents can more cogently be explained by a difference in emphasis, which probably evidences a different (ultimate) origin for both accounts (perhaps the same sources from which Malalas took and then combined them).⁸⁰¹

The 328 account starts as a story with a protracted time scale, starting in fact with the emperor's departure from Rome (in 315? Or 326?), proceeding with long visitations from Nicomedia, and only arriving at the act that completes the foundation (naming the rebuilt city Constantinople) after intermediate building work on the ancient

⁷⁹⁹. See p. 192, above.

⁸⁰⁰. Preger (1901) 338.

⁸⁰¹. That explains why the account in the *Chronicon Paschale* contains some details absent from Malalas that are unlikely to have been invented by the seventh century compiler, such as the role of Nicomedia as Constantine's initial base. Whitby and Whitby (1989) 18 n. 56 also suppose a different source for the first sentence of the 330 account, not in Malalas.

walls of Byzantium. Moreover, there is a repeated emphasis on Rome throughout the description of events and newly built monuments. Constantine departed from Rome to begin with, made a box in the hippodrome ‘in likeness of the one which is in Rome’ and ‘secretly took away from Rome the Palladium’. This account thus shows an evident interest in the new city’s connection with the old capital, and possibly originates from an author, an era or an environment that had a particular interest in the Roman background of Constantinople. As the mention of ‘certain of the Byzantines (...) who have heard it by tradition’ indicates, the era is somewhat removed from the time of Constantinople’s foundation, and perhaps coincides with the surge of antiquarian interest in the sixth century.⁸⁰² This would also explain typical antiquarian information like the name of Byzas, Byzantium’s original Greek founder (about whom Malalas says a fair bit more).⁸⁰³

The 330 account, on the contrary, provides a largely synoptic description revolving around 11 May and the ceremonies attached to it. It focuses on festivals, ritual objects and rituals rather than static buildings and monuments. The building of the city is relegated to a subordinate clause, while great attention is devoted to chronology in giving the date of the foundational act (naming the city Constantinople) with calendrical precision. This sentence is not in Malalas. The emphasis is decidedly on aspects that would come to play a role in later Constantinopolitan history. The elaborately described recurring celebration of 11 May, as commanded by the founder himself, shows how Constantine would have set the example for later emperors by celebrating the festivities for the first time. Constantine’s appointment of magistrates is wholly anachronistic: the first city prefect would be appointed only in 359.⁸⁰⁴ So is the proclamation of Byzantium as ‘Second Rome’. The text even explicitly states that ‘the same most sacred emperor Constantine continued as emperor in Constantinople’, an obvious and superfluous indication if it wasn’t this kind of continuity with the future that counted most to whomever this account originated with, or whenever it was originally composed. We may think of a mid- to late fourth-century context, with the actual installment of the Constantinopolitan urban prefecture in 359 as *terminus post quem*.

A curious afterthought in the 330 account, and a piece of information that takes us back to Rome, is the additional chronological statement that ‘there are from

^{802.} See Ando (2001) 404-405 and cf. Kaldellis (2016) 734.

^{803.} See Grig and Kelly (2012) 10 (for presumable ‘attempts by Hellenic, perhaps non-Christian, intellectuals to create a Hellenic past for their city’, with references to the works of Anthony Kaldellis), 29 (for Hesychius of Miletus) and Dagron (1974) 14-15 for an explanation of such antiquarian tendencies in connection with Rome’s legendary past.

^{804.} Whitby and Whitby (1989) 19 n. 57; Grig and Kelly (2012) 14.

the foundation of Rome until Constantinople was inaugurated 1,080 years.' Like the dating formula at the start of the 330 account, this statement does not occur in Malalas either. According to the Index to Whitby and Whitby's translation of the *Chronicon Paschale* for the years 284-628, this is the only occurrence of an *ab urbe condita* chronology in that part of the work.⁸⁰⁵ The fact that such a chronological reckoning suddenly occurs here is interesting enough in itself, as it construes a close connection between the foundation of Rome by Romulus and the inauguration of Constantinople by Constantine.⁸⁰⁶ This is, actually, the only instance in the *Chronicon Paschale* of a sustained comparison between the *foundation* of both cities. The fact, first of all, that it couples the *κτίσις* of Rome to the *έγκαινίζειν* of Constantinople actually shows that the inauguration of the latter was considered to be the most meaningful event in Constantinople's presumed ktistic process, as it was reconstructed by modern scholars. But also from a chronological point of view the statement may attract our attention. The 1080 years, properly detracted from AD 330, would result in a date of 751 BC for the foundation of Rome. The more traditional date of 753 BC, and the one adopted for the official celebration of Rome's millennium in 248, would, on the contrary, result in the year 328 for the inauguration of Constantinople.⁸⁰⁷ Given its exceptional occurrence here, it is likely that the compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* took this *ab urbe condita* dating formula from another source and erroneously added it to his account of the year 330, where it now sits isolated at the end. As we have no way of knowing what foundation year this source used to calculate the 1080 year period, the most likely guess is that it used the traditional 753 date, and thus dated the inauguration of Constantinople to 328. As a matter of fact, the *ab urbe condita* dating here would fit in neatly with the Rome-oriented information in the 328 account, and may give away their common origin. On the other hand, the reason that it did end up in the 330 account is probably because the original formula already referred to the inauguration (*έγκαινίζειν*) of Constantinople, which the compiler thought happened in 330. This is again an indication that the sources behind the *Chronicon Paschale* did not intend 328 and 330 as separate phases of a single process, but differently regarded 328 and 330 as the year of the city's inauguration.

It is thus clear that the two accounts provide different, mutually exclusive datings of the foundation of Constantinople. These are not easy to reconcile, or to explain away (as Preger did) as one single account from a common source wrongly spread out over two different entries. The fact that Malalas combined the two accounts probably says

^{805.} Whitby and Whitby (1989) 235; Romulus does not occur in the Index, at p. 229.

^{806.} for a similar juxtaposition see Themistius, *Or. XIV.182a*.

^{807.} For similar (problematic) *ab urbe condita* dates in late antiquity, see *Pan. Lat. VII(6) 2.5* and *XII(9) 3.5*, with Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 193 n.5 and 299 n. 19.

more about Malalas than it does about his sources. In the text as it stands, the events described in the 330 account are solidly dated to that year by explicit reference in the main text to both the third indiction and Constantine's 25th regnal year (information which, together with the consuls of that year, had made up the dateline for 330, and is thus mentioned twice). It is therefore close to impossible that this information ended up in the 330 account by mistake.

The information in the 328 account, on the contrary, does not provide such solid chronological markers within the text itself. Lacking in chronological precision, one can think of quite some reasons why it mistakenly ended up in the *Chronicon Paschale*'s 328 entry.⁸⁰⁸ We should thus ask ourselves whether this entry alone constitutes viable evidence to date events related to the foundation of Constantinople to AD 328. Preger defended the validity of this year by referring to general plausibility, circumstantial evidence and a corroborating passage in Pseudo-Codinus' *Patria of Constantinople*.⁸⁰⁹ While that passage from the tenth century is extremely clear in dating Constantine's initial building work on the Western city wall to a given number of months before the final inauguration of the city, the numbers indicating both that amount of months and the absolute year (328, derived from world era-, indiction- and Olympiad-reckonings) in which the initial building work is supposed to have started suffer from considerable uncertainty in the textual transmission.⁸¹⁰ Preger has plausible reasons to read, emend and harmonize the text in such a way that it produces the date 26 November 328, but he does not hide the fact that conformity to the *Chronicon Paschale*'s 328 entry is one of those reasons.⁸¹¹ Using the *Patria* to prove the *Chronicon* then becomes a circular argument. According to the subscriptions in the Theodosian code, Constantine was in Serdica in May (CTh XI.7.4) and in Trier in September (CTh I.4.2). Preger, in order to uphold his argument, conveniently dismisses the second of these as improbable,⁸¹² but modern scholars see no need to do so.⁸¹³ Accordingly,

^{808.} Although the initial dateline of the 330 entry correctly ascribes Constantine's 25th regnal year to 330, the 304 entry had dated Constantine's *dies imperii* to 304 instead of 306 (p. 518 lines 8-10 Dindorf); with no more information to date the inauguration of Constantinople than Constantine's 25th regnal year, the compiler or his source may have based himself on this error and dated the inauguration wrongly to the 25th year after 304, i.e. 328. Both 328 and 330 fall within the 277th Olympiad. Another possibility is confusion with or attraction to the refoundation of Drepanum as Helenopolis, listed just before in the entry for 327 (but perhaps to be dated in 328: Barnes (1982) 77 n. 130).

^{809.} Preger (1901) 337-340.

^{810.} Preger (1901) 338-339.

^{811.} Cf. Cracco Ruggini (1980) 606 n. 36.

^{812.} Preger (1901) 340, according to whom the law was dated to 29 December.

^{813.} Van Poppel (2013) 79-80, Stephenson (2009) 225, Van Dam (2007) 52, Barnes (1982) 77. From 328, Constantine II was installed at Trier (Van Dam (2007) 62; cf. Harries (2012) 187), which makes a visit by his father in that year a logical enterprise (cf. Barnes (1982) 84 n. 157).

Constantine was not even there to found his city in (the fall of) 328 or oversee work on it in the year afterwards.⁸¹⁴ Modern scholars arguing in favor of important ktistic acts in 328 do not seem too bothered by this practical inconvenience.⁸¹⁵

In the end, there is no more intrinsic reason to value the 328 dating than to any of the other datings found in later sources, such as 333/334,⁸¹⁶ 336/7,⁸¹⁷ or even (roughly) 318.⁸¹⁸

Although scholars have taken the *Chronicon's* 328 entry as a cue to steer their interpretation of other chronological information towards that year,⁸¹⁹ as it happens to fit the picture of a modern reconstruction, all this in the end remains a highly hypothetical edifice. In fact, we cannot know if, and, if so, how the description of the 328 entry was embedded chronologically in its original source. Our safest guess is that the *Chronicon Paschale's* compiler had some information (unknown to us) telling him, or making him conclude, that ktistic acts by Constantine at Byzantium took place in 328. A more daunting conclusion would be that the year 328 was (mistakenly) linked to the foundation of Constantinople by that same compiler and was, based on that mistake, elaborated only later as a key moment in the city's ktistic process. All in all, the year 328 should neither be regarded as an important stage in a protracted process of city foundation at Byzantium, nor should the account of the *Chronicon Paschale* be seen as evidence for such a process, spanning from 324 to 330.

There is one more, often overlooked reference to the foundation of Constantinople in the *Chronicon Paschale*.⁸²⁰ After the opening formula with consular dates, the first paragraph in the entry for the year 304 begins an elaborate digression on the imperial college from the Dyarchy of Diocletian and Maximian to the sole rule of Constantius

^{814.} Van Poppel (2013) 79 n. 167, 80 n. 169 and Barnes (1982) 78: he was in Sirmium early March 329, in Naissus in May, lingered in Serdica in June and was in Heraclea in August and October, returning to Serdica in February 330. He could thus only have been in Constantinople in the early part of 328 and the last months of 329.

^{815.} Dagron (1974) 33 ('pas invraisemblable'), Cracco Ruggini (1980) 606 n. 36 ('ancora (...) da Costantinopoli'); no mention of a problem in Calderone (1993), e.g. at 729 n. 28 or 735 n. 51.

^{816.} Philostorgius (II.9) dates the name-change to the 28th year of Constantine's reign; see Dagron (1974) 33, Cracco Ruggini (1980) 603 n. 30 and, for the problems with this passage, Calderone (1993) 730 n. 34. Preger (1901) 336 n. 1 argues the number is corrupt and should originally have been 25, thus conforming to the year 330. Calderone (1993) 735-736 argues Julian and Hesychius of Miletus also point to '332/333', as he defines this moment.

^{817.} Preger (1901) 342.

^{818.} Dagron (1974) 33 n. 6, based on *Patria of Constantinople* (=Pseudo-Codinus) 58 (p. 142, lines 16-17 and p. 144, lines 9-10 Preger); Preger (1901) 341, based on Georgius Monachus; *ibid.* 342, based on both Nicephorus Callistus 8.4 and the *Barbarus Scaligeri* (ed. Mommsen, *MGH, Chron. Min.* I (1892) 291).

^{819.} See note 791, above (for a later passage in the *Chronicon Paschale* itself), note 782, above (for Theophanes) and Preger (1901) 338 (for the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*), *ibid.* 340 (for Julian).

^{820.} Only Preger (1901) 341, to my knowledge, mentions it briefly.

II together with his Caesar, Gallus. As the digression is immediately followed by a short closing paragraph, containing the proclamation of Constantine as emperor (wrongly dated to 304), the digression looks like a preamble, setting the stage for the important climax that follows. This is also evident from Constantine being singled out at the end of the first paragraph. The second paragraph contains some curious statements, styling Maximian, Constantius (Chlorus) and Constantine emperors of 'the Celts' and referring to the latter as Constantius' bastard, while Diocletian and Galerius are termed 'emperor of Rome'. Of interest to our current argument is the remainder of the digression:⁸²¹

(...)

τέσσαρες οὖν βασιλεῖς ηύρεθησαν, Κωνσταντῖνος Κελτῶν, Ἐρώ- (15)
 μῆς Μαξέντιος, νιὸς Ἐρκοντίου Μαξιμιανοῦ, ἀνατολῆς Λικί-
 νίος, καὶ Μαξιμῖνος ἔτι Καῖσαρ μείνας. ἀλλὰ τὸν Μαξέντιον
 ἀνεῖλε Κωνσταντῖνος πολέμῳ· καὶ οὕτω μόνος τῆς δύσεως ἐβα-
 σίλευσεν. καὶ Μαξιμῖνος δὲ στρατεύσας κατὰ Λικινίου σπονδὰς
 ἐποιήσατο πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν Λικίνιον παραχωρῆσαι τῆς βα- (20)
 σιλείας. καὶ οὕτω μονοκράτωρ γενόμενος Κωνσταντῖνος ἔκτισε
 τὸ Βυζάντιον, χρησμὸν εἰληφώς ὅτι ἀπόλλυσθαι μέλλει ἡ βασι-
 λεία Ἐρώμης, χριστιανὸς ἐγένετο. ἐβασίλευσεν δὲ ἔτη λα', μῆ- (518.)
 νας ι'. καὶ ἔσχε παῖδας Κωνστάντιον, Κώνσταντον, καὶ Κων-σταντῖνον.

(...) And so there existed four emperors, Constantine of the Celts, of Rome Maxentius son of Herculius Maximianus, of the east Licinius, and Maximinus who still remained Caesar. But Constantine killed Maxentius in battle, and thus he was sole emperor of the west. And Maximinus, after campaigning against Licinius, made a truce with him so that Licinius retired from the empire. **And thus Constantine, on becoming sole Emperor, founded Byzantium, after receiving an oracle that the Empire of Rome was about to perish, and became a Christian.** He was emperor for 31 years, 10 months. And his children were Constantius, Constans, and Constantine.

The compact sketch of Constantine's career is hard to pin down to a specific origin. The division of the empires between 'Rome' and 'Celts' definitely makes it a heterodox version, perhaps originating at a time and/or place (seventh century Byzantium?) when these were remote concepts, and an emperor of the East could more easily

^{821.} P. 517 line 15 - p. 518 line 2 Dindorf; translation by Whitby and Whitby (1989) 6-7.

qualify as emperor 'of Rome'.⁸²² Interestingly, it also presents Constantine as a bastard (ό νόθος, p. 517 line 7 Dindorf). The entry's brief account of the foundation of Constantinople is the first in sequence to occur in the *Chronicon Paschale*. Constantine's foundation is connected with 'an oracle that the 'βασιλεία' [dominion] of Rome was about to perish'.⁸²³ Whereas the translation links the oracle syntactically to the city foundation, the original Greek rather presented it as the reason why Constantine became Christian (χρησμὸν εὐληφώς ὅτι ἀπόλλυσθαι μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία Ρώμης, χριστιανὸς ἐγένετο, p. 517 lines 22-23 Dindorf).⁸²⁴ Apparently, 'Rome' is a realm intimately connected with paganism, one it doesn't hurt leaving behind. It thus seems that Constantine accomplished an effective *translatio imperii* from moribund, pagan Rome to Christian 'Byzantium', a realm untouched by the prophesied fate (the city founded by Constantine is called Byzantium, not Constantinople). Rather than claiming an intimate connection between Constantinople and Rome, like the 328 account, this entry creates maximum distance between the two. This version thereby provides a foundation myth for Byzantium that does not depend on Rome or its traditions, but solely on a divine admonition by the Christian God. It stands in strong and interesting opposition to the view of Zosimus (II.34), 'the last pagan historiographer of antiquity', according to whom the foundation of Constantinople was not a solution to, but the cause of the ruin of the Roman Empire.⁸²⁵

In terms of chronology, the 304 account contains no precise indication, but Constantine founded his city 'on becoming sole emperor' (καὶ οὕτω μονοκράτωρ γενόμενος Κωνσταντῖνος ἔκτισε τὸ Βυζάντιον, p. 517 lines 21-22 Dindorf). This could perhaps points towards the tradition of a Constantinian city foundation at Byzantium in 324, and thus complement the statement of Themistius to that effect in *Or. IV. 58b*, hitherto often considered unique.⁸²⁶ There are in fact quite some other, earlier sources referring Constantine's city foundation to the immediate aftermath of his victory

^{822.} On the meaning of the term 'Rome' in the Late Antique Eastern empire and Eastern views of the West, see Bowersock (2009), especially 42-46. This passage in the *Chronicon Paschale* provides important evidence corroborating his argument that 'Rome' came to refer unambiguously and then exclusively to Constantinople. For (northern) Italy as the realm of the Celts, see Van Dam (2007) 73 n. 51.

^{823.} Whiby and Whiby (1989) 6 translate ἡ βασιλεία Ρώμης as 'the empire of Rome'; I think the word refers most likely to the western territories ruled by Rome ('the dominion of Rome'), rather than to the abstract idea of Roman rule. One could perhaps conjecture to read τὰ βασιλεία ('seat of empire, capital') instead of ἡ βασιλεία.

^{824.} Although the sentence is asyndetic, it is clearly structured: a participle is twice followed by a finite verb, the former providing the context or explanation for the latter. One should translate: 'And thus Constantine, on becoming sole Emperor, founded Byzantium, and after receiving an oracle that the Empire of Rome was about to perish, became a Christian.'

^{825.} Dagron (1974) 20. For the text, see the revised edition by Paschoud (2000).

^{826.} Preger (1901) 341 takes the 304 account to refer to 325.

over Licinius. One appears to be Praxagoras' lost history, a nearly contemporary work.⁸²⁷ Photius' summary reads: 'Therefore, having gained control and displayed the whole empire to be united, he founded Byzantium, which was renamed after him' (χρατυνάμενος οὖν καὶ μίαν δεῖξας τὴν σύμπασαν βασιλείαν κτίζει τὸ Βυζάντιον ἐπώνυμον ἔσυντῷ).⁸²⁸ Since this is where the chronological succession of events in Photius' summary ends, it may well be that the pagan historiographer Praxagoras chose to end his history with the foundation of Constantinople as its climax,⁸²⁹ rather than the Council of Nicaea (as Eusebius had done). Depending on the exactitude of its dating and interpretation, a remark in one of Optatianus Porfyrius' poems is often also added to the evidence.⁸³⁰ Last but not least, Constantine's own imperial pronouncement from around the year 325, with which we opened this chapter, seems to be important circumstantial evidence: its securely datable reference to the emperor founding new cities makes most sense in connection with an important imperial foundation in the year 324.

That takes us back to the problem with which we began: what value should we attach to the different dates for Constantinople's foundation? Apart from the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, which both date the dedication of Constantinople to 330, as we saw, there is quite good other evidence for the latter year. A case in point is Malalas, the sixth century Antiochene, already mentioned above, and author of the oldest extant world chronicle. As said, he ascribed the foundation of Constantinople, from the building of the walls and the change of name to the celebration of the dedication, in its entirety to the year 330, combining the information listed under the 328 and 330 headings of the *Chronicon Paschale* in one narrative.⁸³¹ Hesychius Illustrius of Miletus, another sixth century historian, wrote an apparently non-Christian chronicle covering the history of the world from the Assyrians to Anastasius (AD 518).⁸³² Although most of it is lost, the sections on Byzantium and Constantinople have been preserved in the collection of the so-called *Patria of Constantinople*. That passage ends with the remark that Constantine

^{827.} See Krallis (2014).

^{828.} FGrH 219, translated by Lieu and Montserrat (1996) 8. This version is similar to the 304 account in some respects.

^{829.} Barnes (2011) 197, following the 'reasonable conjecture' of Jacoby (1930) 632 'that Praxagoras went to Constantinople to present his panegyrical history to the emperor in person at the time of the ceremonial dedication of the new city'.

^{830.} *Carm.* 4.5-6. Cf. Van Dam (2007) 70 n. 47, Ando (2001) 375, with n. 27, referring to Barnes (1975) for the date, and Calderone (1993) 734, discussing the problems involved in dating the poem. Burke (2014) convincingly argues against the common interpretation; see below.

^{831.} Malalas, *Chronogr.* XIII. O. 5-8 (p. 319-322 Dindorf), with Cracco Ruggini (1980) 604-605.

^{832.} See Kaldellis, 'Hesychios of Miletos (390)', in BNJ 390 F 3 for indications of 'the fundamentally non-Christian nature of the work'.

'celebrated the city's inauguration on the eleventh day of the month of May in the twenty-fifth year of his reign' (τὴν τῶν ἐγκαίνιων ἡμέραν κατὰ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην τοῦ Μαΐου μηνὸς, ἐπιτελέσας ἐν ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ εἰκοστῷ πέμπτῳ), i.e. in 330.⁸³³ As the year 330, more precisely pinned down to the date 11 May, was said to be celebrated as the city's birthday, it actually seems logical that this ritually reinforced moment was later considered to be the real date of Constantinople's foundation as a whole.

4.6. A new reconstruction: Rome and Constantinople from 324 to 330

To summarize the situation so far: we have an early, but rhetorically suspect source dating the first foundational act to 324 (Themistius), a host of later and inconsistent, but seemingly well-informed sources apparently clustering a first kytic act around 328, and a relatively solid tradition dating the city's inauguration to 330. It is the historian's pleasant task to make sense out of all this disparate material, coming up with a convincing reconstruction of events.

One way to do so is to meticulously scrutinize all this source material for details about the precise element a given dating may refer to, i.e., not to the foundation as a whole, but to a specific phase in the process of its foundation. In order to bridge or fill the gap between 324 and 330, then, scholars have come up with an elaborate scheme of different foundational acts spread across the years. Preger seems to have inaugurated this scholarly tradition, arguing against scholars identifying one single, "true" moment of foundation, and against Seeck, who believed there was no such moment.⁸³⁴ While Preger described the different phases in general terms, it has become a scholarly commonplace to see them as formal rituals known from Roman religion and augural law. In different reconstructions, the years 324, 328 and 330 are differently coupled to the *inauguratio*, *consecratio* and *dedicatio* of the city, sometimes combined and/or supplemented with a *sanctio* or *limitatio*, *lustratio* and *exstructio*-phase.⁸³⁵ This is when we should remind ourselves that no single source mentions only

^{833.} §42, p. 18 Preger. Text and translation from BNJ 390 F 7 (Kaldellis). Other passages treating the foundation of Constantinople confirm less well to the year 330: §1, p. 1 Preger ('Two and three score and three hundred years had passed in Elder Rome since Augustus Caesar had established his sole rule', δύο καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἀπὸ τῆς Αύγουστου Καίσαρος μοναρχίας διεληλυθότων ἐνιαυτῶν τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ 'Ρώμῃ) and Photius, *Bibl.* 69 ('at the beginning of the two-hundred and seventy-seventh Olympiad', ὀλυμπιάδος ἐβδόμηνς καὶ ἐβδομηκοστῆς καὶ διακοσιοστῆς ισταμένης, BNJ 390 F 1). See Calderone (1993) 736, with n. 59, versus Bowersock (2009) 43.

^{834.} Preger (1901) 336-337; Seeck (1889) 196-197.

^{835.} See Dagron (1974) 32-33, Cracco Ruggini (1980) 596-610, Calderone (1993) 729-737, La Rocca (1993) 566, Ando (2001) 398, all with further references to the immense bibliography on the subject. The most recent exponent of this tradition is Potter (2013), e.g. 241, 259 (suggesting a 'second foundation ceremony' in 328), 263.

the barest outlines of such a scheme,⁸³⁶ nor the idea that the foundation progressed gradually over a six-year period. Although Themistius speaks about the foundation of Constantinople repeatedly, he does not seem to complement his assertion that the city was founded in 324 with a reference to the inauguration of 330, and it remains a striking fact that his reference to 324 constitutes our only (relatively early) source for this date. All we have is conflicting information ascribing the foundation of Constantinople, more or less as a whole, to different years, and a couple of Middle Byzantine sources describing a shorter process. There is no source mentioning both 324 and 330 in one continuous narrative of events. It is in principle unlikely that a supposed course of events spanning from 324 to 330 and underlying such a narrative was not known to, or grasped by, our Late Antique and Early Byzantine sources, and only surfaced, after centuries of suppression, in Middle Byzantine historical collections. On the contrary, it is quite likely that these later sources added much of their own interpretation to whatever historical source material they had at their disposal.⁸³⁷

An alternative explanation is therefore more likely, namely that there was no straightforward course of events to be fitted in one unitary, premeditated scheme, subsequently messed up by and divided over the sources at our disposal. It is, in other words, perhaps more likely that the disparity and the diverging information in our sources reflects a rapid and possibly rather chaotic succession of changes in the role Constantine's new city played over the years, potentially as the result of changing political circumstances and considerations. As Grig and Kelly succinctly phrase it:⁸³⁸

'Exactly how Constantinople was conceived by its founder and perceived by others must have shifted in its earliest years, between its foundation in late 324, its dedication on 11 May 330 (after which it became Constantine's main residence), and Constantine's death seven years later.'

Rather than departing from a bewildering array of later accounts all looking at the foundation of Constantinople from their own distinct set of priorities, we should depart from the historical circumstances that led to Constantine's city foundation in the first place, and ask ourselves a simple question: why found a city? The answer, most likely, did not – at least initially – have to do an awful lot with Rome, and neither with Christianity. Constantine had just won the second decisive victory in his

^{836.} As Cracco Ruggini (1980) 601 n. 25 has to admit, John of Lydia (*De mag.* II.30) mentions only the *consecratio*.

^{837.} See Dagon (1974) 18.

^{838.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 8-9.

career, and as he had thereby reunified the Roman Empire, he was most likely looking for means to consolidate his power and the unity of the realm over which he now ruled.⁸³⁹ Discord was the last thing he needed, and it therefore seems highly unlikely that he would have invested his precious energy in haphazardly moving the capital of the Empire to the east, officially challenging the centrality of Rome, or polemically creating a Christian capital.

So, what can we say about the shifts alluded to by Grig and Kelly? This is where other events in the period between 324 and 330 come into play. At first, Constantinople does not play a major role in imperial activity, even though the Emperor was active in the region. The important ecumenical council of 325 took place in the palace in Nicaea, not in Constantine's supposedly 'Christian capital'.⁸⁴⁰ Eusebius remarked on the appropriateness of Constantine's choice of location: ὥριστο δὲ καὶ πόλις ἐμπρέπουσα τῇ συνόδῳ, νίκης ἐπώνυμος, κατὰ τὸ Βιθυνῶν ἔθνος ἡ Νίκαια ('a city was also designated which was appropriate for the Council, one bearing the name of victory, Nicaea in the province of Bithynia', VC III.6).⁸⁴¹ That almost purposefully excludes the appropriateness of that other recent 'victory city', Constantinople. Within these years falls the celebration of Constantine's 20th anniversary as emperor, his *vicennalia*, in 325/326. Constantinople was apparently not a suitable site for such festivities by then, because the celebrations initially took place in Nicomedia,⁸⁴² where Constantine was allegedly based during the construction of his new city, while the closing of the festive year saw the emperor traveling all the way back to Rome.⁸⁴³ As Van Dam stresses, it was highly unusual to celebrate also the end of an anniversary year,⁸⁴⁴ thus highlighting the importance Rome still held for Constantine.⁸⁴⁵ He apparently wanted to uphold the tradition begun with the celebration of his *decennalia*

^{839.} Cf. Harries (2012) 123.

^{840.} The council was originally to take place in Ancyra (modern Ankara), but the Emperor purposefully moved it to Nicaea: see Van Dam (2007) 176, 209, 288.

^{841.} Cf. also IV.47. On the setting in the palace, see III.10.

^{842.} Hier. *Chron.* s.a. 326; Moser (2018) 51–54; van Poppel (2013) 75; Cameron and Hall (1999) locate the celebrations at Nicaea on the (unlikely) basis of Eus. VC III.22 (*ibid.* 41) and (more probably) III.15 (*ibid.* 267, cf. 184); see also IV.47.

^{843.} See Moser (2018) 15–19; for the possible material evidence of a fragmentary glass plate (*CIL* XV.7007), see Barbero (2016) 52–53, referring to Fuhrmann (1939), and Tedeschi (1991/1992).

^{844.} Van Dam (2007) 49–50; Barnes (2011) 222 n. 1, n. 4 and Körfer (2020) 153–154 point to 310/311 as a parallel, but do not discuss the single celebration of Constantine's *decennalia* in 315, without a repetition in 316; on 310/311, see also Nixon and Rodgers (1994) 255 n. 4. According to Cracco Ruggini (1980) 610 n. 41, without references, it would have been an old custom dating from the Early Imperial period; cf. Kolb (1987) 125 n. 378 on Tetrarchic precedent. Richardson (1975) 78 suggests Constantine had perhaps been petitioned to do so.

^{845.} Constantine's visit to Rome was apparently important enough to merit inclusion in different chronographical works: see Calderone (1993) 733 n. 46.

in Rome, in 315 (and most probably continued by the celebration of the *quinquennalia* of his sons Crispus and Constantine II as Caesars, in 321; the emperor himself was absent, but his *quindecennalia* were mentioned).⁸⁴⁶ That tradition, furthermore, was inaugurated by Diocletian, who travelled to Rome from Nicomedia in 303 for his own *vicennalia*.⁸⁴⁷ All that would change, but only after 326: as far as we know Constantine's 30th anniversary, in 335, was the first not to be celebrated in Rome, but in Constantinople.⁸⁴⁸

That could have to do with what happened in Rome in 326. Zosimus (II.29.5-30.4) mentions that trouble with the pagan aristocracy arose in the old capital, and that the emperor henceforth decided to turn his back on Rome and develop his newly founded city into its Christian replacement.⁸⁴⁹ Where that is likely an exaggerated version of events,⁸⁵⁰ it may very well be that Constantine's visit to Rome was influential to his urban project on the Bosphorus. It was his first visit to Rome after becoming sole ruler of the empire, and, with the senate now backing him for more than a decade, his presence was probably more urgently required in the recently conquered East. He went to Rome notwithstanding. It was probably in this year that either the senate, again, or others, this time, dedicated a second monumental arch to the emperor, the enormous quadrifrontal structure over the Via Flaminia at modern Malborghetto (some 20 km north of Rome).⁸⁵¹ The arch would have commemorated the spot where Constantine had put up camp before the final battle against Maxentius,⁸⁵² and thus stand in a direct tradition inaugurated by the more famous arch near the Flavian amphitheatre, dedicated by the SPQR in 315 to commemorate the victory

^{846.} See briefly Van Dam (2007) 46 (on 315), 51 (on 321, stressing Constantine's absence) and Körfer (2020) 154-155; more elaborately van Poppel (2013) 69-74 (on 315). Our major piece of evidence for the events in 321, the panegyric of Nazarius (*Pan. Lat. IV(10)*), is the subject of a still forthcoming study by Diederik Burgersdijk.

^{847.} See Kolb (1987) 126 and 147, referring to Septimius Severus and Hadrian as comparable, earlier examples.

^{848.} See note 887, below.

^{849.} Dagron (1974) 20-21, Cracco Ruggini (1980) 609-610, Calderone (1993) 733-734, Wiemer (1994) 486-489; see Barbero (2016) 748-750; Bleckmann (2015) 309-310. Note that Zosimus' narrative precludes a foundation in 324; this need, however, not be reason to dismiss it as in chronological error, as Dagron (1974) 20 and Salzman (2016) 23 n. 54 do, since the year 324 was not widely considered to be the moment of Constantinople's foundation in Late Antiquity.

^{850.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 19, Marcone (2002) 145-147, Cameron (2005) 101-102.

^{851.} De Haan and Hekster (2016) 17 assume that Constantine himself was responsible for the arch: in that case, the structure is an even more poignant reminder of the emperor's continuing involvement in Rome.

^{852.} See Van Dam (2007) 54 n. 26 (with references), who convincingly connects this structure to other Constantinian monuments along the Via Flaminia (cf. *ibid.* 53), and Ross Holloway (2004) 53-54 (with visual reconstruction).

itself.⁸⁵³ Perhaps it was Rome's reaction against Constantine's new foundation on the Bosphorus,⁸⁵⁴ which commemorated his victory over Licinius: the new arch reminded the emperor that his earlier victory over Maxentius had been equally, if not more important for his rise to power. There are signs, furthermore, that Constantine's interest in Rome lived on, at least until the burial of his mother Helena in the Eternal City, datable to roughly 329,⁸⁵⁵ in the mausoleum on the Via Labicana that perhaps had originally (and until then?) been intended for the emperor himself.⁸⁵⁶ On the occasion of Helena's funeral Constantine perhaps briefly visited again, albeit without leaving any traces in our record.⁸⁵⁷ Yet even if the emperor himself was absent after 326, the fact that prominent Constantinian women resided in Rome would have guaranteed an enduring imperial presence.⁸⁵⁸ Although the exact chronology of the construction of St. Peter's basilica at the Vatican has become the subject of intense debate,⁸⁵⁹ and it is therefore hard to say whether that imperially sized project was an architectural expression of imperial presence in the 320's, that certainly must have been the case for the Basilica Constantiniana/Salvatoris, the cathedral of Rome now known as S. Giovanni in Laterano. On a famous inscription on the transept arch of Old St. Peter's,⁸⁶⁰ the text of which was preserved in an Early Medieval collection of inscriptions for the use of pilgrims,⁸⁶¹ Constantine was commemorated as the one who 'founded' (*condidit*) that basilica.

Whatever happened in Rome 326, it is only from the years up to and following 330 that we have increasingly solid evidence for Constantine's continued focus on Constantinople. In fact, the *Chronicon Paschale*'s 328 account clearly sets the foundation of Constantinople against the background of Constantine's presence in Rome and Nicomedia, details unlikely to have been invented in the seventh

^{853.} Richardson (1975) 75, not mentioning the arch at Malborghetto, thought the one near the Flavian amphitheater to be dedicated in 326, stressing the importance of the occasion.

^{854.} Also claimed as a reason to dedicate an arch by Richardson (1975) 78, albeit referring to the wrong arch.

^{855.} Drijvers (2016) 151-152 n. 4 argues for 'late in 328 or in the first days or weeks of 329'; the year is given as 330 in e.g. *PLRE* I (1971) 411 s.v. 'Helena 3' and Hillner (2017) 85. See Kienast (1990) 300 = (2017⁶) 291-292 for further references.

^{856.} Briefly Davenport (2017) 35; Hillner (2017) 85; more elaborately Oosten (2016) and Drijvers (2016).

^{857.} Van Dam (2007) 52; Vanderspoel (1995) 52; cf. Hillner (2017) 83-85. There is some unusual direct juridical communication with city Roman magistrates, perhaps announcing or preparing a visit: *CTh. XI.30.14* (in 327), XIV.24.1 (in 328). General probability at least allows for the possibility of an (intended) visit on his way from Serdica (via Oescus) to Trier.

^{858.} See Drijvers (2016) and Hillner (2017) 83 -85 on Helena; Moser (2018) 33 and Hillner (2017) 79 on Galla (based in Etruria); Moser (2018) 41 on Constantia; Hillner (2017) 90 has a convenient table.

^{859.} See conveniently Drijvers (2016) 149-150, with the addition of Brandt (2015b), Lenski (2016) 182-187 and Liverani (2017) 318 n. 13.

^{860.} *ICUR* II.4092:

^{861.} See Liverani (2015) 492-494; de Blaauw (1994) 462.

century, and cities the emperor indeed frequented in the years 326 and after. Constantine seems to have been steadily present at Nicomedia from July 327 until March 328, before heading west.⁸⁶² Nicomedia forms the easternmost terminus of his movements during these years, and thus seems to have been visited on purpose rather than en route; if Constantinople had been Constantine's new residence by then, this would have been the moment to use it.⁸⁶³ In an ingenious inversion of the current interpretation, John Burke even argues – and convincingly so – that the often quoted poems of Optatianus Porfyrius singing of an *altera Roma* ('second Rome', 4.6) and *Roma soror* ('a sister Rome', 18.34) refer not to newly founded Constantinople, but to Nicomedia.⁸⁶⁴ Although Burke perhaps overstates his case when he concludes that, in 324, 'Nikomedia had just become Constantine's prize and his *capital*' (my italics), he is certainly right in redressing the balance in favor of Nicomedia for the years 324 and following. David Potter also offers a salutary reminder that – even if Optatianus' expressions referred to Constantinople – this simply conveys general importance. In Potter's words, this 'represents a tendency to associate cities with the dignity of the old capital. It does not suggest that these cities actually bore this name'.⁸⁶⁵ Even if Constantinople was called 'Rome' in some way, this was a dignity not exclusive to Constantine's newly founded city. Other prominent cities, among which also Nicomedia, were on the same level in the years after 324.

All this of course raises the question what the foundation in 324 would have amounted to. In concord with an interpretation that has recently been gaining ground also among Anglophone scholars,⁸⁶⁶ I would argue that it was initially envisaged as a victory city in the manner of Augustan Nicopolis, destined to preserve and aggrandize the memory of Constantine's decisive victory over Licinius. This

^{862.} Barnes (1982) 77. On Nicomedia as a suitable Eastern capital, see Vanderspoel (1995) 51 and on the city as Diocletian's alternative (to) Rome, see Kolb (1987) 126; Van Dam (2007) 57-58; Humphries (2019) 34-35; cf. Lactant. *De mort. pers.* 7.10.

^{863.} Cf. Moser (2018) 22 on Constantine changing the governorship of Europa and Thrace in 326.

^{864.} Burke (2014) 28-29. He only mistranslates *altera Roma* as 'another Rome': see Grig and Kelly (2012) 11 n. 41. See now Körfer (2020) 112-114, 276-278, who does not mention Burke's interpretation.

^{865.} Potter (2004) 383-384 = (2014) 377. Cf. a synodal letter from Antioch to the bishop of Byzantium, preserved in Syriac, in which Constantinople is called 'New Rome': Schwartz (1959) 136 (cf. 132, 143), with Berger (2006) 442-443. Potter (2004) 383 = (2014) 376-377 wrongly states that the letter was written by Constantine to the bishop of Alexandria. See also Libanius, *Or. XIX.19, XX.24*.

^{866.} Stephenson (2009) 192 (cf. 200-201), followed by Barnes (2011) 112 and elaborated on by Potter (2013) 261-262; the thought was already formulated by Brandt (1998) 118 (with references to contemporary discussions in note 415): 'seinem unmittelbaren Ursprung nach ist Konstantinopel demnach (in guter antiker Tradition) primär als Siegesmonument zu begreifen'.

view finds solid evidence in the near-contemporary *Origo Constantini imperatoris* (= *Anonymous Valesianus/Excerpta Valesiana, pars prior* 29-30):⁸⁶⁷

Constantinus autem ex <se> Byzantium Constantinopolim nuncupavit ob insignis victoriae <memoriam>. quam velut patriam cultu decoravit ingenti et Romae desideravit aequari: deinde quaesitis ei undique civibus divitias multas largitus est, ut prope in ea omnes [thesauros] regias facultates exhauriret. ibi etiam senatum constituit secundi ordinis: claros vocavit.

Constantine, in memory of his famous victory, called Byzantium Constantinople, after himself. As if it were his native city, he enriched it with great assiduity, and wanted it to become the equal of Rome. He sought out citizens for it from everywhere, and lavished so much wealth on it that he almost exhausted the resources of the imperial treasury. There he founded a Senate of the second rank; the members were called *clari*.

Although the text has sadly suffered some damage in its manuscript transmission,⁸⁶⁸ its sense is clear enough: Constantine created a city named after himself in the aftermath of his ‘famous victory’, and its creation was motivated by that victory (*ob*).⁸⁶⁹ Constantinople’s coming into being is subsequently described with great economy. Given the succession of verbs in the perfect tense, rather than the imperfect, the extremely condensed version of the *Origo* should be interpreted as a chronological sequence rather than a synchronic picture. Constantine’s first action (*nuncupavit*) is described in connection with what immediately preceded, the victory: that provides the motive for renaming the pre-existing city of Byzantium after himself. The second sentence then looks both backward and forward, highlighting the model or standard on which Constantine based himself in the lavish decoration (*decoravit*) of his new city *velut patriam*, but also his desire (*desideravit*) regarding the level towards which his efforts are directed: the city should equal Rome. The gradual fulfillment of that desire is clearly presented as a later event (*deinde*), achieved only in stages (the ablative absolute with a perfect participle, *quaesitis ... civibus*, followed by another perfect, *largitus est*, creating considerable chronological relief). His final act, the creation of

^{867.} The text printed is that from the second edition by Moreau and Velkov (1968²), the translation by Jane Stevenson from Lieu and Montserrat (1996) 47-48. On the *Origo*’s presentation of Constantine, see Edwards (2017) and Potter (2017); on its date of composition, Barnes (1989).

^{868.} König (1987) 1-4, 31.

^{869.} Cf. Brandt (1998) 118.

a senate,⁸⁷⁰ represents the last stage, distanced from the first stages by clarifying adverbs (*ibi etiam*).

The early stages of Constantinople as a beautifully adorned victory city are thus reflected in the first and second statements. The chiastic arrangement *insignis victoriae (<memoriam>... patriam) cultu ... ingenti* highlights the connection between the exceptional nature of this victory and the extravagant decoration required to commemorate it. Note also that the text avoids speaking of a proper city foundation: Constantinople adds to and transforms the old city rather than effacing it. The focus on the new and disruptive character of Constantine's ktistic acts, ubiquitous in later sources, is thus almost completely lacking here.⁸⁷¹ What stands out, however, is the connection with his important victory. To mark that momentous achievement, Constantine even changed his name and adopted 'Victor' as a personal epithet and title.⁸⁷² As we have seen in Themistius, the occasion was celebrated and emphasized also in dynastic terms by the proclamation of Constantius II – still a boy at that point – as Caesar. Apart from imperial self-representation and dynastic policy, then, the foundation of an eponymous city in memory of this victory constituted a prime commemorative deed. The best comparison is probably the victory city founded after the battle of Actium by the man who would not long afterward be awarded the name Augustus: Nicopolis in Epirus, Western Greece. That also Constantine made the connection with Actium is suggested by the presence of Augustan statuary in Constantinople, transferred from the site of Actian Nicopolis and prominently displayed in the hippodrome.⁸⁷³ Like the massive victory monument Augustus erected at the site of his camp above Nicopolis, the Actian games he reinstated and the 'Naval Museum' he inaugurated at the Actian temple of Apollo, the foundation of Constantine's eponymous city opposite Chrysopolis must have been made into a monumental marker of his victory, most of all.

The military character and occasion of Constantinople's foundation may also add to an explanation of what happened between 324 and 330, and why the emphasis on the ktistic acts in the former year gradually faded away. Since Constantine's son Crispus

^{870.} On this phrase see Moser (2018) 58–63; on the building that would have housed the Senate, Kaldellis (2016).

^{871.} Cf. Eutropius' claim, intended for Valens, that Constantine *primusque urbem nominis sui ad tantum fastigium evehere molitus est, ut Romae aemulam faceret* (X.8.1), characterized as a text expressing 'ambiguity if not hostility' by Kelly (2003) 588 n.4.

^{872.} Stephenson (2009) 215–217.

^{873.} Krallis (2014) 121 n. 38; Stephenson (2009) 200; Bassett (2004) 62, 213. Van Dam (2010) 65 rather sees a connection with the beginning of imperial rule.

was an integral part of the victory at Chrysopolis,⁸⁷⁴ functioning as Naval commander, it is almost self-evident that he played a role in its commemoration at newly founded Constantinople. The fact that he subsequently fell into disgrace and was killed in 326, suffering *damnatio memoriae*,⁸⁷⁵ may be just one explanation why Constantine had to rethink and reconfigure his eponymous foundation.

In the five and a half years following November 324, Constantine's presence in Constantinople is securely attested on no more than three occasions, two of which were clearly stopovers.⁸⁷⁶ Only in and after 330 does the reconstruction of Constantine's movements by Barnes show a steady presence in Constantinople, functioning as privileged imperial residence.⁸⁷⁷ His arrival in the spring of that year seems, exceptionally, to have been the occasion for the issue of a coin from the Constantinopolitan mint with the legend **ADVENTVS AVGVSTI N.**⁸⁷⁸ Even more so, his next visit to Nicomedia now also seems to have been announced by a coin issue.⁸⁷⁹ Thereafter, his presence in Nicomedia is documented only once, in 334.⁸⁸⁰ The future emperor Julian was born in the Constantinopolitan palace in 331 or 332.⁸⁸¹ It is from the 330s that we furthermore have the first other secure clues about Constantinople functioning as a new imperial residence and centre, operating to the detriment of Rome, and thereby starting to function as its replacement, at least partially. In 334, Constantine issued a constitution referring to Constantinople as an *Urbs* described as *quam aeterno nomine iubente Deo donavimus* ('which I have given an eternal name at God's bidding').⁸⁸² Van Dam implies that the 'eternal name' belongs to Constantinople and is a reference to Rome's status as the Eternal City,⁸⁸³ although it more likely refers to the eternity of Constantine's own name as emperor, after which Constantinople was named.⁸⁸⁴ Perhaps not meant to replace Rome, the description of Constantinople could certainly point to the city's Christian character – although that also depends

^{874.} Cf. Olbrich (2010).

^{875.} See Usherwood (2022) 163–208.

^{876.} Barnes (1982) 76–77: October 325 (lingering in the region), March 326 (en route to Rome) and June 327 (coming back, on his way to Nicomedia).

^{877.} Barnes (1982) 78–80; cf. already Millar (1977) 56.

^{878.} Barnes (1982) 78: RIC VII.576, Constantinople 41.

^{879.} *Ibid.*, with n. 132: RIC VII.626, Nicomedia 160 (ADVENTVS AVG N).

^{880.} Cf. Moser (2018) 22 on Constantine changing the governorship based in Nicomedia around 330.

^{881.} Bouffartigue (1992) 30.

^{882.} *CTh.* XIII.5.7, translation by Grig and Kelly (2012) 11. Cf. Brandt (1998) 122.

^{883.} Van Dam (2007) 58; also Grig and Kelly (2012) 11.

^{884.} Burke (2014) 28, usefully comparing other instances of an *aeternum nomen* referring to the emperor, or cities named after him. Cf. Eus. VC. IV.36.1, quoting the opening words of one of Constantine's letters to Eusebius himself: *κατὰ τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἡμίν πόλιν τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος θεοῦ συναιρομένης προνοίας*.

on whether one reads with *Deo* a capital D.⁸⁸⁵ At the same time, as Berger stresses, Constantine's supposedly 'Christian capital' still resorted under nearby Heraclea from the point of view of ecclesiastical administration.⁸⁸⁶

The accumulation of circumstantial evidence reaches its peak in the years 335/336, when the emperor celebrated his 30th anniversary in office. Contrary to expectations, at least in Italy itself, he did not visit Rome.⁸⁸⁷ For the first time, he celebrated his imperial anniversary in Constantinople. As Van Dam notes, this 'was a clear indication that he and his dynasty now preferred Second Rome to First Rome'.⁸⁸⁸ The Constantinian fate of both Rome and Constantinople was sealed when the deceased Emperor was buried in the latter city, not the former, in 337, again contrary to expectation.⁸⁸⁹ The new dynastic mausoleum on the Golden Horn arguably left little doubt as to the location of the center of the empire then, and in the nearby future.⁸⁹⁰ The year 330 thus seems to be the best attested date for (re)foundation of Byzantium/Constantinople as a new imperial residence. Even then, though, it seems to early to assume that the city on the Bosphorus took over Rome's role as capital of the empire. For one thing, regardless of all later legendary translation accounts, it seems that there is not a single individual we know of who is first attested in Rome, and later in Constantinople.⁸⁹¹

A way to put our reconstruction to the test is to look at the only other near contemporary, but highly contested source treating the foundation of Constantinople: Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*. It was written after Constantine's death, but seems to have been underway ever since the final publication of the revised version of his *Ecclesiastical History* around 326. The material that found its way into the *Life* was thus

^{885.} So e.g. Amidon (2007) 24 n. 26. Lenski (2012a) 78 forcefully characterizes the statement as a message 'always dampened with the usual ambiguity' (cf. Lenski (2015) 345).

^{886.} Berger (2007) 208.

^{887.} Van Dam (2007) 53-56; Moser (2018) 13-14, 41. I fail to see how Eusebius, in the 'Tricennial Oration' composed for the occasion, uses Constantine's 30th anniversary in office 'zu eigenen Ausführungen über die Ewigkeit (*aeternitas*) des kaiserlichen Regiments *in Verbindung mit jener Roms* und das mit dieser Ewigkeit verknüpfte kosmische Glück' (Kolb (2001) 70, referring to *De laudibus Constantini VI.1ff*; my emphasis). Instead, the marked absence of Rome in Eusebius' discussion of eternity connected to Constantine's rule seems a telling indicator that the city was explicitly absent from what Kolb rightly signals as Eusebius' goal in the oration ('Mit der Übernahme des Konzepts der *Roma Aeterna* durch die christliche Kirche konnte auch die Ewigkeit des Kaisers als Träger dieser Herrschaft christianisiert werden', *ibid.*; my emphasis).

^{888.} Van Dam (2007) 58.

^{889.} Van Dam (2007) 58-59; Davenport (2017) 36.

^{890.} Grig and Kelly (2012) 14.

^{891.} Berger (2007) 211. Cf., however, Moser (2018) 13-44 for Roman senators active in the East, and *ibid.* 67, for the presence in Constantinople of senators like Flavius Dionysius.

digesting in the very period under discussion here. Strangely enough, however, the city of Constantinople features only minimally in Eusebius' account of Constantine's deeds.⁸⁹² We will discuss the much quoted passage where it does make an appearance below, but it is worthwhile to first devote our attention to Constantinople's relative absence.

First of all, the foundation of the city is not mentioned in Eusebius' treatment of Constantine's momentous victory over Licinius (II.19). Since he explicitly professes not to mention the 'valiant deeds' and many other acts of the Emperor 'which everybody remembers', but takes as his purpose to write down only 'what relates to the life which is dear to God' (I.11), this could corroborate our interpretation of the 324 foundation. In fact, the foundation of Constantinople is completely absent from the first half of the work, and its first explicit appearance (III.48) occurs nearly 90 pages (of Winkelman's modern edition) into the work.⁸⁹³ That absence stands in stark contrast to other cities where Constantine distinguished himself by church building, and which are accordingly treated by Eusebius to considerable length. Jerusalem (III.25-40) is the prime example, contrastively preceding the paragraph on Constantinople.⁸⁹⁴

The city of Nicaea makes a prominent appearance in his discussion of the council held there in 325 (III.6). As said, Eusebius' remarked on the appropriateness of 'a city (...) bearing the name of victory, Nicaea in the province of Bithynia'. Read with newly founded Constantinople's image as Constantian victory city in mind, this becomes a very poignant, almost sarcastic remark, as Constantinople would have been a far more suitable city on those very grounds.⁸⁹⁵ To an imagined audience that was well aware of Constantinople's status, reading the *Life* after 337, Eusebius' remark may even have read as an implicit justification for not holding the important council in Constantinople, something which by then would have seemed retrospectively logical. In an historical reconstruction independent of Eusebius' *Life*, it may also be remarked that Constantine could have chosen Nicaea as the site for the Council to balance his attention for Nicomedia, as there was a long-standing rivalry between the two cities.⁸⁹⁶

^{892.} Cameron and Hall (1999) 47. This absence is not due to Eusebius' personal lack of knowledge: for his visits to Constantinople, see *ibid.* 11, 23. Cf. Kaldellis (2016) 731 on the absence of the famous, colossal bronze statue of Constantine-Apollo on his porphyry column from Eusebius' accounts, since it 'spoiled his fictional image of Constantine as a purely Christian emperor and could not be explained by his theory that Constantine brought ancient statues to the city to have them ridiculed.'

^{893.} Winkelman (1975) 104.

^{894.} Also Bethlehem (III.43), Antioch (III.50) and Mamre (III.51-53) surround Constantinople's description.

^{895.} Notwithstanding the fact that Nicaea boasted a triumphal arch in honor of Constantine's father, Constantius (Chlorus).

^{896.} See Bejor (1993) 535.

The most striking presence that contrasts Constantinople's absence, however, is the city of Rome, not only with regard to the amount of references, but also in the way the Eternal City is described. Consistently and as if self-explanatory, it is referred to as 'the imperial city' (literally: 'the reigning city', *τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν*). As Dagron notes, only Rome receives this qualification in the works of Eusebius.⁸⁹⁷ Furthermore, this seems to be Eusebius' fixed epithet for Rome in the entire *Life*, used also on occasions concerning church politics, and also describing events after 324: *τῆς Ψωμαίων ἀρχῆς τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν ...τὴν βασιλίδα πόλιν* (I.26, on Rome in 312), *τῆς δέ γε βασιλευούσης πόλεως* (III.7, on Sylvester's bishopric in 325), *πλείστη γοῦν δορυφορίᾳ τιμώμενον ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν ἀγεκομίζετο, ἐνταυθοῖ τε ἡρίοις βασιλικοῖς ἀπετίθετο.* (III.47, on Helena being buried in Rome in around 329).⁸⁹⁸ This consistent styling of Rome contrasts sharply with one of Constantine's own documents cited by Eusebius, where it is referred to it as 'the city of the Romans' (*τὴν Ψωμαίων πόλιν*, III.19, in ca. 325).⁸⁹⁹

In a work that set a totally new paradigm of imperial pageant by presenting Constantine as a new Moses rather than a new Romulus, the city founded by the latter was still styled as a far more important imperial power base than the presumed upstart capital founded on the Bosphorus by the successor of a biblical hero. One explanation is that some of this material was gathered while Constantinople was still not so important, but it is far more likely that even after 337 Constantinople was not the Christian capital it is often (and often based on Eusebius) supposed to have been. Tellingly, that had changed by the later fourth and fifth centuries to such an extent that the Church historian Socrates, also known Socrates Scholasticus, blatantly misunderstood Eusebius' *τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν* (III.47): he naturally assumed it referred to Constantinople, instead of Rome.⁹⁰⁰ That throws Eusebius' striking choice of words into sharp relief, and makes the bishop of Caesarea and Church Father of the East an unlikely (and hitherto unacknowledged) predecessor of the slyly pagan historiographer Ammianus Marcellinus, often accused of acting manipulatively out of anti-Christian sentiments.⁹⁰¹

^{897.} Dagron (1974) 52, with the relevant passages quoted in n. 3. See Drijvers (2016) 147, dismissing the interpretation of the occurrence at III.47 as Constantinople, and Kelly (2003) 591 n. 17 for a possible later reburial in Constantinople.

^{898.} On the year of Helena's death see note 855.

^{899.} On Constantine's references to Rome as 'ἡ μεγάλη πόλις', 'τῆς φιλτάτης πόλεως' and 'τῇ Ψώμῃ' in the enigmatic *Oratio ad sanctorum coetum*, perhaps composed around 325, perhaps more than a decade earlier, see Girardet (2013) 31, with, however, Barbero (2016) 14.

^{900.} Socr. Schol. I.17: see Kelly (2003) 591 n. 17 and note 897.

^{901.} On Ammianus' 'polemical silence' see Kelly (2003), with p. 589 on his deceptive religious utterances; cf. Reitz-Joosse (2021) 55.

