University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

12-2007

The mausoleum of Augustus : expanding meaning from its inception to present day.

Susan L. Fugate Brangers 1970-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Fugate Brangers, Susan L. 1970-, "The mausoleum of Augustus : expanding meaning from its inception to present day." (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 468.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/468>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

THE MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS:
EXPANDING MEANING FROM ITS INCEPTION TO PRESENT DAY

By
Susan L. Fugate Brangers
B. A., Western Kentucky University, 1993
M. A., University of Louisville, 1997

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Allen R. Hite Art Institute
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2007

THE MAUSEOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS:
EXPANDING MEANING FROM ITS INCEPTION TO THE PRESENT DAY

By

Susan L. Fugate Brangers
B.A., Western Kentucky University, 1993
M.A., University of Louisville, 1997

A Dissertation Approved on

November 11, 2007

by the following Dissertation Committee

Karl Kilinski
Dissertation Director

Stephanie Maloney
Dissertation Director

Ben Hufbauer

Christopher Fulton

John Hale

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to
my parents Jack and Amelia Fugate
and
my husband David Brangers and our son Jack David.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Stephanie Maloney for her patient guidance not only through the completion of this dissertation but also during my years of graduate study at the University of Louisville. I would like to thank Dr. Karl Kilinski, of Southern Methodist University, for generously giving of his time not only to read multiple copies of my dissertation but also for traveling to Louisville to meet with me and to hear my defense. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Ben Hufbauer, Dr. John Hale, and Dr. Christopher Fulton, for their invaluable assistance and comments. I must also express my gratitude to Dr. Tom Maloney for his incredible support. This dissertation would have not been completed without it. I will also be forever grateful for the unwavering support I received from my parents, Jack and Amelia Fugate, and my husband, David Brangers. Their assistance and constant encouragement helped me see this dissertation through. I would also like to thank Dave and Margaret (Peggy) Brangers for their encouragement and their many hours of babysitting. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Marina Karem for her assistance in translating some difficult Italian sources.

ABSTRACT

MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS: EXPANDING MEANING FROM ITS INCEPTION TO PRESENT DAY

Susan L. Fugate Brangers

November 11, 2007

In this dissertation I examine the meaning of the Mausoleum of Augustus and how this meaning has evolved and expanded over its two thousand years of existence. The discussion of the meaning of the tomb has often been neglected in previous scholarship due to the continuing debates over possible reconstructions of its appearance, probable antecedents for its design and questions concerning its date of construction. I propose the Mausoleum was constructed primarily as a victory monument. This message is conveyed through the use of architectural elements typical of victory monuments that can be found in and around the city of Rome. The construction of the Ara Pacis and Horologium, creating an Augustan complex in the northern Campus Martius, emphasized this message of victory but also expanded it to include the concept of peace.

I continue my evaluation of the meaning of the Mausoleum of Augustus by tracing its history from the fall of Rome to the twenty-first century. I present the monument as if the main subject of a biography. I examine its role in the life of the city of Rome as it changed from being a tomb to being used as a fortress, vineyard, statue garden, bull ring, and, finally, a concert hall. These various uses over the centuries affected both the physical appearance of the Mausoleum as well as its meaning to the citizens of Rome.

I then examine the role of the Mausoleum in the first half of the twentieth century when it became a centerpiece of Fascist propaganda. In the 1930s Mussolini initiated the excavation and isolation of the monument. It was during this time, that the Piazza Imperatore Augusto was constructed in an attempt to highlight the monument. I suggest that instead of spotlighting the Mausoleum, this work actually ended its vibrant role within the life of Rome. It is only now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, that Mausoleum is beginning to reemerge as an important part of Rome's past and future. This change started with the construction of Richard Meier's Ara Pacis Museum and is continuing with the proposed revitalization of the monument and the Piazza Imperatore Augusto.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Mausoleum of Augustus: Historical views of its appearance, plan, and reconstruction.....	10
3. The Mausoleum of Augustus: Location, Date, and Antecedents.....	24
4. The Mausoleum of Augustus: Its expanding meaning.....	59
5. The Post-Antique History of the Mausoleum of Augustus From the Fall of Rome to the early Twentieth Century	83
6. The Mausoleum in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Century: A new era of meaning.....	106
7. Summary and Conclusion.....	135
REFERENCES.....	143
FIGURE ILLUSTRATIONS.....	156
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	204