As Dagron notes, Eusebius consistently describes Constantinople as ἡ βασιλέως πόλις and ἡ βασιλέως ἐπώνυμος πόλις (“the (eponymous) city of the king/emperor”, III.54, IV.66).⁹⁰² Dagron summarizes the difference with Eusebius’ characterization of Rome as follows: ‘Rome est la ville royale, Constantinople la ville du roi’.⁹⁰³ Constantinople, in other words, is characterized by its strong link to the person of the emperor, while Rome is an imperial city in its own right, ‘a reigning city’ by virtue of itself. That is a decisive difference. Also, Eusebius never styles nor interprets Constantinople as a ‘new’ or ‘second’ Rome, nor does he create a strong link between the two. What became an absolute *topos* in later sources and modern scholarship is thus completely absent from important contemporary sources close to the emperor and his court. It may be salutary to remind ourselves of the relativity of such constructs, also because similar discrepancies are more often attested in the case of Constantine and his reception.⁹⁰⁴

We may then tentatively reconstruct the course of events as follows. After his decisive victory over Licinius, Constantine decided to commemorate his achievement by the foundation of a Nicopolis named after himself on the site of Byzantium, in 324. This city, however, was not intended to function as new imperial residence, let alone capital of the empire. Constantine resided in Nicomedia and celebrated his 20th anniversary as emperor there and in Rome. Possibly under the influence of the events in Rome, and likely following the demise of Crispus, the emperor gradually started to change his mind and decided to transform his victory city in a full-blown imperial residence, which was most likely solemnly dedicated in the year 330. Perhaps a celebration of Constantine’s 25th anniversary as emperor,⁹⁰⁵ not attested by the sources but likely to have taken place on 25 July 330, was one of the first major imperial events to be celebrated in Constantinople – possibly in some sort of concomitance with the dedication ceremony of 11 May. We have no record of such festivities, but the emperor’s presence in the city is securely attested.⁹⁰⁶ One may even conjecture that these otherwise unattested anniversary celebrations in 330 were the reason the dedication took place in 330, shortly before 25 July.

^{902.} Dagron (1974) 51–52, with the relevant passages quoted in n. 1 and 2.

^{903.} *Ibid.* 52.

^{904.} Cf. Brandt (2004) 160 on Winkelmann (1961), who observed that Christian authors like Lactantius and Eusebius devote ample attention to Constantine’s religious policy, while non-Christian authors largely ignore it, and 169–170 on Neri (1995), who observed that the Christian author Rufinus completely ignored the foundation of Constantinople, and Wiemer, who observed the same for the non-Christian author Libanius, ignoring Constantinople out of Antiochene local patriotism.

^{905.} See Körfer (2020) 155.

^{906.} Barnes (1982) 78.

Coincidentally, there may be an indication for this process in some of the sources themselves. There is a tradition, recorded by Sozomenus, Zosimus and Zonaras, that Constantine first started to build his new city in the vicinity of Troy. Alföldi outrightly dismissed this tradition as one of many *a posteriori* fabrications by Constantinopolitan intellectuals, whereas La Rocca and Calderone have independently argued for its reinstatement.⁹⁰⁷ Be that as it may, both Sozomenus and Zosimus clearly develop as a theme the fact that Constantine would have changed his plans. According to Zosimus, he had already built walls between Cape Sigeum and Ilium and then simply changed his mind; Sozomenus attributed the change to a divine vision, in which God guided Constantine from the Trojan plain to Byzantium. The details of the stories seem highly fictitious, but there is perhaps a hint of the reconsiderations and changes of plan that could have taken place in the early years after 324.⁹⁰⁸ Instead of preserving this complicated nuance, one that detracted from the visionary nature Constantine's foundation of mature Constantinople, this Trojan tradition may have turned the initial phase of Byzantium as victory city into an aggrandizing episode, set in the highly suitable area of ancient Ilium, whence also the Palladium originated.⁹⁰⁹

4.7. Conclusion: *Constantinus conditor*

Let us now, as we approach the end of our discussion of the foundation of Constantinople, once more zoom out and look at the empire as a whole. What was the wider response to, and influence of Constantine's ktistic acts on the Bosphorus? His message of presenting himself as a founder of cities, with which we started this chapter, was not lost on a wider audience than just the citizens of a small town in Phrygia, and seems to have been picked up across the emperor's newly conquered realm. A contemporary inscription from Utica in Africa Proconsularis, set up by the proconsul Maecilius Hilarianus, hailed Constantine as 'founder and enlarger of his entire Roman world and the one who increases, through the generosity of his kindness, both the prosperity and the adornment of every single city'.⁹¹⁰ Although it does not literally honor Constantine as founder of the cities mentioned thereafter,

^{907.} Alföldi (1947) 11; La Rocca (1993) 553-556; Calderone (1993) 729 (explicitly refuting Alföldi's numismatic argument in note 28).

^{908.} Comparably, Sozomenus' assertion (II.3) that Constantine started building his city on the site of the Greek camp may reflect the idea that Constantinople was founded on the site of Constantine's camp (Venning (2006) 7).

^{909.} For another reason why Troy may have provided Zosimus with a suitable setting, see Edwards (2017) 87-88.

^{910.} CIL VIII.1179, dedicated to Constantine as *conditori adque (sic) amplificatori totius orbis Romani sui / ac singularum quarumque / civitatum statum adque / ornatum liberalitate / clementiae suae augenti ...* by M(a)ecilius Hilarianus, whose titulature arguably dates this inscription to the years 324-325, when he was proconsul of Africa. In theory, his dedication may even have preceded the actual foundation of Constantinople.

it does begin, rather conspicuously, with the word *conditori*. That was a novelty of sorts: while the reference to the emperor as the one who ‘increases’ the status of cities is fully in line with Tetrarchic precedent,⁹¹¹ styling him as *conditor* had no recent tradition in inscriptions of this kind.⁹¹²

Nevertheless, many instances of this phenomenon popped up exactly in the years after 324. The same proconsul of Africa also honoured Constantine as *conditor* on a fragmentary inscription from Carthage;⁹¹³ so did another senior magistrate in Puteoli (Italy).⁹¹⁴ The city of Philippi (Macedonia) even honoured Constantine outright as [c] *onditorem spl[endidiss(imae)]/ [c]oloniae Phili[ppiensium]*, ‘...founder of the most splendid colony of the Philippians...’.⁹¹⁵ This notable geographical coverage makes it seem like there was a coordinated tendency to honor the emperor’s ktistic quality. Since most of these inscriptions, unlike the inscribed documentary pillar in Orcistus, must have been statue bases (the one in Puteoli even for an equestrian statue), the monuments styling Constantine as *conditor* were quite prominently present in the cityscapes of the time. They visualized Constantine’s own statement in the letter inscribed at Orcistus throughout the Empire, and seem to confirm that the importance of Constantine’s ktistic act was noticed and promoted far beyond Asia Minor.

The case of Philippi is especially interesting, since, in contrast to the other examples from Africa and Puteoli mentioned above, Constantine is not styled *conditor* of the world or another universalistic entity, but of the colony of Philippi itself. The reason for this particular, local honor is not known; Brélaz speculates that it may have had to do with one of the emperor’s visits while passing through.⁹¹⁶

^{911.} See note 715.

^{912.} It rather harks back to Hadrian and the way Roman emperors were honored in the Greek part of empire from the second century onwards: see e.g. *IG VII.1840* for Hadrian *σωτῆρι καὶ κτίστῃ / τῆς οἰκουμένης* (from Thespia in Boeotia), *IG XII.5.741* (likewise, from Andros) and further Pont (2007). Cf. also p. 33, above.

^{913.} *CIL VIII.12524*. See Ladjimi Sebäi (2005) 114–116, who assumes the dedication honors Constantine as founder of Carthage.

^{914.} *AE (1969/1970) 107 = EDH HD012976 = EDRo74974 = LSA-1922*, opening with the interesting chiasmus *propagatori orbis su[i] / Romani nominis conditori*. See further Camodeca (2018) 355–360.

^{915.} *AE (1933) 86 = AE (1948) 207 = EDH HD023862 = LSA-830*, a fragmentary dedication from the forum of Philippi honoring Constantine (in the accusative, perhaps influenced by Greek custom) as [c]onditorem. A third fragment, now finally published, confirms that the term [c]onditorem must be connected with the genitive [c]oloniae Phili[ppiensium] in the next line: see Brélaz (2014) 129–131, with pl. VXI, making the initial ‘universalistic’ restitution of the text as [c]onditorem[omnium salutis] (see *AE (1948) 207*) obsolete. Interestingly, Philippi seems to have preserved a memorial culture for its original founders in the later Empire: cf. note 185.

^{916.} Brélaz (2014) 131. Cf. Rizos (2019) for the possible Christian dimension, which may even associate Constantine with the apostle Paul as founder.

That is perhaps not even necessary. In line with Mark Humphries' more general observation that 'Constantinople's development had a significant impact beyond its immediate confines',⁹¹⁷ one may rather identify the foundation of Constantinople as the context in which this reference to the emperor as city-founder originates. Building on the general observation by Gehn that the fragmentary dedication to Constantine from Philippi (AE (1933) 86 = AE (1948) 207) makes extra sense in the historical circumstances of the emperor's presence in nearby Thrace at the time of Constantinople's foundation, one could plausibly argue that the honorific title [c] *onditorem* is particularly fitting, both chronologically and geographically, to honor Constantine after his ktistic act.⁹¹⁸

Unfortunately, we do not know if Constantine was also honoured as city-founder at Carthage, or rather in the guise of a universalizing *conditor*.⁹¹⁹ Nevertheless, the dedications from Africa and Puteoli provide equally compelling evidence for the contemporary, empire-wide reception of the ktistic stance adopted by Constantine in the Orcistan dossier. Puteoli was Italy's main harbor and an economic powerhouse, a hotspot of Mediterranean trade. Africa, at the same time, was at the height of its economic power, and more than ever before constituted the economic heart of the empire. Both cities must have been home to imperial officials with a lively interest in what was happening in the East around 324. Africa's case is particularly rich and telling, with two dedications by the same official. Traditionally focused on Rome and Italy, Africa is one pole in what Carandini calls the 'new axis between Carthage and Rome' that established itself from the third century AD in the Mediterranean economy.⁹²⁰ Also, the political position of Africa was at the height of tension by the recent rebellion of Domitius Alexander under Maxentius, reminiscent of the revolt of the Gordiani in the 230's AD.⁹²¹ Constantine had defeated Maxentius and thus 'conquered' Africa as well, but his position there must have been open to questions. As Constantine affirmed his power in the East by founding an eponymous victory city at Byzantium, we seem to witness the very first instances of what Carandini calls 'the new axis between Carthage and Constantinople': Africa will draw ever closer to the Eastern Mediterranean, economically and politically.⁹²² What we seem to be glancing at in these two inscriptions is the inception of that process: the pronconsul of Africa's proactive response to Constantine's ktistic stature seems to greet and acknowledge

^{917.} Humphries (2019) 36.

^{918.} Gehn (LSA-830 [retrieved 13 April 2020, 1:11 PM]).

^{919.} See note 913.

^{920.} Carandini (1993) 20.

^{921.} On Maxentius styling himself as CONSERVATOR AFRICAE SVAE, but also presenting the African insurgents as non-Roman opponents, see Wienand (2012) 211.

^{922.} *Ibid.* 21, a development reaching its peak from the middle of the fifth century AD onwards.

the foundation of a new imperial city in the East. It seems to have been beneficial to Maecilius Hilarianus' impressive career: he would later rise to become consul, urban prefect of Rome and praetorian prefect of Italy.⁹²³

It would take further research to confirm these impressions, and consolidate the hypothesis that the foundation of Constantinople was not only broadcasted by the emperor himself, but also perceived as highly important and reflected by contemporaries all around the Empire, from provincial Orcistus to booming cities like Carthage and Puteoli. For now, let us once more return to the site of Constantinople and the emperor's momentuous political choices reflecting on both Rome and his new eponymous city in the East.

So, why Byzantium? Constantine's move East was neither unprecedeted nor unpredictable, since this was where he had to consolidate his power most. The same goes for his measure of founding a new city. It has been suggested that Constantine chose the site because of the fact that Licinius had resided there in the period preceding his defeat.⁹²⁴ That hypothesis is rendered unlikely by the fact that Constantine did not conveniently use and effectively appropriate Licinius' residence with immediate effect in the years after 324⁹²⁵ (unless, of course, as Timothy Barnes supposes, Constantine first completely razed Byzantium to the ground).⁹²⁶ What is striking is Constantine's precise choice of location, rather unfavorable for the support of an immense population, and the unprecedeted success his eponymous city would meet as an imperial capital in the centuries to come.⁹²⁷ For us, it has become hard not to see the elements of Constantinople's future greatness and ingredients of its foundation, meant to be from the beginning – and it was equally hard for early medieval Byzantines not to do so either. But Themistius, addressing Constantius II in 357, claimed that 'almost all men thought that the city's good fortune would die along with your father', a fate that was only prevented by Constantine's son, 'engaging in a noble rivalry with the founder as to who could surpass the other in his benefactions'.⁹²⁸

^{923.} *PLRE I* (1971) 433, s.v. 'Hilalianus 5'; Chastagnol (1962) 103-105; Orlandi (2005) 268-269.

^{924.} Stephenson (2009) 193-194, applauded by Barnes (2011) 112-113; see also Harries (2012) 121. The point had in fact already been suggested by Berger: see Berger (2007) 205, with n. 6, referring to his earlier article from 1997.

^{925.} See Harries (2012) 121.

^{926.} Barnes (2011) 111. The claim is most probably based on a deduction from Eusebius' remark (VC III.48) that Constantine had removed all traces of idolatry from Constantinople, but this seems rather a maximalist interpretation of an already contestable passage.

^{927.} Stephenson (2009) 194-196; Mango (1995); cf. Grig and Kelly (2012) 9 on the success of the new name Constantinople in the fourth and fifth centuries, almost completely effacing 'Byzantium'.

^{928.} *Or. III.48a, b*, translated by Heather and Moncur (2001) 133, with note 275, stating that 'Constantinople's continued dominance was far from automatic'.

City foundations are projections of historical consciousness. The claim works both ways, relating either to the founder (working to project the memory of his deeds into the future) or to subsequent generations looking back at the events (retrojecting later developments on to the initial moment of creation). In Constantinople, both circumstances seem to apply. Constantine founded Constantinople as a device to perpetuate the memory of his momentous victory and a monument to himself as sole ruler of the Roman Empire. When the city had (unexpectedly, perhaps) developed into the solid seat of imperial rule and a manifestly Christian capital, somewhere towards the end of the fourth century, the history of the city's foundation was obviously rewritten in accordance with contemporary developments, ascribing to its original founder the visionary intentions that would have led up to the current preeminence. Every new element that aggrandized the stature of the city's founder also reflects positively on the city founded by him, and accordingly Constantine's life and reputation were repeatedly enhanced and embellished with hagiographical details.⁹²⁹ This process is admittedly worth studying in itself, but possibly has very little to do with the foundation of a city on the Bosphorus in the third decade of the fourth century AD.

The foundation of Constantinople, thus, seems to have been intended neither as the establishment of a new capital, nor as the creation of a specifically Christian city. The interpretation of Constantine's ktistic act, however, as a ktistic renewal of an Eastern Rome in a Christian fashion, was not long in the waiting. As the bishops of Old Rome started to claim special prominence on the basis of the tombs of Peter and Paul and their Roman martyrdom, Constantinopolitans had to muster all the Christian characteristics they could reasonably ascribe to their young, newly established city. Lacking precious relics or impressive local martyrs, the most powerful claim they could come up with was that their city had been founded by the first Christian emperor.⁹³⁰ Most likely, it was this brilliant invention that sparked the Romans, in turn, to come up with a similar claim: that Peter and Paul had not only founded the Roman church and died for their faith in Christ in Rome, but that their martyrdom actually amounted to an act of city-foundation. That, therefore, is the subject of the next chapter.

^{929.} La Rocca (1993) 553; cf. Bowes (2008) 107 on 'the Constantinian myth machine' and Cornell in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1111, who briefly compares Constantinople's foundation narrative with the legendary *Ktiseis* of ancient Greece and stresses that 'a strict distinction between legendary wanderings and historical colonial foundation cannot be made'.

^{930.} Cf. August., *Sermo 105.9* (PL XXXVIII, 624): *Constantinopolis ex quo condita est in magnam civitatem, quoniam a christiano imperatore condita est, (...)*.

CHAPTER

5

OVERVIEW

Rome's Christian founders:
Damasus, Ambrose and Prudentius on Peter and Paul

'How could the teachings of Jesus, directed to his simple Galilean followers, or the advice of Paul, directed to tiny Christian communities scattered here and there in the ancient world, ever be applied to a highly organized, wealthy, and powerful Church centered in Rome?'⁹³¹

In Late Antiquity, the bishops of Rome redefined the old idea of Rome as *caput mundi*. Constantine's imperial patronage of Christian cult places had constituted a major watershed in the development of a Christian Rome, but only later, in the second half of the fourth century, did the leaders of Rome's church gradually start to promote their city as the centre of Christendom. In their efforts to make the Eternal City into a Christian capital, they relied heavily on the memory and martyrdom of Rome's foremost saints, the apostles Peter and Paul. This emphasis manifested itself in different ways. Both saints had a communal feast day on 29 June, one of the most important occurrences in the liturgical year, apart from the canonical high feasts. Moreover, their joint celebration was far more important than any feast devoted to them individually, stressing their union as apostles (known as *concordia apostolorum*). The sites of their tombs were among the first to be monumentalized when Constantine had allowed and promoted the erection of Christian places of worship. By far the most prominent was Old St. Peter's, on the Vatican Hill along the Via Aurelia, an impressive monument to the Prince of the apostles, as well as Rome's first self-proclaimed supporter of Christianity on the imperial throne. More modest was the earliest monumentalisation of St. Paul's tomb outside the walls, along the Tiber and the Via Ostiensis (usually designated with its Italian name, *San Paolo fuori le mura*). Apart from that, the apostles had a third, pre-existing cult site along the Via Appia, where they were venerated together in the complex of catacombs under what is now the church of St. Sebastian (*San Sebastiano* in Italian). It is to Peter and Paul, the leading apostles, that the bishops of Rome turned to promote the idea that their city was the centre of Christendom.

Initially venerated as the founders of the Roman church, they would eventually come to be seen as Christian city-founders, replacing the pagan founders Romulus and Remus. That development, however, was the result of a long and complex trajectory. The clearest and most spectacular example is a sermon written in AD 441 by Pope Leo the Great for the celebration of Peter and Paul on 29 June.⁹³² It is often argued that Leo was preceded by Damasus, Ambrose and Prudentius.

This striking case of ktistic renewal is often treated quite uncritically in modern scholarship, both in terms of chronological development and in terms of historical

^{931.} Gabel, Wheeler and York (2000) 308.

^{932.} See further below, p. 304.

inevitability. This chapter addresses the question how widespread, well established and ancient the idea of Peter and Paul as founders of Rome actually was in Late Antiquity. To do so, it will first devote ample attention to the primary sources, studying and interpreting them with a keen eye for the contemporary political and ecclesiastical circumstances. The remainder of part B of this thesis will show that, rather than an early phenomenon or something bound to happen, Rome's late antique ktistic renewal as a Christian city was both a slow-moving and a highly contested development. That has everything to do with the history of Christianity and traditions of Christian thinking about city-foundation. The fact that it happened at all is connected to the foundation of Constantinople, or rather its subsequent interpretation by Christians in a religious key. Even though the slow start of the developments discussed in this chapter occurred long before Constantine, it is only possible to discuss them now, after the previous chapter has dealt with the thorny issues surrounding Constantine's ktistic acts on the Bosphorus.

When Constantinople started to be seen as a Christian city established by a Christian founder, the application of the concept of ktistic renewal took a decisive turn. Although Constantine, as a ruler founding an eponymous city, had operated in a traditional ktistic paradigm, his subsequent reconfiguration as a Christian city-founder created an entirely new dynamic. Far beyond Constantinople, that dynamic would have lasting consequences for the old Rome on the Tiber, as well. To understand what this new dynamic meant, and what the consequences of this historical coincidence were, it is necessary to take a step back in time and start our investigation by looking at early Christian attitudes towards the concept of foundation. Afterwards, we will be able to trace the ideas about Peter and Paul as founders of Rome from their first emerging stages to their full deployment.

5.1. Church founders and city founders in the Bible and the earliest Christian authors

What was the gist of Christian attitudes towards city foundation and city founders, long before Constantine founded Constantinople and the leaders of the Roman church started to boast Peter and Paul as their founders? In order to address that question, it is imperative to discuss what biblical texts and the early fathers of the church had to say about founders and city foundation. This overview builds on the fundamental groundwork of Wolfgang Speyer, published in 1983 as the lemma on Christian founders ('Gründer. B. Christlich') in the RAC.⁹³³ Speyer surveys the role of the concept of founder under different chronological and thematic headings. In the comparative spirit of the RAC, he draws explicit comparisons with earlier and

⁹³³ Speyer in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1145-1171.

contemporary non-Christian attitudes and developments, treated in the first half of the lemma by Tim Cornell. Speyer starts with the important observation that there is a close connection between the Christian concept of founder and that of the Creator in the Old and New Testament.⁹³⁴ In fact, already in the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Bible, dating to the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC, God is described in Greek as *κτίστης*, “founder”.⁹³⁵ The stock Hebrew verb for the act of creation reserved to God, *bārā'*, is not seldom translated by *κτίζειν*.⁹³⁶ As Speyer goes on to observe, there is a similar overlap in the New Testament and Patristic texts between the traditional terms for founders like *κτίστης*, *conditor*, *fundator* and the designation of God the Creator.⁹³⁷ In the New Testament, *κτίζειν* is the standing expression for creation, and like *bārā'* in the Old Testament God is its only subject.⁹³⁸ It can thus be observed that a nascent tendency in the Septuagint, namely to describe God’s act of Creation in Greek terms strongly associated with foundation, evolved into a rule by the time the texts in the New Testament were written down, during the late first century AD. With regard to the Latin texts, a brief look at the *TLL* may substantiate this claim. *Condere* is often used in the so-called *Itala*, the early Latin translations of the Bible,⁹³⁹ to translate *κτίζειν* in either the Septuagint or the original Greek text of the New Testament.⁹⁴⁰

This lexical overlap between creation and foundation, assimilating the former to the latter, does not always work the other way around. Acts that would, in Greek or Roman terms, be seen as foundational are often phrased decidedly differently in the Greek Old and New Testament. On the one hand, Jesus is described as ‘founder/originator and accomplisher of the faith’ (τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν, Hebr. 12.2, cf. 2.10: τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας) and ‘founder/originator of life’ (τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, Acts 3.15), if that is how ‘ἀρχηγός’ should here be understood. When, on the other hand, the founders of the faith and the church on earth are discussed, the register is less lofty and more material. In Matthew 7.24-27 Jesus described those who follow him in terms of a steady house built on a rock. (ὅστις ὡκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. (...) τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.) The exact same terminology of building, not founding, recurs in Matthew 16.18, when Jesus famously describes Peter as the rock upon which he will build his church (ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). If there ever was an occasion to stress (or to de-

^{934.} *Ibid.* 1145.

^{935.} E.g. LXX Si 24.8; cf. Prehn s.v. ‘Ktistes’ in *RE* XI.2 (1922) 2087.

^{936.} Nelis (1966-1969) 1282, 1285-1286.

^{937.} Speyer in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1145.

^{938.} Nelis (1966-1969) 1285.

^{939.} On the *Itala*, see Schirner (2015) 46-53, and 13-19 on (Late Antique) translations of the Bible in general, both with extensive bibliographical references.

^{940.} *TLL* s.v. *condere* II.E, p. 154 l. 30-55.

emphasize, in fact) the ktistic overtones of the foundation of the church on earth, this would have been it. This cardinal passage, so crucial for the later claims of the Roman episcopal see, could hardly have been more explicit in its avoidance of traditional ktistic terminology.

When it is not Jesus who speaks, but the apostles who speak about him, both Peter (1 Peter 2.4-6: λίθον ζῶντα) and Paul (Eph 2.20-1: ὅντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη) also describe Christ as a stone, following Isaiah 28.16 (Ιδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον). Jesus is the cornerstone of the spiritual edifice in which Christians revere their God, while for Paul (Eph 2.20: ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,) the apostles and prophets are the foundation (θεμέλιον) of God's house. This is where one may be tempted to identify, as many have done from the Christians of Late Antiquity onwards, a biblical passage speaking of the apostles as founders of the faith. That, however, seems not to have been the case. As Speyer notes, "in the New Testament the image of founding occurs only in this metaphorical way".⁹⁴¹ It is instructive that, just a page further down in a modern edition of the New Testament, Paul speaks of God as 'founder' or 'creator' of all things, using κτίζειν (ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, Eph 3.9). Whatever is concerned with the terrestrial foundations of the Christian faith is thus described in a very humble register which is a far cry from the grandiloquent terms, redolent of associations with classical city-foundation, used for the act of creation – and for creation only.

The restraint in terminology when it comes to terrestrial foundations is matched by a restrained application of the concept of founder to earthly agents. For Paul, God is the founder also of the Christian community on earth, and the apostles are not seen as founders in their own right.⁹⁴² The limited claim to a foundational role for the apostles is readily apparent from 1 Corinthians, which addresses several of the issues discussed here in tandem. The apostle explicitly disavows such a role for himself in 1 Cor (1.12-17; 3.4-4.13; cf. Rom 15.20). It seems clear enough that, in New Testament theology, the assumption of a ktistic role by a human actor is an intolerable intrusion upon God's prerogative. According to Paul himself, he is not the founder of the Corinthian church; he has only planted the seed, and it is God alone who causes it to grow and thus has the essential role (έγὼ ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλώς ἐπότισεν, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς ηὔξανεν. ὥστε οὕτε ὁ φυτεύων ἐστίν τι οὕτε ὁ ποτίζων, ἀλλ' ὁ αὔξανων θεός, Cor 3.6-7). When Paul then paraphrases this remark and says that he has laid the

^{941.} Speyer in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1148: 'Im NT begegnet die Vorstellung des Gründens nur in dieser übertragenen Ausdrucksweise.'

^{942.} *Ibid.*

foundation (θεμέλιον) for the temple of God he immediately specifies that this foundation is actually Jesus Christ (θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὃς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός 3.11). As Speyer phrases it, Christ is simultaneously the founder and the foundation of what he has founded.⁹⁴³ Paul's careful way of expressing himself, when read less respectfully and with a decisive strategy to stress his role, could nevertheless be used to corroborate the idea that he was indeed the founder of the Christian community at Corinth. It is thus technically incorrect, but understandable and indicative of other readings that Otto Zwierlein concludes: 'Eine Durchsicht der beiden Briefe des Paulus an die Korinther stellt jedenfalls außer Zweifel, daß Paulus die Gründung der Christengemeinde in Korinth für sich allein beansprucht.'⁹⁴⁴ At the same time, Paul's insistence in denying a prominent role for himself is probably a sign that members of the deviant Corinthian community regarded him as, in some way, their religious founder, analogous to the founders of philosophical schools and doctrines. It is perhaps the first example of a clash between the concept of foundation in Christian doctrine, inspired by biblical theology, and Christian practice, conditioned by Hellenistic and Roman cultural patterns.⁹⁴⁵

Despite Paul's efforts and insistence, the tables would turn as the era of the apostles themselves became a period of the past. According to Speyer, the question who had founded which community became relevant, when, over time, the Coming of Christ did not take place and doctrinal disputes arose between different communities. The first instance of a Christian community affirming its origins in such a way seems – perhaps no chance – to have been that of Rome.⁹⁴⁶ The so called first *Letter of Clement*, traditionally dated to the end of the first century AD,⁹⁴⁷ is much like 1 Cor, as it also is a letter of instruction sent to the Christian community of Corinth.⁹⁴⁸ This time, however, the sender is not an apostle but 'the church of God that sojourns in Rome' (1 Clem prologue). Already in the second century it was thought that Clement of Rome, the alleged fourth bishop of the city, had been its author.⁹⁴⁹ Whatever its precise date and authorship, it seems to contain the first reference to a human founder of a Christian community (1 Clem 5.4-6, 42-44). second century Christians, at least, seem

^{943.} *Ibid.*

^{944.} Zwierlein (2009) 138.

^{945.} It is probably relevant in this respect that the Corinthian community was not at all sectary and its members were very well integrated in the civic life of Roman Corinth: Barbaglio (1997) 105. See further Meeks (1983) 117-125, 131-133.

^{946.} For a concise and up-to-date overview of the discussion regarding Peter's historical role in the earliest Christian community of Rome, see Siecienski (2017) 43-53.

^{947.} Cf. Zwierlein (2009) 245-332, who argues for a dating in the years AD 120-125.

^{948.} Cf. the mention of Paul's letter in 1 Clem 47.1-3.

^{949.} Cf. Zwierlein (2009) 135, 158-160.

to have (mis)read 1 Clement with the purpose of basing their own statements about Peter and Paul at Rome on its authority.⁹⁵⁰

More important than the historical reliability of this claim, moreover, is the fact that Christians of Late Antiquity widely regarded Clement to have been the fourth bishop of Rome, building his authority and that of the church he represented on Peter. After Clement, numerous early Christian authors attest to the role of Peter as well as Paul as founders of the Roman church, attestations reaching a first peak towards the end of the second century AD.⁹⁵¹ This point may be illustrated by several older passages quoted by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, published around AD 326 – a text we already encountered in the previous chapter, as it dates to the time of Constantinople's foundation.⁹⁵²

The first quote derives from a letter (or 'homily') addressed to the Romans, written in Greek by bishop Dionysius of Corinth, dated to AD 170-174:⁹⁵³ (II.25.8)

5

Ως δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἅμφω καιρὸν ἐμαρτύρησαν, Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος ἐγγράφως Ῥωμαίοις ὀμιλῶν, ὡδε παρίστησιν “ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοσαύτης νονθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. καὶ γὰρ ἅμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς ὄμοιως ἐδίδαξαν, ὄμοιώς δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὄμόσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν.” καὶ ταῦτα δέ, ὡς ἂν ἔτι μᾶλλον πιστωθείη τὰ τῆς ιστορίας.

'And that both were martyred at the same time is shown by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in his written homily to the Romans: "by so great an admonition, you have joined together the plantings of the Romans and Corinthians by Peter and Paul. For both of them planted and taught us at Corinth, and similarly, teaching together in Italy, they both gave witness/were martyred at the same time."

The second set of quotes included by Eusebius dates from AD 180-189 and is derived from the third book of bishop Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*, originally written in Greek:⁹⁵⁴ (V.8.1-2 = Iren. III.3.1; V.5.9-6.1 = Iren. III.3.3)

^{950.} Zwierlein (2009) 32, 134-135, 139-140, 155, 237.

^{951.} Speyer in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1151.

^{952.} Burgess (1997) 471-504 for the dating.

^{953.} Zwierlein (2009) 139; translation by Hall (2014) 206.

^{954.} Zwierlein (2009) 140-141.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀρχόμενοι τῆς πραγματείας ὑπόσχεσιν πεποιήμεθα παραθήσεσθαι κατὰ καιρὸν εἰπόντες τὰς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πρεσβυτέρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων φωνὰς ἐν αἷς τὰς περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων γραφῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς κατελθούσας παραδόσεις γραφῆ παραδεδώκασιν, τούτων δὲ καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἦν, φέρε, καὶ τὰς αὐτοῦ παραθάμεθα λέξεις, καὶ πρώτας γε τὰς περὶ τῶν ιερῶν εὐαγγελίων, οὕτως ἔχούσας· ὅ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἐβραιοῖς τῇδι διὰ αὐτῶν διαλέκτω καὶ γραφὴν ἔξηγεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν
Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος (...)

'At the beginning of this work we made a promise to quote from time to time the sayings of the presbyters and writers of the church of the first period, in which they have delivered the traditions which came down to them about the canonical Scriptures. Now Irenaeus was one of these, so let us quote his words, and in the first place those which refer to the sacred Gospels, as follows: "Now Matthew published among the Hebrews a written gospel also in their own tongue, while Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and founding the church. But after their death Mark also (...)"'

οὗτος τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τὴν διαδοχὴν ἐπισκόπων ἐν τρίτῃ συντάξει τῶν πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις παραθέμενος, εἰς Ἐλεύθερον, οὗ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἡμῖν ἔξετάζεται, ὡς ἂν δὴ κατ' αὐτὸν σπουδαζομένης αὐτῷ τῆς γραφῆς, τὸν κατάλογον ἵστησι, γράφων ὡδε·
"θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνω τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν. (...)

'In his third book against the heresies he gives the succession of the bishops in Rome as far as Eleutherus, the events of whose days are now being discussed by us, as though his book had been composed at that time, and he gives the list, writing as follows. "Therefore when the blessed apostles had founded and built the church they gave the ministry of the episcopate to Linus. (...)"'

The fourth quote, finally, stems from the beginning of the third century, when a certain Gaius also wrote (in Greek) about Peter and Paul as founders of the Roman church:⁹⁵⁵ (II.25 5-7)

^{955.} Zwierlein (2009) 4.

Παῦλος δὴ οὖν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ‘Ρώμης τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ’ αὐτὸν ἵστοροῦνται, καὶ πιστοῦται γε τὴν ἵστορίαν ἡ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου εἰς δεῦρο κρατήσασα ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτόθι κοιμητηρίων πρόσρησις, οὐδὲν δὲ ἥττον καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνήρ, Γάϊος ὄνομα, κατὰ Ζεφυρίνον· ‘Ρωμαίων γεγονώς ἐπίσκοπον· ὃς δὴ Πρόκλω τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας προϊσταμένω γνώμης ἐγγράφως διαλεχθείς, αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν τόπων, ἔνθα τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ιερὰ σκηνώματα κατατέθειται, φησίν· “ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι. ἐάν γάρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν ἡ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὀστίαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἰδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.”

‘It is related that in his [Nero’s] time Paul was beheaded in Rome itself, and that Peter likewise was crucified, and the title of “Peter and Paul,” which is still given to the cemeteries there, confirms the story, no less than does a writer of the Church named Gaius, who lived when Zephyrinus was Bishop of Rome. Gaius in a written discussion with Proclus, the leader of the Montanists, speaks as follows of the places where the sacred relics of the Apostles in question are deposited: “But I can point out the trophies of the Apostles, for if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church.”’

In these quoted passages, dating from the late second to the early third century, we may observe a gradual verbal shift from figurative to more materially concrete language, from ‘φυτεύω’ (‘planting’) to ‘θεμελιώ/οίκοδομέω/ἰδρύω’ (‘building’). Their authors adopt canonical vocabulary stemming from the New Testament, but they adapt the context in which it is used to their contemporary realities. The first of the set of passages quoted from Irenaeus is especially significant, since it juxtaposes Peter and Paul’s activity as founders of the Roman church with Matthew’s activity as evangelist. Irenaeus thus, in a subtle manner, bridges the divide between the New Testament canon, in which Peter and Paul were not mentioned as founders, and their evangelising and founding at Rome (with the poignant recurrence of Matthew’s ‘εὐαγγελίου’ in Peter and Paul’s ‘εὐαγγελιζομένων’).⁹⁵⁶ Irenaeus repeated his assertion

⁹⁵⁶ For Irenaeus’ insertion in a passage otherwise copied from Papias see Zwierlein (2009) 142-143.

in many other passages,⁹⁵⁷ and does not limit his stress on apostles as founders of a church to Rome.⁹⁵⁸

By the time of Eusebius, there was manifestly a lively interest in the founders of local Christian communities. Just like he seems to have read other aspects of Dionysius' letter in the light of his own time,⁹⁵⁹ he also seems to have read τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενηθεῖσαν as an unproblematic expression of Peter and Paul's roles as founders of the Roman church. Although Dionysius was more flexible than Paul himself in seeing the apostle as the founder of the Corinthian church, he was still at pains to retain Paul's own original phrasing from 1 Corinthians 3.6-7, discussed above.⁹⁶⁰ Eusebius demonstrates even less unease about framing the apostles as founders. His *Ecclesiastical History* is full of discussions of who founded which church, stressing the continuity of episcopal succession.⁹⁶¹ At the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth book, Eusebius summarises the first seven books succinctly as those describing the succession to the apostles.⁹⁶² This is how far Christian thought had developed since Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. The reluctance to identify the apostles as founders of certain Christian communities had given way, but that was still a far cry from speaking about Christian city founders, and from employing the traditional ktistic terminology for those figures.

It is interesting to note that Eusebius places a major historical caesura at the start of the persecutions and 'the destruction of the churches'. This seems important for our discussion as well, as it ties in with a next evolution of the concept of Christian foundation, one not readily identified by Speyer. The way out of the doctrinal difficulty, which had led Paul to disavow any foundational role for himself, was eventually discovered in the act of martyrdom. Through martyrdom, human individuals were elevated to quasi-divine status, recognised as working directly on the behest of God. A martyr could thus justifiably be seen as the founder as the Christian community, not infringing upon God's status as universal founder (exemplified by Christ as founder of the church, according to Paul) but accompanying and executing the divine plan for the spread of Christianity on earth. Increasingly, it

^{957.} E.g. III.3.2, *maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae*, only transmitted in a Latin translation from the second half of the fourth century. See further Van den Hoek (2020) 214-218.

^{958.} E.g. III.3.4, *apud Eus. H.E. III.23.4* (ἢ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ Παύλου μὲν τεθεμελιωμένη, 'the church at Ephesus was founded by Paul').

^{959.} Zwierlein (2009) 134-135.

^{960.} Cf. Zwierlein (2009) 139 n. 25.

^{961.} E.g. III.4 on apostolic succession, and IV.5, V.12 (with VII.19) on Jerusalem; cf. also the opening words of the whole work in I.1.1, 4.

^{962.} See Carotenuto (2001) xxiv-xxx for an overview of the scholarly discussion.

can be noted that not the pastoral acts of preaching and care for a community, but the lofty and extravagant testimony of faith, expressed by martyrdom, came to be seen as an act relevant to the Christian concept of foundation.

Summarizing what has been said so far, there was a certain tension and unease among early Christians to describe earthly events in terms of foundation, given the fact that God, the creator, was the only true founder of all. This led to a clash with Roman and Hellenistic ideas and practices, according to which the concept of foundation had become widely applicable to different human acts. Christian reservation collided with non-Christian readiness to describe human actions in terms of foundation. This remarkable difference between Christian and non-Christian ideas is highly relevant to our treatment of the Christian founders of Rome, below.

For one thing, it might explain why Eusebius is so sparing in his enthusiasm for the foundation of Constantinople, as was noted in the previous chapter. All he permits himself to say is that Constantine dedicated his city to the God of the martyrs. That is, from a traditional Christian point of view in the early fourth century, perhaps the most one can decently say about the ktistic prerogatives of a ruler presented as inherently Christian. The reason that Eusebius does not speak of Constantinople as a Christian city-foundation, might, in other words, have been that there was no such thing as a Christian city-foundation in the thinking of his day. There was only one, truly Christian city-foundation, already canonized in the Hebrew Bible: Jerusalem. Psalm 48 sings of 'the city where he [The Lord God] lives. His holy mountain (...)’ (48.2), exalting, a couple of verses down, that 'this is the city that God will let stand forever' (48.8).⁹⁶³ It is clear that this is a physical place on earth, God's terrestrial demeanor (Psalm 46.4).⁹⁶⁴ (Deutero-)Isaiah ends his vision of a restored Jerusalem with remarks like 'I am creating a Jerusalem, full of happy people' (65.18). Based and building on these and other exaltations of God's city, the idea of a transcendent, heavenly Jerusalem eventually replaced that of the earthly city of that name, and was canonised in the Apocalypse of John (20-22).⁹⁶⁵ Christians thus saw the Jerusalem God had founded as a heavenly city, a divine alternative to the cities of the Mediterranean world in which they passed their days on earth in expectation of the Last Judgement.

That would definitely be one explanation why it took so long before Peter and Paul came to be seen as the Christian founders of Rome. Being considered the founders of a Christian community and a given church was one thing, as the entity founded

^{963.} Cf. Psalm 149.2.

^{964.} Cf. the oblique reference to Hamor, the founder of Shechem, in Jos 24,32 and Jg 9,28.

^{965.} Speyer in Cornell and Speyer (1983) 1148; see further Arcari (2009).

was still entirely spiritual and an integral part of the entire church, founded by Christ. Founding a city, at least on earth, was, on the other hand, an intrinsically worldly enterprise, as yet unfit for Christian appropriation – even in the mind of Eusebius, at the time when his imperial hero, Constantine, was engaged in founding Constantinople.

5.2. Damasus on Peter and Paul as *nova sidera*

As the bishops of Rome and other cities in the Empire increasingly started to get involved in worldly affairs, Eusebius' hesitation gradually gave way to a tendency, on the part of power hungry ecclesiastics, to intermingle in the political rhetoric of the state. Rome, in particular, had been endowed by Constantine with Christian monuments of unparalleled splendour, but simultaneously saw its political prerogatives severely challenged by the ktistic legacy of that same emperor in Constantinople. In general, a shift in the political centre of gravity towards the East (not only Constantinople, but also, e.g., Antioch) might well have alerted the Western bishops, doctrinally at odds with their Eastern counterparts, as much as it alerted the 'last pagans' of Rome, the old senatorial aristocracy. As the city on the Bosphorus and the great patriarchs of the east tried to increase their hold on politics and doctrine throughout the Empire, Rome and Italy had to react. What the likes of Ambrose and Damasus came up with was a powerful cocktail of Christian sanctity and (formerly) imperial politics, building on the Roman tradition of ktistic renewal. They reinvented the foundation of Rome in a Christian key, creating a construct as attractive and powerful as the idea that Peter and Paul had founded the church of Rome had been to third century Christians. In the new age that had dawned since the death of Constantine, the foundation of merely an ecclesiastical community was not enough: the very city of Rome had to be reinterpreted as a Christian foundation.

The 'Christianization' of Rome's foundation legend has become some sort of a commonplace among modern scholars. They have seen the rise of Peter and Paul to new founders of the city as an essential and inevitable component of the Christianization of Rome in terms of urban topography, ritual time, cultural memory and religious ideology.⁹⁶⁶ In his classical masterpiece on *Roma Christiana*, Charles Pietri tellingly entitled to section on this topic 'L'église romaine et la conquête de la cité'.⁹⁶⁷ When the chronological development of this 'conquest' is set out, recent scholarship tends to emphasize the revolutionary nature of the pontificate of Damasus (AD 366-384). His concerted efforts constituted a definitive breakthrough in several areas at once. He did not leave the grandest architectural or artistic monuments to posterity, but

^{966.} Salzman (1990); Curran (2000) 116-157; Grossi (2000).

^{967.} Cf. Curran (2000) 117.

was certainly fundamental in claiming possession of the city and its inhabitants in more subtle ways. By appropriating the age-old ideology of Rome as Eternal City and *caput mundi* for the new faith, Damasus constructed an impressive and long-lasting ideological edifice on which he himself and his successors would build much of their claims to power. In Marianne Sághy's words, 'his works actually signify a deliberate and thoughtful program to bring about the Romanization of Christianity (and, conversely, the Christianization of Rome).'⁹⁶⁸ Obviously, this entailed a usurpation of Rome's teleological vision of its own history, and it is with Damasus that we must, therefore, begin our investigation of the new Christian founders of Rome.

It is appropriate to begin with a caveat. As John Curran wrote in 1999, 'the 'triumph of Christianity' has been unmasked as a deterministic model created by fifth-century churchmen'.⁹⁶⁹ While the idea of Peter and Paul as new Christian founders of Rome is perhaps equally indebted to fifth-century fabrication, it seems that there still is some work to be done in unmasking that construct or 'deterministic model'. At the same time, we will see that this construct was only partially successful and met with forceful resistance and diverging views, not only from non-Christians. As Curran notes concerning a different case, 'the real conflict of the fourth century' is to be found not between Christians and non-Christians, but between Christians themselves.⁹⁷⁰ That it nevertheless succeeded to push through on the long run was perhaps precisely because it managed to combine traditional sensitivities with contemporary Christian necessities. Rome would rise again, more splendid and majestic than it ever had, and so would her foundation be encompassed in an even more ambitious history of universal salvation.

That said, it will appear that there is no straightforward trajectory in the development of the Christian concept of ktistic renewal for Rome. It was not long after AD 312, in theory, that Rome 'stopped being Babylon to become, through its conversion, a holy city'.⁹⁷¹ We have seen how the panegyrist of 313 styles Constantine as a true Romulus. It would take almost a century for the new Christian elite of the city to assimilate such a ktistic paradigm to their own agenda. Damasus, in the end, created the necessary preconditions for this to happen, but seems to have refrained from making the move himself: he certainly had the opportunity and the reason to do so, and could have done so, had he wanted to. The fact that such a move was theologically disputable, as we have seen above, is perhaps one of the main reasons

^{968.} Sághy (2015) 314.

^{969.} Curran (2000) vi.

^{970.} Curran (2000) ix.

^{971.} Pietri (1986) 49.

for his reluctance. Damasus gained his pontificate not through communal consent, but as the outcome of severe doctrinal struggles with an opponent accused of 'Arian' beliefs, Ursinus.⁹⁷² It is possibly telling that his staunch Cisalpine colleague, Ambrose of Milan - having fewer doctrinal disputes in his disciplined flock - was the first who seems to have overcome that reluctance.

Our account must begin by treating the connection between a poem, a place and a festival, all involving Peter and Paul. The poem is one of Damasus' monumental epigrams, composed for what is now the church of San Sebastiano on the Via Appia outside Rome,⁹⁷³ and possibly connected to the Christian holiday in celebration of Peter and Paul on 29 June. The epigram cannot be precisely dated but certainly belongs to the period of Damasus' pontificate (AD 366 and 384). It celebrated Peter and Paul as *nova sidera*.⁹⁷⁴ Scholars have debated the meaning of this expression, but the general consensus is that it points to the Dioscuri (Castor and Pollux), the pair of divine protectors of the Roman people.⁹⁷⁵ We will come back to that interesting interpretation below. To complement our treatment of the poem, however, we will first look at the festival and the site in their proper contexts.

In Damasus' days, a Christian tradition claimed that 29 June was an important date for Peter and Paul's connection to Rome. Whether, originally, it was the date of both their martyrdoms (as most fourth and fifth century Christian authors affirm), the date of the translation of their relics (as our oldest source could be taken to imply), or a festival in their honor instituted on that date for a different reason is an issue still debated by scholars.⁹⁷⁶ Our oldest source for the date is the entry *III KAL. IUL. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense Tusco et Basso cons.* ('29 June: [Anniversary] of Peter in Catacumbas cemetery, and of Paul in cemetery on Ostian road, when Tuscus and Bassus were consuls [AD 258]') in the so-called *Depositio Martyrum*-part of the codex of the *Fasti Philocaliani*, composed AD 336-354.⁹⁷⁷ It is difficult to disentangle both the accounts of our late antique sources and the conflicting views of modern scholars

^{972.} On the term 'Arian', and the more neutral alternative 'Homoian', see note 1018, below.

^{973.} The current name of the church postdates the era of Damasus, as the church is only known as the *Basilica Sancti Sebastiani* from the Early Middle Ages. In Late Antiquity it was known as the *Basilica Apostolorum* or the *Basilica ad catacumbas*. Initially, before a basilica was built on the spot, the burial site on the Via Appia already existed and was known as *ad catacumbas* – the term would later be generalized to apply to all subterranean *coemeteria* with a Christian character. See further Lønstrup (2008) 39.

^{974.} Epigram 20 in the standard edition of Ferrua (Rome, 1942), followed by Trout (2015). Damasus addresses Peter and Paul as *nova sidera* in line 7. See further below.

^{975.} Van den Hoek (2013) 296-297.

^{976.} See e.g. Pietri (1961) 275-276 = (1997) 1085-1087; Lønstrup (2008) 39-41.

^{977.} See Lønstrup (2008) 39 and Beard, North and Price II (1998) 75 (with n. 3 at p. 76), from whom the translation quoted here is taken.

to establish what 29 June celebrated, and how that celebration was connected to the San Sebastiano in the era before Damasus. All that is certain, it seems, is that there was a feast celebrating the two apostles together. Regarding the site on the Via Appia, furthermore, we have the testimony of devotional graffiti mentioning Peter and Paul, supposedly harking back to the third century.⁹⁷⁸ They do not mention the date 29 June, however, while they do mention other dates, such as 19 March, 22 June and 15 July.⁹⁷⁹ The fact that sources from the late fourth century onwards suggest (and from the middle of the fifth century actually document) that 29 June was a celebration of the communal martyrdom of Peter and Paul taking place at the Via Appia has prompted scholars to project such a celebration back onto the third century. Given the state of the evidence, however, it seems best to leave open precisely what connection existed between 29 June and the site of San Sebastiano before Damasus, apart from a certain veneration (not necessarily involving a festive celebration in church liturgy) for Peter as documented in the *Depositio Martyrum*, compiled between 336 and 354.⁹⁸⁰ The fact that the sixth century *Liber Pontificalis* (39. 2) attributed the construction of San Sebastiano to Damasus (disproved by archaeology) might imply that the involvement of Damasus was not limited to monumentalizing pre-existing cults in the catacombs below.⁹⁸¹

Let us now take a closer look at the topography of Rome related to Peter and Paul. The 'writer of the Church named Gaius', quoted with approval by Eusebius (II.25.6; cf. III.31.1), as we have seen above, pointed to their *tropaia* at the Vatican and the Via Ostiensis. At the time of Constantine, these sites were monumentalized in architecture - Old St. Peter's, on the Vatican Hill, and the more modest early incarnation of St. Paul's outside the walls, along the Via Ostiensis. It is unclear, however, how both these sites precisely relate to the third cult place at the Via Appia on different moments in time. Eusebius, perhaps significantly, makes no mention of a site associated with both apostles other than the Vatican and the Via Ostiensis, even though, on the evidence of the *Depositio Martyrum*, the Roman church seems to have celebrated Peter at the Via Appia between 258 and 366/354, i.e. when Eusebius was writing. The *Depositio Martyrum*, on the other hand, (our earliest source for the communal feast of 29 June) explicitly states that the apostles were venerated separately, topographically speaking, at their burial sites on the Via Appia (Peter) and the Via Ostiensis (Paul). The most striking feature of this topographical disposition, from the mid-fourth century point of view of the text, is the omission of the Basilica

^{978.} Pietri (1961) 275 n. 1; Curran (2000) 40; Lønstrup (2008) 39.

^{979.} Lønstrup (2008) 39 and 57 n. 67 (wrongly identifying *XIIII kal. apriles* as 14 instead of 19 March), with n. 68; Heid in Gnilka et al. (2015²) 168.

^{980.} Lønstrup (2008) 39, 57 n. 74.

^{981.} Curran (2000) 97.

of saint Peter at the Vatican, while the Vatican is mentioned at the feast of the *Cathedra Petri*.⁹⁸² Rather than suspecting the sources we have,⁹⁸³ we may consider an alternative explanation. Curran acutely observes that the Vatican basilica was 'identified strongly with the imperial family'.⁹⁸⁴ The pope in office when the *Depositio Martyrum* was published, Liberius, was in strong conflict with Constantine's son and successor, Constantius II, leading even to the exile of the former at the hands of the latter.⁹⁸⁵ It made thus very well be that the papal or pope-friendly circle in which the 354 *Depositio Martyrum* originated favored the site at the Via Appia as the burial site of Peter over the imperial complex at the Vatican.⁹⁸⁶ That Eusebius, a supporter of Constantine, included the Vatican site but not the Appian one in his *Ecclesiastical History* also fits this picture. All this ties in well with the modern idea that St. Peter's basilica did not necessarily mark the site of Peter's burial, but rather the site of his martyrdom and a *tropaion* commemorating it. We may note that Eusebius, again, speaks in support of the Constantinian project when he reads Gaius' reference to Peter's *tropaion* as a reference not to the place where he died, but 'where after their departure from this life their mortal remains were laid' (HE III.31.1).⁹⁸⁷ The pre-Damasian picture that emerges thus is that Peter and Paul may have been venerated together on one day, 29 June, but not necessarily in one place.

When Damasus took hold of the seat of saint Peter, he initiated a campaign to promote the memory and veneration of the many Roman martyrs and their graves in the many subterranean *coemeteria* of the city, later known as 'catacombs'. Among those martyrs, famously, were Peter and Paul, to whose memory Damasus devoted the epigram at San Sebastiano.⁹⁸⁸ It is clear that he took a considerable interest in the site of San Sebastiano and promoted the communal veneration of Peter and Paul (whether pre-existing or new) on the spot. Although it has not come down to us intact, the sizable marble inscription he had erected in the church has been preserved in medieval manuscripts.⁹⁸⁹ This is not only an important testimony to the cult of Peter and Paul in the late fourth century, but also the first text known to us that maneuvers both apostles in a position coming close to that of Rome's founders. Perhaps more importantly, it is also the first text, it seems, to configure the importance of Peter and Paul in relation not only to the church

^{982.} Pietri (1976) 366-380; Salzman (1990) 46-47; Beard, North and Price II (1998) 76 n. 3; Curran (2000) 130; Lønstrup (2008) 41.

^{983.} Salzman (1990) 46 n. 62, on Chadwick's ingenious theory about the manuscript transmission.

^{984.} Curran (2000) 130.

^{985.} Amm. Marc. XV.7.6-10; Salzman (1990) 222; Curran (2000) 130-131.

^{986.} Cf. Hall (2014) 201 for the hypothesis of a similar dispute between rivalling Christian factions in Rome at the time of Novatian, in the 250's.

^{987.} The elaborate formula perhaps serves to bolster his claim rhetorically.

^{988.} The standard edition is that of Ferrua (1942), now expanded upon by Trout (2015).

^{989.} See Trout (2015) 121-122.

of Rome, but to the city as a whole in civic rather than religious terms. The epigram reads as follows:⁹⁹⁰ (*Epig. 20* (26 Ihm) = *CLE 306* = *ILCV 951* = *ICUR V.13273*)

*Hic habitasse prius sanctos cognoscere debes
nomina quisque Petri pariter Paulique requiris.
Discipulos Oriens misit, quod sponte fatemur;
sanguinis ob meritum Christumque per astra secuti
aetherios petiere sinus regnaque piorum:
Roma suos potius meruit defendere cives.
Haec Damasus vestras referat, nova sidera, laudes.*

5

'You should know that holy men once dwelt here,
whoever you are who seek at the same time the names of Peter and Paul.
The East sent its apostles, a fact we freely acknowledge.
By virtue of their martyrdom – having followed Christ through the stars
they reached the heavenly asylum and the realms of the righteous –
Rome has earned the right to claim them as her own citizens.
These things Damasus wishes to relate in your praise, O new stars.'

Apparently, the poet, identifying himself as Damasus in the last line, addresses a reader "looking for the names of both Peter and Paul",⁹⁹¹ either when first coming into Rome from the South through the Appian Way, or more specifically on a premeditated visit to the site of the inscription (indicated emphatically by *hic* at the start of the poem). This could be taken to imply, for the first time in our record, that the site of the Via Appia was considered to have been the communal burial ground of both apostles at some point in time before Damasus was writing (*prius*, 1).⁹⁹² The meaning of *habitasse* (1) is not at all clear, and intentional ambiguity on the part of Damasus has been supposed,⁹⁹³ but the crucial aspect, rightly stressed by Hall,⁹⁹⁴ is that the circumstance described by the term lie in the past. The contrast between *habitasse* and *prius* (1), on the one hand, and the present tenses *debes* (1) and *requiris* (2), on the other, seems deliberate. Given the disputes over the resting place of the apostles' remains, alluded to above,⁹⁹⁵ and the topographically articulated internal strife that characterized the period both before and after Damasus' election (conflicts in which

^{990.} Translation by Trout (2015) 121.

^{991.} Dijkstra (2016) 125 n. 237.

^{992.} That implication may have influenced our other source to that effect, the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*: see Dijkstra (2016) 125 n. 238.

^{993.} Dijkstra (2016) 127.

^{994.} Hall (2014) 201; cf. Dijkstra (2016) 126-127.

^{995.} See further Hall (2014) 201.

the suburban martyr-sanctuaries played a prominent role)⁹⁹⁶ it is likely that Damasus was interested in neutralising any claim San Sebastiano could lay to the remains of the apostles, without necessarily denying its past role in this regard. By clearly relegating the importance of the Appian site to the past, the bishop brought about unity in the present disputes over apostolic authority, and tried to prevent the risk of 'sectarian occupation'⁹⁹⁷ by his doctrinal and ecclesiastical opponents, Ursinus and his supporters.⁹⁹⁸ Also, it seems, Damasus brought papal policies in line with those of the emperors who supported him against his rival, again furthering a united vision in which the Vatican basilica of saint Peter was unanimously considered to shelter the remains of Christianity's most prominent saint.⁹⁹⁹

Sadly we have no idea what Damasus' attitude towards the role of Peter and his presumed remains (or rather 'relics') at the Vatican basilica would have looked like. At San Sebastiano, however, his efforts are clearly directed at claiming both Peter and Paul for Rome. This is where we may repeat how Marianne Sághy has eloquently stressed that his was the initiative (especially apparent from his epigrams) 'to bring about the Romanization of Christianity (and, conversely, the Christianization of Rome).'¹⁰⁰⁰ He did so by advocating the martyrs' 'naturalization' as Roman citizens, and this is in fact what stands out in our epigram as well. Even more so, the fact that Rome was most entitled to claim Peter and Paul as her citizens is not presented as a compliment to Rome, but as a compliment to both apostles: *Haec Damasus vestras referat (...) laudes (7).*¹⁰⁰¹ Damasus thus goes very far in applying traditional Roman concepts and sensibilities (outstanding individuals being a compliment to the city of Rome) to a Christian case - although it should be observed that these traditions were probably not so contrasting and mutually exclusive as we may still tend to see them. What is interesting, furthermore, is that Damasus chooses to present Peter and Paul as *nova sidera*, in the climactic last line, embellished by an apostrophe to the saints. *Nova* is best explained by Peter and Paul being the Christian replacement of something Rome had known before, and among the scholarly suggestions for what *sidera* may mean the idea that the apostles represent the new divine protectors of Rome in replacement of the Dioscuri seems the most compelling.¹⁰⁰² Be that as

^{996.} See Curran (2000) 142.

^{997.} Curran (2000) 142.

^{998.} Cf. Dijkstra (2016) 124.

^{999.} Cf. *Epig. 4* (5 Ihm), line 5: *una Petri sedes*.

^{1000.} Sághy (2015) 314.

^{1001.} *Haec* obviously refers also to the poem as a whole, but I think there is a strong case for taking it particularly in reference to the preceding line, which constitutes the most ambitious expression of the poem so far.

^{1002.} Cf. Dijkstra (2016) 128; van den Hoek (2013).

it may, it is clear that Damasus explicitly does not present both apostles as the new founders of Rome. That is a telling choice, since he would certainly have had reasons to do so. In his literary style and ideas the bishop drew heavily on Vergil.¹⁰⁰³ Marianne Sághy states that: '[Damasus] was literally interested in associating the martyrs with the founder of Rome. Applying consistently the comparison between Aeneas and the Christians coming from the East, Damasus sought to allude to the foundation of a new city: not only the City of God, but also a new, Christian Rome.'¹⁰⁰⁴ In an epigram designed not for a martyr's tomb but for his own church-foundation in the Campus Martius (San Lorenzo in Damaso) he even employs Vergil's ktistic vocabulary, describing his actions as *nova condere tecta* (57.5).¹⁰⁰⁵ Damasus must, in other words, certainly have been aware of the ktistic concepts and vocabulary of Vergil, which he consciously chose not to apply to his characterisation of Peter and Paul as new protectors of Rome at the Basilica Apostolorum.

Damasus, in other words, promoted Peter and Paul not as founders of Rome, but as the city's rightful citizens, celestial protectors and concordial saints. It has often been stressed that he instrumentalized the theme of *concordia apostolorum*, 'a notion that could conjointly endorse doctrinal unity and papal primacy'.¹⁰⁰⁶ Doctrinal unity and papal primacy were indeed the goals that Damasus pontificate would succeed in furthering considerably. Shortly before he became bishop of Rome, we have conclusive evidence that Peter and Paul were celebrated together on one day, i.e 29 June.¹⁰⁰⁷ Damasus' epigram seems to prove that he developed San Sebastiano into their communal cult-site, and it is conclusive evidence that he presented them in their roles of new citizens and protectors, no longer solely in relation to the Christian Church, but to the city of Rome as a whole. Although it is often stated that Damasus, if not the most active propagator, was among the most active propagators of Peter and Paul - the traditional founders of the Christian Church - as Christian founders of Rome, it is important to point out that we do not have direct evidence for this claim. His prominent epigram for both saints stresses a different role of both apostles and martyrs.¹⁰⁰⁸ Furthermore, it seems highly probable that Damasus promoted 29 June

^{1003.} Sághy (2015) 315-318.

^{1004.} Sághy (2015) 318.

^{1005.} Cf. Curran (2000) 144; Trout (2015) 188; Löx (2013) 141 on Peter compared to Aeneas, with Dijkstra (2016) 124 n. 231.

^{1006.} Trout (2015) 12; cf. Pietri (1961), Huskinson (1982), Lönstrup (2010), Diefenbach (2007) 307-318, Löx (2013) 65-66.

^{1007.} Cf. Heid in Gnilka et al. (2015²) 166.

^{1008.} Cf. the anything but particular and special, but rather formulaic fifth line (*aetherios petiere sinus regnaque piorum*), which occurs almost identically in 25.5, 39.8 and 43.5; cf. Trout (2015) 25-26 for an interpretation of its intratextual value.

as the communal feast of Peter and Paul, but again we have no direct evidence to support this claim.

5.3. Ambrose's hymn *Apostolorum passio*: foundation by martyrdom

After Damasus' epigram, most likely, but before Prudentius, Ambrose composed a hymn to Peter and Paul. The hymn, known as *Apostolorum passio* and numbered hymn 12 in the authoritative edition of Fontaine et al.,¹⁰⁰⁹ was composed for the occasion of the feast of saints Peter and Paul on 29 June, somewhere between AD 375 and 397. Ambrose's hymn differs from other sources treated here in one important respect: it was composed for the congregation of Milan, not (primarily) for a Roman audience. As it was intended for a feast celebrating the Roman martyrdom of Peter and Paul, however, the city of Rome (unsurprisingly) plays a significant role. Even more so: it is the oldest source that connects Peter and Paul to an act of foundation. Rome is said to have been founded (*fundata*, 23) by the blood of martyrdom. Although it doesn't make an explicit comparison with Romulus and Remus, the hymn seems to be the oldest source to speak of the foundation of Rome in connection to Peter and Paul.

The intriguing statement that Rome was founded by the blood of martyrdom (*fundata tali sanguine*, 23) will demand our careful attention in the following paragraphs. Before we turn to the hymn itself, however, it is necessary to introduce Ambrose's political and ecclesiastical background, the cultural context in which he operated and his literary activity. Ambrose's case is slightly complex: his poetry, as was already pointed out above, stands in a less obvious relation to the Roman material it treats than, for example, Prudentius' poems or Damasus' epigrams. Both Damasus and Prudentius were writing their poetry for a Roman audience, based on Roman experiences. Furthermore, their poems seem to be intended for individual consumption, being read (out loud). The metre of both is either the classic hexameter (Damasus' epigrams, Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum*) or a combination of learned lyrical metres (Prudentius' *Peristephanon*).¹⁰¹⁰ Ambrose's hymn, it seems, was intended to be sung by the faithful of his diocese in mass on 29 June. It was choral poetry in a simple iambic

¹⁰⁰⁹ Fontaine et al. (1992). The designation *Apostolorum passio*, repeating the incipit verse of the hymn, is actually the only secure one, since it is variously entitled 'In ss. Petri et Pauli' (Banterle et al. (1994)), 'In festo Petri et Pauli apostolorum' (Simonetti 1956=1988, van der Meer 1970), 'de SS. Petro et Paulo apostolis' (Kytzler 1972). Walpole only gives the hymn a number, XIII – his numbering seems to have been the standard one before the editions of Simonetti (1956=1988) and Fontaine et al. (1992).

¹⁰¹⁰ On the different meters of the *Peristephanon liber*, see Palmer (1989) 75–87.

metre, designed for mass performance. All these aspects deserve some consideration before we plunge into the contents of the hymn itself.¹⁰¹¹

In order to understand Ambrose's relation to Rome and the cultural circumstances that are likely to have played a role in his characterization of Peter and Paul as city founders, it is important to know something about his background and the events that preceded his role as Bishop of Milan.¹⁰¹² Ambrose, born as Aurelius Ambrosius around the year 340 (or possibly 334),¹⁰¹³ grew up as the son of the highest imperial magistrate in the Western provinces, the *praefectus praetorio Galliarum*.¹⁰¹⁴ This was a very high rank, usually assumed by men of consular status. Since Ambrose's father (also named Ambrosius) held this position, we must assume that he was born in Constantine's former imperial city, Trier, at that time also the capital of the *diocesis Galliarum*.¹⁰¹⁵ As praetorian prefect, Ambrose's father must have had direct access to the imperial court of Constantine II, who ruled his part of the empire (Britain, Gaul and Spain) from Trier. Ambrose senior may have died of unnatural causes when Constantine II's brother Constans, who ruled Italy, Africa, Illyrium and Moesia from Sirmium, took over power in Gaul from Constantine II after crushing the his army.¹⁰¹⁶ Such an involuntary death would testify, one might argue, to Ambrose senior's close

^{1011.} The following sketch is largely based on (entries in) modern historical reference works and encyclopedia's, such as Potter (2004); Löhr (2007) 7-51; Den Boeft, s.v. 'Ambrosius', DNP; H. Kraft, s.v. 'Ambrosius, Bf. v. Mailand', LexMA I, 524-525; PLRE I (1971) 51-52, s.v. 'Ambrosius 1' and 'Ambrosius 3'. Quite something on Ambrose's life can be learned from his own writings, but our knowledge about many details ultimately depends on the semi-hagiographical *Vita* composed by Paulinus of Milan in 422. Furthermore, as Den Boeft (s.v. 'Ambrosius', DNP) warns us, we have to take into account Ambrose's 'gezielte Manipulation des Bildes seiner Person und seiner (kirchlichen) Politik, das über die Biographie, die Paulinus von Mailand 422 auf Bitten des Augustinus schrieb, bis heute gewirkt hat'. The most recent edition of the text of the *Vita* is the one by Bastiaensen in Bastiaensen et al. (1975) 51-125.

^{1012.} In general, see the excellent recent volumes edited by, respectively, Fuhrer (2012) and Behrwald and Witschel (2012).

^{1013.} The exact year depends on the interpretation of a passage in Ambr., *Ep.* 59 – see PLRE I (1971) 51, s.v. 'Ambrosius 1'. A modern work proposing AD 333/334 is Dassmann (2004) 11 ≈ (2003) 72.

^{1014.} See PLRE I (1971) 51, s.v. 'Ambrosius 1'. At the time, there were only three such prefects, mostly fulfilling civil, not military duties (Potter (2004) 476-477). On the system of *vicarii praefectorum praetorio*, from Diocletian onwards, and praetorian prefects, later on, operating within a circumscribed provincial territory, see *ibid.* 368-377 and Noethlichs (1982) 73, with n. 15. For the rank itself (and its see in Trier), see Enßlin s.v. 'Praefectus praetorio' in RE XXII (1954) 2441. Primary sources on prefects of the time in Gaul include Hier., *Chron. s.a.* 336: *Tiberianus vir disertus praef. praetorio Gallias regit* (p. 233 Helm); *ibid.* 345, on a certain Titianus (p. 236 Helm); Amm. Marc. XVI.12.14 and Jul, *Ep. Ath.* 282c, on a certain Florentius, active 357-360; Amm. Marc. XXVIII.1.41 and *Cod. Theod.* IX.24.3, both on Maximinus, active 371-376, who was promoted to the rank of *praefectus praetorio Galliarum* after having been *vicarius urbis Romae* (see den Boeft et al. (2011) 14-16).

^{1015.} The assumption, although widely accepted, is not unchallenged: see the discussion by Dassmann (2004) 11 ≈ (2003) 72, and especially Fischer (1984) 132-135.

^{1016.} Potter (2004) 462, 46; Paulinus, *V. Amb.* 2.4, merely states that Ambrose lost his father.

ties to Constantine II. Be that as it may, Ambrose junior must have had a promising future ahead of him – if, at least, the dynastic turmoil amidst Constantine the Great's sons were not to ruin the family's fortune.¹⁰¹⁷

After Ambrose's father's death, the family moved to Rome. Young Ambrose got his proper aristocratic education and grew up in the Eternal City. Ambrose's Roman youth was not free of turmoil. In general, emperors and usurpers rapidly succeeded each other in the West (Constans, Nepotianus, Magnus Magentius, Constantius II, Julian, Jovian, Valentinian); doctrinal strife between 'Arians' and 'Niceans' heightened; 'pagans' were increasingly targeted by the state; divergences between East and West (in religious as well as political matters) sharpened. The sons of Constantine had adopted different religious policies. Generally speaking, 'Arianism' (or, more correctly, 'Homoian' beliefs)¹⁰¹⁸ became particularly strong in the East, backed by Constantius II, and Nicene bishops came under increasing pressure. Conversely, Nicene creeds tended to be current in the West, favoured by Constantine II and Constans. Consequently, the West became a refuge for Eastern Nicene exiles, who eventually involved the West in what had often originated as local religious and political conflicts in the East. This is a very general sketch – of course the categories of 'East' and 'West' are not so clearly distinguishable. But rather than describing it further, it is more interesting for our purpose to look at the position of Trier, Rome and Milan (and the emperors and bishops who resided there) in these conflicts.

Athanasius of Alexandria, the foremost advocate of Nicene orthodoxy in the East, stars prominently in the history of this East-West controversy. He had been exiled to Trier in November 335, forced out of Alexandria by an alliance involving pro-Arian bishops of the East.¹⁰¹⁹ After the death of Constantine the Great, Athanasius obtained amnesty from Constantine II, who held court at Trier (where Ambrose's father was also stationed at that very time). Athanasius returned to Alexandria but was exiled again, his opponents being actively supported by Constantius II. This time, Athanasius fled to Rome, where he was hosted by Constantine's old half-sister Eutropia and politically sheltered by pope Julius I (pope from 337 to 352).¹⁰²⁰ Julius organised a synod to recognise Athanasius' legitimate claim to the Alexandrinian

^{1017.} Potter (2004) 556-557.

^{1018.} Although late fourth century writers like Jerome (*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*, 19) preferred the adjective *Arianus* ("Arian"), with all its pejorative qualities, the positions of the Eastern bishops is more correctly described as 'Homoian': see Löhr (2007) 13, with n. 13, and R.A. Greer, s.v. 'Homoeans', in: *EEC*, 540-541.

^{1019.} Kannengiesser (1997). The precise involvement of Constantine the Great in the case of Athanasius is not a matter of concern now.

^{1020.} Hillner (2017) 86.

chair, directly thwarting Constantius II's condemnation of Athanasius. Julius' support for Athanasius went hand in hand with the Roman bishop's efforts to claim prominence over other episcopal sees. Strengthened by the Roman support, Athanasius sought help from the other Western Emperor. Constantine II being dead, he won Constans for his case. Hence, Athanasius' Eastern conflict became a matter of Empire-wide concern. Constans and Constantius II assembled Western and Eastern bishops in the Council of Serdica, in 342 or 343, but their attempt to unite the bishops failed and the divergences grew into some kind of schism. Constans was murdered in 350 and Constantius II became sole ruler shortly afterwards. His attempts to reunify the church and make the bishops come up with a compromise creed for the whole of his reunified Empire were dominated, unsurprisingly, by a majority of conservative, Homoian bishops from the East. One of those attempts, tellingly, was termed the 'blasphemy of Sirmium' by Hilary of Poitiers, referring to a communal creed formulated in Sirmium in 357.¹⁰²¹ Hilary had in fact been exiled by Constantius II for his support of Athanasius, a sign of the persistence of the Emperor in his efforts to push through an anti-Nicene doctrine.

In the early 370's (so in his early thirties, presumably) Ambrose took office as *consularis Aemilia et Liguria*, based in Milan.¹⁰²² At the time, during the reign of Valentinian I, Milan was an imperial city of prime importance – Valentinian had made it the Western imperial capital in 364, residing either there or in Trier. When Ambrose moved from Rome to Milan, he must have left a city in religious turmoil and political uproar for a city thriving politically as well as economically. Valentinian I never visited Rome – the Eternal city was entrusted to often non-senatorial *vicarii*, men such as the Pannonian Maximinus, who fiercely prosecuted pagan senators.¹⁰²³ That is not to say that Rome had lost its former pre-eminence altogether. In Rome, Damasus, as we have seen, had firmly established himself and his authority as bishop, backed by Valentinian, to the detriment of his Arian competitor Ursinus, who was banished from the city in 367.¹⁰²⁴ In that sense, Ambrose (whatever his own interest in religious matters was, being a man of the civil career) must also have left a city that was establishing itself as a prominent Christian centre, ever more normative in doctrinal matters concerning the whole of Christendom in the Roman Empire. While the court of Valentinian was characterized by 'the absence of a strong religious

^{1021.} Löhr (2007) 12 and R.A. Greer, s.v. 'Homoeans', in: EEC, 541.

^{1022.} Only the *terminus ante quem* for the date, his election as bishop, is known from the sources. Handbooks tend to mention 370 as the date, but do not quote sources in support. For the rank, see Elton (2006) 201, and, more elaborately, Mann (1977) 11-15.

^{1023.} Portmann, s.v. 'Valentinianus [1]' and 'Maximinus [3]', DNP.

^{1024.} See Amm. Marc. XXVII.3.12-13; Coll. Avell. 1-13 (with Evers (forthcoming)); Hunt (2007) 79, 87-88; den Boeft et al. (2009) 64-65.

presence',¹⁰²⁵ at least at Trier, a strong religious presence must have been exactly what characterized Rome in those days.

As *consularis Aemilia et Liguriae* Ambrose attempted to uphold law and order during a dispute over the succession of the deceased bishop of Milan, Auxentius, in 374. By what was either a strike of fate or a well-executed political manoeuvre by his superior officer, Petronius Probus, both factions unexpectedly agreed to elect the intervening civil magistrate, young Ambrose, as their new bishop.¹⁰²⁶ As an ecclesiastical leader, he not only led his Milanese bishopric (and indeed the whole of Western Christendom, in a sense) with political genius, conviction and determination, but also devoted himself to reading and writing. *Hymn 12* is one of the literary works in which his activity as bishop and the developments of the time come together, and should therefore be read with the political, ecclesiastical and cultural conditions of the middle to late fourth century in mind.

Let us now turn to the text. Ambrose's *Hymns* form a small but not to be underestimated part of his substantial output (mostly sermons, letters and writings on exegesis, Christian ethics and doctrine), an output that is entirely conditioned by his episcopal office. The *Hymns*, 'Ambrose's influential poetical experiment',¹⁰²⁷ may be considered the first Latin liturgical songs of which the text is not directly derived from passages in the Bible. Because of their enormous success in later periods, the manuscript tradition is vast and complex,¹⁰²⁸ making it difficult to establish the authenticity and dating of individual hymns.¹⁰²⁹ The reading of the text itself, on the other hand, seems firmly established. A corpus of 14 hymns is considered to be authentic by the editors of the most recent authoritative edition, the one directed by Jacques Fontaine.¹⁰³⁰ The 14 canonical hymns can be classed, roughly, in three categories:¹⁰³¹ hymns to be sung at

^{1025.} Potter (2004) 710 n.173, referring to McLynn (1994) 80-81.

^{1026.} On episcopal elections and the typical narrative pattern occurring in descriptions of these events in (hagiographic) account, see Norton (Oxford 2007); on Ambrose's election in particular: 192, 199, and 204 on him nominating his successor; on Damasus and Ursinus, 63-65.

^{1027.} Den Boeft (2008) 425.

^{1028.} 'The abundance of manuscripts has thus far prevented a systematic study', according to Landfester, s.v. 'Ambrosius' in *DNP Suppl.* I.2.

^{1029.} According to Hunter, 'Of the numerous hymns ascribed to him only the four attested by Augustine are universally regarded as authentic: *Aeterne rerum conditor*, *Deus creator omnium*, *Iam surgit hora tertia* and *Intende qui regis Israel*' (2008) 312). See further Julien (1989) 57-189.

^{1030.} Fontaine et al. (1992). The Italian edition directed by Banerle et al. (1994) considers 13 of those to be authentic, number 14 (*Aeterna Christi munera*) being classed under the 'Inni attribuiti da alcuni ad Ambrogio'. For a short history of the process of editing and canonization of the *Hymns*, see Den Boeft, (1993) 79-80.

^{1031.} When referring to the *Hymns*, I follow the numbering of the standard edition of Fontaine et al. (1992), which coincides with the numbering of the edition of Simonetti (1956) = Simonetti (1988).

the early hours of the day (*H.* 1-4), those for major ecclesiastical high feasts (*H.* 5, 7, 9) and those in honor of martyrs and saints (*H.* 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

The most important one for our investigation is, as said, *H.* 12. In full, it reads:¹⁰³²

(1) *Apostolorum passio*
diem sacrauit saeculi
Petri triumphum nobilem
Pauli coronam praeferens.

(2) *Coniunxit aequales uiros* 5
cruor triumphalis necis ;
deum secutos praesulem
Christi coronauit fides.

(3) *Primus Petrus apostolus,*
nec Paulus impar gratia ; 10
electionis uas sacrae,
Petri adaequauit fidem.

(4) *Verso crucis uestigio*
Simon honorem dans Deo
suspensus ascendit, dati 15
non immemor oraculi :

(5) *praecinctus, ut dictum est, senex*
et eleuatus ab altero,
quo nollet iuit, sed uolens
mortem subegit asperam. 20

(6) *Hinc Roma celsum uerticem*
deuotionis extulit,
fundata tali sanguine
et uate tanto nobilis.

(7) *Tantae per urbis ambitum* 25
stipata tendunt agmina ;
trinis celebratur uiis
festum sacrorum martyrum.

(8) *Prodire quis mundum putet,*
concurrere plebem poli : 30

^{1032.} The text printed here is that of Fontaine et al. (1992); the translation is my attempt to convey the meaning – and sometimes the different possible meanings – of the Latin as literally as possible. A new English translation can be found in Walsh and Husch (2012) 34-37. For an esthetical translation that nevertheless sticks very closely to the Latin, see the German version by Kytzler (1972) 191-193.

*electa, gentium caput !
sedes magistri gentium !*

The passion of the apostles
has consecrated this day of worldly time
bringing forth Peter's noble triumph,
(and) Paul's crown.

The blood of their triumphant death
has united (them as) equal men ;
having followed God as their priest
the faith of Christ has crowned them.

Peter (is) the first apostle,
but neither is Paul inferior to him in grace;
as a sacredly chosen vessel
he has reached an equal level with the faith of Peter.

With the sign of the cross reversed
Simon, bringing honour to God,
ascended upwards, hanging down, not
forgetful of the oracle given him:

the old man, as it has been said, girded
and lifted up by the other,
went whither he wouldest not, but willingly
subdued the cruel death.

Hence Rome has lifted up
her lofty pinnacle of piety,
founded by such blood
and noble through so great a prophet.

In rounds all through the so great city
crowded processions march;
on three streets each is celebrated in great number
the feast of the sacred martyrs.

One would think the world (here) does appear,
the multitude of heavens flocks together (here):
chosen, thou, capital of nations!
seat of the leader of nations!

In terms of structure, it is clear that the hymn is articulated in two parts. The first five strophes (here numbered at the start of each strophe for convenience of reference) deal with the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, while the last three strophes

concentrate on the city of Rome. The sixth strophe, connecting the two parts, sings of Rome as a lofty city through its spiritual glory, being *fundata tali sanguine* (23), “founded by” or “on such blood”. The transition from the detailed description of Peter’s death, with all its spiritual and theological intricacies, to the praise of Rome is achieved smoothly, as the political and ecclesiastical exultation of the Eternal City seems a natural consequence of its spiritual preeminence. *Tali sanguine* refers to the blood of martyrdom, either that of Peter alone (mentioned in the immediately preceding strophes) or that of both Peter and Paul (the “blood of their triumphant death” was mentioned earlier, in line 6). We will come back to the relation between both apostles; what matters most, now, is that the phrase (*Roma*) *fundata tali sanguine* clearly celebrates the Christian foundation of Rome. The hymn as a whole, in fact, presents a fascinating case of ktistic renewal, constructing city foundation as the result of sacred martyrdom.

This raises a couple of interesting questions. In what way is the martyrdom of Peter (and Paul) presented as an act of foundation? Is it the martyrdom of Peter alone, or that of both Peter and Paul that constitutes the Christian foundation of Rome? How does such a Christian foundation relate to earlier foundations, and what dialogue is set up between the (Christian) present and the (non-Christian) past? What is the image of Rome, celebrated in this poem, as it is founded by Peter (and Paul)? And in what way, finally, is the city’s Christian foundation linked to its urban topography? To answer these questions, it is necessary to analyse the entire hymn and the way it functions as poetry that was performed, in its proper liturgical context.

The passion of the apostles (*Apostolorum passio*) fills the first line of the hymn, monumentally stating the subject matter in the nominative.¹⁰³³ The first strophe introduces the occasion of the hymn. The second line mentions that the passion of the apostles has consecrated “a day of worldly time” – the same day that is celebrated in the present by the feast for which the hymn is composed. Lines 3 and 4 specify the passion of the apostles as the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, evoked by the literary motifs/imagery of the triumph and the martyr-crown.

We may instantly observe the skillful artistry with which the hymn is composed. The statement of the main theme (*Apostolorum passio*) is accentuated by a repetition of consonants, the *-pos-* in the first word being echoed by the opening syllable of the second word (*pas-*).¹⁰³⁴ The repetition/alliteration of *p* and *s* is a structural feature of

¹⁰³³. Cf. the openings *Aeterne rerum conditor* (H. 1), *Deus creator omnium* (H. 4) and *Victor, Nabor, Felix pii* (H. 10). The opening of H. 12 is echoed in H. 13, *Apostolorum supparem*, in honor of St. Lawrence.

¹⁰³⁴. The vocal assonance of *a* and *o* (*Apos- ... passio*) is in harmony with the consonants.

the first strophe emphasizing its architecture: the second line presents an alliteration of the *s* (*sacravit saeculi*), whereas the third and fourth line have an repetition/alliteration of *p*'s both inside the lines (*Petri triumphum*; *Pauli ...praeferens*) and at verse incipit (*Petri ... / Pauli ...*).¹⁰³⁵ *Petri* and *Pauli* both stand in the same position at the opening of the line, implying both an equal footing and a certain juxtaposition (the asyndeton leaves the question open). Indeed, Peter comes first and occupies a full line, his triumph of martyrdom gaining an extra epithet (*nobilem*), while Paul comes second and 'his' line accommodates the particle that governs both lines, leaving no room for an extra adjective. The alliteration of the pair *sacravit saeculi* is also in a nice contrast with the opposing meaning of the words, denoting the sacred and the secular sphere respectively.

As always in Ambrose's *Hymns*, however, artistry is no mere poetic ornament pursued for its own sake, but serves a purpose in getting the message across as elegantly and at once effectively as possible. The word *Apostolorum* assonates perfectly with *passio*, but also has the semantic quality that it instantly conveys the very essence of Peter and Paul's nature. They are not just any saints or martyrs, but apostolic ones. What is more: Peter and Paul are the two most important apostles, making the title almost an identifying synonym for their names (*the apostles*, i.e. Peter and Paul), rather than a generic description.¹⁰³⁶ Alternative, but equally applicable terms like *Sancti, beati, martyres* (cf. line 28), *viri* (cf. line 5) or the use of their proper names at the incipit (as in *H. 8* and *10*) wouldn't by far have had the same force.¹⁰³⁷ Where *Apostolorum* already hints at a connection with Christ himself (Peter and Paul not being just ordinary martyrs, but apostles of Christ, most prominently in the case of Peter), *passio* strongly evokes the Passion of the Lord, the ultimate model for martyrdom which was (in Peter's case quite literally) imitated by these apostles.¹⁰³⁸ We will return to the ample role of Christ later in this hymn in our discussion below, but it is good to signal that his presence is evoked from the outset.

Petri and *Pauli* are genitives belonging to two different objects or manifestations of martyrdom. The choice/distribution seems very applicable. Peter has a *triumphus* that is also *nobilem*, a word echoed in line 24, where it applies to Rome. Nobility is almost implied by *triumphus* and thus seems redundant, where it is not for the fact that Peter's triumph is not an "ordinary", pagan triumph (involving bloodshed in war,

^{1035.} The last word of the strophe (*praeferens*) ends with an *s* (the only instance in this strophe, although endings in *-s* are very common in Latin and indeed abound in this hymn), confirming the *p-s* symmetry.

^{1036.} Duval in Fontaine et al. (1992) 526.

^{1037.} Cf. the quotation in prose of the two first verses in a sermon of Augustine: *Apostolorum passio beatorum istum sacravit diem* (*Serm. 299/B, 1*).

^{1038.} Duval in Fontaine et al. (1992) 526.

enslavement of people, animal sacrifice and idolatry in the celebration), but a truly noble, i.e. Christian one. *Triumphus* implies a lot that is very applicable: Romanness, visiting a circuit of places in triumphant procession (Peter's missionary travels) leading to a climax (Rome), elevation to a greater stage of (semi-)divine being (being Rome's, indeed the Christian world's prime saint), approaching towards the supreme God (ascension towards heaven following martyrdom), conquest (the martyrdom setting in motion the Christianization of the (capital city of the) Roman Empire), a triumphal parade-vehicle (the Christian cross), a spectacle-context (as Peter attracted crowds all along and also ultimately with his death, being crucified in the *Circus Cai et Neronis*), benevolence and largesse towards the populace from the booties collected in the wake of the victory (bestowing the blessings of the Christian faith on the world after martyrdom). Triumph also implies subsequent power, rule, success – indeed Peter (or his successor) now reigns Rome and the Roman world (a new, noble Rome) as a new, true (and noble) kind of divine emperor. Finally, the literal motive of triumph is used only twice in scripture, in both instances of Christ himself as the triumphator.¹⁰³⁹ In linking Peter very closely to the idea of triumph (also by the repetition of *tri* in *Petri triumphum*, the *tri* creating chiasmus inside the repetition of *p*'s in *Petri triumphum*), Peter is also linked to Christ by this privileged relation to a common concept.

Paul, conversely, obtains the *corona*. Headgear is an awkwardly applicable attribute for martyrdom brought about by decapitation, sure enough. It is also a sign of victory, obviously, but perhaps not with the same range of privileged connotations as the *triumphus* – it is the more common metaphor for martyrdom.¹⁰⁴⁰ The *corona* as a prize implies a victory after (athletic) competition (rather, perhaps, than victory in war), an image that authors frequently evoke when describing Paul, and is indeed used by Paul in his own self-fashioning.¹⁰⁴¹ He is an athlete of faith, eventually to be crowned by

^{1039.} *Ibid.* 527-528. The passages are *Col.* 2:15 (where in fact the direct context is the crucifixion) and *2 Cor.* 2:14.

^{1040.} Duval in Fontaine et al. (1992) 527, citing *1 Petr.* 5:4; *Jac.* 1:12. and *Apoc.* 2:10, among many other possible instances.

^{1041.} Duval in Fontaine et al. (1992) 527, citing *1 Cor.* 9:25 (a passage that explicitly names the stadium as a venue of competition, using the regime athletes impose upon themselves as a metaphor for a Christian way of life) and *2 Tim.* 4:8 (a passage that is of extreme relevance here, as Paul predicts his own martyrdom using the imagery of the race and the crown that will eventually reward him) – see also *2 Tim.* 2:5 for some very similar language.

Christ himself in heaven.¹⁰⁴² Also the *corona* creates a link with Christ, in other words, but it is a link of subordinate character. Paul will not take the role of Christ himself or occupy an equal level. Indeed, as Paul's own decisive use of the metaphor in 2 Tim. 4:8 makes clear, the *corona* is not reserved to him alone: it is the reward for all those who cherish the advent of the Lord.¹⁰⁴³ If Peter and Paul's *martyria* are imitations of Christ (*passio*, 2), the comparison of Peter's triumph on the cross with that of Jesus strikes better notes than comparing Paul's crown to the spine-crown of Jesus,¹⁰⁴⁴ being an instrument of ridicule in the case of Christ. We will first further pursue the theme of the representation of Peter and Paul in the other strophes, before switching themes and discussing the implications of the important phrase *diem sacravit saeculi* (2).

After the initial strophe setting the scene, the martyrdom of both saints is described in greater detail in the next four strophes. The second and third strophes are mainly concerned with Peter and Paul as a pair, whether equals or not. The fourth and fifth strophes focus on Peter's martyrdom in greater detail. Since Ambrose gives something like a description of the actual events, these last two strophes in particular have, obviously, attracted quite some attention from scholars interested in reconstruction the martyrdoms of Peter. I will come to them later on; we should first consider the exact relation between Peter and Paul, anticipating an answer to the question whether it is the martyrdom of Peter alone, or that of both Peter and Paul that constitutes the foundation of Rome (as treated in the sixth strophe).

The second strophe echoes the first in many ways, but differs sharply in content. The key terms for martyrdom of the first strophe (*triumpum*, 3; *coronam*, 4) are echoed symmetrically in lines 6 (*triumphalis*) and 8 (*coronauit*), occupying an identical metrical position. In this strophe, however, they are no longer attributes of the individual martyrs, but belong collectively to both of them. The Roman martyrdom of both saints is celebrated in conjunction now, just after they were treated rather separately in strophe 1. Now, both their deaths (or indeed their communal death: *necis* is in the singular) are triumphant and Christ's faith has crowned them both. Indeed, the strophe is opened with the word *coniunxit* (again programmatic), signifying tight

^{1042.} λοιπὸν ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ κύριος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὁ δίκαιος κριτής in the Greek (2 Tim. 4:8), translated by Jerome in the Latin Vulgate as *In reliquo reposita est mihi corona iustitiae quam reddit mihi Dominus in illa die iustus iudex*. My lack of experience in Bible scholarship prevents me from attempting a thorough exegesis of this text, but it puzzles me that the present *ἀπόκειται* is translated by Jerome with the perfect *reposita est*, since it obviously seems to refer to a future context. For the text of both the Greek New Testament and the Latin Vulgate, I stick to Nestle et al. (1969).

^{1043.} οὐ μόνον δέ ἐμοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἡγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ; *non solum autem mihi sed et his qui diligunt adventum eius.*

^{1044.} See Mt. 27:29, Mr. 15:17 and Io. 19:2.

unity.¹⁰⁴⁵ The importance and programmatic quality of which is skillfully emphasized. The strophe as a whole is characterized by two verbs preceding their subjects (*coniunxit* ... *cruor*; *coronauit fides*), an unusual placement that gives prominence to the verbs. Just like in the first strophe, the programmatic opening *coniunxit* determines the structural architecture of the strophe, characterized by significant alliterations of the *c* in words that convey other key concepts of the strophe: *cruor*, *Christi* (both at the beginning of the line) and *coronauit*.¹⁰⁴⁶ The verbs frame the alliterating scheme chiastically. Last (and probably least) we should mention *praesulem* echoing *praeferens* (4), an echo that – for a change – seems not so significant.

The unity of both apostles, who are now termed *viros* (5) with a much less weighty word, is emphasized not only by their communal attributes. The blood of triumphant death has united the men as equals (*aequales*), or has united men that were equals already beforehand; there is no way of telling from the grammar whether *aequales* is (only) used proleptically. If it is, the main point made here is that a communal martyrdom has united as equals men that were previously not so, and the equality resides in their martyrdoms (*cruor* being the subject of *coniunxit*). If *aequales* is not proleptic, on the other hand, the point is that their martyrdom has united them, adding the extra bit of information that they were already equals. A lot of interpretative weight has been placed on *aequales*, sometimes without fully considering its possible proleptic nature. We should also consider *viros* (5): they are equal (as) *men*, i.e. their human actions, status and/or behavior (steadfast in the face of martyrdom) are singled out as equal. The point of their equality will be dealt with conclusively as we consider the following strophes, below.

So, if they were already equals, why is the point made that the blood of their deaths has united them? In what sense are they actually united? This statement should be seen in the ritual occasion and liturgical context of the hymn: as they were martyred, quite miraculously, on the same day (cf. *diem*, 2), they now share one communal feast that commemorates their concurrent martyrdoms: 29 June. A lot is made out of this phenomenon in other ancient accounts and modern scholarship. The key term here is *concordia apostolorum*, a very relevant and often recurring theme of papal ideology of the time.¹⁰⁴⁷

^{1045.} The communal aspect of *con-* is later echoed in *concurrere* (v. 30), where the unity of the pilgrims from all the world can be seen to echo the *concordia apostolorum* expressed here.

^{1046.} The compact composition and *brevitas* of Ambrose's *Hymns* leave little room for words that are *not* expressing key concepts, but even so the alliteration links the major themes neatly and conspicuously.

^{1047.} The classic study is Pietri (1961), followed by Huskinson (1982). See now, however, Thacker (2012) and most prominently Lønstrup (2010), currently being edited into a book.

We should remark, however, that the term *concordia* is not used, neither is the temporal concurrence of Peter and Paul martyrdoms stressed anywhere in the poem. It isn't even explicitly stated (instead of adding *saeculi*, in line 2, Ambrose could have inserted a term qualifying *diem* as the communal day of both saints). Indeed, there is no word in the whole poem that even denotes duality (such as *duo*, *ambo*, *duplex*, *gemini*, *alter ... alter*¹⁰⁴⁸ or terms stemming from those roots), and nowhere in the rest of the hymn is their spiritual fraternity or their *concordia* conveyed in any way.¹⁰⁴⁹ Ambrose is certainly not averse of playing with numbers,¹⁰⁵⁰ and here or in the first strophe a reference to the fact that *two* apostles/martyrs/saints are celebrated on *one* day would have been very applicable, as would mentioning that the *two* of them are celebrated *trinis viis* (27). Nothing of the kind occurs. In fact, the only numeral that occurs in the poem apart from *trinis* stresses exactly the opposite of the apostles' duality – *Primus Petrus apostolus* (scil. *est*), as the opening of the third strophe proclaims with full monumentality of diction (line 9). This might give us a hint, already, that duality and *concordia* is not exactly what is celebrated in this hymn.

But before we move on to the third strophe, let us complete our analysis of the second. After the connotation implied in *passio* (1), the second couplet of the second strophe is the first to direct our attention towards God/Christ.¹⁰⁵¹ Peter and Paul have been crowned by the *fides Christi*, whether that means 'Christ's faith' (which I take as an equivalent for 'Christianity' as a concept) or 'faith in Christ', the genitive being either subjective or objective, respectively.¹⁰⁵² I would on first sight be inclined to opt for the latter: their faith in Christ has given them the perseverance to endure martyrdom, the ultimate proof of faith, in fact. Moreover, Peter and Paul are of course the two most paradigmatic believers, themselves setting the ultimate standard of orthodoxy in the New Testament. However, they are also the ultimate propagators of Christ's faith. Here, Peter and Paul have been crowned by *fides Christi* because they have followed God the *praesul*, or have followed God as their *praesul*. The word is a favorite Ambrosian synonym for *deus*, and here, according to Yves-Marie Duval, 'la disjunction *deum* (secuti) *praesulem* souligne de façon expressive cette construction

^{1048.} We will discuss *altero* (v. 18), which is usually interpreted as variant of *alio*, below.

^{1049.} This observation is particularly relevant in view of the comparison between Romulus and Remus, who are typically styled *fratres*, *germani* or *gemini*, and Peter and Paul, a comparison found in Prudentius and Leo the Great, often repeated in modern scholarly literature and hence also applied to earlier phases of the foundation of a Christian Rome by Peter and Paul. We will return to this issue below.

^{1050.} Cf. H. 4.31-32, emphatically opposing *unum* and *trinitas*, and 9.29-32, where *omnes* is in opposition to *solam*.

^{1051.} Cf. Cerini (1987).

^{1052.} Subjective: Simonetti (1956=1988), Kytzler (1972). Objective: van der Meer (1970), Fontaine et al. (1992), Banterle et al. (1994).

usuelle'.¹⁰⁵³ It seems therefore that it should not be taken predicatively ('as their *praesul*'). *Secutos* is interesting, since it also offers a set of interpretations comparable to those of *fides Christi*. It could reference either Peter and Paul's status as apostles, direct followers of Christ, or their role as martyrs, having followed Christ himself in the ultimate sacrifice. The former corresponds to the interpretation of *fides Christi* as subjective genitive: Christianity has crowned them as apostles of Christ. The latter ties in with the objective genitive: their faith has crowned them as martyrs. Since the theme of martyrdom predominates in this part of the hymn, and is also accentuated stylistically (through the alliteration of 'c's, see above), our inclination could verge towards the latter set of interpretations.¹⁰⁵⁴ Most likely, however, both meanings are in interplay with each other, constituting a fine case of (slight) Ambrosian ambiguity. The quotation of line 8 in line 12 (there reading *Petri ... fidem*) further complicates the matter, and we will return to it below.

What is striking in this strophe from a stylistic point of view, furthermore, is the architectural similarities with strophes 1 and 3. *Deum* and *Christi* here occupy the same position in the strophe, at the beginning of the third and fourth lines, as *Petri* and *Pauli* in strophe 1. The fact that the root *corona-* in line 8 exactly reflects the same root in line 4 only emphasizes this further. As said, line 8 is quoted in strophe 3 (line 12), *Petri* there taking the exact same position as *Christi* here. There is certainly something going on here that perhaps reflects trinitarian discussion on the division of roles. In fact, the use of the word *aequales* brings to mind intertexts such as *H. 5*, where the word is used in a trinitarian context, Christ being hailed as *aequalis aeterno patri* (5.25).¹⁰⁵⁵ The (apparently) ambiguous language used before should perhaps be considered as well.

Trinitarian issues left aside, it is certainly striking, to sum up so far, how Peter and Paul are treated both differently and as equals in this *Hymn*. Strophe 2 emphasizes their equality in martyrdom (and/or in matters of faith), while the first strophe had subtly implied that there was perhaps a difference between the two of them.

^{1053.} Duval in Fontaine et al. (1992) 532; for the parallels for *praesul* in Ambrose and other authors, *ibid.* 531.

^{1054.} An extra argument for this interpretation could, possibly, be found in the fact that the prefix *pra-* quotes and recurs in explicit contexts of martyrdom in the rest of the hymn, namely *praeferens* (v. 4) and *praecinctus* (v. 17).

^{1055.} If we look at this intertext from a ritual/liturgical point of view, it is of course not one that is most fresh in the congregation's memory, nor the most imminent one, since *H. 5* was performed at Christmas, six months from June 29th. It could, however, be different in the circular nature of the liturgical year, June 29th being almost the exact 'opposite' of December 25th if we represent the liturgical year, in fact, as a circle. (As far as I am aware, a connection between both feasts has not been explored.) Conversely, however, the intertext in *H. 5* is certainly a prominent one, given the importance of the feast of Christmas in exactly this period – see n. 1057, below.

In strophe 3, the relation between Peter and Paul is complicated further. The opening line of strophe 3, as already mentioned, is a clear and unmistakable proclamation of Peter's primacy, naming Peter first (again) and terming him *primus ... apostolus*. The alliteration of the *p*'s not only heightens the grandeur of the statement, but also, together with the use of the word *apostolus*, echoes the opening line of the *Hymn*. At first glance, with the treatment of both saints' martyrdoms in the previous strophes freshly in mind, we might have expected that *primus* denotes merely a chronological sequence, Peter's martyrdom either having occurred first or being treated first in the poem, i.e. before that of Paul. That interpretation is annulled directly afterwards, however, when the hymn states that Paul is 'not unequal [to Peter] in *gratia*'. These two lines are not about the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, in other words, but about their status as saints and apostles. *Gratia* is of the utmost importance here, since it answers the question left open by the previous strophe, i.e. in what respect Peter and Paul are *aequales viri*. 'Peter (is) the first apostle, but neither is Paul inferior to him in grace' – the crucial words *nec ... impar gratia* can be taken in different ways and should first be carefully considered.

The use of the double negation instead of a single positive expression is the first issue to address. The litotes could simply be taken as a strong affirmation, but in my view the use of the negation may imply that there is more to it than that. The word *primus* in the preceding line raises an expectation that has to be explicitly denied: if Peter is superior to Paul (the former being *primus ... apostolus*), they can not be equal, as was stated in line 5. Although Peter's primacy is in fact denied to a certain extent (qualified by *gratia*, which we will discuss instantly), the use of negation is not unequivocal (as it indeed often isn't).¹⁰⁵⁶ Ambrose seems to contradict himself: Peter is *primus*, but Paul is 'not unequal', 'not inferior', or 'not unlike him'. To what conclusion do both statements add up? Of course, only one of them can logically be *primus* – as the commentary of Banterle et al. acutely remarks, the text reads *primus*, not *prior*, which would give more room for relativity. So, if *nec ... impar* denies the expectation raised by *primus*, what value of *primus* remains?

The solution is in the addition of *gratia*. Even if *nec ... impar* denies no expectation whatsoever and is just a simple litotes, the whole statement is modified by the ablative *gratia*. Paul is not inferior to Peter *as far as his gratia is concerned*: they're both equally in the grace of Christ. Apart from that respect, however, Peter is and remains *primus*. This reading is evidenced and explained both in the next strophes and in the

¹⁰⁵⁶ Linguistic research on the topic of Latin negation in general is still ongoing: see e.g. Orlandini and Poccetti (2008) 1-12; the contributions in Floricic (ed.) (2007); Fruyt (2002) 37-52 and Van Gils (2016). On litotes in particular, as more than a mere stylistic device, see Hoffmann (1987) and Cadbury (1972).

immediately following lines – we'll focus on the latter first. In Paul's case, the reason for his 'equality in grace' is explained by the fact that he was/is 'a sacredly chosen vessel', a divine instrument of God. Ambrose is in fact quoting the biblical passage that recounts how God, through divine epiphany, spoke to Paul to tell him that he was chosen as an instrument to spread the faith among the heathens (Acts 9:15). As such Paul "has reached an equal level with the faith of Peter". Peter, thus, is the guarantor of faith and the level to which Paul must live up. It is in this sense that both apostles are *aequales viri* (5), an expression that is echoed here by *adaequavit* (12). They have been made equal, in the sense that Paul has risen to the level of Peter. The divine election of Paul had set him on a par with Peter. Accordingly, they are joined in martyrdom as equals. But Peter is still *primus apostolus*, a fact that is not only conveyed by the semantics of the text. Indeed, the prominence of Peter is also underpinned by the stylistic architecture of the strophe. *Petri* (12) picks up *Petrus* (9), Peter being named twice, both in the first and the last line of the strophe. In that respect, Peter literally envelopes Paul, who is mentioned and discussed in the intermediate lines.

According to Yves-Marie Duval, this chiasmus emphasizes the equality of both apostles.¹⁰⁵⁷ I would argue exactly the contrary. It is of course difficult to determine the exact 'meaning' of a chiasmus; to my view, an idea of equality would be better served by parallelism or repetition. What is more important, however, is that this is not a chiasmus where Peter and Paul represent equal components (if it is a chiasmus at all). If a chiasmus may be represented in the schema A-B-B-A, it is not that the two statements or lines about Peter (A-B) are echoed by similar statements or lines about Paul (B-A). To the contrary, phrases that take the place of the A in the schema are devoted to Peter (lines 9 and 12, those that take the place of the B to Paul (lines 10 and 11). Duval's interpretation stems from wishful thinking.

When treating the hymn *Apostolorum passio* as a historical source, we may run the risk of overlooking the nature of Ambrose's *Hymns* and the way they deal with time and history in general. It is therefore advisable to devote some attention to this aspect, before drawing conclusions on the basis of the detailed analysis of the contents of the individual strophes. In fact, we may now consider the hymn as a whole and the way it presents and evoke the martyrdom of Peter and Paul (a past event) in conjunction with the liturgical occasion on which the hymn was sung (the performative present).

^{1057.} Fontaine et al. (1992) 532 : 'la strophe 3 affirme à nouveau l'égalité des deux apôtres, (...) mise en valeur ici par la disposition, en chiasme, de ce qui concerne Pierre (v. 9 et 12) et de ce qui concerne Paul (v. 10 et 11).'

Let us look at the verbs first. The verb governed by *Apostolorum passio* in line 1, *sacravit* (2), is in the perfect tense. The hymn, thus, opens with a reference to the past,¹⁰⁵⁸ not to the liturgical present,¹⁰⁵⁹ and invokes the historical dimension of the events that the current feast day commemorates. The perfect tense, which will continue to be used in the next four strophes, could at first glance be understood as initiating a proper historical narrative, taking us back to the time of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul and relating the events in some kind of chronological sequence. In a way, this is what will happen in the fourth and fifth strophes, where the temporal sequence is further structured by participle phrases. In the first three strophes, however, that is not the case: there is no clear chronological sequence in the events described by the verbs in the perfect tense (*sacravit*, 2; *coniunxit*, 5; *coronauit*, 8; *adaequauit*, 12) and the participles (*praeferens*, 4; *secutos*, 7). They all seem to refer to the same event, highlighting only different aspects of Peter and Paul's martyrdom. Apart from the verbs in the perfect tense, the first three strophes (or the first five, indeed) contain no temporal markers such as *tum* or *quondam*, nor any absolute chronological references (such as the repeated references to Nero in *Prud.*, *Perist.* 12) that could set the scene for an historical narrative.¹⁰⁶⁰

There is, in fact, no explicit indication of historical depth separating the past from the present – rather the other way around. Instead of presenting the martyrdom of Peter and Paul as a distant historical event, the first three strophes dwell on the significance of their deaths, in the past, for the Christian faith, in the present, almost blurring the chronological distance that, in theory, separates both time spheres. Nowhere in the whole hymn, indeed, does Ambrose give any indication when the martyrdom of Peter and Paul took place. We should perhaps not have expected him to do so, but it might be useful to remind ourselves of this important fact nonetheless. The antiquity of the apostolic tradition at Rome nor that of the city of Rome is stressed anywhere in the poem, at least not in temporal terms. Ambrose doesn't even highlight or mention the place where Peter and Paul were martyred, apart from the fact that we must infer that it was Rome. The matching epigram of Damasus certainly doesn't fail to drive home the point that Peter and Paul were martyred at Rome and had thus become *cives Romani*. The martyrdom of Peter and Paul, in short, is brought to our attention in many different ways throughout this hymn, but it is evoked spiritually rather than

^{1058.} Cf. *H.* 6 (*revelavit*, v. 4), 10 (*dedit*, v. 5) and 13 (*sacravit*, v. 4).

^{1059.} As *H.* 8 (*natalis est*, v. 2), 11 (*cano*, v. 4) and 14 (*canamus*, v. 4) do.

^{1060.} Of the other hymns in honor of martyrs and saints in a historical key (*H.* 6, 8, 10, 11 and 13), only *H.* 13 employs explicit temporal markers such as *Iam tunc* (v. 13) and *Post triduum* (v. 17). Generally, historical events in the *Hymns* are described in some sort of chronological void. In this respect, as in many others, they differ substantially from the far more elaborate, hexametrical poems of Prudentius, which are innumerable richer in historical contextualization.

described historically. *H. 12*, to sum up so far, is not a piece of historical writing in any way, but a truly lyrical poem. (We will come back to this aspect at the close of this paragraph.)

The emphasis on the current significance of Peter and Paul's martyrdoms is in many ways embodied by the expression *diem sacravit saeculi* (2), that immediately follows the words *Apostolorum passio*. By mentioning the consecration of a *dies saeculi*, the hymn does construct a temporal framework of some kind in which the past is in dialogue with the present occasion of the performance of the hymn and seems to operate on it. Let us therefore look at the expression *diem sacravit saeculi* a little more closely.

Diem ... saeculi may be taken in several ways, depending, primarily, on the exact meaning of the word *saeculi* and the interpretation of the word *diem*.¹⁰⁶¹ *Saeculum* is a notoriously elusive term as far as its precise meaning is concerned. Its uses in classical Latin range from "generation, lifetime, age" (*L&S II.A; OLD 1-5*) to "century" (*L&S II.B; OLD 6*). In the plural, it could hence mean a very long, even an indefinitely long period of time (*L&S II.B.2; OLD 7-9*). This use in particular was favored and developed by Christian authors, so as to become the stock expression for 'eternity'. However, Christian authors also expanded the range of meanings. They used *saeculum* as an equivalent of the biblical *αἰών*, meaning "the world, worldliness" (*L&S II.C*), i.e. a pejorative antonym of *caelum* and all that is elevated and divine.¹⁰⁶² Hence, *saeculum* came to be used as a denominator of all things pagan: "Heathenism" (*L&S II.D*).¹⁰⁶³ Accordingly, we can interpret *diem ... saeculi* in several ways. These different interpretations could of course be set in a hierarchy of probability and applicability beforehand. The standard usage of the terms in the Ambrosian corpus, pointed out by the commentaries, would dictate us to direct our attention to one set of meanings only. I will begin my treatment by discussing the standard scholarly interpretation of the phrase under consideration, but doing *only* that seems me to be a too limited and uncritical approach, relying (too) heavily on the existing commentary traditions and not fitting with the purpose of this research. I will therefore, in the next paragraph, venture to test interpretations that are perhaps not the most expected ones beforehand.

^{1061.} Translations vary: 'questo, esaltando, consacrò tra i giorni' (Banterle et al. 1994); 'a consacré ce jour du siècle' (Fontaine et al. 1992); 'heiligt diesen irdschen Tag' (Kytzler 1972); 'wijdde' in het tijdsverloop den dag' (van der Meer 1970); 'ha consacrato questo giorno dell'anno' (Simonetti 1956=1988).

^{1062.} A use also listed in the *OLD* (s.v. *saeculum* [10]), but only evidenced in the Latin corpus of the *OLD* (reaching until AD 200) by attestations in the *Pseudo-Quintilian Declamationes*.

^{1063.} *L&S* quote *saeculi exempla* (Tert., *Exhort. ad Cast* 13; there is a *varia lectio* that reads *saecularia*) as an instance.

Diem sacravit saeculi could be read in a theological and liturgical key. *Diem ... saeculi* then verges towards the meaning “worldly day”, i.e. a day like that wasn’t consecrated in any way (not even in pagan religion), a moment in time that previously had no connection with the divine sphere. We could understand *diem* in the present, more immediate context of the performance of the hymn in church liturgy. *Diem* then denotes the moment of performance: “this worldly day”, i.e. the day on which Ambrose’s flock would enter church to celebrate the feast of Peter and Paul. It then describes not a distant historical event (a day in history) but a liturgical moment in the present lives of the participants in the liturgy: the passion of the apostles, then, had consecrated this day, now, on which the faithful flock together to celebrate the Christian feast. This interpretation may be compelling in the liturgical context of Ambrose’s hymns, especially if we consider the emphasis that various other hymns lay on either the early hours of the day in general (*H. 1; 2; 4*), the day bringing light after the darkness of night, or a particular day (*H. 9*), all using the word *dies* in the first strophe.¹⁰⁶⁴ In fact, our hymn is the only one of the hymns devoted to martyrs and saints (*H. 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14*) to put such an emphasis on the particular moment. In that respect, it is more similar to the other categories of hymns (*H. 1-4* and *5, 7* and *9*).

However compelling this interpretation may be,¹⁰⁶⁵ it does, on the contrary, seem to be at odds precisely with the addition *saeculi*. Whereas *dies* promptly invokes the occasion in the present, the day of the performance of the hymn, *saeculum* implies a reference to the past. It seems odd, at least, to introduce the moment of the celebration of a great Christian feast as a *dies saeculi*, unless we suppose that it is just rhetorical fill (any day being a worldly phenomenon), or that Ambrose wants to convey that the 29th of June will still be a *dies saeculi* until a pagan feast, still current in Ambrose’s day, is fully replaced by the Christian holiday of Peter and Paul. *Diem ... saeculi* would then refer not to a pagan feast in the past, long consecrated and superseded by the passion of Peter and Paul, but to “Heathenism” that was still very much a thing of the present, only to be consecrated instantaneously as Ambrose’s flock sung and celebrated the *Apostolorum passio*. An outright ‘performative’ interpretation, however, seems a little far-fetched.

Most probably, various meanings and associations of the words used converge. It seems interesting to combine aspects of the historical and liturgical interpretations, arriving at a paraphrase of *diem ... saeculi* such as “this day, which is now celebrated in Christian liturgy, but which was formerly a worldly/pagan day”. Indeed, such a

^{1064.} Also *H. 3, 5* and *7* lay emphasis on their proper moment of performance. *H. 7* uses the word *dies* as well, only that it comes after the first strophe (*praesenti... die* and *hoc ... die* in v. 8 and 11 respectively).