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

1.1 Exterior view of the Mausoleum.....	156
1.2 Entrance corridor from exterior.....	156
1.3 Looking down entrance corridor from inside Mausoleum.....	157
1.4 View of grassy area showing the extant portion of first annular corridor...	157
1.5 Doric cornice with lion's head.....	158
1.6 View of niche and window in third annular corridor.....	158
1.7 View of inner chamber.....	159
1.8 View of both openings to the inner chamber.....	159
2.1 Exterior of Mausoleum of Augustus. Current view.....	160
2.2 View of Mausoleum in current state.....	160
2.3 Plan of Mausoleum by Antonio Muñoz.....	161
2.4 Sectional plan of Mausoleum by Henner von Hesberg.....	161
2.5 Giulio Romano, <i>Vision of Constantine</i> , Stanze Vaticane, early 16 th century...	162
2.6 Plan of the Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from <i>Gli antichi sepolcri</i>	163
2.7 View of the Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from <i>Gli antichi sepolcri</i>	164
2.8 View of the Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from <i>Gli antichi sepolcri</i>	165

2.9 Engraving of reconstructed view of Mausoleum, Gregorio Roisecco.....	166
2.10 Engraving of <i>opus reticulum</i> from Mausoleum by Piranesi.....	167
2.11 Engraving showing Mausoleum and associated artifacts by Piranesi.....	168
2.12 Hypothetical plan of Mausoleum by Piranesi.....	168
2.13 Engraving of reconstruction of Mausoleum by Luigi Canina.....	169
2.14 Reconstruction of Mausoleum by E. Fiorilli.....	169
2.15 Reconstruction of Mausoleum, south elevation.....	170
2.16 Three proposed reconstructions by G. Gatti.....	170
2.17 Reconstruction of Mausoleum by Henner von Hesberg.....	171
2.18 Interior elevation of Mausoleum by Henner von Hesberg.....	171
3.1 Map of Campus Martius.....	172
4.1 View of Augustan complex on the northern Campus Martius.....	173
4.2 View of Ara Pacis, 9 BC.....	173
4.3 Garland relief from interior wall of Ara Pacis.....	174
4.4 Interior wall of Ara Pacis.....	174
4.5 Relief panel of Roma from the Ara Pacis.....	175
4.6 Tellus/Ceres panel from the Ara Pacis.....	175
4.7 Romulus and Remus panel from the Ara Pacis.....	176
4.8 Aeneas/Numa panel from the Ara Pacis.....	176
4.9 Procession relief with Augustus and his family from the Ara Pacis.....	177

4.10 Procession relief with Senators from the Ara Pacis.....	177
4.11 Acanthus relief from the Ara Pacis.....	178
4.12 Egyptian obelisk which once served as the gnomon for the Horologium....	178
4.13 Augustan inscription from the obelisk/gnomon of the Horologium.....	179
4.14 View of Horologium excavation.....	179
4.15 Illustration of the shadow cast by Horologium on the autumnal equinox..	180
5.1 View of Rome by Sebastian Münster, 1550.....	180
5.2 Ash urn of Agrippina, Museo dei Conservatori.....	181
5.3 Sketch showing site plan of Mausoleum and Church of San Rocco.....	182
5.4 Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.....	183
5.5 Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.....	184
5.6 Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.....	185
5.7 Sketch of Doric cornice and dripstone, attributed to Peruzzi.....	185
5.8 Sketch with reconstructed view of Mausoleum, attributed to da Sangallo..	186
5.9 Plan of Mausoleum by Ligorio.....	186
5.10 Reconstructed view of Mausoleum by Ligorio.....	187
5.11 Reconstructed view of Mausoleum by Ligorio.....	188
5.12 Engraving of Mausoleum with Soderini garden by du Pérac.....	189
5.13 Engraving of Mausoleum showing Soderini garden in depleted state.....	189
5.14 View of Mausoleum during excavation of central core, late 18 th century...	190