^{1065.} Kytzler (1972), indeed, translates *sacravit* with a present tense (‘heiligt’), putting full weight on the liturgical moment.

conflation of present commemoration and the past events that are commemorated is evident in many of Ambrose *Hymns*. In *H. 8*, the (*dies*) *natalis* of Agnes is celebrated. The opening strophe makes it clear that the day when she was martyred, in the past (*refudit*, 3), is actually the (*dies*) *natalis* of the present (*est*, 2): both events occupy an identical position on a chronological scale. In *H. 5*, this is made ever more clear by the intermingling of present imperatives and subjunctives, perfect indicatives and present indicatives. In that hymn, transmitted with the superscription *In nocte natalis Domini*, the *persona loquens* starts off by addressing the Lord in person, quoting Psalm 80 (*Qui regis Israel, intende*), and petitioning Christ to incarnate himself, in the present imperative (*excita*, 4; *veni*, 5, 6; *ostende*, 6). Then, after a statement in the perfect tense (*verbum Dei factum est caro / fructusque ventris floruit*, 11-12) confirming that the epochal event of Christ's incarnation has in fact already taken place, the *persona loquens* continues to describe the actual incarnation of Christ, in the present indicative. After switching again to the subjunctive and once more to the imperative, the mode in the last strophe at last return to the present indicative. The subject of the verbs is *nox*, occurring twice in two consecutive lines, in the same metrical position. Together with *iam*, marking the present accomplishment of the incarnation, the repeated mention of the *nox* drives home the main point of the hymn: that the night at which it is performed, in the present, is in fact the *nox natalis Domini* described in the hymn. The poetry not only makes the biblical event recur, but also makes the faithful full participants in it. Something comparable, in my opinion, must be going on as "the passion of the apostles has consecrated this day of worldly time".

How should we classify this poetical technique? It would be wrong to consider it a mere poetical reenactment of past events through skillful *enargeia*. As Jan den Boeft has pointed out convincingly, a conflation of past and present was motivated by theological concerns. The conjunction of episodes in the history of Christian Salvation and moment in everyday liturgical life is an essential part of God's creation. He illustrates this point with the first strophe of *H. 3*. Since that strophe is concerned with the crucifixion of Christ, and thus provides an important intratext for the crucifixion of Peter in our hymn, it is worth quoting both the intratext and Den Boeft's comments on it in full:¹⁰⁶⁶

*Iam surgit hora tertia,
qua Christus ascendit crucem;
nil insolens mens cogitet,
intendat affectum precis.*

^{1066.} *H. 3*, v. 1-4. The text printed here is the one also printed by den Boeft; I added the English translation that can be found in Walsh & Husch (2012) 9.

Now dawns the third hour of the day,
 the hour when Christ mounted the cross;
 let our minds harbor no proud thought,
 but foster eagerness for prayer.

Den Boeft remarks:¹⁰⁶⁷

*'The predicate *ascendit* is ambiguous: as a perfect tense it expresses the uniqueness of the crucifixion as a historical fact, and taken as a present it words the spiritual reiteration of the event at the hour which, as appears from Mark 15,25, has been structurally fixed by God. This ambiguity entails that the first two verses are the self-evident, indeed the 'natural' base for the appeal to assume a disposition of true devotion. Here (...) Ambrose's poetry is akin to the lyrical poetry of all time, in which an overwhelming event or experience in the past can come to life in the perception and the words of the poet. But in his case this takes place within the space and inner coherence of God's creation.'*

Alternatively, the phrase *diem sacravit saeculi* (2) could tie in with a discourse of Christianization, in which case the last meaning of *saeculum* ("Heathenism") would be the more prominent: the passion of the Christian apostles has "consecrated" to the Christian faith a day that was formerly a pagan feast.¹⁰⁶⁸ Perhaps we have to do with one of the many *dies saeculi* that came to be replaced by Christian feasts.¹⁰⁶⁹ This is a maximalist interpretation of *diem ... saeculi*, surely, but a case for it can be made.¹⁰⁷⁰ Indeed, scholars have supposed that there was a Roman festival on 29 June

^{1067.} Den Boeft (1993) 88-89.

^{1068.} Although this interpretation is perhaps not the most prompting on the basis of Ambrosian and Early Christian usages of *saeculum* (and is indeed signaled by none of the existing commentaries), I pursue it both for the sake of completeness and, most prominently, because of its relevance to the question of a connection between Peter and Paul and earlier founders. In general, the existing (literary) commentaries on Ambrose's *Hymns* are not very rich in historical interpretation and focus mainly on literary devices and theological issues. As I have ventured to demonstrate above, the course of Ambrose's life would merit attention to issues of Roman history in his writings, no less than in those of any other Christian author of the time.

^{1069.} A prime example, argued for by Martin Walraff, is the appropriation of the feast of Sol Invictus under Constantine, making it the date of the birth of Christ, Christmas. See Wallraff (2001) (differently Förster (2007), with the review by Wallraff (2010); the debate is still ongoing). A later (but more secure and for our purpose perhaps more significant) example is the appropriation of the Lupercalia by Pope Gelasius in 494, dedicating the day to the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary. See Lönstrup (2008) 29 and 54, n. 13; the classic study is Holleman (1974). On the concept of Christian appropriations of pagan feasts, and the scholarly temptations and risks involved in studying them, see Wallraff (2004) 128-143.

^{1070.} *Dies* itself can carry the meaning "a day marked by a festival or other observance" (OLD 6), a standard Latin term for 'festival' being *dies festus*.

celebrating the foundation of Rome by Quirinus-Romulus.¹⁰⁷¹ A feast of Peter and Paul on the same day would then, in fact, be a very striking appropriation of “pagan” ritual time. It would imply that Peter and Paul were promoted by the Church as new founders (or their communal martyrdom as a new foundation) of Rome, perhaps all the way back to AD 258, the earliest era to which a feast of Peter and Paul on 29 June is attributed by fourth century sources.¹⁰⁷² Gitte Lønstrup, however, in a very valuable article, has argued that this theory is in fact likely to be a scholarly myth.¹⁰⁷³ Scholars certainly had (and have) a tendency to seek for and construct grand narratives about comparisons between Peter and Paul and various combinations of earlier founders, especially Romulus and Remus.¹⁰⁷⁴ Nevertheless, it is certain that the re-dedication of the temple of Quirinus on 29 June had, at some point, been recorded in the *Fasti Venusini*, composed between 16 BC and AD 4.¹⁰⁷⁵ Also, it was mentioned by Ovid in his (poetic) *Fasti*.¹⁰⁷⁶ So, what is the link between those Augustan attestations and the later Christian feast of Peter and Paul? Does the Ambrosian phrase refer to it in any way?

It remains to be seen, of course, if the occasion of the rededication of a temple in the Augustan era was in any way a potent memory in Late Antiquity, potent enough to determine the establishment of a feast of Peter and Paul on that date. Lønstrup, rightly, tends to think it wasn't.¹⁰⁷⁷ The question, then, is if 29 June had any other

^{1071.} Erbes (1899) 39; Cullmann (1952) 64-65; Pietri (1961) 311; Huskinson (1982) 82; Carletti (2000) 362. Of the most recent scholars reiterating the idea, Pietri quotes Cullmann's work, Huskinson refers wrongly to Rimoldi (1958) 34 (who actually denies Cullmann's claims), and Carletti gives no reference for his statement – see Lønstrup (2008) 35-36.

^{1072.} See p. 246, above.

^{1073.} According to Lønstrup, the myth originated with Cullmann (1952), not Mohlberg (1952) or Erbes (1899), since these last to authors did not make the outright claim that that the feast of Peter and Paul replaced the Roman festival that celebrated the anniversary of Rome, i.e. a festival on the date of the actual foundation of the city. I am not sure if Cullmann, on the contrary, is convinced of the fact that the *natalis Urbis* was indeed celebrated on 29 June, and not on 21 April. He implies as much, surely, but this seems to be rhetorical overstatement of the same kind that Erbes (1899) 39 employs concerning this episode. In my opinion, the historiographical myth originated perhaps not with Cullmann (1952) but with Erbes (1899).

^{1074.} See the enthusiasm with which Erbes made his discovery known to the scholarly community (Erbes (1899) 39).

^{1075.} See Lønstrup (2008) 29-30; about the *Fasti Venusini* in general, see Rüpke (1995) 109-112. The *Fasti Venusini* are the only ones among seven extant calendars that survive for the end of June that register an event on the 29th of that month. Actually, this very entry in the *Fasti Venusini* is used to provide a *terminus post quem* for its dating. Hence, there is some circularity in Lønstrup's argument that the Augustus' rebuilding of the temple to Quirinus ‘corresponds to the dating of the *Fasti Venusini* (16 BC – 4 AD).’ (*ibid.* 30) For the possibility that the entry of 29 June was a later addition, see Rüpke (1995) n. 61 and 112. The *terminus ante quem* of AD 4 is also quite hypothetical: *ibid.* 111-112.

^{1076.} *cum data sunt trabeae tempa, Quirine, tuae* (VI. 796).

^{1077.} Lønstrup (2008), especially 27, 35-6 and 38-39, together with Rimoldi (1958) 34.

relevance in the fourth century as *dies saeculi*. The old theory of Erbes does link the Christian feast of Peter and Paul to the founder(s) of Rome in some way,¹⁰⁷⁸ even if it wasn't an appropriation of the pagan festival celebrating the foundation of the city (such as the Quirinalia of 17 February or, of course, the Parilia of 21 April). Erbes attributes the choice for 29 June to the turbulent political circumstances of the summer of AD 258, when Pope Sixtus II felt the threat of prosecution as the second Valerian edict was issued to immediate effect. Sixtus wanted to reinforce the moral and resilience of the Roman church by staging a celebration of the exemplary martyrdom of Peter and Paul. As the edict was issued in the summer, the Quirinalia and the Parilia had already passed as an ideal occasion to stage a feast in honour of the Christian founders of his church. Therefore, he chose 'the closest available date which had any connection to the founder(s) of Rome' instead: 29 June.¹⁰⁷⁹ If that is anything near the truth, it would be interesting to ask ourselves if we might interpret Ambrose's *diem sacravit saeculi* (2) along those lines. Interestingly, this Ambrosian phrase (and indeed the whole of *H. 12*) has not been taken into consideration by either Lønstrup or Erbes. On the other hand, students of Ambrose have not considered the (disputed) historical origin of the feast of Peter and Paul celebrated in this hymn. There may, in short, be something to be gained from a thorough consideration of our hymn in conjunction with the historical discussion about the origins of the feast of Peter and Paul on 29 June.

What we must first establish, however, is the nature of the connection Erbes ponders about (29 June as 'the closest available date which had *any connection* to the founder(s) of Rome'). Lønstrup, perhaps influenced by Erbes' or Cullmann's ideas, states that the 'note in the *Fasti Venusini* [on 29 June], "Quirino in Colle", (...) appears to indicate a celebration for Quirinus [at that date] on the Quirinal Hill which was named after him.'¹⁰⁸⁰ The celebration of the 'festival' she postulates is not recorded in two slightly later Augustan calendars extant for the month of June, and Ovid devotes only two lines to what she terms the 'the cult and the ceremony of 29 June'.¹⁰⁸¹ Hence, she suggests that 'the festival occasioned by the consecration of the second temple to Quirinus had almost been forgotten when, between AD 4 and 7, he wrote his *Fasti*' – the same forgetfulness would explain the absence from the other Augustan

^{1078.} Erbes (1899) 39.

^{1079.} I quote the English paraphrase of Erbes' argument by Lønstrup (2008) 36.

^{1080.} *Ibid.* 30. See also *ibid.* 35: 'It cannot be dismissed that the consecration festival for the Augustan temple to Quirinus took place on 29 June, and that this is the festival referred to in the *Fasti Venusini* and in Ovid's *Fasti*.' For the text of the *Fasti Venusini* (which, more correctly, runs *Quirino in Coll(e)*, the last e being a suppletion), see *Inscr. It.* XIII.2.59 Degrassi.

^{1081.} Lønstrup (2008) 32–33. The date 29 June is not marked out in any way in the *Fasti Maffeiani* (8 BC) and the *Fasti Esquilini* (7 BC).

calendar.¹⁰⁸² Although a festival of the kind that Lønstrup postulates is not impossible, I believe Ockam's razor offers a better solution. The note in the *Fasti Venusini* records not a festival for Quirinus (which, as Lønstrup rightly emphasizes, was celebrated already on 17 February at the grand Quirinalia) that was soon afterwards 'forgotten' – there was no festival in the first place. The note in the *Fasti Venusini* and the very straightforward mention by Ovid in his *Fasti* record a rededication of the temple of Quirinus by Augustus, as a fact of history.¹⁰⁸³ Indeed, an Augustan calendar from Cumae does exactly that, recording major events in the life of Augustus as historical information, including dedications of altars and temples.¹⁰⁸⁴ Hence, 29 June had never had ritual value as a 'festival' or 'celebration', not even in the Augustan Age.¹⁰⁸⁵

Regardless of the question whether there had ever been a festival for Quirinus on 29 June, the date wasn't, as far as we can establish, remembered accordingly in the fourth century: it is absent from all extant fourth century calendars (except, of course, with regard to the feast of Peter and Paul). If there had never been a festival for Quirinus on that date, the theories of Erbsen and Cullmann become even more problematic. More importantly, perhaps, there is a distinct trace of the (ritual) memory of Quirinus apart from the Quirinalia. The fourth century *Fasti Philocaliani*, preserved in manuscript form, mention the 'birthday of Quirinus' on 3 April.¹⁰⁸⁶ This fact, not considered by Erbsen or Lønstrup, further complicates the statement that

^{1082.} *Ibid.* 32. See also *ibid.* 35: '(...) it would not be surprising if the festival on 29 June lost its significance after a few years.'

^{1083.} The general picture of the *Fasti Venusini* corroborates this interpretation. 'Die Informationen sind mehrmals singulär und dann nicht überprüfbar.' (Rüpke (1995) 110)

^{1084.} ILS 108, *Inscr. It.* XIII.2.279 Degrassi. Also the *Fasti Praenestini* record dedications, not involving festival celebrations, as facts of history, for example on 23 April (dedication of a statue of Augustus at the theatre of Marcellus).

^{1085.} This interpretation seems to be corroborated, further, by the fact that Cassius Dio, in discussing Augustus' dedication of the rebuilt temple (LIV.19.1-5), does not mention the day of consecration. Lønstrup (2008) 30 already, rightly, noted this (her argument, however, that Augustus doesn't mention the date in his *Res Gestae* (§19.2) is invalidated by the fact that he never mentions any calendrical date for the restoration or rededication of temples in §§ 19-24 of the *Res Gestae*). Dio, however, does mention gladiatorial games *after* the dedication of the temple (LIV.19.5), but it is not clear from the context whether they were connected to the dedication of the temple or to Augustus' imminent departure from Rome after that dedication – I am inclined to think the latter, since the narrative context implies a link with Augustus' departure rather than with the preceding event of the rededication of the temple. The date of 29 June and its possible links to (a festival of) Quirinus have been object of study all the way back to Mommsen and Wissowa – a full treatment of the question is, however, beyond the scope of this current research. See further Donati and Stefanetti (2006).

^{1086.} *Inscr. It.* XIII.2.245 Degrassi. According to Beard, North and Price II (1998) 69, the birthday was 'added to the calendar at some point after the early first century A.D.' I would guess that the idea originated in connection with the celebration of the Great Mother of the Gods on the same date, as well as the birth of Iuppiter (*Iuppiter ortus erat*, Ov. *Fasti* IV.203, on 3 April). On the manuscript in which the *Fasti Philocaliani* are preserved, see Beard, North and Price I (1998) 378-380.

29 June had any potent connection to the founder(s) of Rome in Late Antiquity – there were dates with such a connection in the fourth century, but not 29 June.

All things considered, we may discard the possibility that Ambrose's *diem sacravit saeculi* (2) can be interpreted as a reference to the Christian appropriation of a pagan feast. The feast that *H. 12* celebrates and the events it commemorates have, in other words, no link with the traditional founders of Rome as far their date is concerned.

5.4. Prudentius on Rome's Christian founders: classical tradition, Christian innovation

Not long after the death of Damasus, in AD 384, and around the time of the death of Ambrose (397) the Spanish Christian Prudentius appeared on the scene in Rome.¹⁰⁸⁷ As the son of a well-to-do, probably Christian family, born in northern Spain in AD 348, he had both a fair number of years and an impressive administrative career behind him when he decided to devote his energy and talents entirely and exclusively to his Christian vocation of writing religiously inspired poetry.¹⁰⁸⁸ From his extant poetry, hugely popular in the Middle Ages and amounting to some 10.000 lines in its entirety, the *Contra Symmachum* ("Against Symmachus") and several hymns in the *Peristephanon* (a collection of poems "on the [martyrs'] crowns") may interest us in particular. The *Contra Symmachum*, a poetic refutation of the efforts of the Roman aristocrat Symmachus to get the altar of Victory reinstalled in the Senate building (Symm., *Rel. 3*), can be dated to the years AD 402-403. In two books of hexameter verse, Prudentius attacked the cause of Symmachus, which was already lost for almost two decades, and had previously been thwarted successfully by Ambrose (*Ep. 18, 19*). Prudentius, however, revisited the case and advanced many new arguments in support of the Christian cause. The *Liber Peristephanon*, also dating to around AD 400, is a collection of lyric poetry in different metres, containing the hymns Prudentius composed in honour of Christian martyrs. Apart from Spanish martyrs and Cyprian of Carthage, he also treated famous Roman heroes of the faith, most notably Laurentius (*Perist. 2*), Hippolytus (*Perist. 11*), Peter & Paul (*Perist. 12*) and Agnes (*Perist. 14*).

Like Damasus and Ambrose, Prudentius was well-versed in classical culture and modes of thought, after following the standard rhetorical training and holding high provincial and imperial offices under the emperor Theodosius (AD 379-395). He surpassed both of them, however, in the extent to which classical literary models

^{1087.} For discussion of the dating of his activity in Rome, see Dijkstra (2016) 190-191.

^{1088.} These biographical data are based exclusively on his own 'preface' (*praefatio*), an introductory proem of 45 lines written probably late in his career to precede an edition of his collected works. The *praefatio* is printed on pages 1-2 of Cunningham (1966); see further Lana (1962) 7-24, with Roberts (1993) 1 n. 2.

and ideological paradigms influence his decidedly Christian poetry. Prudentius is rightly acclaimed for his mastery of classical poetic forms, earning him epithets like *Christianorum Maro et Flaccus* ("Vergil and Horace of the Christians", Bentley)¹⁰⁸⁹ or, more commonly, *Horatius Christianus* ("Christian Horace"). What is striking, however, is that he not only uses traditional poetics, but also traditional subject matter in his plea for the Christian cause. His poems abound in typical elements and expressions of *Laudes Romae* ("Praisings of Rome"), reused and worked so as to fit their new context.

Most important for this study, Prudentius takes Ambrose's claim that Peter and Paul had founded Rome a step further, or rather several steps. Prudentius is the first to compare Peter and Paul to Romulus and Remus and other kthonic heroes of Rome. In a forceful mix of classical style and Christian content, he incorporated Romulus and Remus in an ever more elaborated Christian foundation narrative. They become faithful Christians, while Christ himself, as if Peter and Paul were not enough, becomes the founder of Rome. All of this is aptly put in the mouth of that most Roman of martyrs, St. Lawrence, in a prayer to the Lord as his noble death is only minutes away:¹⁰⁹⁰ (*Perist. 2.409-472*)

5

Haec ludibundus dixerat,
caelum deinde suspicit 410
et congregescens obsecrat
miseratus urbem Romulam:
'O Christe, nomen unicum,
O splendor, O uirtus patris,
O factor orbis et poli
atque auctor horum moenium,
qui sceptra Romae in uertice
rerum locasti, sanciens
mundum Quirinali togae
seruire et armis cedere
ut discrepantum gentium
mores et observantiam
linguasque et ingenia et sacra
unis domares legibus,
en omne sub regnum Remi
mortale concessit genus,
idem loquuntur dissoni

420

^{1089.} See Kytzler (1972) 601.

^{1090.} Text and translation (adapted) from Thomson (1953).

ritus, id ipsum sentiunt.

*hoc destinatum quo magis
 ius Christiani nominis,
 quodcumque terrarum iacet.
 uno inligaret vinculo.*

430

*da, Christe, Romanis tuis
 sit Christiana ut civitas,
 per quam dedisti ut ceteris
 mens una sacrorum foret.*

*confoederantur omnia
 hinc inde membra in symbolum.
 mansuescit orbis subditus,
 mansuescat et summum caput.*

440

*advertat abiunctas plagas
 coire in unam gratiam;
 fiat fidelis Romulus,
 et ipse iam credat Numa.*

*confundit error Troicus
 adhuc Catonum curiam,
 veneratus occultis focis
 Phrygum penates exules.*

*Ianum bifrontem et Sterculum
 colit senatus (horreo
 tot monstra patrum dicere)
 et festa Saturni senis.*

450

*absterge, Christe, hoc dedecus,
 emitte Gabriel tuum,
 agnoscat ut verum Deum
 errans Iuli caecitas.*

*et iam tenemus obsides
 fidissimos huius spei,
 hic nempe iam regnant duo
 apostolorum principes,*

460

*alter vocator gentium,
 alter cathedram possidens
 primam recludit creditas
 aeternitatis ianuas.*

*discede, adulter Iuppiter.
 stupro sororis oblite,*

*relinque Romam liberam,
 plebemque iam Christi fuge.
 te Paulus hinc exterminat.
 te sanguis exturbat Petri,
 tibi id, quod ipse armaveras,
 factum Neronis officit. (...)'*

470

These words spoken in jest, he [St. Lawrence] then looks up to heaven, and sighing deeply prays in pity for the Romulean city:

"O Christ, the one name, the glory and strength of the Father, creator of earth and sky and founder of this city
 who hast set the sceptre of the world on Rome's high citadel, ordaining that the world obey the toga of Quirinus and yield to his arms,
 that thou might'st bring under one system of laws the customs and observance, the speech and character and worship of nations which differed among themselves;
 lo, the whole race of men has passed under the sovereignty of Remus, and usages formerly discordant are now alike in speech and thought. This was appointed that the authority of the Christian name might bind with one tie all lands everywhere.

Grant, O Christ, to thy Romans that the city by which Thou hast granted to all others to be of one mind in worship, may itself be Christian.

All its members everywhere are now allied in one confession of faith. The world it has subdued grows peaceable; may the supreme head too grow peaceable.

May she see that countries far apart are uniting in one state of grace, and may Romulus become one of the faithful, and Numa himself be now a believer.

The superstition which came from Troy still confounds a senate of Catos, doing homage at secret altars to the Phrygians' exiled Penates. The senate worships Janus of the two faces and Sterculus (I shudder to name all these monstrosities our Fathers own) and keeps the festival of old Saturn.

Wipe away this shame, O Christ; send forth thy servant Gabriel that the straying blindness of Julius may recognise the true God.

Already we hold most trusty sureties for this hope, for already there reign here the two chiefs of the apostles,

the one he who called the Gentiles, while the other occupies the foremost chair and opens the gates of eternity which were committed to his keeping.

Away, thou lecherous Jupiter, defiled with the violation of thy sister!
 Leave Rome at liberty, flee from her people, who now are Christ's.
 Paul banishes thee hence, the blood of Peter drives thee out. That deed of Nero's for which thou didst put the sword in his hand hurts thee. (...)"

It is immediately apparent that Prudentius has gone a lot further than Ambrose, by transferring traditional Roman ideology, and the concept of ktistic renewal, to the context of Rome's Christian identity. Prudentius' second *Peristephanon* juxtaposes Rome's traditional foundation myth, where Romulus and Remus (both mentioned in the poem) are preceded by Aeneas (who is not named here, but nodded to by the reference to his son Julius, in line 456), with a succession of Christian ktistic heroes, from Christ to Peter and Paul and, by implication, Lawrence, whose imminent martyrdom enacts the perfect occasion for such a ktistic excursus. We may even wonder whether, just like Camillus and Augustus had been successors of Romulus, the ktistic theme invites comparison between these classic 'second founders' and the current successors of the martyrs, i.e. the popes.

The comparison between pagan and Christian founders has been noted and commented upon by scholars for half a century, but the differences in interpretation among those scholars reveal something of the fact that the Christianization of Rome's foundation conceptualized by Prudentius was not so straightforward. In what follows, I will first review and comment on the most important of these previous interpretations and then end with my own interpretation.

In 1966, the classical scholar Vincenz Buchheit devoted a seminal essay to the Christian 'ideology of Rome' (*Romideologie*) in Prudentius' second *Peristephanon*.¹⁰⁹¹ As an avid student of Vergil, Buchheit well highlights the extent to which Prudentius built on his Augustan predecessor and adapted Vergil's praise of Rome to his own, Christian agenda. Buchheit, however, was also aware of more contemporary, Christian influences on Prudentius' poem. Commenting on the connection with lines 21-24 of Ambrose's *Hymn 12* (see above),¹⁰⁹² Buchheit notes:¹⁰⁹³

^{1091.} Buchheit (1966) = (1971). I quote from the 1971 reprint.

^{1092.} *Ibid.* 469.

^{1093.} Buchheit (1971) 469 n. 55.

'Hier [in Ambr. 12.21-24] ist angedeutet, was Prud[entius] Laur.-Hymnus; perist. 12, 55f. [...] und Aug[ustin] [de] civ[itate] [Dei] 1, 34 (vgl. 2, 29) konkret ausführen: die beiden Apostelfürsten treten in der christlichen Romideologie an die Stelle der Romgründer Romulus und Remus (...)'

Although I do not agree with Buchheit that the replacement of Romulus and Remus by Peter and Paul, as founders of Rome, is documented in the passages he mentions,¹⁰⁹⁴ my interest now lies mainly with his general idea that Prudentius advocates such a replacement. Buchheit's next remark, on the connection between the final lines of Ambrose's hymn and Prudentius' hymn, neatly sums up the general development of the latter's 'ideology of Rome':¹⁰⁹⁵

'Von hier führte ein Weg zur Romideologie des Prudentius. Was bei Damasus und Ambrosius nur im Ansatz erkennbar ist, wurde von Prudentius, vor allem in Auseinandersetzung mit dem Rombild Vergils, ausgestaltet und vollendet.'

Here Buchheit is surely right, but his slightly impressionistic treatment of Prudentius' expression of this general idea is perhaps one of the reasons subsequent interpreters, often building on Buchheit, have not delved further into the details. One of those details is the interesting observation, again acutely made by Buchheit, that Peter and Paul are not the only Christian founders of Rome in *Peristephanon* 2. Commenting on line 416, where Christ is hailed by Lawrence, speaking in pity of Rome, as *auctor horum moenia*, Buchheit notes:¹⁰⁹⁶

'Nicht Romulus, der Sohn des Mars, hat diese Stadt gegründet, nicht Jupiter wird die Weltherrschaft verdankt. Christus, bewusst als virtus patris bezeichnet, ist der Urheber dieser Mauern und der römischen Herrschaft. An die Stelle des Göttersohns Romulus tritt also der Gottessohn Christus.'

Again, Buchheit makes a crucial point, and where he elsewhere overestimates the importance of Vergil as a model, it is his great merit to have identified the thoroughly Vergilian background of this passage. Another very important aspect of his analysis is the parallel he sees between not only the founders of Rome, but also between other actors involved in Vergil's and Prudentius' literary evocations. While Romulus and Remus are replaced by Peter and Paul, and Christ, Theodosius, in Prudentius, is seen

^{1094.} His interpretation (*ibid.* 471) of *Perist.* 12.55-57, that 'mit den *duae fidei dotes* die beiden Romgründer Romulus und Remus ersetzt werden sollen', is not convincing. We will return to Augustine below.

^{1095.} *Ibid.* 469.

^{1096.} *Ibid.* 475.

to take the place occupied by Augustus in Vergil's teleological vision of Rome's future, and Lawrence that of Jupiter, as prophetic authority, both of them in imitation of the prophecy of Jupiter in *Aeneid* I.¹⁰⁹⁷ Buchheit notes:¹⁰⁹⁸

'Laurentius sieht – wie Jupiter den Augustus – Theodosius als kommenden Herrscher, der das Christentum endgültig zum Sieg führen wird. Der Zeitgenosse des Prudentius erlebt so bei der Lektüre des Hymnus Verkündigung und Erfüllung in einem wie der Leser der Aeneis.'

Finally, Buchheit's analysis is important for the last point he makes about *Peristephanon* 2. Towards the end of the hymn, Prudentius paints a fascinating picture of Lawrence's role in heaven, where he is elected as 'perennial consul' of a 'heavenly Rome' (2.559-560). As Buchheit notes, this is probably not only the first instance of a martyr or saint presented as a consul, but also the first occurrence of the conjunction *Roma caelstis*.¹⁰⁹⁹ While Buchheit sees this as a harmonious merging of the literary heritage of both Vergil and the Bible, he does not pause at the highly problematic nature of Prudentius' amalgam, from a biblical or more dogmatic point of view.

Buchheit's treatment, typical of his background as a classical philologist, was preceded by a fundamental article of the French church historian Charles Pietri, published in 1961, of which Buchheit seems unaware.¹¹⁰⁰ Pietri has the virtue of treating the development leading to Peter and Paul's presentation as founders of Rome in its fourth and fifth century Christian context. He compares the literary record, for example, to the many representations of both apostles in Christian iconography. While Pietri precedes Buchheit on several important points, his main weakness is that he treats the issue in a largely synchronic fashion, heaping evidence from roughly 350-450 indiscriminately together. The only chronological point Pietri wants to make is that the development of Peter and Paul into founders of Rome preceded Leo the Great, rather than originating with him.¹¹⁰¹ He is exceedingly vague about the individual contributions to that development of Damasus, Ambrose and Prudentius, and about the way they built on and reacted to one another.

Following in Buchheit's footsteps, Remo Cacitti is the first to ascribe the configuration of Peter and Paul as founders of Rome (in replacement of Romulus and Remus)

^{1097.} *Ibid.* 478-480.

^{1098.} *Ibid.* 479.

^{1099.} *Ibid.* 484.

^{1100.} Pietri (1961) = (1997). The original page numbers are retained also in the reprint.

^{1101.} *Ibid.* 318; cf. 309.

explicitly to Prudentius.¹¹⁰² He also breaks new ground in comparing this phenomenon to other Late Antique invocations of Rome's foundation, namely the idea of *renovatio* inherent in the celebration of Rome's millennium by Philip the Arab and his son as *saeculares Augusti*.¹¹⁰³ That line of inquiry is further enhanced by Pietri's second treatment of the theme in his monumental 1976 monograph *Roma Christiana*. He compares Peter's role to the ktistic aspirations surrounding Constantine (in *Pan. Lat. XII(9) 18.1*), Constantius II (in *Them. Or. 42a*) and Gratian, as well as the Late Antique revival of attention for the she-wolf and Romulus and Remus.¹¹⁰⁴ Pietri, interestingly, also seems to be the first to connect Peter and Paul's new role as city-founders to their role as church-founders, e.g. at Corinth, in the early Christian tradition.¹¹⁰⁵

Pietri, however, is also aware of some of the problems involved in raising Rome to the status of a Christian city.¹¹⁰⁶ Pointing forward to Augustine, he describes the general disagreements between the African bishop's opinion of Rome's role in the history of salvation (see further chapter 5.5, below) and that of e.g. Prudentius.¹¹⁰⁷ He notes that the Christian poet refrains from calling Rome *sacra* and *aeterna*,¹¹⁰⁸ but Pietri devotes no attention to the issue of Christian city foundation in his study.¹¹⁰⁹ That issue – as outlined above – is treated extensively by Speyer in 1983, but he does not treat Prudentius.

In a book entirely devoted to the *Peristephanon*, dating to 1989, Anne-Marie Palmer also comments on the passage presenting Christ as the founder of Rome, already treated by Buchheit. Palmer reads the passage against the Parade of Heroes in *Aeneid* VI and remarks:¹¹¹⁰

'(...) As Lawrence himself remarks later in this same poem, *Christ is now to be considered as the 'auctor horum moenium'* (Pe[rist.] 2. 416), who founded the empire to make a world-wide and united Christendom possible (Pe. 2. 417-32). In *Aeneid* 6, *Augustus replaces Romulus as a second founder of a renewed Rome*; in Pe. 2 and for Prudentius in general, *Christ now replaces Augustus as the true founder of the Christian empire and can be described in the same terms.*'

^{1102.} Cacitti (1972) 423-424.

^{1103.} *Ibid.* 423.

^{1104.} Pietri (1976) 1565-1566.

^{1105.} *Ibid.* 1564, mentioning only Peter, however, not Paul.

^{1106.} *Ibid.* 1636-1641.

^{1107.} *Ibid.* 1645-1650.

^{1108.} *Ibid.* 1650.

^{1109.} Cf. his treatment, again in more general terms, of the concept of *renovatio*, *ibid.* 1641-1645.

^{1110.} Palmer (1989) 129.

It is unclear how Palmer takes Prudentius' *horum moenium* to refer to the empire, and although her attempt to read the ktistic constructs of Prudentius against those of the *Aeneid* is interesting,¹¹¹¹ she misses the obvious point. Christ replaces not Augustus but Romulus (while Augustus is replaced by Theodosius), as Buchheit had already observed. Palmer's only other remark of interest to us here is the statement that the fact that 'Peter and Paul should replace Romulus and Remus in Prudentius' vision of Christian Rome fits in with contemporary propaganda.'¹¹¹² Unfortunately, Palmer does not substantiate that claim and it is unclear to what 'contemporary propaganda' she is referring.

Also in 1989, Martha Malamud read *Peristephanon* 13 (on the virgin martyr Agnes) against the foundation myth of Rome revolving around Romulus, with some spectacular, if not rather speculative conclusions.¹¹¹³ It is perhaps telling how Palmer and Malamud do not refer to the texts treated by the other, and observe completely different adaptations of Rome's ktistic traditions in the poems of Prudentius' *Peristephanon*. Prudentius' poetry apparently leaves a lot of room for interpretation without imposing a unitary vision on the Christian foundation of Rome.¹¹¹⁴ In 1993, Michael Roberts saw yet other examples of ktistic reenactment, uniquely focusing on the Christian founders of Rome, in *Peristephanon* 12.¹¹¹⁵ He also has some insightful comments on the ktistic complex, identified by Buchheit, that equated Peter and Paul with Romulus and Remus: '[a]lthough Prudentius never spells out the parallels between Romulus and Remus and Peter and Paul, it is often thought that the prefaces to *Contra Symmachum*, dedicated to the two apostles, are intended to suggest that connection.'¹¹¹⁶ While he (and rightly so) stresses the implicit nature of Prudentius' ktistic parallel between pagan and Christian founders, the sum total of Prudentius' poems adds up to something very similar for Roberts as well: 'together they constitute a new founding legend of Christian Rome, one that has its origins in the past but continues in the present to be part of the experience of individual Christians, as they celebrate the saints' feast days and move about the city.'¹¹¹⁷

It would be easy to expand this catalogue of interpretations with more examples from recent scholarship, often building on Buchheit, but that would not contribute greatly

¹¹¹¹ Cf. her valuable interpretation of Prudentius' goals in doing so at p. 130, and many other valuable observations, e.g. at 136-139 (on *Perist.* 11 and 12), 140 (on *Perist.* 9) and 159-160 (on *Perist.* 3).

¹¹¹² Palmer (1989) 135.

¹¹¹³ Malamud (1989) 149-156.

¹¹¹⁴ See Roberts (1993) 3-4 on the differences between both books.

¹¹¹⁵ Roberts (1993) 177-178.

¹¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* 184.

¹¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 186.

to the point I have been trying to make.¹¹¹⁸ Despite differences in interpretation, it seems clear enough that Prudentius purposefully compared and contrasted Rome's Christian founders with their non-Christian forerunners.¹¹¹⁹ At the same time, the often implicit nature of such comparisons leaves open how precisely they should be interpreted. Roald Dijkstra cautiously concludes:¹¹²⁰

*'References to pagan literature link the representation of the apostles to Rome's glorious origins, but assuming that Paul was put on a par with Aeneas in the preface [of *Contra Symmachum I*] might be too farfetched. The comparison of Peter and Paul with Romulus and Remus, which is often mentioned in modern literature, is equally based on indirect references and its importance should not be exaggerated.'*

Dijkstra is certainly right in pointing out the enthusiasm with which modern scholars, from Buchheit and Pietri onwards, have identified a forerunner of Leo the Great in Prudentius, pushing back the comparison of both ktistic pairs half a century. That notwithstanding, it seems clear enough that the Spanish poet consciously included Rome's ktistic traditions in his wholesale juxtaposition of pagan and Christian cultural phenomena. As in so many other cases, the Christian counterparts of pagan paradigms first realize the full potential of Rome's destiny, and it is Prudentius' important contribution to have applied that general idea also to the phenomenon of city foundation.

Although Prudentius was familiar with Ambrose's hymn hailing Rome as founded by the blood of martyrdom (*fundata tali sanguine*, 12.23; see above),¹¹²¹ he interestingly chose quite a different way of presenting Rome as a Christian foundation. Peter and Paul's martyrial blood certainly is of fundamental importance to Prudentius as well (e.g. *Peristephanon* 2.407, with 546; 12.4, 10), as it chases away Jupiter, and may even, as Roberts argues, play a role in a typological reenactment of Rome's Christian foundation by the popes.¹¹²² Nevertheless, the only outright evocation of Rome's Christian foundation comes down to the ktistic activity of Christ, not his apostles. In a daring juxtaposition of roles that defies the difficulties surrounding terrestrial foundation in the biblical texts, creation and city foundation coalesce in Christ as *factor*

^{1118.} See Dijkstra (2016) 224 n. 647 for a convenient list of recent references, to which may be added his own interpretation of *Peristephanon 7*, at p. 206, as well as Lühken (2002) 183, Trout (2005) 302 and Humphries (2020) 182.

^{1119.} Apart from Romulus and Remus, see Rapisarda (1964) 628 (quoted by Dijkstra (2016) 212) on Paul as new Aeneas and Roberts (1993) 184-185 on Evander.

^{1120.} Dijkstra (2016) 228. Less cautious: Humphries (2020) 179-185.

^{1121.} Buchheit (1971) 468 n. 54.

^{1122.} Roberts (1993) 177, with 170-171.

orbis et poli atque auctor horum moenium (*Peristephanon* 2.415-416). As Buchheit argues, Lawrence's address is a beautiful symbiosis of the Bible, the *Aeneid* and the Christian faith.¹¹²³ The words *O virtus patris* (414) would actually refer to 1 Corinthians 1.24 – the very text of the New Testament, in other words, that problematized terrestrial foundations by others than Christ himself (see above). That designation, then, fittingly precedes the combined expression of Christ as creator of heaven and earth (415) and founder of (the walls of) Rome (416).

Factor is not a very widespread word in classical Latin, giving it the full weight of Christian connotations stemming from its usage in exactly this sense elsewhere. *Auctor*, conversely, is a solidly classical, also Vergilian term for city founders, e.g. in *Georgics* III.36, *Aeneid* VI.650, VIII.134. One may of course wonder why Christ's ktistic role (as well as his creative one, for that matter) is not described by *conditor*, a word used by Prudentius for Romulus in *Peristephanon* 10.615.¹¹²⁴ Like Damasus and Ambrose, Prudentius was anything but unaware of Vergil's ktistic vocabulary. One telling example among many is a couplet from another hymn steeped in traditional Roman ideology: *Peristephanon* 11, in honor of the venerable martyr Hippolytus. In a speech parallel, in some ways, to that of Lawrence in *Peristephanon* 12, Hippolytus exclaims: (28-34)

*consultus quaenam secta foret melior,
respondit: "fugite, o miseri, execranda Novati
scismata, catholicis reddite vos populis.
una fides vigeat, prisco quae condita templo est,
quam Paulus retinet quamque cathedra Petri.
quae docui, docuisse piget: venerabile martyr
cerno, quod a cultu rebar abesse Dei."*

[A]nd being asked which teaching was the better
he answered: "O my poor friends, shun the accursed schism of
Novatus and return to the orthodox people.
Let the faith be strong in its unity, the faith that was established in the
[early Church
and which Paul and the chair of Peter hold fast.
What I taught, I regret having taught; now that I am bearing witness
I see that what I thought foreign to the worship of God is worthy
[of reverence."

^{1123.} Buchheit (1971) 473.

^{1124.} In an evocation of Rome's traditional foundation myth: *Peristephanon* 10.611-617.

Peter and Paul are here presented as guarantors of the faith (cf. *Peristephanon* 2.457-460) that is 'stored', 'safeguarded', or, as Thomson translates, 'established' (*condita*, 31) in the pristine church.

Several reasons may be suggested why Prudentius uses *auctor* instead of *conditor* when speaking about the foundation of Rome by Christ. *Auctor* counts as a virtual synonym for *conditor*, e.g. in Livy (V.24.11) and Pliny (N.H. XXII.5). In a passage on blame awarded to *conditores urbium*, Quintilian gives the example of the *primus Iudaicae superstitionis auctor* (III.7.21). Similarly, the term *auctor* is used by Tacitus for no other than Christ himself in his famous passage on the fire of Rome in AD 64. Nero blamed the so-called *Christiani*, and Tacitus explains: *auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat* ('Christus, the founder of the name, had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius, by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus', *Ann.* XV.44). It seems a strike of genius that Prudentius chose to describe Christ as founder of Rome with the very word used by the earliest author referring to the first Christian persecution, during which Peter and Paul were supposedly martyred (cf. *Peristephanon* 2.472).¹¹²⁵ But perhaps it also suitably conserves something of its original meaning, derived from *augere*, 'to increase', 'cause to grow', 'enhance': Christ clearly makes Rome bigger and better than it was before, adding the impending martyrdom of Lawrence to those of Peter and Paul, and providing the city with yet another saintly protector.

In *Peristephanon* 2, that role of protector is performed by the saint both in heaven and on earth, as Prudentius testified: (2.549-560)

*sic, sancte Laurenti, tuam
nos passionem quaerimus:
est aula nam duplex tibi,
hic corporis, mentis polo.
illic inenarrabili
allectus urbi municeps
aeternae in arce curiae
gestas coronam civicam.
videor videre inlustribus
gemmis coruscantem virum,*

^{1125.} The passage in which Tacitus calls Christ an *auctor* (*Ann.* XV.44) comes only two pages in a modern edition after Nero's alleged desire for "the glory to found a new city and name it with his own name" (*condenda urbis novae et cognomento suo appellanda gloriam*, *Ann.* XV. 40), i.e. his refounding of Rome as *Neropolis*.

*quem Roma caelstis sibi
legit perennem consulem.*

It is thus, holy Lawrence, that we seek thy passion; for thou hast two seats, that of thy body here on earth, that of thy soul in heaven.

Admitted there as a freeman of the ineffable city, thou wearest the civic crown in that Capitol where sits the everlasting senate.

I think I see the hero flashing with brilliant jewels, whom the heavenly Rome has chosen to be her perpetual consul.

That Christ, concomitantly with his role as creator of heaven and earth, had been presented as founder of Rome, is probably the reason Prudentius permits himself to speak, wholly without precedent, of a 'heavenly Rome' (*Roma caelstis*, 459). No newly coined collocation could have more clearly deconstructed the tension among early Christians (sketched above) between heavenly Jerusalem, founded by God, and earthly Rome. In Prudentius' poetry, Rome has not only affirmed itself as a Christian city foundation on earth: on Christ's authority, it has also come to conquer the heavenly realm of God's own city.

5.5. Augustine's *City of God* as a reaction to the Sack of Rome in AD 410: Romulus and Christ compared

Western Christians in Rome, around the turn of the fifth century, were increasingly successful in advancing their claims that Rome had been founded as a Christian city. At the same time, Rome had become a city without emperors, as the imperial government was now based in Constantinople and Ravenna, and Roman emperors became increasingly unsuccessful in defending Rome against invading armies. The new idea of Rome as a Christian city was severely put to the test in AD 410, when Gothic armies raged the city in the so-called Sack of Rome.¹¹²⁶ How could that disaster, inflicted on the Eternal City, be reconciled with the idea that Rome had been founded by the most prominent saints of Christianity, or even by Christ himself?

That question was treated in a monumental and influential work written by the bishop of a small city in North Africa, Augustine of Hippo's *De civitate Dei*. It merits our close attention for a number of reasons. Augustine's radical answer, to begin with, was that Rome was not a Christian city founded as such, but a mere human construct destined – as all earthly things – to decay once its role in the divine plan for human salvation had been performed. As a Western Christian operating outside Rome, he blatantly denied the ideas put forward by Ambrose and Prudentius, and later adopted by his

¹¹²⁶ On the sack and its aftermath, see Harich-Schwarzauer and Pollmann (2013); van Nuffelen (2015).

own pupil Orosius.¹¹²⁷ Augustine, moreover, creatively adapted the idea of Christ as city-founder to fit his own intellectual programme. He argued that Christ, instead of being the founder of a Christian Rome, was the founder of the one and only truly Christian city: the Heavenly City of God. Redefining – again – what Christian city-foundation meant, Augustine dwelled at length on the foundation of this celestial successor of Rome. In doing so, finally, he made many surprising comparisons with the foundation of Rome, which functions as a ktistic template for his *civitas Dei*. Strikingly, however, the foundation of the Heavenly City by Christ is not compared to the foundation of a Christian Rome by the two apostles, but to the ancient city founded by Rome's fratricidal first king: Romulus. Augustine purposefully creates a typological and literary relationship between the foundation (and founders) of Rome and the foundation (and founder) of the Heavenly City, and in doing so he presents the City of God as the true Eternal City – an epithet traditionally ascribed to Rome.

Ktistic renewal thus plays an interesting and unexpected role in Augustine's work, and that aspect seems not to have been lost on his contemporaries. At some point during the composition of his sizable work *On the City of God*, Augustine got a spontaneous letter from Bethlehem. The content was certainly flattering, but the terms in which the praise it contained was phrased must have tested Augustine's sense of humility to a considerable extent:¹¹²⁸

5

(...) *Macte virtute, in orbe celebraris. Catholici te conditorem antiquae rursum fidei venerantur atque suspiciunt; et – quod signum maioris gloriae est – omnes heretici detestantur et me pari persecuntur odio, ut, quos gladiis nequeant, voto interficiant. Incolumem et mei memorem te Christi domini clementia tueatur, domine venerande et beatissime papa.*

(...) Well done! You are famous throughout the world; the Catholics revere and honour you as the second founder of their ancient faith, while (and this is a sign of greater honour) all the heretics hate you and persecute me, too, with equal hatred; they hope to kill merely by wishing, those whom they cannot kill by sword. May the mercy of Christ our Lord keep you safe and mindful of me, reverent lord and most blessed bishop.

^{1127.} See Klein (1985) on Prudentius and Frend (1989) on Orosius; cf. Jacoby (2004) 165 n. 1266 on similar differences between Augustine and his Christian predecessors. For Augustine's African outlook, see MacCormack (1998) 188.

^{1128.} Hier., Ep. 141 = August., Ep. 195. Text by Hilberg (1996²), translation by White (1990). According to Fürst (1999) 178, Jerome never got an answer to this letter from Augustine, excluding the possibility that such an answer was written but lost in the subsequent tradition of manuscripts.

We cannot be sure who these 'Catholics' were and exactly in what terms they praised Augustine, but the author of this letter – Augustine's contemporary and equally famous Christian man of letters Jerome – must have known what he was doing in reporting and phrasing the praise. Jerome's letter is itself a nice example of ktistic renewal, making the bold move of styling Augustine as *conditor antiquae rursum fidei*, a rather enigmatic expression that means 'a (or 'the') second founder of the (or 'their', i.e. of those 'Catholics') ancient faith', or 'founder of the renewed ancient faith'.¹¹²⁹ We will return to this expression and its interpretation at the end of this paragraph, but whatever it means exactly, it maneuvers the recipient of the letter in a position of canonical, apostolic or perhaps even divine stature and authority. Augustine is presented as a Christian founder.¹¹³⁰ That creates considerable tension with the bishop's own treatment of Christian founders in *De civitate Dei*, reserving that honour exclusively for Christ. These circumstances, therefore, make the bishop of Hippo an even more intriguing subject, and raises interesting questions about the concept of foundation itself and the literary discourse surrounding it among Christian intellectuals around the time of the Sack of Rome in AD 410.¹¹³¹

How did Augustine treat the foundation of Rome in his *De civitate Dei* (henceforth: *De civ.*)? What does his presentation of Christ as founder of the Heavenly City imply for the concept of ktistic renewal in Christian thinking? What might his treatment of founders have to do with him being hailed as *conditor antiquae rursum fidei* by a contemporary Christian readership?

When Jerome's letter from Bethlehem had made its way to the city of Hippo on the coast of Roman Africa, around AD 418,¹¹³² it probably found the local bishop, Augustine, busy writing, in between preaching and other ecclesiastical duties, what would become his major work: *On the City of God*. He worked on the 22 books of this *magnum opus* for at least a decade, probably 15 years. It was written, or at least begun, in reaction to the upheaval and sense of calamity caused by the Sack of Rome in AD 410,

^{1129.} 'Die Katholiken verehren und rühmen Dich als Neubegründer des alten Glaubens', as Fürst (1999) 184, 208 translates the words. He states: 'Die (...) Briefe, (...) 141 bzw. 142, sind die rätselhaftesten der ganzen Korrespondenz.' Possibly, letters 141 and 142 are in fact two pieces of one and the same letter, separated in the later tradition.

^{1130.} It is, in my opinion, probable that the bold nature of this statement is hinted at by the introductory remark *scit, quid dicam, prudentia tua*, 'you know what I am referring to', as translated by White (1990), who connects it to the preceding lines rather than the ones that follow.

^{1131.} See also Zwierlein (1978), Włosok (1993-1995) and, with further bibliographical references, De Bruyn (1993) 406 n. 6.

^{1132.} On the dating of the letters between both men, see the references in Fürst (1999) 89 n. 4, and *ibid.* 178, 184-187 for our letter in particular.

and to the ensuing accusations against Christians. The immense work¹¹³³ was finished around AD 426/427, when the author, in his 70s, looked back on his entire literary output in his *Retractationes*. Just like modern behemoth-sized bestsellers, however, readers didn't have to wait for the completion of the whole thing to get a taste of the work. Book I was perhaps published separately in advance, but surely books I-III were, as a set, around the year 413. Books IV & V were in circulation by 415, and VI-X followed suit by 417. It was around this time that Jerome's letter should be dated, with the first decade completed or nearing completion. The remaining twelve books, almost 50% longer than the first half of the work, were also published in various installments in the next ten years.

This practice largely reflects the skillfully designed structure of the work, divided into sets and subsets. Apart from the internal evidence of prefaces, *clausulae* and explicit authorial remarks, we have the extraordinary evidence of Augustine's own instructions, directed to a friend, how to produce and publish further copies from an exemplar the author personally sent along with a letter.¹¹³⁴ The larger units of books I-X and XI-XXII, constituting the two halves of the work, deal roughly with the refutation of the values of the worldly city, on the one hand, and the superiority of the heavenly city, on the other (after which the work is named).¹¹³⁵ The first half can be read as Augustine's attack against pagan religion, morals and philosophy; the second as his positive plea for Christianity.¹¹³⁶ The first decade can be further divided in two pentads, while the second set of twelve books forms a triad of four books each.¹¹³⁷ Predictably, once the work was complete, its author protested against the idea that one part could be read and regarded apart from the other.¹¹³⁸ But the phased nature and chronology of its publication justify approaches that look at parts of the whole in more detail – a justification reinforced by Augustine's own behavior during and even after the completion of the work, such as a separate recitation of book XVIII supervised by the author.¹¹³⁹ The first decade deals intensively with Rome and its foundation, and is therefore of crucial importance to our investigation. Augustine, to quote Mark Vessey, 'had a way of beginning at the beginning, then beginning again'.¹¹⁴⁰ After ten books in which he had reviewed the history of the Rome 'from its beginnings' (*ab origine sua*; *De civ.* II.2), Augustine 'renewed his undertaking' in the

^{1133.} *ingens opus*, cf. *De civ.* XXII.30

^{1134.} *Ep.* 1A*.1

^{1135.} For the two-cities theory, see Van Oort (2007) 353-360.

^{1136.} Wetzel (2012b) 2.

^{1137.} Vessey (2012) 14, 29-30, Wetzel (2012b) 2.

^{1138.} Vessey (2012) 29. See further Caltabiano (1995).

^{1139.} Vessey (2012) 27.

^{1140.} *Ibid.* 14.

preface to the second half, starting all over again.¹¹⁴¹ Augustine's general movement away from the calamity of the Sack of Rome in the second half is another reason why we will look at the first decade in particular, rather than the work as a whole. Moreover, Jerome's statement about Augustine as *conditor* cannot have been related to the second half, which still had to be written at the time. We will therefore focus on the first ten books, with a specific question in mind: what does a work provoked by the Sack of Rome have to say about its foundation?

Although *De civitate Dei* was provoked by the Sack of Rome and is often associated with the fall of the Roman Empire, the work has a lot to say about the foundation of Rome and the origins of the Empire that bore its name. The first mention of Rome's foundation occurs right away in chapter 2 of book I, at the start of Augustine's refutation of the pagan claim that Christians were to blame for the Sack of Rome:¹¹⁴²

tot bella gesta conscripta sunt uel ante conditam Romam uel ab eius exortu et imperio (...)

[Let them read] the countless descriptions of wars fought before Rome was founded or carried on after her rise and expansion of power (...)

This is just a brief mention in passing, but it is also the first explicit mention of the city of Rome: the treatment starts with the city's foundation. Note, however, that that is not where Augustine begins. His refutation harks back to an even earlier event: the fall of that other great city, Troy, from which Rome was said to come forth. The foundation of Rome and the fall of Troy inform the opening chapters of *De civitate Dei*, in reverse chronological order. In a way, Augustine thus echoes the literary work that most informs his treatment of these themes, Vergil's *Aeneid*, book I of which deals intensively with the foundation of Rome (in the *proæmium* and the Prophecy of Jupiter), while the fall of Troy is recounted in book II. Augustine knew his Vergil well – perhaps better than many modern readers – and effectively turns his model upside down, not unlike Vergil himself had inverted his model, Homer. While for Vergil the demise of Troy lead to the foundation of a better, purified version of it in Italy, i.e. Rome, for Augustine the fall of Troy is a pressing precedent for the recent fall of Rome. Vergil's dramatizing account of Troy's 'conquered Gods' is fully exploited by the bishop of Hippo to drive home the point that Rome, now, could not be saved by its allegedly powerful gods, just as Troy couldn't either, back in the beginnings of history.

¹¹⁴¹ *Ibid.* Cf. August. *Retract.* II.43/69 on the division between the first ten books (*His ergo decem libris...*) and the *pars altera operis huius, quae libris duodecim continetur* (text by Mutzenbechter (Tvrnholti 1984) 125).

¹¹⁴² August. *De civ.* I.2. Text by Dombart & Kalb (1955), translation by McCracken (1957).

After, among other things, an excruciating moral justification of the cruelties committed in 410 (in which Augustine is particularly nasty about women), the foundation of Rome resurfaces towards the end of book I, just before the two last chapters that look ahead to the books that follow. A recurring theme of the book is the shelter and safe haven Christian churches had provided to pagans and Christians alike during the Sack. This theme now takes an unexpected turn.¹¹⁴³

et tamen quod uiuitis dei est, qui uobis parcendo admonet, ut corrigamini paenitendo; qui uobis etiam ingratis praestitit, ut uel sub nomine seruorum eius uel in locis martyrum eius hostiles manus euaderetis. Romulus et Remus asylum constituisse perhibentur, quo quisquis confugeret ab omni noxa liber esset, augere quaerentes creandae multitudinem ciuitatis. mirandum in honorem Christi processit exemplum. hoc constituerunt euersores urbis, quod constituerant antea conditores. quid autem magnum, si hoc fecerunt illi, ut ciuium suorum numerus suppleretur, quod fecerunt isti, ut suorum hostium numerositas seruaretur?

Nevertheless, the fact that you [Rome's pagans] still live is God's doing, who in sparing you gives you notice to correct your ways by repentance. Ungrateful as you are, it is He who has granted you to escape the enemy's [=Alaric's Goths'] hands either by taking the name of His servants or in the sanctuaries of the martyrs. Romulus and Remus, seeking a means of increasing the population of the city they were founding, are alleged to have established an asylum where any man might seek refuge and be free from guilt, an admirable precedent that in due course was followed in the respect shown to Christ's name. The destroyers of the city have set up the very thing that its founders had set up before. Furthermore, how can we regard their doing so as a great thing, who did it to supplement the number of their own citizens, when these did the same in order to preserve the great numbers of their own enemies?

For no particular reason, at first sight, Augustine brings in Romulus and Remus' asylum, comparing the foundation of Rome with its fall. Even more so, he also presents the asylum of Romulus and Remus as a prefiguration of Christ's clemency.¹¹⁴⁴ Of course, the Christian version surpasses Romulus and Remus' exemplum in every way, as the rhetoric of the passage beautifully brings out. But why mention it in the

^{1143.} August. *De civ.* I.34.

^{1144.} 'The eternal city, in its genesis, finds a counterpart in the nascent temporal city' (Bruggisser (1999) 85). Cf. Vössing (2018) 1227 and MacCormack (1998) 202 n. 116.

first place? Does Augustine perhaps want to demonstrate that the Sack of Rome is not an end, but the beginning of a Christian repetition of the foundation of Rome? The fall of Troy had led to a refounded Troy in Rome. Does Rome's fall lead to a refounded 'Rome' in heaven?

Apart from the comparison between foundation and fall, in the quote above, structural patterns reinforce the idea that this is also a comparison between founders amongst each other. In his ktistic guise, Christ's presence dominates the opening of book I, or rather of the whole work, in the notoriously sophisticated preface, as we will see below. Book I opens with the *conditor* of the *gloriosissima civitas Dei*, Christ, and draws to a close with the *conditores* of that other crucial city, Rome. Two ktistic parties thus frame a book that is invested with both the destruction and the foundation of cities, most notably Rome.

In book II Augustine then begins again, at the very beginning:¹¹⁴⁵

(...) *quibus dictis primum terminauit librum. deinceps itaque dicere institui, quae mala ciuitas illa perpessa sit ab origine sua siue apud se ipsam siue in prouinciis sibi iam subditis, (...)*

(...) When I had covered these points, I ended my first book. The next item on my programme accordingly is to recount what misfortunes the aforesaid city has endured from its beginning, whether in the capital itself or in its provinces after their subjection (...)

A Christian rehearsal of Livy? No: Augustine proceeds thematically rather than chronologically, treating the gods' involvement in moral and spiritual evils. Nevertheless, references to Romulus abound. He serves as a favorite example for various perversions during Augustine's attack on Roman religious ideology and practice: divine birth, deification, etcetera. Even though the non-chronological structure doesn't require it, Rome's founder is all over the place.

In book III, Augustine returns to the theme of book I: worldly evils and physical calamities. Again, he begins with Troy, but only a couple of paragraphs into the book Romulus is back on stage. At this point, Augustine comes to speak about the most reprehensible and poisonous of Romulus' ktistic acts: the slaying of Remus, exploited by enemies of Rome ever since the conquest of Greece and Asia in the last centuries

^{1145.} August. *De civ. II.2.*

BC.¹¹⁴⁶ There was certainly no lack of Christian authors polemically exploiting Rome's primordial sin of fratricide in Late Antiquity, and this probably explains why Philippe Brugisser takes the *a priori* view that: '[f]ollowing in the wake of other writers, Augustine duly denounced all that was dishonorable in the deeds of the *conditor*, and did his utmost to destroy the flattering image of Romulus that persisted in the minds of the pagans.'¹¹⁴⁷

This view, however, has to be rejected. Although the prolific bishop of Hippo is relentlessly vicious in his attack on Roman religion, he – rather surprisingly – treats Romulus and the matter of the fratricide inflicted on Remus with a degree of scholarly respect unprecedented in *De civitate Dei*, and perhaps in all of Christian literature. Comparing Troy and Rome in a discussion of the anger of the gods, Augustine discusses 'the slaying of Romulus' brother' and 'parricide in an infant city'. He then writes:¹¹⁴⁸

5

nec ad causam, quam nunc agimus, interest, utrum hoc fieri Romulus iusserit aut Romulus fecerit, quod multi in pudicitia negant, multi pudore dubitant, multi dolore dissimulant. nec nos itaque in ea re diligentius requirenda per multorum scriptorum perpensa testimonia demoremur: Romuli fratrem palam constat occisum, non ab hostibus, non ab alienis. si aut perpetrauit aut imperauit hoc Romulus, magis ipse fuit Romanorum quam Paris Troianorum caput; cur igitur Troianis iram deorum prouocauit ille alienae coniugis raptor, et eorundem deorum tutelam Romanis inuitauit iste sui fratris extinctor? si autem illud scelus a facto imperioque Romuli alienum est: quoniam debuit utique vindicari, tota hoc illa ciuitas fecit, quod tota contempsit, et non iam fratrem, sed patrem, quod est peius, occidit. uterque enim fuit conditor, ubi alter scelere ablatus non permisus est esse regnator.

Nor is it relevant to the present issue whether Romulus ordered the deed to be done or was himself the agent, a fact that many shamelessly deny, many shamefastly question and many sorrowfully conceal from view. Let us, then, not linger here for research into many writers and the weighing of their evidence in the case. Romulus' brother, all agree, was openly slain, and not by enemies nor by foreigners. Whether Romulus was the agent or the principal only, he was in a truer sense

^{1146.} Brugisser (1999) 83.

^{1147.} *Ibid.* 76. Cf. *ibid.* 84 (discussing the asylum): 'the Christian tradition [...] could only confirm [Augustine] in his unfavorable perception of the Romulean institution', and a similar line of interpretation in Vössing (2018) 1225.

^{1148.} August. *de civ.* III.6.

the chief of the Romans than was Paris of the Trojans. Why, then, did that kidnapper of another's wife provoke against the Trojans the wrath of the gods, while that slayer of his own brother rallied to the Romans the protection of the same gods? If, on the other hand, that crime did not come home to Romulus either as enacted by him or by his order, since the crime should in any case have been dealt with, the city as a whole committed the murder that as a whole it overlooked, so that this way it slew, not its brother, but its father, which is worse. For each was a founder of the city in which one of the two, removed by a crime, was not allowed to be a ruler.

It is clear that the slaying of Remus is an awful and despicable evil. The astonishing aspect of Augustine's take on this is that he does not exploit the apologetic potential of blaming that evil entirely and unambiguously on Rome's founder. There is a sharp contrast here with his contemporary and fellow Christian, Jerome, who indisputably denounced Romulus' fratricide.¹¹⁴⁹ Augustine, however, leaves open the question whether Rome's founder was indeed the perpetrator of this evil, tentatively casting the blame on others and exonerating the *conditor*. He suspends his judgement on the matter because 'it would take too long evaluate the statements of so many writers' – the mere fact that he thought he would have had to proceed so carefully, in a scholarly way even, shows that Romulus escapes the simple equation of Roman religion with perversity and fraud that pervades (the early books of) his *City of God*.¹¹⁵⁰ Augustine's treatment of Romulus and Jerome's diverge, the latter rhetorically bulldozing Rome to the ground along with its esteemed founder, where Augustine treats the *conditor* with considerable clemency.¹¹⁵¹

For Augustine, the founder of Rome was apparently too important to discard. The question is, of course: why? Perhaps the addressee of *De civitate Dei*, a high official and trustee of the emperor Honorius (but also a devout Catholic), played some role in mitigating polemic, as that same emperor was positively compared to Romulus by the poet Claudian.¹¹⁵² His insistence on Remus also belonging to the founders of

^{1149.} Hier., *Praefatio ad Dydim. spir.* (PL XXIII, 107).

^{1150.} The Vestal Virgins, a potential pagan example *par excellence* of Christian female chastity, certainly do not escape his vile and vicious invective (*De civ.* III.18)

^{1151.} Cf. *De civ.* XV.5, where Augustine compares Cain and Abel to Romulus and Remus, thus attributing the Roman twins a similar role in God's divine plan. See MacCormack (1998) 208.

^{1152.} *Carm* 8 (*de IV cos. Hon.*) 491-493; 28 (*de VI cos. Hon.*) 57, 642. See Bruggisser (1999) 80; Gassman (2017) 617. Augustine mentions and (exceptionally for a contemporary poet, let alone a non-Christian one) quotes Claudian at *De civ.* V.26, in his own adapted and de-paganizing version of a couple of lines from *de III cos. Hon.*

the city may therefore have to do with an exemplary and an anchoring function of the twin founders for the contemporary diarchy of Arcadius and Honorius.¹¹⁵³ A more compelling answer can be found in the relationship with Christ as the *conditor civitatis Dei*. Even in the theologically most despicable episode of the Romulean myth – the founder's deification – Augustine sees a comparison with Christ:¹¹⁵⁴

ipsorum autem regum qui exitus fuerunt? de Romulo uiderit adulatio fabulosa, qua perhibetur receptus in caelum; (...) acciderat enim et solis defectio, quam certa ratione sui cursus effectam imperita nesciens multitudo meritis Romuli tribuebat. quasi uero si luctus ille solis fuisset, non magis ideo credi deberet occisus ipsumque scelus auersione etiam diurni luminis indicatum; sicut re uera factum est, cum dominus crucifixus est crudelitate atque impietate Iudeorum. quam solis obscurationem non ex canonico siderum cursu accidisse satis ostendit, quod tunc erat pascha Iudeorum; nam plena luna sollemniter agitur, regularis autem solis defectio non nisi lunae fine contingit.

What, moreover, were the departures of the kings themselves like? Fictitious flattery says of Romulus that he was taken up into heaven. (...) For an eclipse of the sun had also taken place; and the ignorant populace, not knowing that the mathematical regularity of the sun's own course produced it, gave Romulus' noble deeds the credit. They might have reflected that, if the sun's eclipse was really evidence of grief, that was rather an argument for the belief that he was murdered; when the light of day withdrew, that was visible evidence of very crime. Compare the actual fact when the Lord was crucified by the cruel and sacrilegious Jews. That the eclipse that then occurred was not caused by the regular movement of the heavenly bodies is clearly shown by the fact that it took place at the passover of the Jews. This festival is celebrated at full moon, but eclipses of the sun regularly occur only in the dark of the moon.

A solar eclipse marks both their deaths. Jesus surpasses Romulus in every way: he does so naturally. But Augustine – again – compares Romulus and Christ on equal terms: an eclipse of the sun followed the ends of both their earthly lives. This sustained comparison between both founders is a structural element in the early books of *De civ.*, focusing on the kistic role of Christ. Rather than strongly dissociating him from

^{1153.} See Bruggisser (1987) 148-153.

^{1154.} August. *De civ.* III.15.

his ktistic forerunners, Augustine invites his readers to compare Romulus and Christ in many ways, on multiple occasions.

Augustine, long before the Sack of Rome, had a habit of describing God as the Creator who “has made and founded everything”.¹¹⁵⁵ Prompted by the event of AD 410, however, he seems to have expanded this description of God as ktistic agent, adding a more specific accent.¹¹⁵⁶ Christ becomes the founder of something more focused: a city. Right up front, in the opening movement of the expanding textual universe that *De civ.* would become, Christ figures in exactly this particular ktistic guise:¹¹⁵⁷

Gloriosissimam ciuitatem Dei siue in hoc temporum cursu, cum inter impios peregrinatur ex fide uiuens, siue in illa stabilitate sedis aeternae, quam nunc expectat per patientiam, quoadusque iustitia conuertatur in iudicium, deinceps adeptura per excellentiam uictoria ultima et pace perfecta, hoc opere instituto et mea ad te promissione debito defendere aduersus eos, qui conditori eius deos suos praefrerunt, fili carissime Marcelline, suscepi, magnum opus et arduum, sed Deus adiutor noster est. nam scio quibus uiribus opus sit, ut persuadeatur superbis quanta sit uirtus humilitatis, qua fit ut omnia terrena cacumina temporali mobilitate nutantia non humano usurpata fastu, sed diuina gratia donata celsitudo transcendat. rex enim et conditor ciuitatis huius, de qua loqui instituimus, in scriptura populi sui sententiam diuinae legis aperuit, qua dictum est: Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam. hoc uero, quod Dei est, superbæ quoque animæ spiritus inflatus adfectat amatque sibi in laudibus dici:

*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.
unde etiam de terrena ciuitate, quae cum dominari adpetit, etsi populi seruant, ipsa ei dominandi libido dominatur, non est praetereundum silentio quidquid dicere suscepti huius operis ratio postulat si facultas datur.*

Most glorious is and will be the City of God, both in this fleeting age of ours, wherein she lives by faith, a stranger among infidels, and in the days when she shall be established in her eternal home. Now she

^{1155.} August., *Ep. 17.5, unum ipsum deum, qui fecit et condidit omnia* (“the one God himself, who has made and founded everything”; text by A.L. Goldbacher (Vindobonae 1895) 44). The letter, addressed to a pagan friend, dates from the year AD 391.

^{1156.} Cf. August., *Sermo 81.9* (PL XXXVIII, 505, quoted by MacCormack (1998) 189), where Augustine compares the foundation of Rome by Romulus (*Conditori eius facimus iniuriam, quia dicimus, Roma ruit, quam condidit Romulus?*) with the creation of the world by God (*Mundus (...), quem condidit Deus*). The sermon dates from shortly after the Sack of Rome. See also *Sermo 105.7* (PL XXXVIII, 623).

^{1157.} August. *De civ. I. Praef.*

waits for it with patience, “until righteousness returns to judgement” [Ps 93,15]; then she shall possess it with preeminence in final victory and perfect peace. In this work, on which I embark in payment of my promise to you, O dearest son Marcellinus, it is my purpose to defend the City of God against those who esteem their own gods above her Founder. The work is great and difficult, but God is my helper. Well do I know the powers needed to persuade the proud how great is the virtue of humility, that lofty quality by which our city is raised above all earthly heights that are rocked by ever-streaming time, not raised by the devices of human arrogance but by the endowment of grace divine. For the King and Founder of this City, which is the subject of my discourse, has revealed in the scripture of his people a statement of divine law, which I quote: “God resists the proud but gives grace to the humble.” [Iac 4,6; 1 Pt 5,5] Indeed, it is this distinction, which belongs to God, that the inflated fancy of a proud spirit assumes when it chooses to be praised in the following terms: “To spare the fallen and subdue the proud.” [Verg. *Aen.* VI.853] This is why I cannot, in so far as the plan of my undertaking demands and my own ability permits, pass over in silence that earthly city which, when it seeks for mastery, though the nations are its slaves, has as its own master that very lust for mastery.

The preface is a literary trumpet call heralding the eventual fulfillment of Christian redemption, when that most glorious city of God ‘shall be established in her eternal home’. It leaves no doubt about the fact that, in the work on which Augustine embarks, Christ is *conditor civitatis Dei* above all else. Apart from the word *Dei* in the opening line, the first mention of Christ is in his role as founder (*qui conditori eius*).¹¹⁵⁸ Later on, he is hailed as *rex enim et conditor ciuitatis huius*, a description fully resembling the vocabulary used for the traditional founders of Rome, such as Romulus. That lexical affinity does not stand alone. In a forceful juxtaposition with two biblical quotes,¹¹⁵⁹ the last part of the preface contains a prominent quote from Vergil’s *Aeneid* – more specifically, from the famous ‘Parade of Heroes’ in book VI (treated at length in chapter 2 of this dissertation, above). Although the quote itself does not contain clear ktistic overtones, the Vergilian passage from which it is quoted certainly does. Any reader of Augustine’s preface with a solid education in Latin literature would be able to recall the context of this line, where Anchises speaks to Aeneas about his future Roman descendants.¹¹⁶⁰ It

^{1158.} As Jacoby (2004) 159 remarks, after Thraede (1977) 104, these words are echoed both at the end of the first decade (X.32) and at the start of the second half of the work (XI.1). Neither of these scholars seems to note the particularity of Christ’s ktistic role in these instances.

^{1159.} Müller (2003) 240, 244.

^{1160.} Cf. Pollmann (1997) 35.

is a context full of ktistic figures and vocabulary, from Romulus to Augustus and the latter's role as founder of a new Golden Age. Just like Augustine turns the ideology of Roman world-dominion as it was expounded in the *Aeneid* upside down, so, it seems, does he invert and reinvent the ktistic prerogative of Rome's traditional founders as they were enshrined in Vergil's epic, and attributes it to Christ as *conditor* instead.¹¹⁶¹

This, however, is only where the comparison between Roman and Christian founders, both explicit and implicit, begins. Soon, halfway book II, the city founded by Christ is not only 'most glorious', but also *aeterna*, 'eternal': *aeternam et (...) gloriosissimam civitatem*'.¹¹⁶² Of the two characterizing epithets, the latter (*gloriosissimam*), also the opening word of the whole work, is of biblical origin, as Augustine duly explains.¹¹⁶³ The other (*aeterna*) is of course the stock epithet of Rome, ever since the Augustan poet Tibullus, who first spoke of Rome as *aeterna urbs*, referring to its foundation by Romulus.¹¹⁶⁴ This epithet is more than literary flourish: it appeared on numerous public displays. From Hadrian onwards, coin legends proclaimed the Emperor to be ruler of *Roma Aeterna*.¹¹⁶⁵ In the main temple-complex of Madauros, a city about 100 km. inland from Hippo Regius, a statue was dedicated to the Eternal City of Rome in AD 375/378 by a local magistrate together with the municipal council, with the words *AETERNAM VRBEM ROMAM* figuring prominently on the accompanying inscription.¹¹⁶⁶ In one of his letters from the early 390's, Augustine describes the forum of Madauros as a place he remembers very well, mentioning two statues of Mars placed there.¹¹⁶⁷ A similar (but earlier) dedication to *VRBI ROMAE AETERNAE AVG(VSTAE)* is known from nearby Thubursicum Bure, also a city familiar to Augustine;¹¹⁶⁸ another example is known from Cirta.¹¹⁶⁹ On the coins in the pockets

^{1161.} Cf. Jacoby (2004) 158–159 on the structural parallelism between the preface of *De civ.* and the *proæmium* of the *Aen.*, arguing that the quote from the *Aeneid* makes one think Augustine wanted to write a "Christian anti-*Aeneid* in prose" ('eine Christliche Gegenaeneis in Prosa'). See further *ibid.* 166–167, and contrast Müller (2003) 243, arguing against a similar suggestion by O'Meara.

^{1162.} August. *De civ.* II.18.

^{1163.} August. *De civ.* II.21

^{1164.} Tibullus II.5.23–24.

^{1165.} Pratt (1965); see also the classical study by Paschoud (1967) 226 and *passim*. For coins (RIC X 1403–1407) and medallions (RIC X 1408) bearing the legend *INVICTA ROMA AETERNA*, minted by Priscus Attalus around the time of the Sack of Rome, i.e. just before the composition of *De civ.* began, see Mittag (2017) 238–239, with Icks (2020) on Priscus.

^{1166.} Ferchiou (1990) 756–758, 760; see MacCormack (1998) 176 n. 2.

^{1167.} August., *Ep.* 17.1, *et in isto foro recordarer esse in duobus simulacris unum Martem nudum, alternum armatum* (text by A.L. Goldbacher (Vindobonae 1895) 40). Statues of Mars are not unlikely to be connected to a dedication evoking the eternity of Rome, as we saw in the Comitium under Maxentius, discussed above.

^{1168.} *CIL VIII.1427 = ILS 3926.*

^{1169.} *CIL VIII.6965 = ILS 3181.*

and the public places in the cities of Augustine and his readers, Rome's traditional eternity still had a forceful *Sitz im Leben* through prominent physical references.¹¹⁷⁰

Rome as Eternal City was also very much alive in fourth century imperial discourse, and it is thus highly significant that Augustine, during the first books of *De civ.*, gradually unfolds the notion that instead of Rome, the city founded by Christ is the true eternal city.¹¹⁷¹ In the second half of book V, i.e. towards the close of the first pentad, this notion really gains traction through abundantly repeated references. In chapter 19, the author feels the need to specify, apparently for mere purposes of clarification, that *his* eternal city is the one which 'in our sacred books (...) is called the City of God'.¹¹⁷² This seems to give away that this is predominantly a non-Christian notion alien to Scripture, but one that Augustine nevertheless feels the urgent need to introduce. He does so to anchor his metaphysical concept of an eternal and everlasting, but hardly tangible city of God in the earthly, omnipresent and traditional eternity of Rome.¹¹⁷³ Augustine never mentions Rome's traditional eternal quality, canonized by the Latin classics as an aspect inherent in the city's foundation. In the early books of *De civ.* Rome is anything but eternal: Augustine compares the distance between the heavenly city and Rome to the distance between heaven and earth, between *eternal* life and *temporal* delights.¹¹⁷⁴ One of the most well-known and powerful expression of Rome's eternity, the 'empire without end' prophesied for Rome by Jupiter in Vergil's *Aeneid* (I.279), is twisted around and applied not to Rome, but to the heavenly homeland.¹¹⁷⁵

Nevertheless, the eternity of the heavenly city is still implicitly connected to the foundation of Rome through the figure of Romulus. In yet another comparison between the cities founded by Christ and Romulus, the Romulean asylum is - again - presented as a prefiguration of Christian salvation:¹¹⁷⁶

'(...) remissio peccatorum, quae cives ad aeternam colligit patriam, habet
aliquid, cui per umbram quondam simile fuit asylum illud Romuleum (...)'

^{1170.} Cf. MacCormack (1998) 175-176.

^{1171.} See Vössing (2018) 1228, with references, and Doignon (1966).

^{1172.} August. *De civ.* V.19: (...) *ciuitatis aeternae, quae in sacris litteris nostris dicitur ciuitas dei*, (...).

^{1173.} On Augustine's earlier ideas about Jerusalem versus Babylon, and versus Rome, see MacCormack (1998) 184-185.

^{1174.} August. *De civ.* V.17: *consideremus (...) ut, cum illa ciuitas, in qua nobis regnare promissum est, tantum ab hac distet, quantum distat caelum a terra, a temporali laetitia uita aeterna, (...)* ('Let us consider (...) that the city in which we Christians have the promise of reigning is as far removed from this Rome as heaven is from earth, eternal life from temporal joys, (...)').

^{1175.} August. *De civ.* II.29.

^{1176.} August. *De civ.* V.17.

'(...) And the remission of sins that gathers citizens for the eternal city has something in it of the famous asylum of Romulus, which was a sort of shadow cast ahead.'

Here the asylum is no longer the model for a circumstantial, earthly event like the display of Christian clemency during the Sack of Rome, as it had been in *De civ.* I.34, but for something on a much higher level, for the ultimate remission of sins 'that gathers citizens for the eternal city'. Towards the end of the first pentad, Romulus has thus become a precursor of Christ, not only as a founder, but also as Redeemer of humanity. It is clear that, in Augustine's view, the foundation of Rome has a role to play even in the most theologically complex and important aspects of biblical teleology.

Contrary to Jerome's slander, Augustine sees positive comparisons between Romulus and Christ. In *De civitate Dei* Rome is not, and never will be, the city of Christ, not even of the apostles, almost totally absent in *De civ.* Rome is far less important for Augustine than it is for Ambrose and Prudentius. But at the same time the foundation of Rome, for Augustine, is a lot more than the foundation of just any earthly city. The origins of Rome function as an important literary, typological and perhaps even theological anchoring device for his concept of Christ's Eternal City and salvation.

The letter from Jerome referred to at the beginning of this paragraph was written in the midst of the Pelagian controversy, and it mainly praises Augustine on his stance and action in that difficult dispute.¹¹⁷⁷ But it was also written in the midst of the publication and circulation of the first installments of Augustine's major work on religion in society, in which the concept of foundation plays such an important role. That role is likely to have been the reason for Jerome's particular choice of words, praising Augustine as *conditor antiquae rursum fidei*.¹¹⁷⁸

The *locus classicus* for the expression *condere rursum/s* is the 'Parade of Heroes' in book VI of the *Aeneid*, the monumental compliment to Augustine's famous namesake, Augustus, treated in chapter 1.¹¹⁷⁹ In both form and content this seems a particularly neat intertext for Jerome to have built upon. Vergilian phraseology, that preferred source of reference for learned and allusive communication between classically

^{1177.} See Hennings (1994) 49, Fürst (1999) 184, 208-210. Orosius called both Augustine and Jerome *columnae et firmamenta ecclesiae catholicae* (*Apol.* 1.4) – see Fürst (1999) 210, 220.

^{1178.} See Fürst (1999) 221 on the entirely new tone in Jerome's letters to Augustine around this period. To my knowledge, the publication of the first books of *De civ.* has never been related to Jerome's language of praise for Augustine.

^{1179.} Verg. *Aen.* VI.791-797.

trained aristocrats and men of letters (also Christian ones) like Augustine and Jerome, may then have given the literary self-conscious Jerome a clue for how to phrase his praise of Augustine – if, of course, it weren't the first installments of the latter's own work, full of *conditores*. Whatever the source, it was a brilliant stroke of literary genius to praise the bishop of Hippo for his doctrinal and anti-heretical efforts in terms reminiscent of his own, incontestable and monumental plea for Christianity.

Christ was Augustine's championed *conditor gloriosissimae civitatis Dei*. But Augustine himself was Jerome's, or indeed all the Catholics', founder of the true and renewed ancient faith. Faith in the salvation, so masterfully advocated, that the heavenly city of God and its founder had on offer to humanity. By drawing on the precedent of Romulus' foundation of Rome, Augustine anchored his innovative transferral of the epithet 'eternal' from Rome to the Heavenly City in existing discourses and ideas. Jerome, rather than praising Augustine as innovator, hails him as the one who has *again* established the *ancient* faith, thus anchoring Augustine's activity in pristine practice.

5.6. Conclusion

From our earliest Christian texts to the heyday of Early Christian poetry around the turn of the fifth century, a clear development can be discerned, leading from hesitation and reluctance vis-à-vis the idea of a Christian city-foundation on earth to the acceptance and appropriation of that idea. The vicissitudes influencing that development were manifold, and we have highlighted a few of them. It seems clear that the crucial turning point was not the era of Constantine and Eusebius, but rather that of Damasus and Theodosius. Following on each other, Ambrose and Prudentius contributed in their own significant ways to the idea that Rome had been founded as a Christian city. Ambrose, taking Damasus' emphasis on the Roman martyrs a step further, claimed that Rome had been founded by the blood of martyrdom, referring to the apostles Peter and Paul. Prudentius, on the contrary, ascribed the foundation of a Christian Rome to Christ himself. Although there is a significant difference between the two, their common denominator seems equally important. Now that Rome, in the late fourth century, had to claim its position of prominence against increasingly powerful imperial capitals and patriarchates in the East, claiming Christian foundation turned out to be a successful formula. On the other hand, Augustine's highly original response to the Sack of Rome tried to swing the pendulum back towards biblical restraint about terrestrial foundations. He resisted the 'classical' model of Constantine as a Christian city founder, of Peter and Paul as successors of Romulus and Remus, and of Rome as a refounded Christian city. How did this end?

Regardless of Augustine's authority and literary talent (or perhaps because of it), a Roman pontiff clearly spoke out in contrast to Augustine's opinion on the matter of Rome's Christian foundation. With full papal authority, Leo the Great unequivocally proclaimed Peter and Paul to be the new founders of Rome. In a sermon delivered for the first time on 29 June 441, just nine months after his papal election, and known from two subsequent recensions, he compares both apostles explicitly to Romulus and Remus, addressing the city of Rome: (*Serm. 82.1*)¹¹⁸⁰

Isti sunt sancti patres tui verique pastores, qui te regnis caelestibus inserendam multo melius multoque felicius condiderunt quam illi quorum [prima studio moenium tuorum fundamenta locata sunt, ex quibus is] qui tibi nomen dedit fraterna te caede foedavit.

They are your holy fathers and true shepherds, who founded you to be included in the heavenly kingdom, far better and much more happily than those men, [by whose zeal the first foundations of your walls were laid: and] of whom the one who gave you his name defiled you with fratricide.

Many aspects of this sermon are quite striking, not in the least the way in which Leo, speaking as the successor of St. Peter, verbally echoed the panegyric for Maximian of AD 289, discussed in chapter 3, above.¹¹⁸¹ There, Maximian and Diocletian are told to have outdone Romulus and Remus, on the occasion of Rome's traditional birthday celebration, on 21 April. Now, Peter and Paul are suitably presented as their substitutes, on what we may consider Rome's new birthday, 29 June. In Leo's sermon, the apostles become full-blown city-founders, honoured as such in a public celebration on the anniversary date of their ktistic acts. In the last of the three recensions, there is even an explicit reference to the first city walls, *moenia*, of Rome. As Neil acutely remarks, this finds a parallel further on in the sermon, where a

^{1180.} Text from Chavasse (1973) 508-509, translation by Neil (2009) 115. The parts between square brackets were added in a later recension by Leo himself. On the three known recensions of this sermon, known as 82A/α, B/β and C/γ, see Neil (2009) 113.

^{1181.} See p. 156. There are many other indirect rather than verbal echoes, e.g. in Leo's description of the festive occasion as *ibi in die martyrii eorum sit laetitiae principatus* (*Serm. 82.1*), 'there is found supreme happiness on the day of their martyrdom'), comparable to the panegyric's *uestri imperii primi dies sunt principes ad salutem* (*Pan. Lat. X(2) 1.5*, 'it is the first days of your rule which mark the beginning of its salvation'), or *unius fidei pietas exigit ut quidquid pro salute universorum gestum recolitur, communibus ubique gaudiis celebretur* (*Serm. 82.1* 'devotion to the one faith demands that any action for the salvation of all that is observed anew should be celebrated everywhere with equal joy'), similar to *iure igitur hoc die quo immortalis ortus dominae gentium ciuitatis uestra pietate celebratur* (*Pan. Lat. X(2) 1.4*, 'it is therefore right that on this day on which the birth of the eternal City, mistress of nations, is celebrated by your piety').

crowd of martyrs is said to surround the city like a protective wall (*Serm. 82.6*). It is interesting to note that Leo not only refutes (or blatantly ignores) Augustine's ideas, and declares himself a strong supporter of the line of reasoning adopted by Damasus, Ambrose and Prudentius. He also borrows from an imperial panegyric, delivered in praise of Rome's traditional foundation, in order to make his point – and, most probably, to either address that part of the population of Rome that still held the traditional founders in high regard, or to 'anchor' his innovative presentation of Peter and Paul as city founders in the tradition of Romulus and Remus.¹¹⁸² Leo thus rejects the notion, expressed by Paul himself and reaffirmed with vehemence by Augustine, that there could be no such thing as a Christian city-foundation of earth. Instead, he forcefully positions Peter and Paul as Christian, saintly and apostolic founders of Rome, transforming the city from a bulwark of its pagan past to a place that is even fit 'to be included in the heavenly kingdom'.

In a way, this brings us full circle, from the first Late Antique reconfigurations of Rome's foundation and the rule of Maximian and Diocletian as ktistic renewal of Rome, to the point where Peter and Paul take over as new founders of the city. As we have seen, Christian authors and rulers employed classical methods and terms to present themselves and their holy heroes as successors of the traditional founders of Rome, often employing concepts in a creative and surprising way. At the same time, it is very clear that this process only took place at a relatively late stage in the development of Rome's Christian identity, as the concept of ktistic renewal encountered severe resistance from those who recognized to what extent it was at odds with biblical orthodoxy. That orthodoxy was, to a large extent, formulated by the same apostle, Paul, who later came to be seen as a new founder of Rome – against his own will, as it were.

^{1182.} See also Humphries (2020) 174, and cf. Vitiello (2021) 134-137 on the political circumstances in which Leo was operating, and the celebration of the *natalis urbis* in the 440's.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the phenomenon of ktistic renewal in the Roman world, with a focus on the city of Rome in the Early Augustan Age and Late Antiquity. Both periods were – each in their own way – characterized by massive upheaval and revolutionary changes, and in both cases leading figures reflected and acted upon ideas of foundation to interpret those changes, or to bolster their control of the city and the legacy it represented. Both Augustus and a host of later figures – from Maximian to Constantine and Jesus Christ – were seen as founders or refounders of Rome. All of them embodied a particular, contemporary ideal of the Eternal City's history and future. At the same time, the comparative approach adopted here has revealed considerable differences between these various ktistic renewals. It is now necessary to draw up the balance sheet and summarize what the various case studies treated in this dissertation tell us about ktistic renewal in those case studies' specific historical contexts, and, by extension, in the Roman world at large.

Augustus was not the first Roman leader to be compared to one of the city's founders, but the extent to which his reign was perceived and presented as a refoundation of Rome was without precedent. Early Augustan poets keenly exploited the openness of the Roman concept of foundation to make that unprecedented development possible. Through a thorough analysis of one of the era's most important and influential literary works, Vergil's *Aeneid*, chapter 2 has shown that there was a special discursive quality to the concept of ktistic renewal in the Augustan period. Because early poets like Vergil redefined what 'founding' meant and what acts could be seen to constitute (or contribute to) an act of foundation, the Early Augustan Principate was successfully presented as a refoundation of Rome. Rather than the *princeps* himself, a poet like Vergil can thus be seen, if not as an architect, at the very least as an important contributor to the concept here described as 'ktistic renewal'. This interpretation is confirmed by Vergil's contemporary and fellow poet Propertius, who acknowledges both the ktistic claim laid out in the *Aeneid* and the fundamental role of Vergil as a poet in making that claim. Propertius highlights the *Aeneid*'s focus on ktistic themes as one of its principal characteristics. The hypothesis that the *Aeneid* constitutes a representative expression of Augustan ideology on ktistic renewal is corroborated by Propertius' contemporary reaction to the nascent epic. For a full picture, it would have to be checked against other literary and nonliterary sources from the period to be definitively proved, but nothing speaks strongly against it. In fact, the Imperial accounts of Suetonius and Florus are completely in accordance with this conclusion, as well as Gary Miles' interpretation of Vergil's most important contemporary author on the subject, the historiographer Livy.

In general, the conclusions of part A are fully in accordance with the importance a vast majority of ancient historians and archaeologists of the Augustan Age ascribe to

Romulus and Aeneas as models for Augustus. The notion that the Augustan principate constituted a refounding of Rome or was seen as such is widespread, but is usually based on relatively late, or not precisely datable Augustan and Imperial sources. This thesis has argued that the idea originated in the decade following the battle of Actium, and was probably influenced by the foundation of Actia Nicopolis at the site of the decisive victory over Mark Antony and Cleopatra. Also, it has foregrounded the role of literary agents such as Livy and Vergil in constructing the idea or significantly contributing to it. City foundation, for Augustan Romans, did not equal a single moment of creation, but rather came to constitute an incremental process, featuring many founders in succession.

While the idea of Rome's refounding in the Augustan Age is well-established in modern scholarship, even if undertheorized, the refoundations of Rome in Late Antiquity have received considerably less attention. This thesis breaks new ground in providing the first attempt at an overview and comparative treatment of both traditional, non-Christian founders and Christian founders. The case study on Maximian and Maxentius in chapter 3 has shown how creatively Roman emperors and orators adopted and adapted traditional ideas of ktistic renewal to articulate their political and ideological position *vis-à-vis* the *Urbs*.

Maximian, of all emperors, saw his Dyarchic reign with Diocletian in the guise of a refounding of Rome, as a panegyrist well-versed in Vergil presented it in 289. Maxentius, conversely, developed different conceptions of ktistic renewal, not depending on Augustan precedents, but rather presenting him as a worthy successor of the Tetrarchs in general and his father Maximian in particular. Ideas about the foundation and refounding of Rome were very much alive when Constantine victoriously crossed the Tiber with his armies and took control of the city. As chapter 3 has demonstrated, Maxentius' policy of appropriating Romulus was not lost on the Moesian emperor, raised to the purple in far away Britain. Constantine – or his panegyrist and mintmasters – successfully manipulated Maxentius' policies to bolster his control of Rome. At the same time, his status as a ktistic figure came to depend less on his control over the Eternal City, because of his famous act of city foundation on the other end of the Empire.

The founding of Constantinople, however, is as poorly understood in its original intentions as it is well known for its lasting consequences, causing a shift of power within the Later Roman Empire. Chapter 4 has revealed how little we know about what happened, and when that would have happened, with any degree of certainty. The most likely course of events is that Constantine founded Constantinople as an eponymous

victory city similar to Augustan Actia Nicopolis, without the intention, initially, to transform it into a lasting imperial capital, let alone a rival to Rome. That idea became clear only from 330 onwards, five and a half years after the city's likely foundation. Only from the 350s onwards, however, do we begin to get indications that Constantine was seen as the founder of a new Rome on the Bosphorus. While Constantinople had initially, in 324, been a more modest ktistic renewal of ancient Byzantium, it now came to be seen as a ktistic renewal of Rome. It took another couple of decades before this idea was transposed to a Christian set of intentions, claiming that Constantine had founded Constantinople as a Christian city. A Christian idea of ktistic renewal had been born.

From victory city to new Rome, Constantinople forced the Romans in the West to rethink their position. At the same time, the Christian idea of ktistic renewal forced Christians to come to terms with their own traditions based on the Bible. Scripture quite explicitly reserved all acts of foundation for God, Creator of all things. In doctrinal and dogmatic terms, the idea that Constantine was a Christian city founder represented an intolerable infringement on the prerogatives of God. That this idea was nevertheless put forward thus called for a double reaction, from both Romans and doctrinal Christians, studied in chapter 5.

Rome retaliated by promoting its two most prominent saints and martyrs to Christian city founders. While the Roman bishop Damasus paved the way, it was the influential bishop of Milan, Ambrose, who first presented the martyrdom of Peter and Paul as the foundation of Rome, the city being founded on their blood. Although Ambrose still reserved the word *condere* for God, the claim he made was clearly revolutionary. That there was an inherent tension in presenting Peter and Paul as founders of Rome is revealed by Prudentius' second *Peristephanon* poem. The Christian poet from Spain presented Peter and Paul more explicitly as the successors of Romulus and Remus. At the same time, he raised Christ to a position accompanying and superseding both saints as founders of Rome, thus diminishing the infringement on God's prerogatives. We can also see how the conceptual capability to accommodate several founders at the same time, familiar from the Augustan Age, finds a striking parallel in Late Antique, Christian Rome. A similar, but paradoxical development took place in the antiquarian traditions of Early Medieval Constantinople, where Constantine as founder is joined not by Christian forerunners, but by the alleged original founder of Byzantium, the legendary Byzas, and the Roman emperor Septimius Severus.¹¹⁸³

The idea that Constantine was the Christian founder of Constantinople must already have been an outrage of sorts for dogmatic Christian thinkers. Rome's self-confident

¹¹⁸³. See Pont (2010).

re-configuration of Peter and Paul, and then Christ, as its very own founders must have raised the stakes even further. While it may have called for a reaction right away, the traumatic events surrounding the Sack of Rome in AD 410, less than a decade later, made the situation potentially inflammable. How could God have allowed a city reputedly founded by Christ to be sacked and pillaged? Solicited for a reaction, the prolific Bishop of Hippo, Augustine, confidently took up the challenge to make sense of this apparent paradox. The fall of Rome elicited a meditation on the foundation of a heavenly city of God, one that reveals itself to be strikingly dependent on the foundation of Rome by Romulus. Augustine, observing Rome from a relative distance, thus reacts to the fall of Rome in an unpredictable way, neither tapping into the newly developed concept of Rome's Christian foundation (on which the *de civitate Dei* has surprisingly little to say),¹¹⁸⁴ nor juxtaposing a fallen Rome with the vibrant Christian metropolis that Constantinople had by then become, under the Theodosians.¹¹⁸⁵ Instead of a Christian Rome, he sees a totally different entity as the successor of the mighty city on the Tiber. This may serve as a reminder that ktistic renewals can not only react to each other through time, but also openly contradict one another at the same time. Heavily influenced by Vergil in his conception of Roman history, and by the biblical canon in his conception of the heavenly city, Augustine combines two intellectual traditions treated in earlier case studies of this thesis into a new and innovative whole. Accordingly, the final case study presents one possible outcome of the way different ideas about ktistic renewal interacted with each other. That outcome, arguably very specific to a north African Bishop caught up in theological and doctrinal controversies, is contextualized by looking at the reactions of Augustine's contemporary, Jerome, and a slightly later Bishop of Rome, Pope Leo the Great.

GC

In a way, Augustine's doctrinally pure conception of a Christian city-foundation advocated a return to biblical orthodoxy. In Scripture, the only Christian city, founded by none other than God himself, is (heavenly) Jerusalem. That the bishops of Rome presented Rome as a Christian city founded by Peter and Paul was a complete outrage, from a theological point of view. Augustine and Jerome recognized this, but the papacy, despite their eloquent attacks, had the best of it. In a Christian Mediterranean world, the bishops of Rome got caught up in a battle between non-Christian and Christian traditions vis-à-vis city foundations, a battle between Vergil and the Bible. Although Christianity defeated polytheism, that turned out to

^{1184.} Augustine's silence on the foundation of a Christian Rome seems extra poignant in view of his prominent claim, at the end of *De civ.*'s preface, that he 'cannot pass over' the earthly city 'in silence' (*non est praetereundum silentio*).

^{1185.} By only a single reference to the Christian nature of Constantinople in his major work (V.25), Augustine deserves a remarkable place of honor, next to Eusebius, in the mostly pagan pageant of literary authors conspiring against the importance of what they saw as the upstart imperial capital: see page 225.

be a Pyrrhic victory of sorts. It was the conceptual frame of Vergil that eventually prevailed. The clearest case is perhaps Dante's *Inferno*, where the two poets speak about Aeneas as the ultimate founder of the Christian Rome of St. Peter. Dante has himself say: (*Inferno* II.20-24)¹¹⁸⁶

(...) *ch'e' fu de l'alma Roma e di suo impero
ne l'empireo ciel per padre eletto:
la quale e'l quale, a voler dir lo vero,
fu stabilita per lo loco santo
siede il successor del maggior Piero.*

20

(...) since in the empyrean heaven he [Aeneas] was chosen
to father honored Rome and her empire;
and if the truth be told, Rome and her realm
were destined to become the sacred place,
the seat of the successor of great Peter.

This thesis has traced the Christian idea of ktistic renewal, first expressed in the fourth century with regard to an earthly city, back to its origins in the Old and New Testament, focusing on the Pauline letters. At the same time, it has largely left out the developments in the non-Christian world from the 20's BC to the 280's AD, pausing only briefly at Suetonius and Florus in the Hadrianic period, and Cassius Dio in the Severan. While the concept itself of ktistic renewal in the non-Christian Roman world seems not to have undergone major alterations in that intermediate period, there was perhaps one major change in the way it was applied. Like so many other roles and functions previously open to high-ranking Republican magistrates and members of Roman aristocratic families, the role and honour of city-founder was increasingly monopolized by the emperor. While someone like Munatius Plancus was still able to found the colonies Lugdunum (Lyon) and Raurica, perhaps named after himself, and could be celebrated as their founder on the inscription of his monumental tomb in Caieta (Gaeta),¹¹⁸⁷ this became almost impossible from Augustus onwards. Cities being founded or refounded during and after the Augustan age tend to, almost exclusively, carry the name of the ruling emperor: think of all the cities named 'Augusta', 'Caesarea' or 'Sebaste', sometimes founded by client kings in honour of the emperor. The tradition continued after Augustus with countless (*coloniae*) *Iuliae*, *Claudiae*, *Flaviae* and *Aeliae*, and cities with Greek-style names like Hadrianopolis, Philippopolis (in Syria), Maximianopolis, and, obviously,

^{1186.} Text by Petrocchi (1966-1967); translation by Mandelbaum (1980).

^{1187.} CIL X.6087. See Matijević (2008), especially 150-153, 161-163.

Constantinopolis. The tradition continued until at least Justinian, with *Justiniana Prima*. It is interesting that this road was explicitly closed to others than the emperor on at least one occasion we are aware of. When the philosopher Plotinus proposed the emperor Gallienus to refound a city in Campania and to name it *Platonopolis*,¹¹⁸⁸ the idea was opposed by the courtiers: such an infringement on the emperor's own prerogatives could probably not be tolerated.

Returning to the Christian realm, it would certainly be fruitful to trace the development of Christian ideas about city foundation and ktistic renewal alongside those in the wider culture of the Roman Empire. The works of Flavius Josephus and Plutarch, in particular, may provide a treasure trove of reflections on the concept of ktistic renewal in Hellenized, Greek and Jewish intellectual circles, alongside those of Clemens of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian. Such a truly diachronic treatment would further substantiate the trajectory from Vergil to Augustine that this thesis has only been able to outline cursorily. It is hoped that the conclusions resulting from this tentative analysis raise valuable new questions and open up exciting avenues of research, rather than representing the final say on this topic.

The focus on the comparison between two periods, however, also has its advantages over diachronic treatment: it reveals the significant particularities rather than the steady patterns. Although the concept of foundation and ideas about ktistic renewal were repeatedly redefined, bringing to light some major differences between the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity, as well as within Late Antiquity itself, it is also striking that ktistic renewal was adopted as a discursive strategy over and over again, in so many different contexts. That is the notable similarity between both periods: ideas about foundation continued to provide a mental framework to interpret changes, even through the transformation from polytheistic religion to Christianity. In Rome and Byzantium, and the postclassical Greek and Latin cultures that they dominated, these ideas lived on.¹¹⁸⁹ The concept of ktistic renewal proved stronger than biblical theology – until Luther appeared at the gates. Revived, however, during periods as diverse as the Catholic counterreformation, the anti-clerical *Risorgimento* and the fascist regime of Mussolini, the idea that Rome could be refounded and reborn continued to play a fundamental role in the way the status of the Eternal City was presented and perceived.

GC

^{1188.} Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 12; Firmicius Maternus, *Mathesis* I.7.16. Cf. Sabo (2015) 213–214.

^{1189.} For Justinian, for example, see note 738, above, and the preface to *Nov. 47* (Schoell and Kroll (1963⁸) 283, unpublished translation by Fred H. Blume at https://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/novels/41-60/Novel%2047_Replacement.pdf [accessed 13-08-2023, 19:26]), with Hekster (2022) 194; Kruse (2019) 108–110; Wolfram (1990) 271. On Roman Africa under Byzantine rule, with the important phenomenon of the resurgence of political epic in the works of Corippus, see e.g. Lassère (2015) 695–733.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographic abbreviations

AE *L'Année épigraphique: revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine*.

ANRW H. Temporini and W. Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Teil II: Principat* (Berlin 1974-1998).

BNJ Brill's New Jacoby, <https://scholarlyeditions.brill.com/bnjo/> (Leiden 2006-).

CAH X² A.K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, second edition X: The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.-A.D. 69* (Cambridge 1996²).

CAH XII F.E. Adcock et al. (ed.), *The Cambridge ancient history, XII: The imperial crisis and recovery, A.D. 193-324* (Cambridge 1939).

CAH XII² A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey and Av. Cameron (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, second edition XII, The Crisis of Empire A.D. 193-337* (Cambridge 2005²).

CCSL *Corpus christianorum. Series Latina* (Turnholti 1954-...).

CIL *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, consilio et avtoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenbvrgensis editvm* (Berolini 1863-).

DNP H. Cancik and H. Schneider (ed.), *Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike I-XVI* (Stuttgart 1996-2003).

DNP *Suppl.* H. Cancik, M. Landfester and H. Schneider (ed.), *Der neue Pauly. Supplemente* (Stuttgart 2004-).

EDR Epigraphic Database Rome, <http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php>

EV F. della Corte (ed.), *Enciclopedia Virgiliana I-V* (Rome 1984-1991).

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin 1902-).

ILCV E. Diehl (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres I-III* (Berlin, 1924-1931).

ILS H. Dessau (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae I-III* (Berlin 1892-1916).

Inscr. It. A. Degrassi (ed.), *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII.2: Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani* (Roma 1963).

KP K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer (ed.), *Der kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike I-V* (Stuttgart 1975).

LSA Last Statues of Antiquity Database, <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk/> (Oxford 2012).

LTUR E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae I-VI* (Roma 1993-2000).

MAMA *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (Manchester 1928-2013).

MGH *Monumenta Germaniae historica* (Hannover).

OCD S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (ed.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 1996³).

OED J.A. Simpson (ed.), *Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford 1989).

OLD P.G.W. Glare et al. (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1982).

PLRE A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Morris (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I-III* (Cambridge 1971-1992).

RE G. Wissowa et al. (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft I-XXIV, I A-X A, Suppl. I-XVI* (1893-1980); T. Erler et al., *Gesamtregister I: Alphabetischer Teil* (Stuttgart 1997).

RIC H. Mattingly and E.A. Sydenham (ed.), *The Roman imperial coinage* (London 1923-2007).

RPC A. Burnett, M. Amandry, P.P. Ripollès (ed.), *Roman Provincial Coinage* (1992-).

TLL *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (Leipzig 1900-2006; Berlin 2007-).

VE R.F. Thomas and J.M. Ziolkowski (ed.), *The Virgil encyclopedia* I-III (Chichester/Malden, MA 2013).

Titles of academic journals are abbreviated according to the well-established system adopted by *L'Année philologique*; see the full list published online at <https://about.brepolis.net/aph-abbreviations/>

Primary sources (editions and translations)

Cary, E. and H.B. Foster (ed.), *Dio Cassius, Roman history* (London-New York 1914-1927).

Chavasse, A. (ed.), *Sancti Leonis Magni Romani pontificis Tractatus septem et nonaginta* (Turnholti 1973) [=CCSL 138A].

Conte, G.B. (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis* (Berlin 2009).

Cunningham, M.P. (ed.), *Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina* (Turnhout 1966).

Dindorf, L. (ed.), *Chronicon paschale I* (Bonn 1832).

Dombart, B. and A. Kalb (ed.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Civitate Dei I-II* (Turnhout 1955).

Downey, G. and H. Schenkl (ed.), *Themistii orationes quae supersunt I* (Lipsiae 1965).

Fontaine, J. et al. (ed.), *Ambrosius Mediolanensis. Hymnes* (Paris 1992).

Forster, E. S. (ed.), *Florus, Epitome of Roman History* (Cambridge, MA 1929).

Heyworth (2007b) = Heyworth, S.J. (ed.), *Sexti Properti Elegos* (Oxford 2007).

Hilberg, I. (ed.), *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae III* (Vindobonae 1996²).

Hirtzel, F.A. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis, Opera* (Oxonii 1900).

Ianell, G. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Lipsiae 1930).

Ihm, M (ed.), *C. Suetoni Tranquili opera I: De vita Caesarum libri VIII* (Lipsiae 1908).

Maisano, R. (ed.), *Discorsi di Temistio* (Torino 1995).

Mandelbaum, A., *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: A Verse Translation with an Introduction* (New York 1980).

McCracken, G. E., *Augustine, City of God I: Books 1-3* (Cambridge, MA 1957).

Moreau, J. and V. Velkov (ed.), *Excerpta Valesiana* (Leipzig 1968²).

Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.), *XII Panegyrici Latini* (Oxonii 1964) [= reprinted in Nixon and Rodgers (1994)].

----- (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis, Opera* (Oxonii 1969).

Petrocchi, G. (ed.), *Le opere di Dante Alighieri: edizione nazionale. La commedia: secondo l'antica vulgata* (Milano 1966-1967).

Postgate, J.P. (ed.; revised by G.P. Goold), *Catullus, Tibullus, Pervigilium Veneris* (Cambridge, MA 1995²) [first edition: 1913].

Schoell, R. and G. Kroll (ed.), *Corpus Iuris Civilis III: Novellae* (Berolini 1963⁸).

Thomson, H.J. (ed.), *Prudentius II* (Cambridge, MA 1953).

White, C., *The correspondence (394-419) between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo* (New York 1990).

Scholarly literature

Adler, E., *Vergil's Empire: Political Thought in the Aeneid* (Lanham 2003).

Ahl, F., *Publius Vergilius Maro* (Oxford 2007).

Albertson, F.C., 'Maxentian hoards and the mint at Ostia', *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 30 (1985) 119-141.

Alföldi, A., 'On the Foundation of Constantinople: A Few Notes', *JRS* 37 (1947) 10-16.

-----, 'Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik: Kleine Beiträge zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte. 2. Der neue Romulus', *MH* 8 (1951) 190-215.

Amidon, P.R., *Philostorgius: Church History. Translated with an introduction and notes* (Atlanta 2007).

Anagnostou-Laoutides, E., 'Tyrants and Saviors in *Pan. Lat.* 12(9): Pro-Constantinian Readings of the *Aeneid*', *JLA* 14 (2021) 75-96.

Anderson, W.S., *The Art of the Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1969).

Ando, C.C., 'The Palladium and the Pentateuch: towards a sacred topography of the later Roman Empire', *Phoenix* 55 (2001) 369-410.

Angelova, D.A., *Sacred Founders: Women, Men, and Gods in the Discourse of Imperial Founding, Rome through Early Byzantium* (Oakland 2015).

Antoniou, A.A., 'Cassius Dio (51.20.6-8) and the Worship of the Living Emperor in Italy', *Mnemosyne* 72 (2019) 930-948.

Arcari, L., 'La Gerusalemme nuova di « Apocalisse » 21, 1-22, 5: auto-rappresentazione comunitaria e mito di ri-fondazione nell'« Apocalisse » di Giovanni', *SMSR* 75.1 (2009) 199-225.

Ardeleanu, S., P. Houten and S. Panzram, 'L'émergence du culte impérial en Afrique Proconsulaire: matérialité, acteurs, contextes spatiaux', in: S. Aounallah et al. (ed.), *L'Africa antica dall'età repubblicana ai Giulio-Claudii [= L'Africa Romana XXII]* (Roma 2024) 367-383.

Austin, R.G., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford 1964).

-----, 'Ille ego qui quondam...' *CQ* 18 (1968) 107-115.

-----, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford 1971).

-----, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford 1977).

Aymard, J., 'Commode-Hercule fondateur de Rome', *REL* 14 (1936) 350-364.

Azara, P., R. Mar Medina and E.S. Pascual (ed.), *Mites de fundació de ciutats al món antic (Mesopotàmia, Grècia i Roma)* (Barcelona 2001).

Ballériaux, O. and J. Schamp (ed.), *Thémistios I: Discours I-IV. Les héritiers de Constantin* (Paris 2022).

Balmaceda, C., *Virtus Romana. Politics and morality in the Roman historians* (Chapel Hill, NC 2017).

Banterle, G. et al., *Sant' Ambrogio. Inni, iscrizioni, frammenti* (Milano 1994).

Barbaglio, G., *San Paulo. Lettere* (Milano 1997).

Barbero, A., *Costantino il vincitore* (Roma 2016).

Barchiesi, A., *Il poeta e il principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusteo* (Roma 1994) [Eng. transl. Berkeley 1997].

-----, *Ovidio. Metamorfosi I: Libri I-II* (Milano 2005).

Bardill, J., *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age* (Cambridge 2012).

Barnes, T.D., 'Publius Optatianus Porphyrius', *AJPh* 96 (1975) 173-186.

-----, *The new empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA 1982).

-----, 'Jerome and the *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*', *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 158-161.

-----, 'Review article: Was there a Constantinian revolution?', *JLA* 2 (2009) 374-384.

-----, *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Malden, MA 2011).

Baron, C., 'The Dog That Did Not Bark? Cassius Dio and Herodotus', in: Madsen and Lange (2021) 88-108.

Barsanti, C., 'Costantinopoli: testimonianze archeologiche di età costantiniana', in: G. Bonamente et al. (ed.), *Constantino il Grande dall'antichità all'umanesimo I* (Macerata 1992) 115-150.

Bassett, S.E., *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople* (Cambridge 2004).

-----, 'Constantinople, Archaeology', in: M. Gagarin (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* II (Oxford 2010) 292-294.

Basta Donzelli, G., 'Katane-Aitna tra Pindaro ed Eschilo', in: B. Gentili (ed.), *Catania antica* (Pisa 1996) 73-95.

Bastiaensen, A.A.R. et al., *Vita di Cipriano. Vita di Ambrogio. Vita di Agostino* (Milano 1975).

Bastien, P. and A. Cothenet, *Trésors monétaires du Cher: Lignières (294-310), Osmery (293-313)* (Wetteren 1974).

Bastien, P. and F. Vasselle, *Le trésor monétaire de Domqueur (Somme): Etude sur les émissions de bronze de Trèves, Lyon et Londres de la réforme de Dioclétien à 309* (Wetteren 1965).

Bauer, F.A., *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike* (Mainz 1996).

Baynes, N.H., 'Constantine', in *CAH* XII (1939) 678-699.