5.15 View of Anfiteatro Correa during a fireworks show in late 18 th century.....	190
5.16 Elevation drawing of the Augusto by Cordingley and Richmond.....	191
6.1 Mussolini reading his speech announcing the isolation of the Mausoleum..	191
6.2 G. Gatti's reconstruction of the Mausoleum.....	192
6.3 View of interior of Mausoleum showing partial wall reconstruction.....	192
6.4 View of Mausoleum showing current ground level.....	193
6.5 View of National Social Security Administration Building	193
6.6 Western inset window from the National Social Security Administration Building.....	194
6.7 Eastern inset window from the National Social Security Administration Building	195
6.8 Mosaic triptych from the National Social Security Administration Building	196
6.9 Latin inscription from the National Social Security Administration Building	196
6.10 View of the eastern building for the National Social Security Administration.....	197
6.11 Detail of frieze from the eastern building for the National Social Security Administration	197
6.12 Latin inscription from the front of the eastern building for the National Social Security Administration	198
6.13 Morpurgo's building for the Ara Pacis.....	198
6.14 View of Collegio degli Illirici.....	199
6.15 Model of Foro Mussolini.....	199

6.16 General view of entrance to Foro Mussolini, called the Piazza Imperii.....	200
6.17 Mosaic of the two Romes from Piazza Imperii.....	201
6.18 Plan for Piazza Imperii including Fountain of the Sphere, on the left.....	202
6.19 Plan of Masoleum by Antonio Muñoz.....	202
6.20 New Ara Pacis Museum by Richard Meier.....	203

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Today, when approaching the Mausoleum of Augustus one is struck by two opposing thoughts (Figures 1.1).¹ One is both overwhelmed by the immense bulk of the extant walls and amazed to see how much of the monument has been lost. Along the exterior wall a few remnants of the travertine facing still remain. Cypress trees and bushes are planted above this wall in a mound of earth in an attempt to reconstruct the original appearance of the tomb as a tumulus. To enter the Mausoleum, one passes through the ancient entrance corridor to what, in antiquity, would have been the first of three annular corridors that encircled the central chamber (Figures 1.2-1.4). Of the two ring walls that define this corridor, only one, the outermost wall, still completely encircles the tomb. The upper stories of this wall, though, are no longer extant. A small portion of the other wall still stands but is largely reconstructed.

Where two of the ancient annular corridors would have stood, there is now a grassy area open to the sky. Lying about in this area are marble fragments

¹ The following description of the Mausoleum is based on observations made by the author while studying the monument in November 2005.

that, presumably, were found during the various excavations in and around the Mausoleum. These fragments appear to be from different artistic periods reflecting the Mausoleum's use and reuse over the centuries. Pieces of a Doric cornice with a lion's head and dripstone are some of the oldest fragments (Figure 1.5). Other fragments include pieces of marble columns and what appears to be a section of a marble lancet window. Since these fragments are not labeled, it is difficult to interpret their original purpose or location.

The most complete interior feature of the Mausoleum is the central core which is composed of the third annular corridor which forms an ambulatory around the circular tomb chamber. The corridor is dark, lit only by two small windows high overhead. In the outer wall of the ambulatory are three tall niches at three of the cardinal points (Figure 1.6). Scattered about the chamber are large cut stones, some of which seem to contain portions of epitaphs for those who were once buried there. Others contain decorative reliefs which are difficult to interpret because of their state of preservation. The wall of this chamber is constructed of regular courses of brick and in a few locations small portions of the original travertine veneer are still present.

The circular wall of the inner chamber once supported a tall pillar on which was placed a bronze statue of the emperor (Figure 1.7). The ash urn of Augustus was placed in this room so that it was located directly below his statue.

There are two openings on either side of the room, both on the same axis as the entrance to the third annular corridor (Figure 1.8). A large part of the wall of this small central chamber collapsed over the centuries and, even though it has been reconstructed, it is difficult to discern its original structure.

The Mausoleum, as it stands today, is a monument in great disrepair. Weeds are growing from its walls obscuring and further destroying the structure. It has become a roost for innumerable pigeons, which is causing further damage. Most importantly, it appears to be suffering from general neglect unfitting for a monument to Rome's first emperor. However, it is still impressive in its size and, albeit greatly reduced, its grandeur.