Beacham, R., 'The Emperor as Impresario: Producing the Pageantry of Power', in: Galinsky (2005) 151-174.

Beard, M., J.A. North and S.F. Price, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge 1998).

Beck, H.-G., 'Konstantinopel – das neue Rom', *Gymnasium* 71 (1964) 166-174.

Behrwald, R., *Die Stadt als Museum? Die Wahrnehmung der Monuments Roms in der Spätantike* (Berlin 2009).

Behrwald, R. and C. Witschel (ed.), *Rom in der Spätantike. Historische Erinnerung im städtischen Raum* (Stuttgart 2012).

Bejor, G., 'L'oriente asiatico: Bitinia-Ponto, Galazia, Cappadocia' in: A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma* III.2 = A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini and A. Giardina (ed.), *L'età tardoantica: I luoghi e le culture* (Torino 1993) 533-542.

Béranger, J., *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (Basel 1953).

Berger, A., 'Konstantinopel, die erste christliche Metropole', in: H. Schlange-Schöningen (ed.), *Konstantin und das Christentum* (Darmstadt 2007) 204-215 [first published as 'Konstantinopel, die erste christliche Metropole?', in: G. Brands and H.-G. Severin (ed.), *Die spätantike Stadt und ihre Christianisierung* (Wiesbaden 2003) 63-71].

-----, 'Konstantinopel (stadtgeschichtlich)', in: G. Schöllgen et al. (ed.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* XXI (Stuttgart 2006) 435-483.

-----, A., *Konstantinopel. Geschichte, Topographie, Religion* (Stuttgart 2011).

Besnier, M., *Histoire ancienne. Histoire romaine* IV.1: *L'empire romain de l'avènement des Sévères au concile de Nicée* (Paris 1937).

Biesinger, B., *Römische Dekadenzdiskurse* (Stuttgart 2016).

Binder, G., *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis* (Meisenheim am Glan 1971).

-----, 'Aetiologische Erzählung und augusteisches Programm in Vergils Aeneis', in: Id. (ed.), *Saeculum Augustum II: Religion und Literatur* (Darmstadt 1988) 255-287.

-----, 'Vom Mythos zur Ideologie. Rom und seine Geschichte vor und bei Vergil', in: Id. and B. Effé (ed.), *Mythos: erzählende Weltdeutung im Spannungsfeld von Ritual, Geschichte und Rationalität* (Trier 1990) 137-161.

-----, 'Der brauchbare Held: Aeneas. Stationen der Funktionalisierung eines Ursprungsmythos', in: H.-J. Horn and H. Walter (ed.), *Die Allegorese des antiken Mythos in der Literatur, Wissenschaft und Kunst Europas* (Wiesbaden 1997) 311-330.

Binder, V., 'Inspired Leaders versus Emerging Nations: Varro's and Cicero's Views on Early Rome', in: C. Smith and K. Sandberg (ed.), *Omnium annalium monumenta: historical writing and historical evidence in Republican Rome* (Leiden 2018) 157-181.

Bleckmann, B., 'Constantine, Rome, and the Christians', in: Wienand (2015) 309-329.

Block, E., *The Effects of Divine Manifestations on the Reader's Perspective in Vergil's Aeneid* (New York 1981).

Blonc, C., 'La construction de la mémoire civique dans les colonies d'Afrique romaine: mémoire de la fondation ou de la refondation?', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlet and Rivoal (2017) 79-92.

Boehm, R., *Synoikism, urbanization, and empire in the early Hellenistic period* (diss. Berkeley 2011).

Bonamente, G. & A. Carile (ed.), *Costantino Il Grande nell'età bizantina* (Spoleto 2004) = *Bizantinistica* 5 (2004).

Bonamente, G., N. Lenski and R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), *Costantino prima e dopo Costantino. Constantine before and after Constantine* (Bari 2012).

Bond, S.E., 'Curial Communiqué: Memory, Propaganda, and the Roman Senate House', in: L.L. Brice and D. Slootjes (ed.), *Aspects of ancient institutions and geography: studies in honor of Richard J. A. Talbert* (Leiden 2015) 84-102.

Bondurant, A.L., 'A disputed line in the Aeneid: I, 426', *CJ* 20 (1925) 534-540.

Boni, G. et al., 'Iscrizione latina arcaica scoperta nel Foro Romano', *NSA* (1899) 151-200.

Boni, G., 'Esplorazioni nel Comizio', *NSA* (1900) 295-340.

Borzsák, S., 'Cicero und Caesar. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel des Romulus-Mythos', in: A. Michel and R. Verdière (ed.) *Ciceroniana. Hommages à K. Kumaniecki* (Leiden 1975) 22-35.

Boschung, D., A.W. Busch and M.J. Versluys (ed.), *Reinventing 'the invention of tradition'? Indigenous pasts and the Roman present* (Paderborn 2015).

Bouffartigue, J., *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps* (Paris 1992).

Bowersock, G. W., 'The new Hellenism of Augustan Athens', *ASNP* 7 (2002) 1-16.

-----, 'Old and New Rome in the Late Antique Near East', in: P. Rousseau and M. Papoutsakis (ed.), *Transformations of Late Antiquity. Essays for Peter Brown*. (Farnham/Burlington, VT 2009) 37-49.

Bowes, K., *Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity* (Cambridge 2008).

Bowie, A. M., *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge 1993).

Boyle, A.J., *The Chaonian dove. Studies in the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid of Virgil* (Leiden 1986).

Brachet, J.-P., 'Moenia ponere: une manière archaïque de désigner la fondation d'une cité en latin', in: P. Defosse ed., *Hommages à Carl Deroux II: Prose et linguistique, médecine* (Bruxelles 2002) 64-75.

-----, 'Les fondements indo-européens de lat. "urbem condere"', *Latomus* 63 (2004) 825-840.

Brandt, H., *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit. Von Diokletian und Konstantin bis zum Ende der konstantinischen Dynastie (284-363)* (Berlin 1998).

-----, 'Temistio e Costantino il Grande', in: Bonamente & Carile (2004) 159-170.

----- (2015a) = 'Konstantin der Grosse in einer Ehrung aus Mustis', *ZPE* 193 (2015) 304-309.

----- (2015b) = 'Konstantin, seine Söhne und die Basilica S. Petri in Rom', *ZPE* 196 (2015) 272-276.

Bravi, A., 'L'arco di Costantino nel suo contesto topografico', in Bonamente, Lenski & Lizzi Testa (2012) 445-462.

Bréhier, L., 'Constantin et la fondation de Constantinople', *RH* 119 (1915) 241-272.

Brélaz, C., *Corpus des inscriptions grecques et latines de Philippe II.1: La colonie romaine: La vie publique de la colonie* (Paris 2014).

-----, 'Entre Philippe II, Auguste et Paul: la commémoration des origines dans la colonie romaine de Philippe', in: S. Benoist, A. Daguet-Gagey and C. Hoët-van Cauwenbergh (ed.), *Une mémoire en actes: espaces, figures et discours dans le monde romain* (Villeneuve d'Ascq 2016) 119-138.

Brinkman, J.A., 'The Foundation Legends in Vergil', *CJ* 54 (1958) 25-33.

Brisson, J.P., 'Temps historique et temps mythique dans l'Énéide', in: H. Bardon and R. Verdière (ed.), *Vergiliana. Recherches sur Virgile* (Leiden 1971) 56-69.

Brown, N.G., 'The Living and the Monumental on the Anaglypha Traiani', *AJA* 124 (2020) 607-630.

Brown, P. and Testa, R.L., *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (Münster 2011).

Bruggisser, P., *Romulus Servianus: la légende de Romulus dans les "Commentaires à Virgile" de Servius: mythographie et idéologie à l'époque de la dynastie théodosienne* (Bonn 1987).

-----, 'City of the Outcast and City of the Elect: The Romulean Asylum in Augustine's *City of God* and Servius' *Commentaries on Virgil*', in: M. Vessey, K. Pollmann and A.D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *History, Apocalypse, and the Secular Imagination* (Villanova 1999) 75-104 = *AugStud* 30.2 (1999) 75-104.

----- (2002a) = *Remus conditor Vrbis*, l'empereur Maxence, le grammairien Servius et le théologien Augustin. Ou trois perceptions de la Rome des origines', in: S. Ratti (ed.), *Antiquité et citoyenneté* (Besançon 2002) 125-149.

----- (2002b) = 'Constantin aux Rostres', in: G. Bonamente and F. Paschoud (ed.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Perusinum* (Bari 2002) 73-91.

-----, 'Romulus aux anges. En passant par le récit de Philostorgue sur la fondation de Constantinople', in: P.-A. Deproost and A. Meurant (ed.), *Images d'origines, origines d'une image: hommages à Jacques Poucet* (Louvain-la-Neuve 2004) 335-367.

Brugnoli, G., 'Reges Albanorum', in: *Atti del Convegno virgiliano di Brindisi nel bimillenario della morte* (Napoli 1983) 157-190.

Brugnoli, G. and F. Stock, 'Questioni biografiche III, IV, IV.', *GIF* 43 (1991) 133-150.

Buchheit, V., *Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis* (Heidelberg 1963).

-----, 'Christliche Romideologie im Laurentius-Hymnus des Prudentius', in: P. Wirth (ed.), *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1966) 121-144 = R. Klein (ed.), *Das frühe Christentum im römischen Staat* (Darmstadt 1971) 455-485.

-----, *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgika. Dichtertum und Heilsweg* (Darmstadt 1972).

-----, 'Vergilische Geschichtsdeutung', *GB* 1 (1973) 23-50.

Büchner, K., s.v. 'P. Vergilius Maro, II.D' in *RE* VIII A.2 (1958) 1265-1486 = P. Vergilius Maro. *Der Dichter der Römer* (Stuttgart 1959).

Bühl, G., *Constantinopolis und Roma: Stadtpersonifikationen der Spätantike* (Zürich 1995).

Bur, C., 'Une refondation ordinaire: *lustrum condere* et recensement dans la Rome républicaine', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlet and Rivoal (2017) 269-280.

Burck, E., *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* (Berlin 1964²).

-----, 'Livius und Augustus', *ICS* 16 (1991) 269-281.

-----, *Das Geschichtswerk des Titus Livius* (Heidelberg 1992).

Burgersdijk, D.W.P., 'Enjambement in *Aeneis* 4', *Lampas* 36 (2003) 167-187.

Burgess, R.W., *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two contemporary accounts of the final years of the Roman empire* (Oxford 1993).

-----, 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' Chronici canones and Historia ecclesiastica', *JThS* 48 (1997) 471-504.

Burke, J., 'Inventing and re-inventing Byzantium: Nikephoros Phokas, Byzantine Studies in Greece, and 'New Rome', in: I. Nilsson and P. Stephenson (ed.), *Wanted: Byzantium. The Desire for a Lost Empire* (Uppsala 2014) 9-42.

Busolt, G., *Griechische Staatskunde* [= *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* IV.1.1] II: *Darstellung einzelner Staaten und der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen* (bearb. von H. Swoboda; München 1926³).

Butrica, J.L., 'Editing Propertius', *CQ* 91 (1997) 176-208.

-----, 'The Transmission of the Text of Propertius', in: H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's companion to Propertius* (Leiden 2006) 25-43.

Cabouret, B., 'La fondation de cités du IIe au IVe siècle (des Antonins à Théodose) d'après la *Chronique de Jean Malalas*', in: S. Agusta-Boulard et al. (ed.), *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas* II (Paris 2006) 173-185.

Cacitti, R., 'Subdita Christo servit Roma Deo: Osservazioni sulla teologia politica di Prudenzio', *Aevum* 46 (1972) 402-435.

Cadario, M., 'Le statue di Cesare a Roma tra il 46 e il 44 a.C. La celebrazione della vittoria e il confronto con Alessandro e Romolo', *Acme* 59.3 (2006) 27-70.

Cadbury, H.J., 'Litotes in Acts (Lexical notes on Luke-Acts, VIII)', in: E.H. Barth and R.E. Croxford (ed.), *Festschrift to honor Wilbur Gingrich, lexicographer, scholar, teacher, and committed Christian layman* (Leiden 1972) 58-69.

Cairns, F., *Tibullus. A Hellenistic poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979).

-----, 'The etymology of *militia* in Roman elegy', *EClás* 88 (1984) 211-22.

-----, *Virgil's Augustan epic* (Cambridge 1989).

-----, *Sextus Propertius. The Augustan elegist* (Cambridge 2006).

Calderone, S., 'Costantinopoli: la «seconda Roma», in: A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma* III.1 = A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini and A. Giardina (ed.), *L'età tardoantica: Crisi e trasformazioni* (Torino 1993) 723-749.

Calomino, D., 'ΚΤΙΣΤΟΥ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ: una legenda monetale inedita tra le emissioni augustee di Nicopolis', *NAC* 34 (2005) 183-216.

-----, 'La *civitas libera Nicopolitana* nel riscontro delle fonti numismatiche: problemi di interpretazione', *MediterrAnt* 11 (2008) 161-174.

-----, *Nicopolis d'Epiro: nuovi studi sulla zecca e sulla produzione monetale* (Oxford 2011).

Caltabiano, M., 'Libri e lettori nelle Lettere di Agostino recentemente scoperte', in: C. Moreschini (ed.), *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardoantica. Atti del terzo convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi* (Napoli 1995) 67-78.

Cameron, Alan, *Callimachus and his critics* (Princeton 1995).

-----, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford 2011).

Cameron, Averil, 'Introduction', in: Lieu and Montserrat (1998) 1-4.

-----, 'The reign of Constantine, A.D. 306-337', in *CAH* XII² (2005) 90-109.

Cameron, Averil and S.G. Hall, *Eusebius' life of Constantine* (Oxford 1999).

Camodeca, G., *Puteoli Romana: istituzioni e società. Saggi* (Napoli 2018).

Camps, W.A., *Propertius. Elegies Book II* (Cambridge 1967).

-----, *An introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1969).

-----, 'Lettura del primo libro dell'Eneide', in: M. Gigante (ed.), *Lecturae Vergilianae III: L'Eneide* (Napoli 1983) 15-30.

Cancik, H., 'Ein Volk gründen: ein myth-historisches Modell in Vergils *Aeneis*', in: A.F. Harald Bierl et al. (ed.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung* (München 2004) 307-323.

-----, «Götter einführen»: ein myth-historisches Modell für die Diffusion von Religion in Vergils *Aeneis*, in: D. Elm von der Osten, J. Rüpke and K. Waldner (ed.), *Texte als Medium und Reflexion von Religion im römischen Reich* (Stuttgart 2006) 31-40.

Canella, T. (ed.), *L'impero costantiniano e i luoghi sacri* (Bologna 2016).

Carandini, A., 'L'ultima civiltà sepolta o del massimo oggetto desueto, secondo un archeologo', in: A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma III.2* = A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini and A. Giardina (ed.), *Letà tardoantica: I luoghi e le culture* (Torino 1993) 11-38.

----- (ed.), *La Leggenda di Roma I-IV* (Milano 2006-2014).

Carandini, A. and D. Bruno, *La casa di Augusto dai Lupercalia al Natale* (Roma Bari 2008).

Carbonell Manils, J., 'Inscripciones inéditas del *Phrygianum* y de las necrópolis vaticanas (Girona, Arxiu de la Catedral, ms. 69 de pere Miquel Carbonell)', *ZPE* 194 (2015) 259-270.

Carile, A., 'Costantinopoli Nuova Roma', in: F. Cardini (ed.), *La città e il sacro* (Milano 1994) 203-242.

Carletti, C., 'Damaso', in: *Enciclopedia dei Papi* (Roma 2000) 349-372.

Carney, E.D., 'City-founding in the *Aeneid*', in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history IV* (Bruxelles 1986) 422-430.

Carotenuto, E., *Tradizione e innovazione nella «Historia Ecclesiastica» di Eusebio di Cesarea* (Bologna 2001).

Cartault, A., *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide* (Paris 1926).

Casali, S., 'Killing the father: Ennius, Naevius and Virgil's Julian imperialism', in: W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers (ed.), *Ennius perennis: the Annals and beyond* (Cambridge 2007) 103-128.

Castelletti, C., 'Following Aratus' plow: Vergil's signature in the *Aeneid*', *MH* 69 (2012) 83-95.

-----, 'Virgile, Properce, Auguste et la *Roma quadrata*. La *sphragis* comme acte de foundation?', *REL* 93 (2015) 211-234.

Castiello, A., *Augusto il fondatore: la rinascita di Roma e il mito romuleo* (Wiesbaden 2021).

Ceaşescu, P., 'Das programmatische Edikt des Augustus – eine mißverstandene Stelle', *RhM* 124 (1981) 348-353.

Cerini, F., *Cristo: Dio, uomo, salvatore negli Inni di Ambrogio* (diss. Roma [Augustinianum] 1987).

Chandler, L., *Ovid's Fasti, Livy and the History of Rome from Romulus to the Gallic Siege* (diss. Manchester 2017).

Chastagnol, A., *Les Fastes de la Préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire* (Paris 1962).

-----, 'L'inscription constantinienne d'Orcistus', *MEFRA* 93 (1981) 381-416 [reprinted in Id., *Aspects de l'antiquité tardive* (Roma 1994) 105-142].

-----, 'Deux notules sur l'époque de Dioclétien. II: Maximien Hercule à Rome', *BSAF* 1980-1981 (1982) 187-191 [reprinted in Id., *Aspects de l'antiquité tardive* (Roma 1994) 303-307].

Chenault, R., 'Statues of Senators in the Forum of Trajan and the Roman Forum in Late Antiquity', *JRS* 102 (2012) 103-132.

Cipriani, M., 'Dinamiche di sviluppo e processi di trasformazione a Poseidonia dal tardo arcaismo alla fine del V sec. a.C.', in: E. Greco and A. Rizakis (ed.), *Gli Achei in Grecia e in Magna Grecia: nuove scoperte e nuove prospettive* (Atene 2019) 485-500.

Clarke, J.R., 'Augustan Domestic Interiors: Propaganda or Fashion?', in: Galinsky (2005) 264-280.

Clausen, W.V., *A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford 1994).

Cloché, P., *Un fondateur d'empire, Philippe II roi de Macédoine 383/2 - 336/5 avant J.-C.* (Saint Étienne 1955).

Coarelli, F., 'L'urbs e il suburbio', in A. Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico II: Roma: politica, economia, paesaggio urbano* (Roma 1986) 1-58.

----- (1995a) = 'Ficus Navia', in *LTUR* II (1995) 248-249.

----- (1995b) = 'Ficus Ruminalis', in *LTUR* II (1995) 249.

-----, 'Sepulcrum Romuli', in *LTUR* IV (1996) 295-6.

-----, 'L'edilizia pubblica a Roma in età tetrarchica', in: W.V. Harris and J. Arce (ed.), *The transformations of Urbs Roma in late antiquity* (Portsmouth 1999) 23-33.

-----, *Roma* (Guide archeologiche Mondadori) (Milano 2000³ [1974]).

----- (tr. J.J. Clauss and D.P. Harmon), *Rome and Environs: an Archaeological Guide* (Berkeley 2007).

Cohn, B.S., 'Representing Authority in Victorian India', in: Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) 165-209.

Cole, S., *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome* (Cambridge 2013).

Coleman, K.M. (ed.), *Statius, Silvae* IV (Oxford 1988).

Conington, J. and H. Nettleship, *The Works of Virgil with a Commentary* I-III (London 1883-1898).

Connolly, J., 'Figuring the Founder. Vergil and the Challenge of Autocracy', in: Farrell and Putnam (2010) 404-417.

Conte, G.B. (tr. J.B. Solodow; revised by D.P. Fowler and G.W. Most), *Latin literature: a history* (Baltimore 1994).

Conway, R.S., *Aeneidos liber I. Ed. with Notes* (Cambridge 1935).

Cooley, A.E. (ed.), *Res gestae divi Augusti: text, translation, and commentary* (Cambridge 2010).

Corcoran, S., 'Maxentius: a Roman emperor in Rome', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 59-74.

Cornell, T.J. and W. Speyer, s.v. 'Gründer', in: T. Klauser et al. (ed.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* XII (Stuttgart 1983) 1107-1171.

Cornell, T.J. et al. (ed.), *The fragments of the Roman historians* I (Oxford 2013).

Cracco Ruggini, L., 'Vettio Agorio Pretestato e la fondazione sacra di Costantinopoli', in: "Philias Charin". *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manzi* II (Rome 1980) 593-610.

-----, 'La citta imperiale', in: A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma* IV = E. Gabba and A. Schiavone (ed.), *Caratteri e morfologie* (Torino 1989) 201-266.

Crofton-Sleigh, E.J., *The Building of Verse: Descriptions of Architectural Structures in Roman Poetry* (diss. Univ. of Washington 2014).

Crook, J.A., 'Augustus: power, authority, achievement', in *CAH* X² (1996) 113-146.

Cucchiarelli, A. (ed.), *Publio Virgilio Marone, Le Bucoliche* (Roma 2012).

Cullhed, M., *Conservator urbis suae. Studies in the politics and propaganda of the emperor Maxentius* (Stockholm 1994).

Cullmann, O., *Saint Pierre - Disciple, Apôtre, Martyr* (Paris 1952).

Curran, J.R., *Pagan City and Christian Capital. Rome in the 4th Century* (Oxford 2000).

Dabin, M., 'Fondation et refondation des temples en Mésopotamie aux IV^e et III^e millénaires av. J.-C.', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlet and Rivoal (2017) 229-242.

Dagron, G., *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris 1974) [2nd edition: (Paris 1984²)].

-----, 'Constantinopoli: un'altra realtà di "megalopoli" in Oriente', in: Ensoli and La Rocca (2000) 230-233.

D'Angour, A.J., *The Greeks and the new: novelty in ancient Greek imagination and experience* (Cambridge 2011).

Dardenay, A., *Les mythes fondateurs de Rome: images et politique dans l'Occident romain* (Paris 2010).

-----, *Images des fondateurs: d'Énée à Romulus* (Bordeaux 2012).

Dassmann, E., 'Ambrosius in Rom', *RQA* 98 (2003) 72-86.

-----, *Ambrosius von Mailand: Leben und Werk* (Stuttgart 2004).

Davenport, C., 'Rome and the rhythms of imperial life from the Antonines to Constantine', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 23-39.

Davenport, C., and C. Mallan (ed.), *Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio's Roman History* (Cambridge 2021).

DeBruhun, J.B., *Roman Propertius and the reinvention of elegy* (Ann Arbor 2003).

De Bruyn, T.S., 'Ambivalence Within a "Totalizing Discourse": Augustine's Sermons on the Sack of Rome', *JECS* 1 (1993) 405-421.

Degrassi, A. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII.2: Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani* (Roma 1963).

de Haan, N., 'De verankering van het verleden. Titus Livius en het culturele geheugen van Rome', *Lampas* 45 (2012) 99-117.

de Haan, N. and O. Hekster, 'In Hoc Signo Vinces': The Various Victories Commemorated Through the *Labarum*', in: Verhoeven, Bosman and van Asperen (2016) 17-30.

Delatte, L. et al., *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et index inverse de la langue latine* (Liège 1981).

Demand, N.H., *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Bristol 1990).

den Boeft, J., 'Ambrosius Lyricus', in: Id. and A. Hilhorst (ed.), *Early Christian poetry: a collection of essays* (Leiden 1993) 77-89.

-----, 'Delight and Imagination: Ambrose's Hymns', *VChr* (2008) 425-440.

den Boeft, J., J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst & H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII* (Leiden 2009).

-----, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII* (Leiden 2011).

De Ranieri, C., 'Renovatio temporum e 'rifondazione di Roma' nell'ideologia politica e religiosa di Commodo', *SCO* 45 (1995) 329-368.

DeRose Evans, J., *The Art of Persuasion. Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus* (Ann Arbor 1992).

Deschamps, L., 'Verbum quod conditum est... Réflexions sur une expression varronienne', *Latomus* 47 (1988) 3-12.

Desideri, P., 'Alessandro nei discorsi politici di Temistio', in: J.-M. Carrié & R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), "Humana sapit". *Études d'Antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini* (Turnhout 2002) 169-178.

de Trizio, M.S., *Panegirico di Mamertino per Massimiano e Diocleziano* (Panegyrici Latini 2 [10]) (Bari 2009).

de Vaan, M., *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* (Leiden 2008).

Di Benedetto, V., 'La consapevolezza di morte in Turno', *RFIC* 123 (1995) 45-72.

-----, 'Pathos e ideologia nel finale dell'Eneide', *RFIC* 124 (1996) 149-174.

Diefenbach, S., *Römische Erinnerungsräume. Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Berlin 2007).

di Fazio, C., *I sacra dei Latini. Santuari, culti e aspetti rituali* (diss. Roma [Sapienza] 2015).

Dijkstra, R., *The Apostles in early Christian art and poetry* (Leiden 2016).

----- (2020a) = Dijkstra, R. (ed.), *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter* (Leiden 2020).

----- (2020b) = 'Peter, Popes, Politics and More: the Apostle as Anchor', in: Dijkstra (2020a) 3-25.

Dillon, J. N., 'The Inflation of Rank and Privilege: Regulating Precedence in the Fourth Century AD', in: Wienand (2015) 42-66.

Dinter, M.T. and Guérin, C. (ed.), *Cultural Memory in Republican and Augustan Rome* (Cambridge 2023).

Dobbin, R.F., 'Julius Caesar in Jupiter's Prophecy, *Aeneid*, Book 1', *CA* 14 (1995) 5-40.

Doignon, J., 'Le titre de *Nobilissimus Puer* porté par Gratien et la mystique littéraire des origines de Rome à l'avènement des Valentiniens', in: R. Chevallier (ed.), *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à A. Piganiol* (Paris 1966) 1693-1709.

Donati, N. and P. Stefanetti, *Dies natalis: i calendari romani e gli anniversari dei culti* (Roma 2006).

Donciu, R., *L'empereur Maxence* (Bari 2012).

Dougherty, C., *The poetics of colonization: from city to text in archaic Greece* (Oxford 1993).

-----, 'Archaic Greek foundation poetry: questions of genre and occasion', *JHS* 114 (1994) 35-46.

Dreizehnter, A., 'Pompeius als Städtegründer', *Chiron* 5 (1975) 213-245.

Drijvers, J.W., 'Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of the Image of Maxentius', in: H. Amirav and B. ter Haar Romeny (ed.), *From Rome to Constantinople. Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron* (Leuven 2007) 11-27.

-----, 'Helena Augusta and the City of Rome', in: Verhoeven, Bosman and van Asperen (2016) 147-153.

-----, 'Panegyricus Latinus 12(9): Constantine's Religious Ideology', *JLA* 14 (2021) 50-74.

Drost, V., *Le monnayage de Maxence (306-312 après J.-C.)* (Zürich 2013).

-----, 'L'atelier monétaire d'Ostie (308/309-313 ap. J.-C.): enjeux géopolitiques', *MEFRA* 126 (2014) 227-238.

Dulière, C., *Lupa Romana. Recherches d'iconographie et essai d'interprétation* (Bruxelles 1979).

Dumser, E.A., *The Architecture of Maxentius: A Study in Architectural Design and Urban Planning in Early Fourth-Century Rome* (diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 2005).

Eden, P.T., *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII* (Leiden 1975).

-----, 'Virgil, *Aeneid* VIII: a Reconsideration', in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* IV (Bruxelles 1986) 431-450.

Eder, W., 'Augustus and the Power of Tradition', in: Galinsky (2005) 12-32.

Edmondson, J.C., 'Introduction: Approaching the Age of Augustus', in: Id. (ed.), *Augustus* (Edinburgh 2009) 1-29.

Edwards, C., *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City* (Cambridge 1996).

Edwards, M., 'Constantine in the Pagan Memory', in: A.E. Siecienski (ed.), *Constantine: religious faith and imperial policy* (London 2017) 75-90.

Elia, F. (ed.), *Politica retorica e simbolismo del primato. Roma e Costantinopoli (secoli IV - VII)* (Catania 2002-2004).

Elton, H., 'The Transformation of Government under Diocletian and Constantine', in: D.S. Potter (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire* (Malden, MA 2006) 193-205.

Enenkel, K.A.E., 'Epic Prophecy as Imperial Propaganda? Jupiter's First Speech in Virgil's *Aeneid*', in: K.A.E. Enenkel and I.L. Pfeijffer (ed.), *The Manipulative Mode* (Leiden 2005) 167-218.

Enk, P.J. (ed.), *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I* (Leiden 1946).

----- (ed.), *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber secundus I-II* (Leiden 1962).

Ensoli, S. and E. La Rocca (ed.), *Aurea Roma: dalla città pagana alla città cristiana* (Roma 2000).

Enßlin, W., s.v. 'Praefectus praetorio' in *RE* XXII (1954) 2391-2502.

Erbes, C., *Die Todesstage der Apostel Paulus und Petrus und ihre Römischen Denkmäler* (Leipzig 1899).

Ernout, A. and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots* [4. éd.; 4. tir. augm. d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par J. André] (Paris 1985).

Ernout, A., 'Remarques sur l'étymologie latine', *REL* 3 (1925) 101-129.

Erskine, A., *Troy between Greece and Rome: local tradition and imperial power* (Oxford 2001).

-----, 'Alexandria in the Alexandrian Imagination', in: S.L. Ager and R.A. Faber (ed.), *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World* (Toronto 2013) 169-183.

Evers, A. (ed.), *Religion, Power, and Politics in Late Antiquity: Bishops, Emperors, and Senators in the Collectio Avellana (AD 367-553)* (forthcoming)

Fabbrini, F., *Translatio imperii: l'impero universale da Ciro ad Augusto* (Roma 1983).

Fairclough, H.R. and G.P. Goold (ed.), *Virgil, I: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI* (Cambridge, MA 1999); II: *Aeneid VII-XII, Appendix Vergiliana* (Cambridge, MA 2000).

Falcasantos, R.S., *Constantinople: ritual, violence, and memory in the making of a Christian imperial capital* (Oakland, CA 2020).

Farrell, J.A. and M.C. J. Putnam (ed.), *A companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its tradition* (Malden, MA 2010).

Favro, D., 'Making Rome a World City', in: Galinsky (2005) 234-263.

Fedeli, P. (ed.), *Sextus Propertius, Elegiae* (Stuttgart 1984).

-----, *Properzio, Elegie. Libro II* (Cambridge 2005).

Federico, E. 'Masmaba: uno scomodo libico alla corte di Augusto', *QS* 50 (1999) 163-171.

Feeley, D.C., 'History and revelation in Vergil's underworld', *PCPhS* 32 (1986) 1-24.

Herchiou, N. 'Un témoignage de la vie municipale d'Abthugni au Bas Empire', in: A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana VII.2* (Sassari 1990) 753-761.

Ferrua, A., *Epigrammata Damasiana* (Città del Vaticano 1942).

Ficuciello, L., 'Il sacello-heroon di Poseidonia: problemi e prospettive di ricerche alla luce delle recenti indagini', in: M. Cipriani, E. Greco and A. Pontrandolfo (ed.), *Dialoghi sull'Archeologia della Magna Grecia e del Mediterraneo VI: Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale di Studi* (Paestum 2022) 65-77.

Fischer, B., 'Ist Ambrosius wirklich in Trier geboren?', in: E. Dassmann and K. Thraede (ed.), *Vivarium. Festschrift Theodor Klauser zum 90. Geburtstag* (Münster 1984) 132-13.

Fletcher, K.F.B., *Finding Italy: travel, nation and colonization in Vergil's Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 2014).

Floricic, F. (ed.), *La négation dans les langues romanes* (Amsterdam 2007).

Flower, R., 'Visions of Constantine', *JRS* 102 (2012) 287-305.

Flügel, C., H. Dolenz, K. Schmidt and C. Baur, 'Die augusteische Gründungsphase der *Colonia Carthago Magnae in Vestigiis Carthaginis*', *MDAI(R)* 124 (2018) 353-423.

Follieri, E., 'La fondazione di Costantinopoli: riti pagani e cristiani', in: *Roma, Costantinopoli, Mosca* (Napoli 1983) 217-231.

Fontaine, J. et al. (ed.), *Ambrosius Mediolanensis. Hymnes* (Paris 1992).

Fordyce, C.J., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII-VIII* [with a commentary by C.J. Fordyce; introduction by P.G. Walsh; edited by J.D. Christie] (Oxford 1977).

Formicola, C., 'Per un invito 'iniziatico' a ragionar di Virgilio' ['discussione' of Nicastri (2006)], *BStudLat* 37 (2007) 145-161.

Formigli, E., 'La Lupa Capitolina. Un antico monumento cade dal suo piedistallo e torna a nuova vita', *MDAI(R)* 118 (2012) 505-530.

Förster, H., *Die Anfänge von Weihnachten und Epiphanias: eine Anfrage an die Entstehungshypothesen* (Tübingen 2007).

Forsythe, G., review of Miles (1995), *BMCRev* 3.3 (1996) 135-140.

Fowler, D., 'Virgilian narrative. (a) Story-telling', in: Martindale (1997) 259-270.

Fox, M., *Roman historical myths: the regal period in Augustan literature* (Oxford 1996).

Franchi, B., 'L'epos virgiliano e l'eziologia', *MD* 34 (1995) 95-106.

Franke, P., 'Apollo Leucadius oder Octavianus?', *Chiron* 6 (1976) 159-163.

Fraschetti, A., 'Costantino e l'abbandono del Campidoglio', in: A. Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico* II (Rome 1999) 59-98.

-----, *Romolo il fondatore* (Rome 2002).

Fraser, P.M., *Cities of Alexander the Great* (Oxford 1996).

Fratantuono, L.M. and R.A. Smith, *Virgil, Aeneid* 5 (Leiden 2015).

Fratantuono, L.M. and R.A. Smith, *Virgil, Aeneid* 4 (Leiden 2022).

Frend, W.H.C., 'Augustine and Orosius on the end of the ancient world', *AugStud* 20 (1989) 1-38.

Freudenburg, K., 'Recusatio as Political Theatre: Horace's Letter to Augustus', *JRS* 104 (2014) 105-132.

Frier, B.W. et al., *The Codex of Justinian I-III* (Cambridge 2016).

Froesch, H., 'Arma virumque cano. Beobachtungen zu den Eingangswörtern der Aeneis', *Anregung* (1991) 309-312.

Frolow, A., 'La dédicace de Constantinople dans la tradition byzantine', *RHR* 127 (1944) 61-127.

Fruyt, M., 'La négation comme modalité originale: quelques exemples latins', in: Id. and C. Moussy, *Les modalités en latin* (Paris 2002) 37-52.

-----, 'Latin Vocabulary', in: J. Clackson (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language* (Oxford 2011) 144-156.

Fuchs, H., 'Rückschau und Ausblick im Arbeitsbereich der lateinischen Philologie', *MH* 4 (1947) 147-198.

Fürst, A., *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus* (Münster 1999).

Führer, T. (ed.), *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike: Repräsentationen städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur und Kunst* (Berlin 2012).

Fuhrmann, H., 'Studien zu den Consulardiptychen verwandten Denkmälern, I. Eine Glasschale von der Vicennalienfeier Constantins des Grossen zu Rom im Jahre 326 n. Chr.', *MDAI(R)* 54 (1939) 161-175.

Fustel de Coulanges, [N.D.], *La cité antique. Étude sur le culte, le droit, les institutions de la Grèce et de Rome* (Paris 1876⁶).

Gabel, J.B., C.B. Wheeler and A.D. York (ed.), *The Bible as literature: an introduction* (Oxford 2000⁴).

Gaertner, J.F. 'Livy's Camillus and the political discourse of the Late Republic', *JRS* 98 (2008) 27-52.

Gagé, J., 'Le *Templum Urbis* et les origines de l'idée de *Renovatio*', in: *Mélanges Franz Cumont* I (Bruxelles 1936) 151-188.

-----, 'Le *solemne urbis* du 21 avril au III^e siècle ap. J-C: Rites positifs et spéculations séculaires', in: *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974) 225-241.

Galasso, L., 'La più antica storia di Roma nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio (14, 772-804)', in: M. Faraguna and V. Vedaldi Iasbez (ed.), *Δύνασθαιδιδάσκειν: studi in onore di Filippo Càssola per il suo ottantesimo compleanno* (Trieste 2006) 261-271.

Gale, M. (ed.), *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura* V (Oxford 2009).

Galinsky, K., 'Aeneas at Rome and Lavinium', in: R.M. Wilhelm and H. Jones (ed.), *The two worlds of the poet: new perspectives on Vergil* (Detroit 1992) 93-108.

-----, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton 1996).

-----, 'Clothes for the Emperor', *Arion* 10 (2003) 143-169.

----- (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge 2005).

-----, review of Schauer (2007), *BMCRev* 6.29 (2008).

-----, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor* (Cambridge 2012).

Galletier, E., *Panégyriques latins II: Les panégyriques constantiniens (VI-X)* (Paris 1952).

Ganiban, R.T., *Vergil, Aeneid Book 1* (Newburyport, MA 2008).

Gantz, T.N., 'Lapis niger. The tomb of Romulus', *La Parola del Passato* 29 (1974) 350-361.

Gassman, M., 'The Roman kings in Orosius' *Historiae aduersum paganos*', *CQ* 67 (2017) 617-630.

Gatti, G., 'Monumenti epigrafici rinvenuti nel Foro romano', *BCAR* 27 (1899) 205-247.

Gazich, R., 'Moenia disponere: Properzio, Callimaco e la città augustea', *Aevum Antiquum* 10 (1997) 289-226.

Gerland, E., 'Byzantion und die Gründung der Stadt Konstantinopel', *ByzJ* 10 (1934) 93-105.

Gervais-Lambony, P., F. Hurlet and I. Rivoal (ed.), *(Re)Fonder. Les modalités du (re)commencement dans le temps et dans l'espace* (Paris 2017).

Getty, R. J., 'Romulus, Roma and Augustus in the Sixth book of the Aeneid', *CPh* 45 (1950) 1-12.

Geymonat, M. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis, Opera* (Roma 2008) [augmented and corrected reprint of the 1973 edition in the Corpus Paravianum].

Geyssen, J.W., *Imperial panegyric in Statius: a literary commentary on Silvae 1.1* (Bern 1996).

Girardet, K.M., 'Das Edikt des Imperator Caesar in Suetons Augustusvita 28,2. Politisches Programm und Publikationszeit', *ZPE* 131 (2000) 231-243.

----- (ed.), *Konstantin, Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen* (Freiburg im Breisgau 2013).

Girod, R., 'Virgile et l'histoire dans l'Énéide', in: R. Chevallier (ed.), *Présence de Virgile* (Paris 1978) 17-33.

Giusti, E., *Carthage in Virgil's Aeneid: staging the enemy under Augustus* (Cambridge 2018).

Gnilka, C., 'Prudentius über das *Templum Romae* und seine Statuen (Prud. c. *Symm.* 1,215/237)', in: M. Jordan-Ruwe (ed.), *Bild- und Formensprache der spätantiken Kunst. Hugo Brandenburg zum 65. Geburtstag* (Münster 1994) 65-88.

Gnilka, C., S. Heid and R. Riesner, *Blutzeuge. Tod und Grab des Petrus in Rom* (Regensburg 2015²).

Gnoli, T., 'Costantino in Giovanni Malala', in: Bonamente & Carile (2004) 204-216.

Godin, B., *Innovation Contested: The Idea of Innovation over the Centuries* (London 2015).

Goldammer, K., *Wörterbuch der Religionen. Begründet von Alfred Bertholet in Verbindung mit Hans Freiherrn von Campenhausen* (Stuttgart 1976³).

Goldman-Petri, M., 'The Altar of P. Perelius Hedulus in Carthage and the Social Aspects of Provincial Image-Making', in: A. Russell and M. Hellström (ed.), *The Social Dynamics of Roman Imperial Imagery* (Cambridge 2020) 180-214.

Goldschmidt, N., *Shaggy crowns. Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 2013).

-----, 'Textual Monuments: reconstructing Carthage in Augustan literary culture', *CPh* 112 (2017) 368-383.

Goold, G.P., 'The voice of Virgil: the pageant of Rome in Aeneid 6', in: A.J. Woodman and J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Author and audience in Latin literature* (Cambridge 1992) 110-123.

-----, *Propertius. Elegies* (Cambridge, MA 1999²).

Grandazzi, A., 'Urbem condere: de la linguistique à l'histoire?: à propos de Varro, *ling.*, V, 143.', in: D. Briquel, C. Février and C. Guittard (ed.), *Varietates Fortunae: religion et mythologie à Rome: hommage à Jacqueline Champeaux* (Paris 2010) 159-173.

-----, 'Archéologie romaine: un achaïsme peut en cacher un autre', *Ktema* 31 (2006) 89-96.

Grandpierre, V., 'Fondations urbaines dans le Proche-Orient ancien', *Histoire urbaine* 13 (2005) 13-32.

Gransden, K.W., *Virgil, Aeneid, book VIII* (Cambridge 1976).

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid, book XI* (Cambridge 1991).

Graves, R. (ed.), *Suetonius. The twelve Caesars* (Harmondsworth 1957).

Greco, E. (ed.), *La 'tomba' del fondatore e le origini di Poseidonia* (Paestum 2014).

-----, 'Mythical and Historical Heroic Founders: The Archaeological Evidence', in: K. Kalogeropoulos, D. Vassilikou and M. Tiverios (ed.), *Sidelights on Greek Antiquity* (Berlin 2021) 299-320.

Green, S.J., 'Malevolent gods and Promethean birds: contesting augury in Augustus's Rome', *TAPhA* 139 (2009) 147-167.

Grig, L. and G. Kelly, 'Introduction. From Rome to Constantinople', in: L. Grig and G. Kelly (ed.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 2012) 3-30.

Griffin, J., 'The creation of characters in the Aeneid', in: Id., *Latin poets and Roman life* (London 1985) 183-197 [first published in: B.K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and artistic patronage in ancient Rome* (Austin, TX 1982) 118-134].

Grimal, P., *Virgile, ou la seconde naissance de Rome* (Paris 1985).

Groag, E., s.v. 'Maxentius' in *RE* XIV.2 (1930) 2417-2484.

Grossi, V., 'La cristianizzazione del tempo a Roma: dal culto cristiano all'anno liturgico', in: L. Pani Ermini and P. Siniscalco (ed.), *La comunità cristiana di Roma I: La sua vita e la sua cultura dalle origini all'alto medio evo* (Città del Vaticano 2000) 171-191.

Grossi, I., 'Sugli ultimi *curatores / consulares aedium sacrarum*', in: Canella (2016) 361-386.

Groves, J.V., *Ethics and Imperialism in Livy* (diss. Univ. of Michigan 2013).

Grünewald, T., *Constantinus Maximus Augustus. Herrschaftspropaganda in der zeitgenössischen Überlieferung* (Stuttgart 1990).

Gschnitzer, F., 'Von Personennamen abgeleitete Ortsnamen im Griechischen und in griechischer Überlieferung. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Verbreitung dynastischer Städtegründungen vor dem Hellenismus', *Ktema* 12 (1987) 127-137.

Guilhemet, J.-P. and H. Ménard, 'Fondations ou refondations urbaines dans l'Antiquité', *Histoire urbaine* 13 (2005) 1-12.

Gurval, R.A., *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War* (Ann Arbor 1995).

Gutzwiller, H., *Die Neujahrsrede des Konsuls Claudius Mamertinus vor dem Kaiser Julian* (Basel 1942).

Györi, V., 'The *lituus* and Augustan provincial coinage', *AAntHung* 55 (2015) 45-60.

Habicht, C., *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte* (München 1956).

Habinek, T.N., *The politics of Latin literature: writing, identity, and empire in ancient Rome* (Princeton 2001).

Haley, E.W., 'Hadrian as Romulus or the Self-Representation of a Roman Emperor', *Latomus* 64 (2005) 969-980.

Hall, J.M., *Artifact & Artifice. Classical Archaeology and the Ancient Historian* (Chicago 2014).

Hall, L.J., 'Cicero's *instinctu divino* and Constantine's *instinctu divinitatis*: the evidence of the Arch of Constantine for the senatorial view of the "vision" of Constantine', *JECS* 6 (1998) 647-671.

Halter, T., 'Vergils Aeneis-Proömium', *WS* 77 (1964) 76-109.

Hannah, B. G., *Exegi Monumentum: Architecture in Latin Epic* (diss. Ithaca 2007).

Hansen, I.L., R. Hodges and S. Leppard (ed.), *Butrint 4: The Archaeology and Histories of an Ionian Town* (Oxford 2013).

Harden, D.B., 'The Topography of Punic Carthage', *G&R* 9.25 (1939) 1-12.

Hardie, A., *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, patrons and epideixis in the Graeco-Roman world* (Liverpool 1983).

Hardie, P.R., *Virgil's Aeneid – Cosmos and imperium* (Oxford 1986).

-----, 'Ovid's Theban History: The First 'Anti-Aeneid?}', *CQ* 40 (1990) 224-235.

----- (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid, book IX* (Cambridge 1994).

-----, 'Virgil's epic techniques: Heinze ninety years later', *CPh* 90 (1995) 267-276.

-----, *Virgil* (Oxford 1998).

-----, review of Horsfall (2006), *BMCRev* 08.47 (2007).

-----, review of Schauer (2007), *Gnomon* 81 (2009) 700-703.

----- (ed.), *Ovidio. Metamorfosi VI: Libri XIII-XV* (Milano 2015).

Harich-Schwarzbauer, H. and K. Pollmann (ed.), *Der Fall Roms und seine Wiederauferstehungen in Antike und Mittelalter* (Berlin 2013).

Harries, J., *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363. The New Empire* (Edinburgh 2012).

Harrison, E.L., 'Foundation prodigies in the *Aeneid*', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5 (1985) 131-164.

Harrison, J.R., 'Augustan Rome and the Body of Christ: A Comparison of the Social Vision of the "Res Gestae" and Paul's Letter to the Romans', *HThR* 106 (2013) 1-36.

Harrison, S.J., 'Some Views of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century', in: Id. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1990) 1-20.

-----, 'Aeneid 1. 286, Julius Caesar or Augustus?', *PLLS* 9 (1996) 127-133.

-----, 'Virgil and the conspiracy theorists', *CR* 52 (2002) 292-294.

-----, review of Schauer (2007), *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009) 510-513.

Havas, L., 'Romulus Arpinas: ein wenig bekanntes Kapitel in der römischen Geschichte des Saeculum-Gedankens', *ACD* 36 (2000) 71-88.

-----, 'Caesar als Romulus der Eroberer', in: H. Heftner and K. Tomaschitz (ed.), *Ad fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch* (Wien 2004) 355-367.

Heather, P. and D. Moncur, *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius* (Liverpool 2001).

Hejduk, J., 'Jupiter's *Aeneid: Fama and Imperium*', *CA* 28 (2009) 279-327.

Hekster, O., 'The city of Rome in late imperial ideology: The Tetrarchs, Maxentius, and Constantine', *MediterrAnt* 2 (1999) 717-748.

-----, 'The constraints of tradition. Depictions of Hercules in Augustus' reign', in: C. Gazdac et al. (ed.), *Orbis antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis* (Cluj-Napoca 2004) 235-241.

-----, 'Keizers en hun steden: Constantijn, Maxentius, Rome en Constantinopel', in: D.W.P. Burgersdijk and W.J.I. Waal (ed.), *Constantinopel. Een mozaïek van de Byzantijnse metropool* (Leiden 2011) 47-58.

-----, *Emperors and Ancestors. Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition* (Cambridge 2015).

----- (2020a) = 'When Was an Imperial Image? Some Reflections on Roman Art and Imagery', in: A. Russell and M. Hellström (ed.), *The social dynamics of Roman imperial imagery* (Cambridge 2020) 275-288.

----- (2020b) = 'Ruling through Religion? Innovation and Tradition in Roman Imperial Representation', in: Dijkstra (2020a) 26-40.

-----, *Caesar Rules. The Emperor in the Changing Roman World (c. 50 BC – AD 565)*. (Cambridge 2022).

Hellström, M., 'The People' and Cassius Dio', in: Davenport and Mallan (2021) 199-217.

Henck, N., 'Constantius ὁ Φιλοκτίστης?', *DOP* 55 (2001) 279-304.

Hennings, R., *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2, 11-14* (Leiden 1994).

Henry, J., *Aeneida, or: Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneid I* (London 1873).

Herm, G., *Das zweite Rom. Konstantinopel, Drehscheibe zwischen Ost und West* (Düsseldorf/Wien 1968).

Herrin, J., *Byzantium: the surprising life of a medieval empire* (London 2007).

Heslin, P., *The Museum of Augustus: the Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin Poetry* (Los Angeles 2015).

Hexter, R., 'Sidonian Dido', in: Id. and D. Selden (ed.), *Innovations of antiquity* (New York 1992) 332-384.

-----, 'Imitating Troy. A Reading of *Aeneid* 3', in: Perkell (1999a) 64-79.

Heyworth (2007a) = Heyworth, S.J., *Cynthia: a companion to the text of Propertius* (Oxford 2007).

Heyworth, S. J. and Morwood, J., *A Commentary on Vergil, Aeneid 3* (Oxford 2017).

Hightet, G., *The speeches in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton 1972).

Hillner, J., 'A woman's place: imperial women in late antique Rome', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 75-95.

-----, *Helena Augusta. Mother of the Empire* (Oxford 2023).

Hinds, S., 'Reflexive Annotation in Poetic Allusion', *Hermathena* 158 (1995) 41-51.

Hirst, G., 'The Significance of *augustior* as applied to Hercules and to Romulus: A note on Livy I, 7, 9 and I, 8, 9', *AJPh* 47 (1926) 347-357.

Hjort Lange, C.H., *Res Publica Constituta: Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment* (Oxford 2009).

Hobsbawm, E. and T. Ranger (ed.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge 1983).

Hoff, M.C., 'Augustus, Apollo, and Athens', *MH* 49 (1992) 223-232.

Hofmann, J.B. and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (München 1972).

Hoffmann, M.E., *Negatio contrarii. A study of Latin litotes* (Assen 1987).

Holleman, A.W.J., *Pope Gelasius I and the Lupercalia* (Amsterdam 1974).

Holt, P., 'Who Understands Vergil's Prophecies?', *CJ* 77 (1982) 303-314.

Hornblower, S., 'When was Megalopolis founded?', *ABSA* 85 (1990) 71-77.

Hornsby, R.A., *Patterns of action in the Aeneid: an interpretation of Vergil's epic similes* (Iowa City 1970).

Horsfall, N., 'Virgil's Roman Chronography: A Reconsideration', *CQ* 24 (1974) 111-115.

-----, 'Aeneas the colonist', *Vergilius* 35 (1989) 8-27.

-----, 'Virgil and the poetry of explanations', *G&R* 38 (1991) 203-211.

-----, 'Aeneid', in: Id. (ed.), *A companion to the study of Virgil* (Leiden 1995) 101-216.

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden 2000).

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary* (Leiden 2003).

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary* (Leiden 2006).

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary* (Leiden 2008).

-----, *Virgil, Aeneid 6: A Commentary* (Berlin 2013).

Houten, P.H.A., *Civitates Hispaniae. Urbanisation on the Iberian peninsula during the High Empire* (diss. Leiden 2018).

Hughes, L.B., 'Vergil's Creusa and *Iliad* 6', *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997) 401-423.

Hülsen, C., 'Die neuen Ausgrabungen auf dem Forum Romanum', *Archäologischer Anzeiger* [s.n.] (1900) 1-9.

Humphries, M., *Cities and the Meanings of Late Antiquity* (Leiden 2019).

-----, 'Romulus and Peter: Remembering and Reconfiguring Rome's Foundation in Late Antiquity', in: Dijkstra (2020a) 172-187.

Hunsucker, R., 'Romulus en Augustus – *nomen est omen?* Suetonius en Cassius Dio over de *princeps* en de stichter van Rome', *Hermeneus* 86 (2014) 57-62.

-----, 'Aeneas in de literaire tijdmachine van Vergilius: een denkbeeldige reis door het Rome van alle tijden (*Aeneis* VIII.26-369)', *Roma Aeterna* 3 (2015) 14-33.

----- (2018a) = 'Maxentius and the *aeternae urbis suae conditores*: Rome and its Founders from Maximian to Constantine (289-313)', in: D. Burgersdijk & A. Ross (ed.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire* (Leiden) 83-112.

----- (2018b) = 'De nieuwe stichters van de Eeuwige Stad. Meervoudige verankering in het Rome van Augustus en de Late Oudheid', *Lampas* 51 (2018) 358-374.

-----, 'De hut van Romulus en het huis van Augustus: over de Palatijn en de stichting van Rome', in: J. Castricum et al. (ed.), *Ab Urbe Condita. Nieuwe perspectieven op de cultuurgeschiedenis van Rome* (Leeuwarden 2025) 31-42.

Hunsucker, R. and R. Praet, 'Reinventing tenacious anchors: Romulus in the cultural memory of the early and late Roman Empire', online working paper (2016), *Anchoring in Antiquity Conference Proceedings*, available at http://www.ru.nl/publish/pages/862191/hunsucker_praet.pdf.

Hunt, A., 'Keeping the memory alive: the physical continuity of the *ficus Ruminalis*', in: M. Bommas, J. Harrisson and P. Roy (ed.), *Memory and Urban Religion in the Ancient World* (London 2012) 111-128.

Hunt, D., 'Valentinian and the Bishops: Ammianus 30.9.5 in Context', in: J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst & H. C. Teitler (ed.), *Ammianus after Julian. The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26 - 31 of the Res Gestae* (Leiden 2007) 71-93.

Hunt, J.W., *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid* (Carbondale 1973).

Hunter, D.G., 'Fourth-century Latin writers: Hilary, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Ambrose', in: F. Young, L. Ayres and A. Louth (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge 2008) 302-317.

Hurlet, F. and C. Müller, '(Re)fondation et colonies romaines: regards croisés sur Carthage et Corinthe', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlet and Rivoal (2017) 79-120.

Hurst, H.R., 'Fouilles britanniques au Port circulaire et quelques idées sur le développement de la Carthage romaine', *CEA* 17 (1985) 143-156.

Huskinson, J.M., *Concordia Apostolorum. Christian propaganda at Rome in the fourth and fifth centuries. A study in early Christian iconography and iconology* (Oxford 1982).

Icks, M., 'Three usurpers in Rome: the *urbs aeterna* in the representation of Maxentius, Nepotian, and Priscus Attalus', *Studies in Late Antiquity* 4 (2020) 4-43.

Inglebert, H., *Interpretatio christiana. Les mutations des savoirs, cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire, dans l'antiquité chrétienne, 30-630 après J.-C* (Paris 2001).

Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (F Gr Hist) II.D: *Zeitgeschichte. Kommentar zu Nr. 106 – 261* (Berlin 1930).

Jacoby, N., *Philologischer Kommentar zu Augustinus De civitate Dei, Buch I* (Frankfurt am Main 2004).

Jaeger, M.K., *The poetics of place: The Augustan writers and the urban landscape of Rome* (diss. Berkeley 1990).

Jäggi, C., 'Donator oder Fundator? Zur Genese des monumentalen Stifterbildes', *Georges-Bloch-Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Instituts der Universität Zürich* 9-10 (2002-2003) 27-45.

James, S.L., 'Establishing Rome with the Sword: *Condere* in the *Aeneid*', *AJPh* 116 (1995) 623-637.

Jones, J.E., 'Cities of Victory – Patterns and Parallels', in E. E. Chrysos (ed.), *Nicopolis I. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Nicopolis* (Preveza 1987) 99-108.

Jones, P.V., *Reading Virgil: Aeneid I and II* (Cambridge 2011).

Julien, M.-H., 'Les sources de la tradition ancienne des hymnes attribuées à Saint Ambroise', *RHT* 19 (1989) 57-189.

Kaldellis, A., 'The Forum of Constantine in Constantinople: What do we know about its original architecture and adornment?', *GBRS* 56 (2016) 714-739.

-----, review of Humphries (2019), *BMCRev* 04.45 (2020).

Kallendorf, C., review of M.J. Clarke, B.G.F. Currie and R.O.A.M. Lynn (ed.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford 2006), in *The Review of English Studies* 58 (2007) 212-213.

Kannengiesser, C., s.v. 'Athanasius', in: E. Ferguson, M.P. McHugh and F.W. Norris (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York 1997) 137-140.

Kelly, G., 'The new Rome and the old: Ammianus Marcellinus' silences on Constantinople', *CQ* 53 (2003) 588-607.

Kenney, E. J., review of E. Norden, *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (Berlin 1966), *CR* 18 (1968) 105-107.

----- (ed.), *Lucretius: De rerum natura, Book III* (Cambridge 2014²).

Kienast, D., *Augustus: Prinzeps und Monarch* (Darmstadt 1982) [3rd edition with corrections and additions: (Darmstadt 1999³)].

-----, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt 1990) [6th edition with corrections and additions, by D. Kienast, W. Eck and M. Heil: (Darmstadt 2017⁴)].

Kilpatrick, R.S., *The poetry of criticism; Horace, Epistles II and Ars Poetica* (Edmonton 1990).

Kißel, W., review of Thomas (2001), *Gnomon* 75 (2003) 733-735.

Klein, R., 'Das spätantike Romverständnis vor Augustinus', *BJ* 185 (1985) 97-142.

Kleiner, D.E.E., 'Semblance and Storytelling in Augustan Rome', in: Galinsky (2005) 197-233.

Klingner, F., 'Virgil und die geschichtliche Welt', in: Id., *Römische Geisteswelt* (Leipzig 1943) 91-112 [= (München 1965⁵) 293-311= (Stuttgart 1979) 293-311].

-----, *Virgil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* (Zürich 1967).

Klodt, C., *Bescheidene Grösse. Die Herrschergestalt, der Kaiserpalast und die Stadt Rom: Literarische Reflexionen monarchischer Selbstdarstellung* (Göttingen 2001).

Kluczek, A.A., 'Conditores Urbis Romae, Livius and Roman coins', in: A. Gillmeister (ed.), *Rerum gestarum monumentis et memoriae. Cultural readings in Livy* (Warszawa 2018) 105-126.

Kofler, W., *Aeneas und Vergil: Untersuchungen zur poetologischen Dimension der Aeneis* (Heidelberg 2003).

Kolb, F., *Diocletian und die Erste Tetrarchie. Improvisation oder Experiment in der Organisation monarchischer Herrschaft?* (Berlin 1987).

-----, 'Bemerkungen zur urbanen Ausstattung von Städten im Westen und im Osten des Römischen Reiches anhand von Tacitus, Agricola 21 und der Konstantinischen Inschrift von Orkistos', *Klio* 75 (1993) 321-341.

-----, *Herrsscherideologie in der Spätantike* (Berlin 2001).

Kolter, C., *Die Einstellung vorkonstantinischer Apologeten zum römischen Staat am Beispiel der römischen Frühzeit* (diss. Aachen 2008).

Konstan, D., 'Narrative and Ideology in Livy: Book I', *CA* 5 (1986) 198-215.

Koortbojian, M., *The divinization of Caesar and Augustus: precedents, consequences, implications* (Cambridge 2013).

Körfer, A.-L., *Kaiser Konstantin als Leser. Panegyrik, performance und Poetologie in den carmina Optatians* (Berlin 2020).

Kornemann, E., 'Zum Augustusjahr', *Klio* 31 (1938) 81-91.

-----, 'Das Problem des Untergangs der antiken Welt', in: K. Christ (ed.), *Der Untergang des römischen Reiches* (Darmstadt 1970) 201-227 [reprinted from *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* 12 (1922) 242-246].

Körner, C.A., *Philippus Arabs: ein Soldatenkaiser in der Tradition des antoninisch-severischen Prinzipats* (Berlin 2002).

Kraggerud, E., 'Which Julius Caesar? On Aen. 1, 286-296', *SO* 67 (1992) 103-112.

-----, 'Caesar versus Caesar again: a reply', *SO* 69 (1994) 83-93.

Krallis, D., 'Greek glory, Constantinian legend: Praxagoras' Athenian agenda in Zosimos *New history?*', *JLA* 7 (2014) 110-130.

Kraft, K., 'Zur Münzprägung des Augustus', *Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main* 7.5 (1969).

Kraus, C.S., 'No Second Troy': Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, book V', *TAPhA* 124 (1994) 267-289.

Krautheimer, R., *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley 1983).

Kruse, M., *The Politics of Roman Memory: From the Fall of the Western Empire to the Age of Justinian* (Philadelphia 2019).

Kuhn, C.T., 'Cassius Dio's Funeral Speech for Augustus: Sources, Rhetoric, Messages', in: Davenport and Mallan (2021) 115-132.

Kytzler, B. (ed.), *Roma aeterna. Lateinische und griechische Romdichtung aus Antike, Mittelalter, Renaissance und Gegenwart* (Zürich 1972).

Ladjimi Sebaï, L., *La colline de Byrsa à l'époque romaine: étude épigraphique et état de la question* (Paris 2005) = *Karthago* 26 (2005).

Lampe, G.W.H. et al. (ed.), *A Patristic Greek lexicon I: α-Βαραθρόω* (Oxford 1961).

Lana, I., *Due capitoli prudenziiani: la biografia, la cronologia delle opere, la poetica* (Roma 1962).

Landucci, F., 'La translatio imperii dal mondo greco al mondo romano', *Erga-Logoi* 6 (2018) 7-28.

Landwehr, B., *Geschichte des Sagbaren. Einführung in die historische Diskursanalyse* (Tübingen 2001).

La Rocca, E., 'La fondazione di Constantinopoli', in: G. Bonamente et al. (ed.), *Constantino il Grande dall'antichità all'umanesimo* II (Macerata 1993) 553-583.

-----, 'Dal culto di Ottaviano all'apoteosi di Augusto', in: G. Urso (ed.), *Dicere laudes: elogio, comunicazione, creazione del consenso* (Pisa 2011) 179-204.

-----, 'La Roma di mattoni diventa di marmo', in: La Rocca et al. (2013) 92-105.

La Rocca, E. et al. (ed.), *Augusto* (Milano 2013) [French edition: *Auguste* (Paris 2014)].

Lassère, J.-M., *Africa, quasi Roma. 256 av. J.-C.-711 ap. J.C.* (Aix-en-Provence 2015).

Lathoud, D., 'La consécration et la dédicace de Constantinople', *EO* 23 (1924) 289-314 & 24 (1925) 180-181.

Leadbetter, W.L., 'Best of Brothers: Fraternal Imagery in Panegyrics on Maximian Herculius', *CPh* 99 (2004) 257-266.

Leerssen, J., 'Imagology: History and method', in: M. Beller and J. Leerssen (ed.), *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. A Critical Survey* (Amsterdam 2007) 17-32.

Lenski, N.E., 'Evoking the pagan past: *instinctu divinitatis* and Constantine's capture of Rome', *JLA* 1 (2008) 204-257.

----- (2012a) = 'The Reign of Constantine', in: Lenski (2012b) 59-90.

----- (2012b) = N.E. Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine. Revised edition* (Cambridge 2012²).

-----, 'Constantine and the Tyche of Constantinople', in: Wienand (2015) 330-352.

-----, *Constantine and the cities: imperial authority and civic politics* (Philadelphia 2016).

Leonardis, I., *Varrone, unus scilicet antiquorum hominum: senso del passato e pratica antiquaria* (Bari 2019).

-----, 'Varro and the Re-foundation of Roman Cultural Memory Through Genealogy and *Humanitas*', in: Dinter and Guerin (2023) 97-114.

Leppin, H. and W. Portmann, *Themistios: Staatsreden* (Stuttgart 1998).

Leppin, H. and H. Ziemssen, *Maxentius. Der letzte Kaiser in Rom* (Mainz 2007).

Leschhorn, W., *Gründer der Stadt. Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart 1984).

Lichtenberger, A., 'Philippoi oder Gorgippia – Zum Beginn der Benennung von Städten nach Herrschern in der griechischen Welt', in: H. Klinkott (ed.), *Anatolien im Lichte kultureller Wechselwirkungen. Akkulturationsphänomene in Kleinasiens und seinen Nachbarregionen während des 2. und 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (Tübingen 2001) 167-180.

Lieberg, G., *Poeta creator. Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1982).

Lieu, S.N.C. and D. Montserrat (ed.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine views: a source history* (London 1996).

-----, *Constantine: history, historiography, and legend* (London 1998).

Lipka, M., *Language in Vergil's Eclogues* (Berlin 2001).

Lippold, A., *Die Historia Augusta: eine Sammlung römischer Kaiserbiographien aus der Zeit Konstantins* (Stuttgart 1998).

Liverani, P., 'Dal palatum imperiale al palatum pontificio', in J.R. Brandt (ed.), *Rome AD 300-800: power and symbol, image and reality* (Rome 2003) 143-163 [= AAAH 17 (2003) 143-163].

-----, 'Saint Peter's, Leo the Great and the leprosy of Constantine', *PBSR* 76 (2008) 155-172.

-----, 'Old St. Peter's and the emperor Constans? A debate with G. W. Bowersock', *JRA* 28 (2015) 485-504.

-----, 'Costantino il vincitore: a proposito di una recente pubblicazione', *RAC* 93 (2017) 315-343.

Löhr, W., 'Western Christianities', in: A. Casiday and F.W. Norris (ed.), *Cambridge History of Christianity* II: *Constantine to c. 600* (Cambridge 2007) 9-51.

Lombardo, S., *Virgil, Aeneid. Translated by Stanley Lombardo. Introduction by W. R. Johnson* (Indianapolis 2005).

Longo, F., 'From Sybaritic *Teichos* to Poseidonia. Reflections on the origins and early decades in the Life of an Achaean *apoikia*', in: E. Greco and A. Rizakis (ed.), *Gli Achei in Grecia e in Magna Grecia: nuove scoperte e nuove prospettive* (Atene 2019) 465-484.

Lönstrup, G., 'Constructing Myths: The Foundation of Roma Christiana on 29 June', *ARID* 33 (2008) 27-64.

-----, *Concordia Apostolorum – Concordia Augustorum: The Making of Shared Memory in and between the Two Romes in the Fourth and Fifth Century* (diss. Aarhus 2010).

----- (= Lönstrup Dal Santo, G.), 'Storytelling and Cultural Memory in the Making: Celebrating Pagan and Christian Founders of Rome', in: Salzman, Sághy and Lippi Testa (2015) 328-340.

Loriot, X. and D. Nony, *La crise de l'empire romain: 235-285* (Paris 1997).

Louden, B., 'The Gods in Epic, or the Divine Economy', in: J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Malden, MA 2005) 90-104.

Lowrie, M., *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome* (Oxford 2009).

Löx, M., *monumenta sanctorum. Rom und Mailand als Zentren des frühen Christentums: Märtyrerkult und Kirchenbau unter den Bischöfen Damasus und Ambrosius* (Wiesbaden 2013).

Lubbe, W.J.G., *Incerti panegyricus Constantino Augusto dictus. Teksuitgave met inleiding en vertaling* (diss. Leiden 1955).

Luce, T.J., 'Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum', in K. Raaflaub and M. Toher (ed.), *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate* (Berkeley 1990) 123-138.

Lühken, M., *Christianorum Maro et Flaccus: zur Vergil- und Horazrezeption des Prudentius* (Göttingen 2002).

Luke, T.S., *Ushering in a new republic: theologies of arrival at Rome in the first century BCE* (Ann Arbor 2014).

Lyne, R.O.A.M., 'Propertius and Tibullus: early exchanges', *CQ* 48 (1998) 519-544.

Maccari, A., 'Auctis populi Romani finibus. Lo ius preferendi pomerii in età imperiale e il "pomerio romuleo" di Claudio in Tac. *Ann. XII, 24'*, *SCO* 63 (2017) 219-247.

MacCormack, S., 'Latine prose panegyrics', in: T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and aftermath* (London 1975) 143-205 [= REAug 22 (1976) 29-77], of which pages 177-186 were reprinted in R. Rees (ed.), *Latin panegyric. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* (Oxford 2012) 240-250.

-----, *The shadows of poetry. Vergil in the mind of Augustine* (Berkeley 1998).

Machado, C., 'Building the Past. Monuments and Memory in the Forum Romanum', in: W. Bowden, A. Gutteridge and C. Machado (ed.), *Social and Political Life in Late Antiquity* (Leiden 2006) 157-192.

-----, *Urban Space and Aristocratic Power in Late Antique Rome: AD 270-535* (Oxford 2019).

Mackail, J.W., 'Virgil's use of the word *ingens*', *CR* 26 (1912) 251-254.

-----, 'The *Aeneid* as a work of art', *CJ* 26 (1930) 12-18.

Mac Sweeney, N., *Foundation myths in ancient societies: dialogues and discourses* (Philadelphia 2015).

Madsen, J.M. and C.H. Lange (ed.), *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches* (Leiden 2021).

Malamud, M., *A poetics of transformation: Prudentius and classical mythology* (Ithaca 1989).

Malkin, I., 'What's in a name? The eponymous founders of Greek colonies', *Athenaeum* 63 (1985) 114-130.

-----, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden 1987).

-----, 'Exploring the validity of the concept of "foundation": a visit to Megara Hyblaia', in: V.B. Gorman and E.W. Robinson (ed.), *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham* (Leiden 2002) 195-225.

Maltby, R., *A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies* (Leeds 1991).

Manders, E., *Coining Images of Power: Patterns in the Representation of Roman Emperors on Imperial Coinage, A.D. 193-284* (Leiden 2012).

Mango, C., *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e - VII^e siècles)* (Paris 1985).

-----, 'Constantine', in: A.P. Kazhdan et al. (ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium* (Oxford 1991) 508-512.

-----, 'Introduction', in: C. Mango and G. Dagron (ed.), with G. Greatrex, *Constantinople and its Hinterland, Papers from the Twenty-seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (Oxford April 1993)* (Aldershot 1995) 1-6.

-----, 'Introduction', in: C. Mango (ed.), *The Oxford history of Byzantium* (Oxford 2002) 1-16.

Mann, J.C., 'Dukes and comites in the fourth century', in: D.E. Johnston (ed.), *The Saxon Shore* (London 1977) 11-15.

Marangoni, C., *Supplementum etymologicum latinum I* [suppl. to Maltby (1991)] (Trieste 2007).

Marcone, A., *Costantino il Grande* (Roma 2000).

-----, *Pagano e cristiano: vita e mito di Costantino* (Roma 2002).

Marcos, M., 'Costantino, Elena e il culto di Luciano d'Antiochia ad Elenopoli', in: Canella (2016) 413-430.

Margutti, S., 'Costantinopoli e le sue origini troiane', *RAL* 9.5 (2014) 153-182.

Markus, R.A., *Saeculum: history and society in the theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge 1970).

Marlowe, E., 'Liberator urbis sua: Constantine and the ghost of Maxentius', in: B.C. Ewald and C.F. Noreña (ed.), *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual* (Cambridge 2010) 199-219.

Martin, P.M., *L'idée de royaute à Rome* II (Clermont-Ferrand 1994).

Martindale, C., 'Descent Into Hell: Reading Ambiguity, or Virgil and the Critics', *PVS* 21 (1993) 111-150.

----- (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge 1997).

Mastrocinque, A., 'Guerra di Troia e guerra civile in Orazio', *AIIS* 12 (1991-1994) 347-356.

Matijevic, K., 'Beobachtungen zur Gründung von Lugdunum/Lyon', *Gymnasium* 115 (2008) 141-168.

Matthes, M.M., *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics: Readings in Livy, Machiavelli and Rousseau* (University Park, PA 2000).

Mattingly, H., E.A. Sydenham and C.H.V. Sutherland, *The Roman imperial coinage* IV.3 (London 1949).

Mause, M., *Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik* (Stuttgart 1994).

Mayer, E., *Rom ist dort, wo der Kaiser ist: Untersuchungen zu den Staatsdenkmälern des dezentralisierten Reiches von Diocletian bis zu Theodosius II* (Mainz 2002).

Mazé, C., '«C'est comme son monument qu'il a fait cela». Fondations et restaurations cultuelles en Égypte ancienne (III^e millénaire – mi-II^e millénaire av. J.-C.): de l'occupation de l'espace à l'ordonnancement du temps?', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlet and Rivoal (2017) 169-186.

Mazzarino, S., 'La data dell'*Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum*, il *ius Italicum* e la fondazione di Costantinopoli: note sui discorsi di Costantino', in: Id., *Antico, tardoantico ed èra costantiniana* I (Città di Castello 1974) 99-150.

Mazzoni, C., *She-wolf: the story of a Roman icon* (Cambridge 2010).

McEvoy, M. and M. Moser, 'Introducing imperial presence in late antique Rome (2nd-7th centuries AD)', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 15-21.

McGlew, J.F., *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1993).

McGushin, P., 'Aeneas' lasting city', *Latomus* 24 (1965) 411-420.

McIntyre, G., 'Camillus as Numa: religion in Livy's refoundation narratives', *JAH* 6 (2018) 63-79.

McLynn, N.B., *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkely 1994).

Meeks, W.A., *The first urban Christians. The social world of the apostle Paul* (New Haven 1983).

Mellor, R., *The Roman historians* (London 1999).

Meyboom, P.G.P., 'The Creation of an Imperial Tradition. Ideological Aspects of the House of Augustus', in: K.A.E. Enenkel and I.L. Pfeijffer (ed.), *The Manipulative Mode* (Leiden 2005) 219-274.

Miles, G.B., *Virgil's Georgics. A new interpretation* (Berkeley 1980).

-----, 'The cycle of Roman history in Livy's first pentad', *AJPh* 107 (1986) 1-33.

-----, 'Maiores, conditores, and Livy's perspective on the past', *TAPhA* 118 (1988) 185-208.

-----, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca 1995).

-----, 'The *Aeneid* as Foundation Story', in: Perkell (1999a) 231-250.

Millar, F., *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC - AD 337)* (London 1977).

Miller, J.F., *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* (Cambridge 2009).

Mineo, B., 'Camille, dux fatalis', in: G. Lachenau and D. Longrée (ed.), *Greco et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire I: Représentations, récits et idéologie* (Rennes 2003) 159-175.

-----, 'Livy's Historical Philosophy', in: B. Mineo (ed.), *A Companion to Livy* (Malden 2015) 139-152.

Mitchell, S., 'The Cities of Asia Minor in the Age of Constantine', in: Lieu and Montserrat (1998) 52-73.

-----, *A history of the later Roman Empire, AD 284-641* (Malden, MA 2007).

Mittag, P.F., 'Prima urbes inter... aurea Roma? Roma und die Münzprägung der Jahre 364 bis 476 n. Chr.', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 235-241.

Mócsy, A., 'Ubique res publica. Zu den Autonomiebestrebungen und Uniformierungstendenzen am Vorabend des Dominats', *AAntHung* 10 (1962) 367-384.

Modrow, S., *Vom punischen zum römischen Karthago. Konfliktreflexionen und die Konstruktion römischer Identität* (Heidelberg 2017).

Mohlberg, K.L., 'Historisch-kritische Bemerkungen zum Ursprung der sogenannten 'Memoria Apostolorum' an der Appischen Strasse', in: B. Fischer and V. Fiala (ed.), *Colligere Fragmenta. Festschrift für A. Dold zum 70. Geburtstag am 7.7. 1952* (Beuron 1952) 52-74.

Möller, J., 'Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis: die Camillus-Darstellung als Kommentar zur Errichtung des Prinzipats', *AU* 57 (2014) 36-41.

Mokni, S., 'Les premiers temps de la Carthage romaine' et la titulature de la colonie', *CCG* 19 (2008) 53-76.

Moreno Resano, E., 'La política de fundación de ciudades de Constantino 306-337', *Historia Antigua* 19-20 (2006-2007) 285-307.

Mortensen, E. 'Ktistes: mythical founder hero and honorary title for new heroes', *ActaHyp* 14 (2015) 213-237.

Morwood, J., 'Aeneas, Augustus, and the Theme of the City', *G&R* 38 (1991) 212-223.

Moser, M., *Emperor and senators in the reign of Constantius II. Maintaining imperial rule between Rome and Constantinople in the fourth century AD* (Cambridge 2018).

-----, review of D. Burgersdijk & A. Ross (ed.), *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire* (Leiden), *BMCRevO3.33* (2019).

Most, G.W., 'Memory and forgetting in the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 47 (2001) 148-170.

Most, G.W. and S. Spence, 'Introduction [Re-Presenting Virgil: Special Issue in Honor of Michael C. J. Putnam]', *MD* 52 (2004) 11-19.

Müller, G.A., *Formen und Funktionen der Vergilzitate bei Augustin von Hippo* (Paderborn 2003).

Mundt, F., 'Die Rolle der Stadt in der lateinischen Herrscherpanegyrik am Beispiel Roms und Mailands', in Fuhrer (2012) 163-187.

Murphy, M.L., *Lexical Meaning* (Cambridge 2010).

Nadeau, Y., *Safe and subsidized: Vergil and Horace sing Augustus* (Bruxelles 2004).

Nagle, B.R. (ed.), *The Silvae of Statius* (Bloomington 2004).

Neel, J., *Legendary rivals: collegiality and ambition in the tales of early Rome* (Leiden 2014).

Neil, B., *Leo the Great* (London 2009).

Nelis, D.P., 'L'Énéide et les origines de Rome: l'épopée étiologique', in: V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland (ed.), *Origines gentium* (Paris 2001) 223-240.

----- (2015a) = 'Vergilian Cities. Visions of Troy, Carthage and Rome', in: T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City* (Berlin 2015) 19-46.

----- (2015b) = 'Juno, sea-storm and emotion in Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.1-156: Homeric and Epicurean contexts', in: D. Cairns and L. Fulkerson (ed.), *Emotions Between Greece and Rome* (London 2015) 149-161.

Nelis, J., s.v. 'Schepping', in: A. van den Born (ed.), *Bijbels Woordenboek* (Roermond 1966-1969) 1282-1286.

Neri, V., 'La figura di Costantino negli scrittori latini cristiani dell'età di Onorio', *Simblos* 1 (1995) 229-264.

Nesselrath, H-G., 'Die Gens Iulia und Romulus bei Livius (Liv. I 11-16)', *WJA* 16 (1990) 153-172.

Nestle, E., E. Nestle, and K. Aland (ed.), *Novum Testamentum graece et latine* (London 1969²²).

Newman, R.J., 'A dialogue of power in the coinage of Antony and Octavian (44-30 B.C.)', *AJN* 2 (1990) 37-63.

Nicastri, L., *Per una iniziazione a Virgilio* (Salerno 2006).

Nickbakht, M.A. and Scardino, C. (ed.), *Aurelius Victor. Historiae Abbreviatae* (Paderborn 2021).

Niehl, R., *Vergils Vergil: Selbstzitat und Selbstdeutung in der Aeneis: ein Kommentar und Interpretationen* (Bern/ Frankfurt am Main 2002).

Nikolopoulos, A.D., 'Patriam mutare: colonization in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', QUCC 83 (2006) 71-81.

Nixon, C.E.V., 'The panegyric of 307 and Maximian's visits to Rome', *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 70-76.

Nixon, C.E.V. and B.S. Rodgers, *In praise of later Roman emperors: the Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary, with the Latin Text of R. A. B. Mynors* (Berkeley 1994).

Noethlichs, K.L., 'Zur Entstehung der Diözesen als Mittelinstantz des spätromischen Verwaltungssystems', *Historia* 31 (1982) 70-81.

Norton, P., *Episcopal elections, 250-600: hierarchy and popular will in late antiquity* (Oxford 2007).

Ntantalia, F., *Die Bronzemedailloons unter Konstantin dem Großen und seinen Söhnen. Die Bildtypen der Constantinopolis und die kaiserliche Medaillonprägung von 330-363 n. Chr.* (Saarbrücken 2001).

Oakley, S.P., *A commentary on Livy.: Books VI-X, I: Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford 1997).

----- (1998a) = *A commentary on Livy.: Books VI-X, II: Books VII-VIII* (Oxford 1998).

----- (1998b) = review of Miles (1995), *CP* 93 (1998) 279-286.

Oberhummer, E., s.v. 'Constantinopolis' in RE IV.1 (1900) 963-1013.

Oenbrink, W., 'Maxentius als *conservator urbis suae*. Ein antitetrarchisches Herrschaftskonzept tetrarchischer Zeit', in: D. Boschung and W. Eck (ed.), *Die Tetrarchie. Ein neues Regierungssystem und seine mediale Präsentation* (Köln 2006) 168-209.

Ogilvie, R.M., 'Lustrum condere', *JRS* 51 (1961) 31-39.

-----, *A commentary on Livy, books 1-5* (Oxford 1965).

O'Hara, J.J., *Death and Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton 1990).

-----, 'Temporal distortions, «fatal» ambiguity, and *Iulius Caesar at Aeneid 1.286-96*', *SO* 69 (1994) 72-82.

Olbrich, K., 'Kaiser in der Krise – religions- und rechtsgeschichtliche Aspekte der 'Familienmorde' des Jahres 326', *Klio* 92 (2010) 104-116.

-----, 'Die Gründung Konstantinopels zwischen Sagenkreisen und Zeitzyklen: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion constantinisch-augusteischer Kultprogramme', *Klio* 97 (2015) 176-228.

O'Neill, J.R., 'Claudius the Censor and the Rhetoric of Re-Foundation', *CJ* 116 (2020) 216-240.

Oosten, D., 'The Mausoleum of Helena and the adjoining basilica *ad duas lauros*: construction, evolution and reception', in: Verhoeven, Bosman and van Asperen (2016) 131-143.

Oppermann, H. (ed.), *Wege zu Vergil. Drei Jahrzehnte Begegnungen in Dichtung und Wissenschaft* (Darmstadt 1963).

Orlandi, S., *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente romano VI: Roma. Anfiteatri e strutture annesse, con una nuova edizione e commento delle iscrizioni del Colosseo* (Roma 2005).

Orlandini, A.M. and P. Poccetti, 'Three types of negation: different values of *nec* in Latin and in the languages of ancient Italy', in: R. Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif* (Hildesheim 2008) 1-12.

O'Rourke, D., 'The representation and misrepresentation of Virgilian poetry in Propertius 2.34', *AJPh* 132 (2011) 457-497.

Osborne, R., 'Epilogue', in: Mac Sweeney (2015) 227-233.

Osborne, R. and C. Vout, 'A Revolution in Roman History?', *JRS* 100 (2010) 233-245.

Paduano, G. (ed.), *Virgilio. Tutte le opere* (Milano 2016).

Palmer, A.-M., *Prudentius on the martyrs* (Oxford 1989).

Panella, C., 'I segni del potere', in: Id. (ed.), *I segni del potere: realtà e immaginario della sovranità nella Roma imperiale* (Bari 2011) 25-76.

Pansard-Benson, J., *Visualizing the origins of Rome: art, identity and foundation mythology in the early mid empire* (MPhil diss., Cambridge 2007).

-----, *Visualising Rome's Foundation myths* (diss. Cambridge 2012).

Papi, E., s.v. 'Statua: Lupa, Romulus et Remus', in *LTUR* V (1999) 290-291.

Paratore, E., 'La storia di Roma nella poesia epica latina', in: *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema 'La poesia epica e la sua formazione'* (Roma 1970) 117-178 = in: Id., *Romanae litterae* (Roma 1976) 127-189.

----- (ed.), *Virgilio, Eneide*, I: *Libri I-II* (Milano 1978), II: *Libri III-IV* (Milano 1978), III: *Libri V-VI* (Milano 1979), IV: *Libri VII-VIII* (Milano 1981), V: *Libri IX-X* (Milano 1982), VI: *Libri XI-XII* (Milano 1983).

Paribenì, A., 'Le città costantiniane: da York a Gerusalemme', in: A. Melloni (ed.), *Costantino I. Enciclopedia Costantiniana* I (Roma 2013) 433-451.

Pascale, G., *Temistio, Orationes 4, 5, 7. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Bari 2022).

Paschoud, F., *Roma aeterna: études sur le patriotisme romain dans l'Occident latin à l'époque des grandes invasions* (Rome 1967).

----- (ed.), *Zosime: Nouvelle Histoire* (Paris 2000).

-----, s.v. 'Rom II (Sinnbild)', in: T. Klauser et al. (ed.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* XXIX (Stuttgart 2019) 138-192.

Pearcy, L.T., review of Fletcher (2014), *BMCRev* 09.07 (2015).

Pelling, C., 'The triumviral period', in *CAH* X² (1996) 1-69.

Penella, R.J., *Man and the word: the orations of Himerius* (Berkeley 2007).

Penwill, J.L., 'De integro condere: rediscovering Numa in Livy's Rome', *Scholia* 13 (2004) 28-55.

Perkell (1999a) = C. Perkell (ed.), *Reading Vergil's Aeneid* (Norman 1999; repr. 2002, 2006).

----- (1999b) = 'Aeneid 1: An Epic Programme', in: Perkell (1999a) 29-49.

Perret, J. (ed.), *Virgile, Énéide, livres I-IV* (Paris 1977).

Petersen, H., 'Livy and Augustus', *TAPhA* 92 (1961) 440-452.

Petrović, I., 'Deification: gods or men?', in: E. Eidinow and J. Kindt (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of ancient Greek religion* (Oxford 2015) 429-443.

Pietri, C., 'Concordia apostolorum et renovatio urbis (Culte des martyrs et propagande pontificale)', *MEFR* 73 (1961) 275-322.

-----, *Roma Christiana: recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte* (Rome 1976).

Pippidi, D., 'Occentare sive carmen condere', *Orph* (1928) 65-71.

Plischke, S., 'Herrschartslegitimation und Städtekult', in: L.-M. Günther and S. Plischke (ed.), *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult* (Berlin 2011) 55-76.

Poletti, B., *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the 'Founders' of Rome: Depicting Characters in the Roman Antiquities* (diss. Alberta 2018).

Pollini, J., *From Republic To Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, And Power In The Visual Culture Of Ancient Rome* (Norman 2012).

Pollmann, K., 'Augustins Transformation der traditionellen römischen Staats- und Geschichtsauffassung (Buch 1-5)', in: C. Horn (ed.), *Augustinus. De civitate dei* (Berlin 1997) 25-40.

Pont, A.-V., 'L'empereur «fondateur»: enquête sur les motifs de la reconnaissance civique', *REG* 120 (2007) 526-552.

-----, 'Septime Sévère à Byzance: l'invention d'un fondateur', *AntTard* 18 (2010) 191-198.

Porte, D., 'Romulus-Quirinus, prince et dieu, dieu des princes. Étude sur le personnage de Quirinus et sur son évolution, des origines à Auguste', in *ANRW* II.17.1 (1981) 300-342.

Portmann, W., *Geschichte in der spätantiken Panegyrik* (Frankfurt am Main 1988).

Pöschl, V., *Die Dichtkunst Virgils. Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis* (Wiesbaden 1950) = (tr. G. Seligson) *The art of Vergil. Image and symbol in the Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 1962).

Potter, D., *The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180-395* (London 2004).

-----, *Constantine the Emperor* (Oxford 2013).

-----, 'Writing Constantine', in: A.E. Siecienski (ed.), *Constantine: religious faith and imperial policy* (London 2017) 91-112.

Pouille, B., 'Néropolis', *Latomus* 69 (2010) 359-365.

Powell, B.B., *The Aeneid, Vergil. Translated from the Latin with notes and Introduction by Barry B. Powell, with a Foreword by Denis Feeney* (Oxford 2015).

Pratt, K.J., 'Rome as Eternal', *JHI* 26 (1965) 25-44.

Preger, T., 'Das Gründungsdatum von Konstantinopel', *Hermes* 36 (1901) 336-342.

Prehn, B., s.v. 'Ktistes' in *RE* XI.2 (1922) 2083-2087.

Price, S.R.F., *Rituals and power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).

Primmer, A., 'Zu Thema und Erzählstruktur der Aeneis', *WS* 14 (1980) 83-101.

-----, 'Das Tischprodigium im Rahmen der Aeneis', *WS* 107-108 (1994-1995) 397-416.

Priol, E., 'Refonder en Grèce à l'époque hellénistique: acte total ou mutation partielle? Les synœcismes dans le cadre des synopolies des années 350 aux années 150 av. J.-C.: l'exemple de Latmos et Pidasos', in: Gervais-Lambony, Hurlot and Rivoal (2017) 143-156.

Puech, V., 'Constantin vu par Malalas: la légende officielle du VIe siècle?', in: E. Amato, P. De Cicco and T. Moreau (ed.), *Canistrum ficiis plenum. Hommages à Bertrand Lançon. Revue des Études Tardo-antiques, Supplément V* (2018) 315-331.

Purcell, N., 'The Nicopolitan synoecism and Roman urban policy', in: E. Chrysos (ed.), *Nicopolis I. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Nicopolis* (Preveza 1987) 71-90.

Putnam, M.C.J., *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Ithaca 1965).

-----, 'Italian Virgil and the idea of Rome', in: L.L. Orlin (ed.), *Janus. Essays in ancient and modern studies* (Ann Arbor 1975) 171-199 [reprinted with minor modifications by the author in K. Volk (ed.), *Vergil's Georgics* (Oxford 2008) 138-160].

-----, *Virgil's poem of the earth. Studies in the Georgics* (Princeton 1979).

-----, *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill 1995).

-----, *The humanness of heroes. Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil's Aeneid* [with an Afterword by David Rijser] (Amsterdam 2011).

Quaranta, P., *Da Troia a Lavino: il mito di Enea nell'arte privata romana di età imperiale. Schemi, modelli e significati* (diss. Heidelberg 2015).

Quint, D., 'Painful Memories: *Aeneid* III and the Problem of the Past', *CJ* 78 (1982) 30-38.

-----, 'Repetition and Ideology in the *Aeneid*', *MD* 23 (1989) 9-54 [reprinted in P. Hardie (ed.), *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors IV* (London 1999) 117-157].

Radt, S.L., *Strabons Geographika VI: Buch V-VIII: Kommentar* (Göttingen 2007).

Ramskold, L. and N.E. Lenski, 'Constantinople's dedication medallions and the maintenance of civic traditions', *NZ* 119 (2012) 31-58.

Rea, J.A., *Legendary Rome: myth, monuments and memory on the Palatine and Capitoline* (London 2007).

Rebuffat, R., 'Maximien en Afrique', *Klio* 74 (1992) 371-379.

Reed, J.D., 'Vergil's Roman', in: Farrell and Putnam (2010) 66-79.

Rees, R., *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric, AD 289-307* (Oxford 2002).

----- (2004a) = 'Introduction', in: Id. (ed.), *Romane Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (London 2004) 1-16.

----- (2004b) = *Diocletian and the tetrarchy* (Edinburgh 2004).

Reitz-Joosse, B., *Building in Words. The Process of Construction in Latin Literature* (Oxford 2021).

Ribbeck, O. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis, Opera* (Lipsiae 1894-1895).

Richardson, J.H., 'On The Nature of the Romulean Tribes', *CJ* 117 (2022) 454-475.

Richardson, L., 'The Date and Program of the Arch of Constantine', *ArchClass* 27 (1975) 72-78.

----- (ed.), *Propertius, Elegies I-IV* (Norman, OK 1977).

Rieks, R., 'Vergils Dichtung als Zeugnis und Deutung der römischen Geschichte', in *ANRW* II.31.2 (1981) 728-868.

Rijser, D., *Een telkens nieuwe oudheid. Of: hoe Tiberius in New Jersey belandde* (Amsterdam 2016).

-----, 'Van broedermoord en erfzonde. De configuratie van het begin van Rome onder keizer Augustus', *Roma Aeterna* 7.1 (2019) 52-59.

Rimell, V., *The closure of space in Roman poetics: empire's inward turn* (Cambridge 2015).

Rimoldi, A., *L'apostolo San Pietro: fondamento della Chiesa, principe degli apostoli ed ostiario celeste nella Chiesa primitiva dalle origini al Concilio di Calcedonia* (Romae 1958).

Rissanen, M., 'The *Lupa Romana* in the Roman provinces', *AArchHung* 65 (2014) 335-360.

Rizos, E., 'Ubi Paulus et Sileas in carcere fuerunt. Sacral topography, civic memory, and Christianisation in Philippi', *JbAC* 62 (2019) 94-117.

Roberts, M.J., *Poetry and the Cult of the Martyrs: The Liber Peristephanon of Prudentius* (Ann Arbor 1993).

Rödel, C. and S. Ardeleanu, 'Nordafrika', in: T. Hölscher (ed.), *Handbuch der römischen Staatsdenkmäler* II (forthcoming).

Rodríguez Gérvás, M.J., *Propaganda política y opinión pública en los Panegíricos latinos del Bajo Imperio* (Salamanca 1991).

Rodríguez Mayorgas, A., 'Romulus, Aeneas and the cultural memory of the Roman Republic', *Athenaeum* 98 (2010) 89-109.

Roels, E.J.J., 'Iovius Augustus en Herculius Caesar? Het belang van de *signa* 'Iovius' en 'Herculius' onder de keizers van de tetrarchie', *Skript Historisch Tijdschrift* 35.1 (2013) 16-29.

----- (2018a) = *Textual monuments. Epigraphic dossiers on civic monuments in Hellenistic and Imperial Asia Minor (4th cent. BC – 3rd cent. AD)* (diss. Heidelberg 2018).

----- (2018b) = 'The Queen of inscriptions contextualized. The presence of civic inscriptions in the pronaos of ancient temples in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor (fourth century BCE–second century CE)', in S. de Blaauw and E. van Opstall (ed.), *Sacred thresholds. The door to the sanctuary in Late Antiquity* (Leiden 2018) 221-253.

-----, *The Writing on the Wall. Aspects of Epigraphic Culture(s) in Hellenistic Asia Minor* (forthcoming).

Rogerson, A. *Virgil's Ascanius: imagining the future in the Aeneid* (Cambridge 2017).

Rolfe, J.C. (ed.), *Suetonius* (revised edition; Cambridge, MA 1997-1998) [first published London 1913-1914].

Roller, D.W., *The building program of Herod the Great* (Berkeley 1998).

Rollins, A., *Rome in the Fourth Century A.D. An Annotated Bibliography with Historical Overview* (Jefferson, NC 1991).

Ross, A.J., 'Empire Inside Out: Celebrating Constantine's Victories between Rome and Trier.' *CQ* 72 (2022) 805–21.

Ross Holloway, R., *Constantine and Rome* (New Haven 2004).

Rothstein, M. (ed.), *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius I, I-II* (Berlin 1920²).

Rouse, W.H.D. and M.F. Smith (ed.), *Lucretius, De natura rerum, On the nature of things* (Cambridge, MA 1992²).

Rüpke, J., *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom* (Berlin 1995).

Ruscu, L., 'Actia Nicopolis', *ZPE* 157 (2006) 247–255.

Russell, T., *Byzantium and the Bosphorus. A Historical Study, from the Seventh Century BC until the Foundation of Constantinople* (Oxford 2017).

Russo, E., 'Costantino da Bisanzio a Costantinopoli', *AAAH* 29 (2018) 73–112.

Ryberg, I.S., 'Vergil's Golden Age', *TAPhA* 89 (1958) 112–131.

Sabo, T., 'The politics of the One', *AClass* 58 (2015) 209–216.

Sacks, K.H., *Diodorus Siculus and the first century* (Princeton 1990).

Sághy, M., 'Romanae Gloria Plebis. Bishop Damasus and the Traditions of Rome', in: Salzman, Sághy and Lizzi Testa (2015) 291–313.

Sahotsky, B.H., *The Roman Construction Process: Building the Basilica of Maxentius* (diss. Los Angeles 2016).

Sailor, D., 'Dirty Linen, Fabrication, and the Authorities of Livy and Augustus', *TAPhA* 136 (2006) 329–388.

Saladin, C.S., *Resurrecting Carthage: Mapping Memory and Identity in the Landscape of the Roman Colony, c. 146 BCE – 200 CE* (diss. University of Minnesota 2023).

Salzman, M., *On Roman time: the codex-calendar of 354 and the rhythms of urban life in late antiquity* (Berkeley 1990).

-----, 'Constantine and the Roman Senate: Conflict, Cooperation, and Concealed Resistance', in: Salzman, Sághy and Lizzi Testa (2015) 11–45.

Salzman, M.R., M. Sághy and R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), *Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome: Conflict, Competition, and Coexistence in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge 2015).

Santa Maria Scrinari, V., *Il Laterano Imperiale I: Dalle «Aedes Laterani» alla «Domus Faustae»* (Città del Vaticano 1991).

Santoro Lhoir, F., 'Heroic Epithets and Recurrent Themes in *Ab Urbe Condita*', *TAPhA* 120 (1990) 221–241.

Sauron, G., 'Mythe et pouvoir: la mystification augustéenne', in: La Rocca et al. (2014) 32–36 [extended version of 'Mito e potere: la mistificazione augustea', in: La Rocca et al. (2013) 85–88].

Schanz, M. and C. Hosius, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft VIII.2.ii: Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian* (München 1935⁴).

Schauer, M., *Aeneas dux in Vergils Aeneis. Eine literarische Fiktion in augusteischer Zeit* (München 2007).

Scheid, J., 'Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation', in: Galinsky (2005) 175–193.

Scheithauer, A., 'Die Römer und ihre Frühzeit', *RhM* 141 (1998) 286–307.

Schettino, M.T., 'L'histoire archaïque de Rome dans les fragments de Dion Cassius', in E. Caire and S. Pittia (ed.), *Guerre et diplomatie romaines (IV^e – III^e siècles av. J.-C.). Pour un réexamen des sources* (Aix-en-Provence 2006) 61–75.

Schiesaro, A., review of O'Hara (1990), *CP* 88 (1993) 258–265.

Schirner, R.S., *Inspice diligenter codices: philologische Studien zu Augustins Umgang mit Bibelhandschriften und -übersetzungen* (Berlin 2015).

Schmidt, E.A., 'The Meaning of Vergil's *Aeneid*: American and German Approaches', *CW* 94 (2000) 145-171.

Schörner, G., 'Different Pasts: Using and Constructing Memory in Augustan Carthage and Corinth', in: Dinter and Guerin (2023) 394-412.

Schwartz, E., *Gesammelte Schriften III: Zur Geschichte des Athanasius* (Berlin 1959).

Seeck, O., 'Die Zeitfolge der Gesetze Constantins', *ZRG* 10 (1889) 177-251.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Statius, Silvae* (Cambridge, MA 2003) = [revised edition with corrections by C.A. Parrott (Cambridge, MA 2015²)].

Siecienski, A.E., *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford 2017).

Simonetti, M., *Innologia Ambrosiana* (Alba 1956) = Id. (ed.), *Ambrogio, Inni* (Firenze 1988).

Singer, J., Singer, *URBS CAPTA – COLONIA DEDUCTA. Die Verarbeitung der Neugründungen Capuas, Korinths und Karthagos in der augusteischen Literatur* (diss. München 2022).

Sini, F., 'Initia Urbis. La fondazione di Roma tra teologia e diritto nei poeti dell'epoca di Augusto (Virgilio e Ovidio)', *Diritto @ Storia. Scienze Giuridiche e Tradizione Romana* 1 (2002) [online at http://eprints.uniss.it/128/1/Sini_F_Articolo_2002_Initia.pdf]

-----, 'Initia Urbis e sistema giuridico-religioso romano (*Ius sacrum* e *ius publicum* tra terminologia e sistematica)', *Diritto @ Storia. Scienze Giuridiche e Tradizione Romana* 2 (2004) [online at http://eprints.uniss.it/154/1/Sini_F_Articolo_2004_Initia.pdf]

Sistikou, E., 'Beyond the *Argonautica*: In Search of Apollonius' *Ktisis* Poems', in: T.D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (ed.), *Brill's companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden 2008²) 311-340.

Sluiter, I., 'Anchoring Innovation: A Classical Research Agenda', *European Review* 25 (2017) 1-19.

-----, 'Oud is het nieuwe nieuw. Een inleiding op Anchoring Innovation', *Lampas* 51 (2018) 289-295.

Smith, C.J., 'Caesar and the history of early Rome', in: G. Urso (ed.), *Cesare: precursore o visionario?* (Pisa 2010) 249-264.

-----, 'Varro and the contours of Roman antiquarianism', *Latomus* 77 (2019) 1090-1118.

Smith, R.R.R., Review of Torelli (1982), *JRS* 73 (1983) 225-228.

Spannagel, M. *Exemplaria principis: Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* (Heidelberg 1999).

Speck, P., 'Urbs, quam Deo donavimus. Konstantins des Großen Konzept für Konstantinopel', *Boreas* 18 (1995) 143-173.

Stahl, H.-P., *Poetry underpinning power. Vergil's Aeneid: the epic for Emperor Augustus. A recovery study* (Swansea 2016).

Starr, R. J., 'Annos undeviginti natus: Augustus and Romulus in *Res gestae* 1.1', *Historia* 58 (2009) 367-369.

Steffensen, N., *Nachdenken über Rom: literarische Konstruktionen der römischen Geschichte in der Formierungsphase des Principats* (Stuttgart 2018).

Stégen, G., *Le livre I de l'Énéide* (Namur 1975).

Stephenson, P., *Constantine: Unconquered Emperor, Christian Victor* (London 2009).

Stevenson, T. R., 'Parens Patriae and Livy's Camillus', *Ramus* 29 (2000) 27-46.

Stocks, C., 'Romuleos superabit voce nepotes: remembering Romulus in Silius Italicus', in: A. Augoustakis and M. Fucecchi (ed.), *Silius Italicus and the tradition of the Roman historical epos* (Leiden 2022) 249-265.

Storoni Mazzolani, L., *L'idea di città nel mondo romano: l'evoluzione del pensiero politico di Roma* (Napoli 1967).

Straub, J., 'Die Zinsgesetze des Severus Alexander', in: Id. (ed.), *Regeneratio imperii. Aufsätze über Roms Kaisertum und Reich im Spiegel der heidnischen und christlichen Publizistik* (Darmstadt 1972) 304-313 [originally published as 'Il precesto aureo', in *Atti del Colloquio Patavino sulla Historia Augusta* (Roma 1963) 21-28].

Strubbe, J.H.M., 'Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität', *AncSoc* 15-17 (1984-1986) 253-304.

Stübler, G. *Die Religiosität des Livius* (Stuttgart 1941).

Suerbaum, W., 'Aeneas zwischen Troja und Rom. Zur Funktion der Genealogie und der Ethnographie in Vergils *Aeneis*', *Poetica* 1 (1967) 176-204.

-----, 'Der Aeneas Vergils – Mann zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft', *Gymnasium* 100 (1993) 419-447.

Sullivan, J.P., 'Form opposed: elegy, epigram, satire', in: A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Roman epic* (London 1993) 143-161.

Swist, J.J., *A principio reges: the reception of the seven kings of Rome in imperial historiography from Tiberius to Theodosius* (diss. Univ. of Iowa 2020).

Syme, R., *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939).

-----, 'Imperator Caesar, a study in nomenclature', *Historia* 7 (1958) 172-188 [reprinted in Id., *Roman Papers I* (Oxford 1979) 361-377].

-----, 'Livy and Augustus', *HSPh* 64 (1959) 27-87 [reprinted in Id., *Roman Papers I* (Oxford 1979) 400-454].

Tallet, P., 'Remarques sur la fondation des villes en Égypte pharaonique', *Histoire urbaine* 13 (2005) 33-50.

Tarrant, R. (ed.), *Virgil: Aeneid, Book XII* (Cambridge 2012).

Taylor, L.R., *The divinity of the Roman emperor* (Middletown 1931).

Tedeschi, A. 'Il vetro dei Vicennalia dell'Antiquarium Comunale di Roma: una nuova proposta di lettura', *BCAR* 94 (1991/1992) 33-50.

Tennyson, T.T., 'Cicero's Romulus and the crafting of historical *exempla*', *History of Political Thought* 43 (2022) 1-30.

Termeer, M. K., *Latin colonization in Italy before the end of the Second Punic War. Colonial communities and cultural change* (diss. Groningen 2015).

-----, 'Placing the gods in a colonial setting: sanctuaries in Norba and Paestum', in: C. Williamson (ed.), *Sacred Landscapes, Connecting Routes. Religious Topographies in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leuven 2024) 123-142.

Ternes, C.-M. (ed.), *Condere Urbem* (Luxembourg 1992).

Thacker, A., 'Patrons of Rome: the cult of Sts Peter and Paul at court and in the city in the fourth and fifth centuries', *EME* 20 (2012).

Thomas, R.F., 'From *recusatio* to commitment: the evolution of the Vergilian programme', *PLLS* 5 (1985) 61-73.

-----, 'Genre through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius', in: M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (ed.), *Theocritus* (Groningen 1996) 227-246.

-----, *Reading Virgil and His Texts. Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor 1999).

-----, *Virgil and the Augustan reception* (Cambridge 2001).

-----, 'Torn between Jupiter and Saturn: ideology, rhetoric and culture wars in the *Aeneid*', *CJ* 100 (2004-2005) 121-147.

Thraede, K., 'Das Antike Rom in Augustins *De Civitate Dei*. Recht und Grenzen ein verjährtens Themas', *JbAC* 20 (1977) 90-148.

Tilly, B., *P. Verg. Maronis Aeneidos Liber XII* (London 1969).

Toll, K., 'Making Roman-ness and the *Aeneid*', *ClAnt* 16 (1997) 34-56.

Tondo, S., 'Aspetti giuridici della fondazione di Costantinopoli', *SDHI* 65 (1999) 255-268.

Torelli, M., *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Ann Arbor 1982).

-----, *Paestum romana* (Roma 1999).

Tränkle, H., 'Properz über Virgils Aeneis', *MH* 28 (1971) 60-63.

Trout, D.E., 'Damasus and the invention of early Christian Rome', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33 (2003) 517-536 [reprinted in: D.B. Martin and P. Cox Miller (ed.), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies: Gender, Asceticism, and Historiography* (Durham, NC 2005) 298-315].

-----, *Damasus of Rome. The epigraphic poetry: introduction, texts, translations, and commentary* (Oxford 2015).

Turcan, R., 'Janus à l'époque imperiale', in *ANRW* II.17.1 (1981) 374-402.

Tycner-Wolicka, M., *Fundacja i dedykacja Konstantynopola w polityce Konstantyna Wielkiego i w tradycji bizantyńskiej* (diss. Warszawa 2013).

Usherwood, R., *Political Memory and the Constantinian Dynasty: Fashioning Disgrace* (Cham 2022).

Vagliari, D., 'Gli scavi recenti nel Foro Romano', *BCAR* 31 (1903) 3-239.

Van Dam, R., *The Roman Revolution of Constantine* (Cambridge 2007).

-----, *Rome and Constantinople: Rewriting Roman History During Late Antiquity* (Waco 2010).

-----, 'Constantine's first visit to Rome with Diocletian in 303', *JLA* 11 (2018) 6-41.

van den Hoek, A., 'Divine twins or saintly twins: the Dioscuri in an early Christian context', in: Id. and J.J. Herrmann, Jr, *Pottery, pavements, and paradise: iconographic and textual studies on late antiquity* (Leiden 2013) 255-300.

-----, 'Peter without Paul: Aspects of the Primordial Role of Simon Peter in an Early Christian Context', in: Dijkstra (2020a) 203-230.

van der Meer, F., *Lofzangen der Latijnse kerk* (Utrecht 1970).

Vanderspoel, J., *Themistius and the Imperial Court. Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius* (Ann Arbor 1995).

-----, 'A Tale of Two Cities. Themistius on Rome and Constantinople', in: Grig & Kelly (2012) 223-240.

van Gils, L.W., 'Common Ground in Latin Discourse: two case studies of narrative negation in Cicero and Vergil', in: P. Poccetti (ed.), *Latinitatis rationes: descriptive and historical accounts for the Latin language* (Berlin 2016) 763-779.

van Nuffelen, P., 'Not Much Happened: 410 and All That', *JRS* 105 (2015) 322-329 [review of Harich-Schwarzauer and Pollmann (2013)].

Van Oort, J., 'De ciuitate dei (Über die Gottesstadt)', in: V.H. Drecoll (ed.), *Augustin Handbuch* (Tübingen 2007) 347-363.

van Poppel, S., *Urbs et Augustus. The City of Rome in Politics and Representations of Power during the Constantinian Dynasty* (306-361) (diss. Nijmegen 2013).

van Rookhuijzen, J.Z., 'Thetis in the Ovens: A reconsideration of Herodotus' topography of Magnesia', *JHS* 137 (2017) 24-41.

Varner, E.R., 'Maxentius, Constantine, and Hadrian: Images and the Expropriation of Imperial Identity', in: S. Birk (ed.), *Using images in late antiquity* (Oxford 2014) 48-77.

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

Varvounis, M.G., 'Une tradition populaire sur la fondation de Constantinople', *Byzantion* 66 (1996) 454-460.

Vasaly, A., *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley 1993).

-----, *Livy's political philosophy: power and personality in early Rome* (New York 2015).

Venning, T. (with an introduction by J. Harris), *Chronology of the Byzantine Empire* (Basingstoke 2006).

Ver Eecke, M., 'De l'Aventin au Palatin: le nouvel ancrage topographique de Rémus au moment du passage de la République à l'Empire', *DHA* 32 (2006) 75-94.

-----, *La République et le roi: le mythe de Romulus à la fin de la République romaine* (Paris 2008).

Verhoeven, M., L. Bosman and H. van Asperen (ed.), *Monuments & memory: Christian cult buildings and constructions of the past. Essays in honour of Sible de Blaauw* (Turnhout 2016).

Vessey, M., 'Reinventing history: Jerome's *Chronicle* and the writing of the post-Roman West', in: S. McGill, C. Sogno and E. Watts (ed.), *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 284 - 450 CE* (Cambridge 2010) 265-289.

-----, 'The history of the book: Augustine's *City of God* and post-Roman cultural memory', in: Wetzel (2012a) 14-32.

Viermann, N., *Herakleios, der schwitzende Kaiser. Die oströmische Monarchie in der ausgehenden Spätantike* (Berlin 2021).

von den Hoff, R., 'Theseus – Stadtgründer und Kulturheros', in: E. Stein-Hölkeskamp and K.-J. Hölkeskamp (ed.), *Erinnerungsorte der Antike. Die griechische Welt* (München 2010) 300-315.

von Haehling, R., *Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerkes: nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus* (Stuttgart 1989).

von Premerstein, A., *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* (München 1937).

von Ungern-Sternberg, J., 'Die Romulusnachfolge des Augustus', in: W. Schuller (ed.), *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* (Darmstadt 1998) 166-182.

-----, 'M. Furius Camillus – ein zweiter Romulus?', in: M. Coudry and T. Späth (ed.), *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique = Die Konstruktion der grossen Männer Altroms* (Paris 2001) 289-297.

Vössing, K., s.v. 'Roma', in: R. Dodaro et al. (ed.), *Augustinus-Lexikon IV* (Basel 2018) 1218-1230.

Vuković, K., 'The Festival of the Lupercalia as a Vehicle of Cultural Memory in the Roman Republic', in: Dinter and Guerin (2023) 281-293.alde, A., *lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [3. neu bearb. Aufl. von J.B. Hofmann] (Heidelberg 1938-1956).

Wallace, S., 'The significance of Plataia for Greek *eleutheria* in the early Hellenistic period', in: A. Erskine and L. Llewellyn-Jones (ed.), *Creating a Hellenistic World* (Swansea 2011) 147-176.

Wallmann, P., *Triumviri Rei Publicae Constituendae. Untersuchungen Zur Politischen Propaganda Im Zweiten Triumvirat (43-30 V. Chr.)* (Bern 1989).

Wallraff, M., Christus Verus Sol. *Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike* (Münster 2001).

-----, 'Pantheon und Allerheiligen: Einheit und Vielfalt des Göttlichen in der Spätantike', *JbAC* 47 (2004) 128-143.

-----, review of Förster (2007), *Gnomon* 82 (2010) 339-344.

Walsh, P.G., 'Livy and Augustus', *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* IV (1961) 26-37.

Walsh, P.G. and C. Husch, *One Hundred Latin Hymns. Ambrose to Aquinas* (Cambridge, MA 2012).

Wardle, D., 'Suetonius and Augustus' 'programmatic edict', *RhM* 148 (2005) 181-201.

-----, 'Suetonius on Augustus as god and man', *CQ* 62 (2012) 307-326.

----- (ed.), *Suetonius. Life of Augustus* (Oxford 2014).

Warwick, H.H., *A Vergil concordance* (Minneapolis 1975).

Weber, W., *Princeps. Studien zur Geschichte des Augustus* (Stuttgart 1936).

Weeda, L., *Vergil's political commentary in the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid* (Warsaw/Berlin 2015).

Weinstock, S., *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971).

West, D., 'Multiple-Correspondence Similes in the *Aeneid*', *JRS* 59 (1969) 40-49 [reprinted in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1990) 429-444].

-----, 'The deaths of Hector and Turnus', *G&R* 21 (1974) 21-31.

Westreicher, I., *Das Enjambement als künstlerisches Stilmittel in der Aeneis* (Innsbruck 1946).

Wetzel (2012a) = J. Wetzel (ed.), *Augustine's City of God. A Critical Guide* (Cambridge 2012).

----- (2012b) = 'Introduction', in: Wetzel (2012a) 1-13.

Whitby, M., and M. Whitby (ed.), *Chronicon Paschale 284 - 628 AD* (Liverpool 1989).

White, Cynthia, 'Rome, the city as text: response', *CO* 91 (2016) 56-63.

Wiemer, H.-U., 'Libanios und Zosimos über den Rom-Besuch Konstantins I. im Jahre 326', *Historia* 43 (1994) 467-494.

Wienand, J., *Der Kaiser als Sieger. Metamorphosen triumphaler Herrschaft unter Constantin I.* (Berlin 2012).

----- (ed.), *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD* (Oxford 2015).

Wifstrand Schiebe, M., *Vergil und die Tradition von den römischen Urkönigen* (Stuttgart 1997).

Wilkinson, K.W., 'Palladas and the Foundation of Constantinople', *JRS* 100 (2010) 179-194.

Williams, R.D., 'The sixth book of the *Aeneid*', *G&R* 11 (1964) 48-63 [reprinted in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1990) 191-207].

-----, *The Aeneid of Virgil I: Books 1-6* (Basingstoke and London 1972), II: *Books 7-12* (Basingstoke and London 1973).

-----, *Technique and ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven 1983).

-----, *The Aeneid* (London 1987).

Winkelmann, F., 'Konstantins Religionspolitik und ihre Motive im Urteil der literarischen Quellen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts', *AAntHung* 9 (1961) 239-256.

----- (ed.), *Eusebius Caesariensis. Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* (Berlin 1975).

Wintjes, J., 'Zur Datierung von Themistius or. 4', *BZ* 96 (2003) 703-708.

Wiseman, T. P., *Remus. A Roman Myth* (Cambridge 1995).

----- (2009a) = 'The house of Augustus and the Lupercal', *JRA* 22 (2009) 527-545.

----- (2009b) = *Remembering the Roman people. Essays on late-republican politics and literature* (Oxford 2009).

-----, 'Roma Quadrata, archaic huts, the house of Augustus, and the orientation of Palatine Apollo', *JRA* 25 (2012) 371-387.

-----, 'The Palatine, from Evander to Elagabalus', *JRS* 103 (2013) 234-268.

-----, 'Rome on the balance: Varro and the foundation legend', in: D.J. Butterfield (ed.), *Varro Varius. The Polymath of the Roman World* (Oxford 2015) 93-122.

Wlosok, A., 'Die Eroberung Roms durch Alarich in Äußerungen des Hieronymus und des Augustinus. Eine Textsammlung', in: *Das Bewußtsein von Krise und Kontinuität im antiken Denken. Dokumentation der Vorträge und Arbeitskreise, 16. Ferienkurs für Lehrer der alten Sprachen* (Stuttgart 1995) 88-130.

Wolfram, H., *Das Reich und die Germanen. Zwischen Antike und Mittelalter* (Berlin 1990).

Woodman, A.J., 'Myth and History in Livy's Preface', in: K.S. Kingsley, G. Monti and T. Rood (ed.), *The Authoritative Historian: Tradition and Innovation in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge 2023) 82-98.

Woolf, G., 'Provincial Perspectives', in: Galinsky (2005) 106-129.

Worstbrock, F.J., *Elemente einer Poetik der Aeneis. Untersuchungen zum Gattungsstil vergilianischer Epik* (Münster 1963).

Wrede, H., 'Der genius populi Romani und das Fünfsäulendenkmal der Tetrarchen auf dem Forum Romanum', *BJ* 181 (1981) 121-142.

Wulf-Rheidt, U., 'Augustus und das Gespür für den richtigen Ort - Die Situierung der ersten Kaiserresidenz auf dem Palatin in Rom', in: A. Felix et al. (ed.), *Orte der Herrschaft. Charakteristika von antiken Machtzentren* (Rahden 2012) 33-40.

-----, 'Die schwierige Frage der Nutzung des Römischen Kaiserpalastes auf dem Palatin in Rom in der Spätantike', *AntTard* 25 (2017) 127-148.

Xella, P., 'Le origini della città nel Vicino Oriente antico: tra archeologia e mitología', in: J. Martínez-Pinna Nieto (ed.), *Initia Rerum. Sobre el concepto del origen en el mundo antiguo* (Málaga 2006) 9-28.

Xinyue, B., *Politics and Divinization in Augustan Poetry* (Oxford 2022).

Zachos, K.L., 'The *tropaeum* of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim report', *JRA* 16 (2003) 65-92.

Zanker, A.T., 'Late Horatian lyric and the Virgilian golden age', *AJPh* 131 (2010) 495-516.

Zanker, P., *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (München 1990²).

Zecchini (2001a) = G. Zecchini, 'Feste e identità: dai Ludi Saeculares ai Natali di roma', in: A. Barzanò (ed.), *Identità e valori: fattori di aggregazione e fattori di crisi nell'esperienza politica antica* (Roma 2001) 195-208.

----- (2001b) = *Cesare e il mos maiorum* (Stuttgart 2001).

-----, 'Augusto e l'eredità di Cesare', in: G. Urso (ed.), *Cesare: precursore o visionario?* (Pisa 2010) 47-62.

Zetzel, J.E.G., 'Rome and its traditions', in: Martindale (1997) 188-203.

Ziemssen, H., *Das Rom des Maxentius. Städtebau und Herrscherbild zu Beginn des 4. Jh. n. Chr.* (diss. Hamburg 2011).

Zinsli, S.C., *Kommentar zur Vita Heliogabali der Historia Augusta* (Bonn 2014).

Zuchtriegel, G., *Colonization and Subalternity in Classical Greece. Experience of the Nonelite Population* (Cambridge 2017).

Zwierlein, O., 'Der Fall Roms im Spiegel der Kirchenväter', *ZPE* 32 (1978) 48-80.

-----, *Petrus in Rom: die literarischen Zeugnisse* (Berlin 2009).

APPENDIX

The meaning(s) of *condere* – an etymological and lexicological overview

Condere can have many possible, even contrasting meanings. This is a general overview of the word's etymology and possible meanings in Latin at large.

Condere is a compound verb often assimilated to Latin *dare* (cf. Greek διδόναι, Proto Indo-European **deh₃*).¹¹⁹⁰ The Late Antique grammarian Priscian (*Gramm.* II.516.9-10) in fact stated: 'condo' *compositum a 'do' et ex eo 'abscondo'*, 'condere is a compound of *dare* and *abscondere* also derives from it'.¹¹⁹¹ According to modern etymological studies, however, the verb takes its root not from *dare* but from Proto Indo-European **dhē-* (or **d^heh₁*), meaning 'to put, to place' (cf. Greek τιθέναι).¹¹⁹² As far as etymology is concerned, the closest Greek variant of *condere* is συντίθέναι: both verbs combine the root **dhē-* with the suffix σύν-/con- ('... together': the suffices are not etymologically related) and thus carry the basic literal meaning 'to put together', 'to unite'. Latin cognates of *condere* are similar compound verbs like *abdere*, *addere* and *perdere*, all with perfects in -*didi*. Also *credere* and *facere* stem from the root **dhē-*, the latter being the Latin simplex verb formed from Proto Indo-European (PIE) **dhē-/d^heh₁*.¹¹⁹³ From *condere* other compound verbs were in turn formed, notably *abscondere* and *recondere*.

As far as frequency is concerned, forms of *condere* occur 182 times in the corpus of Classical Latin used by Delatte et al., i.e. once every 4366 words (0,023 % of all words).¹¹⁹⁴ Occurrences are almost equally distributed between prose and poetry: 93 vs. 89 occurrences.¹¹⁹⁵ The noun *conditor* occurs 25 times in the corpus of Delatte et al., i.e. once every 31.786 words (0,0031 % of all words).¹¹⁹⁶ Unlike *condere*, *conditor* has a far from equal distribution over prose and poetry: 20 vs. 5 occurrences.¹¹⁹⁷

^{1190.} See, still, e.g. Rimell (2015) 40.

^{1191.} The only ancient etymology listed by Maltby (1991); no extra information in Marangoni (2007). Maltby refers to the text edition and numbering of Hertzius/Keil (Lipsiae 1855-1858); I haven't been able to consult the new edition by M. Passalacqua (Roma 1999).

^{1192.} De Vaan (2008) 175-176 employs the more complex spelling of the root (**d_heh₃*), while Ernout and Meillet (1985), as well as Walde (1938-1956) and many others, print the simple form **dhē-*.

^{1193.} The radical ending -*c* in the root *fac-* is the product of extension of the consonant in the perfect stem *fec-*: see Fruyt (2011) 148.

^{1194.} Delatte et al. (1981) 20, 124. Cf. a very frequent verb like *facere*, occurring 2765 times, i.e. once every 287 words or in 0,348 % of all words. *Condere* is in the same frequency range as verbs like *canere* (188 times), *fundere* (185), *iactare* (183) and *caedere* (179). The corpus of Delatte et al. (1981) is made up of a representative choice of (parts or excerpts of) literary works of Latin authors from Catullus and Caesar to Juvenal and Tacitus, encompassing 794.662 words in total (see *ibid.* 1).

^{1195.} Also in this respect *condere* resembles *fundere* (93 times in prose vs. 92 in poetry) and *iactare* (94 vs. 89).

^{1196.} Delatte et al. (1981) 20, 144. Nouns with the same frequency include *adversarius*, *atrium*, *culmen* and *miraculum* (all 25 times). Cf. a very frequent noun like *rex*, occurring 1544 times, i.e. once every 515 words or in 0,194 % of all words.

^{1197.} Compare *adversarius* (25 times in prose vs. 0 in poetry), *atrium* (12 vs. 13), *culmen* (3 vs. 22) and *miraculum* (22 vs. 3).

The *TLL* distinguishes two basic meanings of *condere*. In the Latin of the modern lexographers, these are circumscribed as ‘**I** in locum *conferre, colligere; reponere, abscondere*’ (“to bring (together) to a certain place, to collect; to put back, to put away”) and ‘**II** *facere, efficere, constituere; auctorem esse*’ (“to make, to accomplish, to establish; to report as an author”).¹¹⁹⁸ The first meaning is an action inflicted on a movable entity, typically portable (inanimate) objects, animals or human beings. The second meaning often concerns larger, immobile entities (such as buildings, city walls and cities), but also non-physical entities like political and religious bodies, institutions, and concepts, or texts. This general distinction in basic meanings is further defined lexographically. The two sections I and II of the lemma are divided into subsections designated by capital letters (I.A-C and II.A-E), representing distinctive semantic fields within which both basic meanings of *condere* operate. They thus constitute eight different semantic fields, to which I will refer as *TLL I.A-C* and *TLL II.A-E*.¹¹⁹⁹ Mirroring both basic meanings of *condere*, these semantic fields are heavily dependent on the object governed by the verb.

The *OLD* uses a serial instead of a hierarchical system to distinguish between the verb’s meanings, numbering them 1 through 14. These are in turn divided into non-capital letter subsections. In the table below, I have grouped the different meanings according to the *TLL* and added the English translations and relevant sections numbers of the *OLD*:

^{1198.} *TLL* IV (1906-1909) 148.21 and 152.44. I here reprint the bold face of the original. The translations provide translations of the *TLL*’s Latin, not English-language dictionary entries for *condere*.

^{1199.} The alphabetical subsections are further divided into Roman numeral sub-subsections and non-capital letter sub-sub-subsections, further specified by sub-sub-sub-subsections with Arabic numerals. As these are mainly used to distinguish different syntactical usages within one semantic field, or proper vs. metaphorical uses, they are of less interest to us here.

TLL #	OLD #	translation
I		<i>in locum conferre, colligere;</i> “to bring (together) to a certain place, to collect; to put back, to put away” <i>reponere, abscondere</i>
I.A	12	12 To make by putting together, construct, compose.
I.B	1, 2a, 2b, 3a	1 To put or insert (into). 2a To store up for future use, put away. 2b to preserve, store up (food, fodder, etc.); to bottle (wine, oil) for keeping. 3a To restore (a thing) to its place, put away
I.C	2c, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13	2c to store up in the mind, memory, etc.; to preserve, keep safe. 3b To sheathe, put away (a sword or other weapon). 4 To inter, bury (a corpse). 5 To put away for concealment. 6 To put away for protection, hide. 7a To put out of sight (without any intention of keeping secret). 7b to plunge, bury (a weapon in an opponent's body). 8 To cause to disappear (as an indirect result of one's action). 9 To have hidden within, contain. 13a LVSTRVM ~ere, To conduct the ceremony of purification which concluded the census. 13b to bring to a close, end.
II		<i>facere, efficere, constituere;</i> “to make, to accomplish, to establish; to report as an author” <i>auctorem esse</i>
II.A	10b	10b to set up, establish (a temple, altar, etc.).
II.B	10a, 10c	10a To found, establish (a city or state). 10c to establish, form (a nation, etc.).
II.C	11	11a To originate, institute (a custom, law, reputation, etc.). 11b to inaugurate (a period).
II.D	14	14a To compose, write (a poem or other literary work). 14b to describe in literature, record, write of.
II.E	/	<i>apud Christianos i. q. creare</i> , “in Christian authors of the same meanig as ‘to create’”

A

SAMENVATTING

Samenvatting in het Nederlands¹²⁰⁰

Inleiding en deel A: de Augusteïsche tijd

Dit proefschrift gaat over een onderwerp dat behoort tot de geschiedenis van de stad Rome in de oudheid, en wellicht het beste kan worden toegelicht met een voorbeeld. In januari van het jaar 27 v.Chr. stond de Romeinse senaat voor de schone taak om met een gepaste titel de ongekende machtspositie te omschrijven van één man, die feitelijk alle macht in handen had, maar zich onder geen beding van de traditionele term *dictator* wilde bedienen, laat staan *rex*. De keuze viel op *Augustus*, een oud Latijns woord dat 'verheven' betekent, en bij gebrek aan een officieel ambt van keizer de latere Romeinse geschiedenis inging als de geldende keizertitel. Vele 'verhevenen' heersten na Augustus in zijn naam, maar ook na de val van het Romeinse rijk en het verdwijnen van de rijken die zich daarop beriepen, leeft de ertitel van Augustus voort in het leven van alledag. Omdat de Romeinse maand *Sextilis* nog tijdens zijn leven tot *Augustus* werd omgedoopt, en zowel de christelijke kerk als moderne seculiere staten de Romeinse kalender overnamen, beleeft een aanzienlijk deel van de wereldbevolking de jaarlijkse zomervakantie onder de aegis van de 'eerste Romeinse keizer'.

Het had echter niet al te veel gescheeld of we waren er massaal op uitgetrokken in de maand 'Romulus'. Verschillende antieke auteurs noemen de naam van Rome's oorspronkelijke stichter als het belangrijkste alternatief voor de ertitel Augustus, en dit laat zien op welke manier men probeerde de nieuwe alleenheerschappij in het verleden te verankeren. Het regime van de adoptiefzoon en opvolger van de vergoddelijkte Caesar werd vergeleken met de stichting van de stad alsof zijn bewind een nieuwe stichting van Rome betekende. Het meest uitgesproken hierover is de tweede-eeuwse keizerbiograaf Suetonius, die in §7.2 van zijn biografie (in de vertaling van Daan den Hengst) nauwgezet beschrijft hoe Augustus aan zijn titel kwam: '[...] hij nam op grond van een voorstel van Munatius Plancus de bijnaam Augustus aan. Sommigen hadden voorgesteld hem Romulus te noemen, omdat hij als het ware de nieuwe grondvester van Rome was, maar uiteindelijk had het voorstel om hem liever Augustus te noemen de overhand gekregen. Deze naam, afgeleid van *auctus* (vermeerdering) of van *avium gestus* dan wel *gustus* (de vlucht of de manier van pikken van de vogels) was, zo redeneerde men, niet alleen nieuw, maar tegelijk verhevener, omdat ook plaatsen van godsdienstige betekenis, waar na het raadplegen van de vogeltekens iets wordt gewijd, deze benaming dragen, zoals blijkt uit het vers van Ennius: 'Sinds het roemruchte Rome is gesticht onder gewijde tekens (*augusto augurio*)'.

¹²⁰⁰. Deze samenvatting is gedeeltelijk gebaseerd op een eerder in het tijdschrift *Lampas* verschenen artikel: zie voetnoot 1, aan het begin van de Engelstalige tekst.

Ogenschijnlijk betekenen 'Romulus' en 'Augustus' twee heel verschillende dingen. De eerste optie verwijst naar de omstandigheid dat Rome's nieuwe machthebber 'als het ware ook zelf een stichter van de stad' was. Wat dit precies betekent is in feite de hoofdvraag, die aan die proefschrift ten grondslag ligt. Daarover straks meer. De tweede optie lijkt vooral te verwijzen naar de religieuze sanctionering van het nieuwe regime: religieuze plaatsen en wat daarin na vogelschouwing wordt ingewijd worden ook *augusta* genoemd, een benaming die Suetonius etymologisch probeert te verklaren door haar af te leiden van *auctus* of een bepaalde gedraging van vogels: hetzij hun *gestus* ('beweging', al dan niet door de lucht), hetzij hun *gustus* ('proeven', van het hen ritueel toegeworpen voedsel). De naam Augustus zou er dan op doelen dat de drager ervan de macht over Rome op religieus gesanctioneerde wijze had verkregen, of Rome in welke zin dan ook had vergroot. Dat was allebei mogelijk waar, maar het lijkt mij niet waarschijnlijk dat Munatius Plancus met deze etymologieën zowel de senaat als de jonge Caesar zou hebben overtuigd in 27 v.Chr.

Waar Munatius wel de handen mee op elkaar kon krijgen was, mijns inziens, een verhulde verwijzing naar de stichting van Rome. Het citaat van Ennius, dat Suetonius toevoegt ter ondersteuning van zijn betoog, lijkt rechtstreeks uit de koker van Augustus' kersverse spindokter Munatius te komen. Het ondersteunt namelijk niet zozeer Suetonius' betoog, als wel de keuze voor Augustus als alternatief voor Romulus: net als de naam van de stichter verwijst ook de titel Augustus naar de stichting van de stad, maar dan zonder de negatieve connotaties van Romulus (broedermoord, koningschap). Daarom is Augustus, zoals Suetonius (of wellicht Munatius) benadrukt(e), ook *non tantum novum sed etiam amplius cognomen*: nieuw omdat het, in tegenstelling tot Romulus, nog niet als naam in gebruik was, maar ook (zoals den Hengst prachtig *ad sententiam* vertaalt) 'verhevener' dan Romulus, omdat het precies de bovenmenschelijke eigenschappen van Romulus als stichter van het grootse Rome in gedragen taal weet te vatten. Voor ons is het lastig om de 'nieuwigheid' van Augustus als naam nog te voelen, maar die moet in de jaren 20 van de eerste eeuw v. Chr. voorop hebben gestaan, en daarmee waarschijnlijk ook de verklarende koppeling met het *augurium augustum*. De naam Augustus is daarmee een voorbeeld in optima forma van wat je, vrij naar het succesvolle onderzoeksprogramma van Nederlandse classici en oudheidkundigen, het 'verankeren van innovatie' (*anchoring innovation*) zou kunnen noemen. De naam benoemt de nieuwe positie van een niet-dictatoriale alleenheerser met een term die als persoonsnaam volledig nieuw en uniek is, maar tegelijk door Ennius gesanctioneerd is en bovendien verwijst naar de stichting van Rome, de historische omstandigheid waar het nieuwe regime mee werd vergeleken om het aanvaardbaar te maken.

Wat Augustus deed, was evenwel niet helemaal nieuw. De stichting van Rome was geen onveranderlijk ijkpunt waar steeds op dezelfde manier op werd teruggegrepen. Er circuleerden in de Late Republiek, een generatie voor Augustus, talrijke verhalen over de stichting van de stad. De meest bekende variant, die we bijvoorbeeld bij Ennius en Cicero terugvinden, dichtte de hoofdrol toe aan Romulus, die samen met zijn tweelingbroer Remus het plan had opgevat om een nieuwe stad te stichten. Helaas volgde op dat plan een tweestrijd, die door het waarnemen van de vogel tekens aan de arbitrage van de goden werd voorgelegd, waarbij Romulus als overwinnaar uit de bus kwam middels het eerder genoemde *augurium augustum*. Ondanks dat dit het meest voorkomende verhaal was, zag Sallustius (in *de Catilinae coniurazione*, §6) er rond 43 v.Chr. bijvoorbeeld geen been in om stellig en doodleuk niet Romulus, maar de minstens vijf eeuwen oudere Trojaanse prins Aeneas ondubbelzinnig als stichter van Rome aan te wijzen. Die versies konden dus naast elkaar bestaan, samen met nog een hele reeks meer en minder ingrijpende varianten. Wat dat betreft was Rome, in de antieke wereld, ook zeker geen uitzondering: talrijke (Griekse) steden kenden verschillende, soms ook onderling tegenstrijdige of concurrerende stichtingsverhalen. Daaruit blijkt al dat dergelijke verhalen niet alleen, of niet zozeer uit puur historische interesse werden verteld, maar ook om fundamentele eigenschappen van de desbetreffende stad in het heden te benadrukken, of simpelweg en zo roemrijk mogelijke oorsprong te (re)construeren. Wanneer die eigenschappen veranderden, of nieuwe maatstaven bepaalden wat roemrijk was, ligt het in de lijn der verwachting dat ook dat stichtingsverhaal navenant werd aangepast.

Dat is de dynamiek, die in dit proefschrift centraal staat, en waarvoor, bij gebrek aan een bestaande term, de term 'stichtingsvernieuwing' (Engels: *ktistic renewal*) wordt gehanteerd. Het gaat daarbij om het in de antieke wereld niet ongebruikelijke fenomeen, dat individuen, die verregaande veranderingen of ingrijpende vernieuwingen teweeg brengen in een bepaalde politieke, maatschappelijke, culturele of religieuze entiteit, als 'stichters' of 'herstichters' van die entiteit worden gepresenteerd of geïnterpreteerd. Dat fenomeen wordt in dit proefschrift onderzocht aan de hand van het voorbeeld van een stad, waarvan de inwoners zich in de loop van de geschiedenis op een steeds groeiende reeks stichters en herstichters gingen beroepen: Rome. De 'Eeuwige Stad' is niet alleen een uniek voorbeeld van een groot aantal stichterfiguren dat in de antieke bronnen wordt vermeld, maar ook van de mate waarin die stichterfiguren verschillen, en desalniettemin in een continue, vrijwel naadloze opvolging konden worden gepresenteerd. Waar in veel antieke steden verschillende stichterfiguren *concurrerende* aanspraken maakten op het primaat van de rol van stichter, ontstond in Rome het creatieve idee, in ieder geval vanaf de Augusteïsche tijd, dat al die stichters *complementair* konden zijn, en elkaar konden aanvullen – een beetje zoals de profeten in het Oude Testament.

H. 1. Augustus als ‘tweede stichter’ van Rome

In 31 v.Chr. versloeg de man die toen nog bekend stond als *Imperator Caesar Divi filius* Antonius en Cleopatra bij het Griekse Actium. De zege werd gevierd en kracht bijgezet door ter plaatse een ‘overwinningstad’ te stichten, Actia Nicopolis. De nieuwe stad werd een groots opgezet paradijsje, met een stadion en een theater waar Actische Spelen werden gehouden, visueel gedomineerd door een overwinningsmonument voorzien van prachtige reliëfs en een enorme Latijnse inscriptie. De dakgooten van dit monument waren versierd met terracotta afbeeldingen van de wolvin met de tweeling, en verwezen dus expliciet naar de stichting van Rome. Op de lokale munten werd trots melding gemaakt van de *princeps* als stichter. Ook op de centrale Romeinse muntslag lijkt dat thema te worden uitgedragen: in een serie indrukwekkende *denarii* verscheen ook een muntafbeelding van het ritueel van een stadsstichting. Een gangbare interpretatie is dat deze munt verwijst naar de stichting van Nicopolis. Het is duidelijk dat de adoptiefzoon van Julius Caesar zich al vóór 27 publiekelijk associeerde met de rol van stedenstichter. Aangezien hij buiten Rome ook daadwerkelijk een stichter was, wekt het misschien nog minder verwondering dat hij die status ook in Rome kreeg toebedeeld als een manier om zijn positie in de Romeinse staat en zijn vergaande omvorming van de Eeuwige Stad onder woorden te brengen.

Literaire auteurs speelden een grote rol in het presenteren van de *princeps* als nieuwe stichter van de stad. De geschiedschrijver Livius is een goed voorbeeld. Volgens zijn eigen politieke testament (*Res Gestae* 20.4) liet Augustus zich erop voorstaan talrijke tempels in Rome, door ouderdom en gebrek aan onderhoud vervallen, gerestaureerd te hebben. Zelf gebruikte hij daarvoor het werkwoord *refeci*, ‘ik heb opnieuw gemaakt’. Livius omschreef Augustus, op een van de weinige bewaard gebleven plaatsen in zijn monumentale geschiedwerk waar de *princeps* prominent naar voren komt (*Ab urbe condita* IV.20.7), echter veel pregnanter als *templorum omnium conditorem aut restitutorem*, ‘stichter of hersteller van alle tempels’. Deze typering staat in een passage over de tempel van Jupiter Feretrius; die was al eerder genoemd in boek I, waar Romulus als stichter ervan (*conditor templi*, I.10.7) werd omschreven. Dit geeft de gebeurtenis een heel andere connotatie dan in de *Res Gestae* en verbindt Augustus met Romulus.

Livius’ typering hangt nauw samen met zijn gebruik van de term *conditor* (‘stichter’) in de eerste tien boeken van zijn geschiedwerk. In het kielzog van Romulus worden talrijke Romeinse leiders als zodanig omschreven, zoals de overige koningen (II.1.2) en Brutus (VIII.34.3). Met name Camillus wordt als tweede stichter en opvolger van Romulus gepresenteerd (V.49.7-8; vergelijk VII.1.8-10). Het is in deze

reeks vermeldingen dat we, volgens geleerd als Gary Miles, ook de omschrijving van Augustus als *conditor* moeten plaatsen. Door allusies op Romulus en expliciete koppelingen tussen nieuwe *conditores* en de oorspronkelijke stichter van de stad wordt de semantische waarde van de term *conditor* opgerekt om van toepassing te zijn op al diegenen, die een wezenlijke bijdrage aan de ontwikkeling van Rome als stad en staat geleverd hebben.

We zouden in de overgebleven boeken van Livius dus een poging kunnen ontwaren om Augustus, vergelijkbaar met het eerdere citaat uit Suetonius, in de positie van stichter van Rome te manoeuvreren. Dat Livius daarbij gebruik maakt van allusies op Romulus en Camillus, in plaats van zijn poging explicet te maken, was waarschijnlijk bewust. Net zoals Augustus zelf er immers voor waakte de vergelijking met Romulus al te explicet te maken (door simpelweg de naam Romulus aan te nemen), zijn Augusteïsche auteurs eveneens voorzichtig en gaan ze subtiel te werk in het presenteren van Augustus als stichter.

H. 2. Vergilius' *Aeneis* als stichtingepos

Dezelfde combinatie van allusie en voorzichtigheid zien we ook bij Vergilius. In zijn *Aeneis* trekt er, net als bij Livius, een hele reeks stichters aan de lezer voorbij, naar aanleiding waarvan het werk terecht als 'ktistisch' epos is omschreven. Deze gedeelde karakteristiek van beide werken is op zich al opvallend en interessant. De *Aeneis* maakt bovendien duidelijk hoezeer die nadruk op stichters en stichtingen door bewuste keuzes tot stand komt. Zo kon het moment, waarop Aeneas en zijn makkers na hun schipbreuk (boek I) in het Carthago van koningin Dido aankomen, niet significanter gekozen zijn: Dido en haar Tyriërs zijn net bezig om, voor Aeneas' ogen, een nieuwe stad te stichten. Die stad heeft, in Vergilius' beschrijving, bovendien alles weg van een Romeinse kolonie. Dat feit moet bij de eigentijdse lezer bijzonder hebben geresoneerd, omdat precies Augustus in de jaren 20 v.Chr. Carthago opnieuw had gesticht als de Romeinse Colonia Iulia Concordia. Opnieuw lopen oeroude stichters en eigentijdse herstichters dus in elkaar over.

Een ander voorbeeld is Aeneas' aankomst in het latere Rome, in boek VIII. De arcadische banneling Evander leidt Aeneas rond in het door hemzelf gestichte Pallanteum, en verwijst daarbij bovendien naar eerdere stedenstichtingen door Janus en Saturnus. Als enige in de hele *Aeneis* wordt Evander als *conditor* getypeerd met de pregnante uitdrukking *Romanae conditor arcis*, 'stichter van de Romeinse burcht' (VIII.313). Door Evander min of meer uit het niets (vóór Vergilius stond hij zeker niet zo bekend) tot stichter van Rome *avant la lettre* te bombarderen, draagt Vergilius op significante wijze bij aan de verruiming van het begrip van 'stichter'

van Rome, waardoor dit niet alleen terug in de tijd, tot aan Janus en Saturnus, maar door analogie ook tot in de latere geschiedenis kon worden opgerekt. Rome heeft, net als bij Livius, niet één stichter die op één enkel moment de stad in zijn geheel heeft gesticht, maar is ontstaan in een aaneenschakeling van stichtingsmomenten, zelfs nog vóór Romulus. 'Stichten' is dus geen eenmalige scheppingsdaad, maar eerder een incrementeel proces dat in potentie voort kan blijven duren. Hoe hier precies over gedacht werd vóór de Augusteïsche tijd zal uit verder onderzoek moeten blijken, maar het heeft er alles van weg dat de semantische verruiming van het door Livius en Vergilius gebezige stichtingsbegrip in hoge mate Augusteïsch is.

Behalve dat dit in conceptuele zin de mogelijkheid creëert om ook Augustus, met zijn omineuze *cognomen*, als stichter te betitelen, en de *princeps* inderdaad op allerlei subtile manieren als 'ktistische' opvolger van Evander, Aeneas en Romulus wordt voorgesteld, is er één passage waar dat in het bijzonder naar voren komt. Het betreft de beroemde onderwereldscène in boek VI, waarin Anchises aan Aeneas de toekomst van Rome voorspelt aan de hand van een stoet Romeinse helden die nog geboren moeten worden. Het is in deze passage (Vergilius, *Aeneis* VI.791-795) dat Augustus, naar wie al eerder in het werk impliciet was verwezen, onomwonden met zijn recente ktistische *cognomen* wordt geïdentificeerd: 'Dit is hem, deze man, die je zo vaak aan jou voorspeld hebt horen worden: Augustus Caesar, nageslacht van een god (*Augustus Caesar, divi genus*), die in Latium opnieuw gouden eeuwen zal stichten, (*aurea condet / saecula*) overal in de streken waar ooit Saturnus heerste, en die zijn heerschappij zal uitbreiden voorbij woestijnberbers en Indiërs).'¹²⁰¹

Op allerlei manieren wordt – wederom zonder het helemaal uit te spellen – Augustus hier als tweede stichter van Rome voorgesteld. Precies en alleen op dit punt in zijn voorspelling van de Romeinse geschiedenis onderbreekt Anchises de chronologische volgorde: Augustus komt direct na Romulus, die als stichter van Rome de rij had geopend. Om uit te drukken dat Augustus een nieuwe gouden tijd doet aanbreken is *condere* een gewaagde keuze. Het woordgebruik is een verwijzing naar de profetie van Jupiter in boek I. Daar voorspelde de oppergod eveneens de stichting van Rome door Romulus en een tijd van voorspoed onder Augustus. In boek I lezen we dat Romulus 'aan Mars gewijde stadsmuren zal stichten' (*Mavortia condet / moenia*, I.276-277), nadat de stichtingen van Lavinium door Aeneas en Alba Longa door Ascanius niet met *condere* maar met minder programmatische woorden waren omschreven. Het zwaartepunt in die passage ligt op de stichting van Rome door Romulus, gemarkeerd door *condere* en Jupiters monumentale woorden 'heerschappij zonder grenzen heb ik hun gegeven' (*imperium sine fine dedi*, I.279). Dat grenzeloze *imperium* keert in boek VI

¹²⁰¹ Tenzij anders vermeld zijn de vertalingen van eigen hand.

terug, maar dan gekoppeld aan Augustus in plaats van Romulus. Belangrijker nog: Anchises omschrijft Romulus' activiteit niet meer met *condere*, maar reserveert het woord voor Augustus. *aurea condet | saecula* verwijst duidelijk naar *Mavortia condet | moenia*, en in een soort voortschrijdende, macro-tekstuele profetie is de focus daarmee opgeschoven van Romulus naar Augustus als tweede stichter – niet meer van Rome alleen, maar van een nieuwe gouden tijd voor heel de beschaafde wereld.

Wederom schurkt de weergave van Augustus zeer dicht tegen de status van Rome's stichter aan, zonder evenwel dit idee volledig expliciet te maken. Interessant is daarbij dat Vergilius Augustus explicet voorstelt als *her*-stichter van een gouden tijd door het gebruik van *rursus* ('opnieuw', VI.793): opnieuw stichten is precies wat Augustus met Rome zou hebben gedaan. Door de termen *conditor* en *condere* op creatieve en saillante wijze te gebruiken lijken auteurs als Livius en Vergilius een belangrijke conceptuele bijdrage te hebben geleverd aan een zodanige verruiming van het begrip 'stichten', dat Augustus' innovatieve regime en zijn herstel van zowel de stad als de staat als een 'stichting' of 'herstichting' van Rome konden worden omschreven. Net als de oorspronkelijke stichting van de stad (of beter: eerdere opeenvolgende stichtingshandelingen) betekende dat een cesuur in de geschiedenis, een punt waarop Rome een bepalende nieuwe richting insloeg. Soms was daarbij sprake van een terugkeer naar een eerdere toestand die door verval verloren was gegaan. Zowel de flagrante innovaties als de programmatiche wederopleving van omstandigheden uit het verleden konden dus onder het begrip van 'stichten' worden geschaard, en daarmee was dat een krachtig paradigma om de Augusteïsche revolutie mee te duiden en te omschrijven.

Deel B: de Late Oudheid

De Late Oudheid is een periode waarin Rome – net als in de Augusteïsche tijd – ingrijpende veranderingen en een culturele revolutie doormaakte. Met de machtsvername in Rome door keizer Constantijn (312 n.Chr.) en de vestiging van zijn alleenheerschappij in het sinds Diocletianus in delen geregeerde Romeinse rijk (324 n.Chr.) gingen een aantal fundamentele omwentelingen gepaard. Net als de regeerperiode van Augustus was die van Constantijn vooral een katalysator en climax van een aantal langer lopende ontwikkelingen. Religieuze veranderingen, als onderdeel waarvan het Christendom als nieuwe godsdienst was opgekomen, kregen hun voorlopige beslag in een tolerantiebeleid en actieve ondersteuning door de keizer. Geopolitieke machtsverschuivingen, waarbij de focus van de keizer steeds meer op de rijksgrenzen kwam te liggen, mondden geleidelijk uit in de overname van de rol van Rome als politiek en economisch centrum van het rijk door Constantinopel.

Dat had onherroepelijk consequenties voor de identiteit van de stad Rome, en het is interessant om te zien hoe ook deze veranderingen zich in stichtingsverhalen weerspiegelden. Daarbij veranderde niet alleen, wederom, de betekenis van het concept 'stichten', maar ook die van 'Rome', als concept. Aan de ene kant herdefinieerde de stad aan de Tiber zich gaandeweg als christelijke metropool. Aan de andere kant ging Constantinopel, als nieuw bestuurlijk centrum van het rijk, zich steeds sterker profileren als een 'nieuw' of 'tweede' Rome aan de Bosporus. Beide ontwikkelingen zijn niet op één specifiek omslagmoment vast te pinnen, maar het is redelijk goed mogelijk om de verankering van die veranderingen in ideeën over stichtingsvernieuwing (ook chronologisch) te traceren.

H. 3. Maximianus, Maxentius en de 'stichters van zijn eigen eeuwige stad'

Dat de stichting van Rome ook lang na Augustus belangrijk bleef blijkt allereerst uit enkele niet-christelijke voorbeelden. Eind derde eeuw, nog voor de Tetrarchie, installeerde Diocletianus aanvankelijk een Dyarchie, waarin hij als Augustus van het Oosten het rijk bestuurde samen met Maximianus als Augustus van het Westen. In de religieus getinte legitimering van hun gedeelde macht verbond Diocletianus zich met Jupiter en Maximianus zich met Hercules: dat was één manier om de nieuwe regeringsvorm te verankeren in bekende conceptuele kaders. Een andere verankерingsstrategie zien we terug in een Latijnse lofrede voor Maximianus uit het jaar 289 n.Chr., gehouden in Trier op de geboortedag van Rome, 21 april. De redenaar wist Maximianus als 'Herculische' keizer handig met de stichting van Rome te verbinden door Hercules' rol daarin als ktistische held voorop te stellen. Hij greep terug op eerdergenoemde episode uit boek VIII van de *Aeneis*, waar Evander ook nog aan Aeneas had verteld hoe Hercules (als een soort typologische voorganger van Augustus) het gebied waar later Rome zou verrijzen tot beschaving had gebracht. Omdat Hercules niet als letterlijke stichter gold, staat de redenaar explicet stil bij de band tussen de rol van Evander als stichter en Hercules als degene die die stichting heeft 'ingewijd', alsof de stichting door Evander anders niet voltooid was (*Panegyrici Latini* X(2) 1.2): 'het is immers zeker waar wat wij over de oorsprong van die stad hebben vernomen, namelijk dat de eerste zetel van uw goddelijkheid aldaar, dat heilige en eerbiedwaardige paleis, door een buitenlandse koning is gesticht (*regem advenam condidisse*), maar door Hercules, toen die te gast was, is ingewijd (*sed Herculem hospitem consecrasse*)'. Uit de grabbelton van Romeinse stichtingsverhalen komt Hercules in 289 dus opeens met nadruk naar voren. De mythische held wordt tot voorbeeld gekneed voor zijn verre nazaat Maximianus als rechtmatige opvolger en stichter. De keizer viert de stichtingsdag van Rome zo uitbundig, na zijn recente zeges aan de rijksgrenzen, ' [...] dat u die (reeds) gestichte stad (*urbem illam sic colas conditam*) zo eert, dat het lijkt alsof u die zelf gesticht zou hebben (*quasi ipse*

condideris). Inderdaad zou iedereen immers, meest eerbiedwaardige keizer, u en uw broer met recht de stichters van het Romeinse rijk (*Romani imperii ... conditores*) kunnen noemen' (*Panegyrici Latini* X(2) 1.4-5).

In die woorden kunnen we gevoeglijk een directe reminiscentie ontdekken van de traditie om Augustus te typeren als *quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis* ('als het ware de nieuwe grondvester van Rome'), en daarmee wordt de voorstelling van Maximianus als herstichter van Rome dubbel verankerd: niet alleen in Hercules, als voor de gelegenheid opgewaardeerde 'stichter' van Rome, maar ook in Augustus als een eerdere 'tweede stichter'. Ook het Augsteïsche model om een nieuwe stichter in een reeks eerdere stichters (in plaats van één enkele stichter) te verankeren keert hier terug. Terwijl Maximianus als Herculische keizer in zijn 'eigen' stichtingsheld wordt verankerd, wordt de Dyarchie van Diocletianus en Maximianus teruggevoerd op Remus en Romulus. Om de innovatie van de Dyarchie in de stichting van de stad te verankeren wordt de stichtingsgeschiedenis nogmaals gekneed: Remus wordt als medestichter van Rome gerehabiliteerd om een ktistisch precedent te scheppen voor Diocletianus en Maximianus. Om de discutabele positie van Remus zoveel mogelijk onschadelijk te maken (met de onvermijdelijke vraag: wie van de twee keizers is Remus?) benadrukte de redenaar in allerijl dat de keizers in hun eendracht de kibbelende tweelingstichters ruimschoots overtreffen, net zoals het gebied waarover ze heersen het oorspronkelijke *pomerium* van Rome veruit overstijgt. In plaats van enkel de stichters van Rome zijn zij de stichters van het hele Romeinse rijk geworden. Ook dat was, tot slot, een rol die eerder aan Augustus was toegeschreven, waarmee Maximianus' verankерingsstrategie driemaal teruggrijpt op de stichter van het keizerrijk als tussenstap. Maximianus doet dat zo succesvol dat zijn zoon en zelfverklaarde opvolger Maxentius (306-312) zijn eigen positie als herstichter van Rome niet meer in het Augsteïsche model verankerde, maar direct in het voorbeeld van zijn eigen vader. Op een van de meest prominente locaties van het antieke Rome, waar Maxentius als keizer van een afgesplitst deelrijk zijn hoofdstad weer had gevestigd, richtte hij een monument op voor de stichters van Rome. Met dat monument, voor de Curia (het Senaatsgebouw) op een hoek van het Forum Romanum, eerde Maxentius zowel de god Mars als 'de stichters van zijn eigen eeuwige stad' (*aeternae urbis suae / conditoribus*; *CIL VI.33856a*), een ongekende formulering waarmee de keizer zichzelf als nieuwe stichter positioneerde. De inwijding van het monument, waarschijnlijk op 21 april van het jaar 308 na Chr., lijkt wederom de verjaardag van de stad Rome op saillante wijze kracht te hebben bijgezet, ter meerdere eer en glorie van de heerser. Ook op Maxentius' munten kwamen Romulus en Remus veelvuldig voor. Dat Maxentius Rome én de stichters van de stad opnieuw zo prominent op de voorgrond plaatste, lijkt zijn rivaal Constantijn er, na diens overwinning op

Maxentius, min of meer toe hebben gedwongen om die een plek te geven in zijn eigen machtslegitimatie. Door een nieuwe lofredenaar werd Maxentius als 'valse Romulus' (*falsum Romulum; Panegyrici Latini XII(9) 18.1*) afgeschilderd – en Constantijn daarmee als de ware opvolger van de stichter van Rome.

H. 4. Constantinopel: een christelijk Rome?

Als we het hebben over herstichtingen van Rome in de Late Oudheid kan niet voorbij worden gegaan aan de stichting van Constantinopel. Omdat de laatantieke en Byzantijnse bronnen daarover vaak een connectie met Rome veronderstellen, is een van de gangbare interpretaties dat Constantijn een 'nieuw Rome' wilde stichten, al dan niet als christelijke versie van de oude hoofdstad. Die bronnen zijn echter dermate gekleurd (en bijna zonder uitzondering geschreven met de kennis van achteraf) dat het moeilijk is om deze interpretatie aan de historische intenties van Constantijn toe te schrijven. Zeker is dat de stad gesticht is in de nasleep van Constantijns overwinning op Licinius bij Chrysopolis, aan de overkant van de Bosphorus. Algemene waarschijnlijkheid spreekt daarom in het voordeel van de theorie dat Constantinopel niet zozeer als langgekoesterde nieuwe hoofdstad, maar eerder als door de gelegenheid ingegeven overwinningsmonument is gesticht, in de geest van Augustus' Nicopolis.

Hoewel dat moeilijk te bewijzen is, is het idee dat Constantijn Constantinopel als 'nieuw Rome' zou hebben gesticht waarschijnlijk het product van latere tijden, ongeveer vanaf Theodosius, toen de stad aan de Bosphorus steeds meer de rol van centrale hoofdstad begon te vervullen. Die nieuwe rol van Constantinopel valt samen met de ontwikkeling ervan tot expliciet en exclusief christelijke stad. Beide vernieuwingen moeten retrospectief aan Constantijn als stichter zijn toegeschreven. Daarmee werd Constantinopel waarschijnlijk de eerste belangrijke stad in het Romeinse rijk waarvan men betoogde dat die als christelijke stad was gesticht. De nieuwe hoofdstad in het Oosten kon zich misschien niet, zoals Rome, op een oorsprong en bijna voortdurende machtspositie beroemen die al meer dan 1000 jaar terug in de tijd ging, maar kon die ouderdom allicht pareren met een ideologisch 'zuivere' ontstaansgeschiedenis, zonder broedermoord en heidense bijsmaak. Constantinopel was bovenal een nieuwe stad, althans in naam, en het is natuurlijk een slimme marketingstrategie om unieke eigenschappen maximaal uit te buiten. Het lijkt erop dat de Eeuwige Stad op een dergelijke claim in Constantinopel reageerde door zich zelf ook op een christelijke stichting te gaan beroepen. Rome zou daarbij Rome niet zijn geweest, als ze het beroep op de eerste christelijke keizer als stichter op haar beurt niet wist te pareren met de oudste en meest prominente christenen als stichters: de apostelen Petrus en Paulus.

H. 5. De apostelen Petrus & Paulus als nieuwe stichters van Rome

In de derde eeuw n.Chr. was het idee steeds breder gedeeld geraakt dat Petrus en Paulus in Rome waren geweest, daar christenen hadden gedoopt, een kerkgemeente hadden gesticht (met Petrus als eerste bisschop) en tenslotte onder Nero in Rome de marteldood waren gestorven. Dit idee kreeg een eerste monumentale uitdrukking onder Constantijn met de bouw van de oude Sint-Pietersbasiliek bovenop het vermeende graf van de prins der apostelen. Onder bisschop Damasus (366-384) werd de rol van Petrus en Paulus als stichters van de Romeinse kerk een leidend motief in de internationale profiling van Rome als hoeder van de orthodoxie en machtscentrum in kerkpolitieke kwesties. Damasus maakte zich er met name hard voor de leidende rol van zijn 'apostolische' zetel ten opzichte van de machtige Oosterse patriarchaten in Alexandrië, Antiochië en (in toenemende mate) Constantinopel veilig te stellen. Een andere voorvechter van het primaat van Rome was de invloedrijke bisschop van Milaan, Ambrosius. Van zijn hand is de eerste letterlijke omschrijving van Petrus en Paulus als stichters van de stad Rome als geheel, in plaats van enkel de Romeinse kerk. Het betreft een hymne gecomponeerd voor de religieuze feestdag van beide apostelen op 29 juni, bedoeld om in de kerk te worden gezongen en dus voor een breed publiek geschreven. In de zesde strofe (Ambrosius, *Hymne 12, Apostolorum Passio*, 21-24) wordt Rome als volgt bezongen: 'Vandaar heeft Rome haar hoog uitstekende hoofd van devotie opgericht, gesticht op dergelijk bloed (*fundata tali sanguine*) en nobel door een zo grote ziener'.

Rome wordt duidelijk voorgesteld als gesticht 'op' of misschien voornamelijk 'door dergelijk bloed', een verwijzing naar de in de eerdere strofen uitgebreid beschreven marteldood van Petrus en Paulus. De stichting van het christelijke Rome gaat dus terug op weer een heel ander soort stichtingsdaad. Niet het waarnemen van vogeltekens, het ploegen van het tracé van stadsmuren, het vestigen van een nieuw politiek bestel of het brengen van vrede en voorspoed, maar de marteldood omwille van Christus en het vergieten van gewijd bloed zijn de sluitsteen van een alternatieve, op christelijk-devotionele leest geschoeide stichtingsgeschiedenis van Rome geworden. Behalve het concept van 'stichten' wordt ook het begrip 'Rome' daarmee opnieuw gedefinieerd. De omwenteling van een militair en politiek oppermachtig centrum van een grenzeloos imperium naar een spiritueel en metafysisch bolwerk van orthodoxie en devotie wordt dus wederom als stichtingsvernieuwing gepresenteerd, maar om die vernieuwing te verankeren moet ook de stichting van Rome weer drastisch worden geherdefinieerd.

Hoewel Ambrosius de stichting van het christelijke Rome door Petrus en Paulus presenteert als losstaand van eerdere stichters, duurt het niet lang voor de traditionele stichtingsverhalen met de nieuwe christelijke versie in dialoog worden

gebracht. De uit Hispania afkomstige dichter Prudentius lijkt in precies dit gat te zijn gesprongen. Zijn christelijke Rome is, evenmin als het Rome van Augustus, het werk van één enkele stichter. Romulus en Numa hebben zich ook tot het Christendom bekeerd, Petrus en Paulus heersen over Rome als apostelvorsten, maar de daadwerkelijke stichter van Rome is bij hem niemand minder dan Jezus Christus (Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 2.413-416, 441-444, 457-460). Prudentius bedient zich dus van het Augsteïsche model, dat inhoudt dat nieuwe stichters van Rome in een climactische reeks van opeenvolgende stichters worden geplaatst en als eindpunt daarvan worden voorgesteld. De aantrekkracht van die Augsteïsche strategie heeft dus de christianisering van Rome overleefd, en bleef een populaire manier om verregaande veranderingen te omschrijven, duiden, legitimieren en historiseren.

Het Augsteïsche concept van stichtingsvernieuwing was in het vroegchristelijke Rome echter niet alleen een beproefd succesverhaal. Het heeft er alles van weg dat de voorstelling van Petrus en Paulus als christelijke stichters van Rome in christelijke kringen aanvankelijk uiterst omstreden moet zijn geweest. In tegenstelling tot de klassieke traditie van stichtingsvernieuwing in het algemeen en de Augsteïsche variant daarvan in het bijzonder liet de Bijbelse traditie nauwelijks ruimte voor menselijke stichters. In de Griekse Septuagint-vertaling van het *Oude Testament* werd God als *κτίστης* ('stichter') omschreven; in de Griekse boeken van het *Nieuwe Testament* werd het werkwoord *κτίζειν* ('stichten') gebruikt om de scheppingsdaad van God te omschrijven, en was die term ook aan het opperwezen voorbehouden. Aardse stichtingen worden in Bijbels Grieks steeds met andere termen omschreven. Zelfs christelijke geloofsgemeenschappen op aarde gesticht door apostelen zijn uiteindelijk allemaal tijdelijk, in afwachting van een hemelse toekomst. Het enige eeuwige is de scheppingsdaad van God. Wellicht kan dit verklaren waarom Ambrosius het woord *fundare* gebruikte in zijn karakterisering van Rome als gesticht door het voor God vergoten bloed der apostelen: in een andere, naar die openingswoorden genoemde hymne is God bij Ambrosius immers *aeterne rerum conditor* ('eeuwige stichter/schepper van de dingen'). Prudentius, die een deel van de gewetensnood al kon verhelpen door Christus zelf tot stichter van Rome te maken, koos misschien bewust niet voor de term *conditor*, maar voor het minder beladen *auctor* ('maker; schepper; stichter').

Hoe dan ook is het duidelijk dat Ambrosius en Prudentius zich theologisch gezien op glad ijs bevonden met hun christelijke stichtingsvernieuwing van Rome. Dat is, naast de opkomende concurrentie van Constantinopel als christelijke stichting, wellicht een tweede reden dat het na 312 nog zo'n twee generaties duurde voor men Rome van een christelijke stichtingsgeschiedenis begon te voorzien. Het anker was wel vorhanden, maar vooralsnog moeilijk hanteerbaar. Mogelijk speelden deze twee redenen op

elkaar in, en was de gewaagde opwaardering van Constantijn tot christelijke stichter van Constantinopel aanleiding om de doctrinaire reserve ook in Rome overboord te gooien en Petrus en Paulus, die inmiddels al tot volwaardige stichters van de Romeinse kerk waren uitgegroeid, ook tot stedenstichters te bombarderen.

In Noord-Afrika was iemand daar bepaald niet enthousiast over. De Bijbelse bezwaren tegen aardse stichters van christelijke entiteiten liggen bij Augustinus nog zo zwaar op de maag, rond 420 n.Chr., dat hij in zijn *De Civitate Dei* ('Over de stad Gods') nauwelijks melding maakt van Petrus en Paulus, en al helemaal niet als stichters van Rome. Dat zwijgen legde uiteraard redelijk wat gewicht in de schaal, maar hoewel de *De Civitate Dei* van de bisschop van Hippo in de middeleeuwen ongekend invloedrijk zou worden in de ontwikkeling van visies op de geschiedenis van Rome, trok het Augusteïsche model van Prudentius in de vijfde eeuw vooralsnog aan het langste eind. De pragmatische paus Leo de Grote gaf in 441 na Chr. de genadeslag voor Augustinus' gewetensbezwaren, door in een openbare preek op 29 juni (Leo de Grote, *Sermo 82.1*) vanaf de spreekwoordelijke *cathedra Petri* onomwonden en pontifical te verkondigen dat Rome gesticht was door de beide apostelen: 'Dat zijn jouw heilige vaders en ware herders, zij die, zodat jij in de hemelse rijken kunt worden opgenomen, jou veel beter en veel voorspoediger hebben gesticht dan degenen door wier ijver de eerste fundamenten van jouw muren zijn gelegd (*te regnis coelestibus inserendam multo melius multoque felicius condiderunt, quam illi quorum studio prima moenium tuorum fundamenta locata sunt*). Eén van hen, die jou je naam heeft gegeven, heeft jou met broederlijk bloed bezoedeld. Het is wellicht een treffende verbeelding van de manier waarop meervoudige verankering in ideeën over stichtingsvernieuwing werkte, dat de kerkvorst met de woorden *multo melius multoque felicius condiderunt* de passage (13.1) in de lofrede uit 289 citeert, waarin Diocletianus en Maximianus (twee van de grootste christenvervolgers) als nieuwe stichters van Rome worden voorgesteld. Opnieuw vloeien stichters en herstichters in elkaar over. De geschiedenis van Rome is dus niet alleen een geschiedenis *ab urbe condita* ('vanaf de stichting van de stad'), maar ook – om tot slot de Augusteïsche geschiedschrijver Livius te parafraseren – een van een eeuwige *urbs condenda* ('te stichten stad').

CURRICULUM VITAE

Raphaël Hunsucker (1986) was born in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and grew up in the village of Breukelen. His first education was obtained at the R.K. Basisschool Willibrordus and the Gemeentelijk Gymnasium Hilversum, where he graduated in 2004. Afterwards, he studied Greek & Latin at the Universiteit van Amsterdam, with a minor in Religious studies, obtaining his BA degree in 2009 with a thesis on the prophecy of Jupiter in Vergil's *Aeneid*, and his MA in 2012 with a thesis on the foundation of Cyrene (Libya) as described by Pindar and Herodotus. In 2006, he was an ERASMUS-exchange student at the Università degli Studi di Bologna, Italy. Additionally, he obtained an MA-degree in Ancient and Medieval History from the Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen in 2011, with a thesis on the Palatine as the site of Rome's foundation according to authors from the Augustan Age. He was a bursary of the Royal Netherlands Institute Rome (KNIR) in 2011 and 2012, PhD-student and lecturer at Radboud University from 2012 to 2018, a temporary researcher at the university of Tübingen (2018) and temporary lecturer at the universities of Utrecht (2021) and Leiden (2024). On the side, he was a board member of the Amsterdam chapter of the Dutch Classical Association (NKV) and the Zenobia Foundation, and founding editor of the journal *Roma Aeterna*. He currently lives in Amsterdam and Rome, working as an entrepreneur in the cultural sector and the sustainable travel business.

Stories about the foundation of Rome were continuously rewritten, also during Antiquity itself. Often, the city's most distant beginnings were related to contemporary concerns, and founders of Rome came to act as mirrors through which the Romans, paradoxically, recognized the novelties of the present in their primordial past.



A concrete example of this phenomenon is what may be defined as 'ktistic renewal': influential agents of change or innovation could come to be seen as 'second founders' of the city, redefining the concept of foundation itself. The epithet 'second founder', for example, was famously applied to the emperor Augustus, comparing him to one of Rome's original founders, Romulus. In Late Antiquity, however, the apostles Peter and Paul were also seen as new founders of a reborn, Christian Rome. In both periods, foundational figures thus came to legitimate far-reaching religious and political changes. This thesis examines the repeated recourse to new and second founders of Rome in the Augustan Age and Late Antiquity, to highlight the phenomenon of 'ktistic renewal' in two very distinct, but ultimately comparable contexts.



Front side of a reused Antonine statue base with an inscription (CIL VI.33856 a) mentioning the emperor Maxentius (whose name was later erased) as dedicant of a monument to Mars and "the founders of his own Eternal City". The base was excavated in the Comitium-area at the Roman Forum by Giacomo Boni in 1899, where it can still be seen. Photo: H.-G. Kolbe (CIL-Archiv, Inv.-Nr. PH0003220).