Scholarly interest in the Mausoleum of Augustus has increased in recent decades partially because of the excavation and isolation of the monument in the 1930s. This work, sponsored by Mussolini, exposed, for the first time since antiquity, the complete remaining structure of the tomb with its five concentric walls. There has been general interest in the Mausoleum since the Renaissance. Its plan and original appearance has been discussed in publications since the late nineteenth century. It was after World War II, though, that publications began to emerge with increasing frequency. These publications can be placed within one or more of the following categories: reconstructions of the tomb's original

appearance, discussions of the tomb's possible antecedents, and historical accounts of the tomb since the fall of Rome.

Henner von Hesberg in *Das Mausoleum des Augustus. Der Bau und seine inschriften*² provides a thorough discussion of the Mausoleum's plan, extant structure, and what is generally accepted as the most accurate reconstruction. In the same publication Silvio Panciera publishes the inscriptions found during the excavations.

In the debate over the tomb's antecedent(s), the Etruscan tombs at Cerveteri, the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos, and the tomb of Alexander the Great are the monuments most frequently proposed. Penelope Davies in her book, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*³, accepts the argument for the tomb of Alexander the Great, even though we have no structure with which to make a comparison. She also proposes that the plan of the Mausoleum may have been derived from other Alexandrian monuments, such as the Pharos. The debate over the tomb's antecedents continues in publications with little resolution. A thorough account of the history of the Mausoleum from the Middle Ages through the twentieth century is provided by Anna Maria Riccomini in *La ruina di si bela cosa: vicende e*

² Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994.

³ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

trasformazioni del Mausoleo di Augusto.⁴ In this work, she compiles and analyzes historical documents on the tomb and its environs.

These publications, which address the issues of reconstruction, antecedents, and historical accounts of the Mausoleum of Augustus, fail to consider the meaning of the monument. At first glance, Paul Rehak appears to address this question in his recent publication *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*⁵ but, in fact, he only provides a summary of previously published works.

In this dissertation, I propose that the meaning of the Mausoleum of Augustus has evolved and expanded over the past two thousand years. I believe that the tomb originally gained meaning from its location on the northern Campus Martius and later from the construction of important Augustan monuments within its vicinity. I also suggest that the passage of time has impacted and changed this meaning.

Before discussing the expanding meaning of the Mausoleum, I provide an overview of the monument's plan and structure. As part of this discussion, I include a summary of the various reconstructions that have been proposed since the Renaissance. During the construction of new buildings in the area of the Mausoleum, portions of its walls, that had previously been buried, were

⁴ Rome: Electa, 1996.

⁵ Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

revealed. The artists/architects Peruzzi and da Sangallo observed and sketched these wall sections before they were reburied. Despite these studies, it was during the Renaissance that the first fanciful, multi-tiered reconstructions of the tomb were produced. These inaccurate drawings and prints influenced the public's perception of the monument until the early twentieth century when archaeological studies resulted in more accurate reconstructions.

I also discuss the importance of the Mausoleum's location for I believe it is a necessary factor for understanding its meaning. From the earliest days of Rome, the Campus Martius was crucial to the life of the city though it was located outside the *pomerium*. It held religious and cultural significance since it was associated with the god Mars and was believed to be the site of the apotheosis of Romulus. It was where citizens gathered for the election of consuls and censors, where generals began their triumphal processions, and where foreign dignitaries stayed while they waited for an invitation to enter the city. Burial on the Campus was occasionally granted by the Senate as a special honor to those who provided exceptional service to the Republic. Therefore, Augustus's tomb gained greater meaning by its placement on this site.

Knowledge of the date for the initial construction of the Mausoleum would also aid in an understanding of its meaning. Unfortunately, the primary

sources are unclear as to when Augustus⁶ began building his tomb. After examining the primary sources and discussing the prevalent theories concerning the dates of the Mausoleum, I suggest that the monument was actually constructed later than these theories propose.

A third factor in interpreting the meaning of the tomb is determining the source, or sources, for its design. Publications on the Mausoleum, in recent years, have mainly focused on this search for the monument's antecedents. It has been proposed that antecedents for the design of the tomb can be found not only in Etruria but also in Anatolia, Greece, Egypt, and Algeria. After reviewing these various proposals and offering a critical analysis, I suggest prototypes for the design of the Mausoleum can be found in and around the city of Rome itself.

Thus, I propose that the meaning of the Mausoleum relates directly to the history of the city and not of the Empire. I examine the original appearance of the tomb and discuss how its different architectural features can be found in earlier Roman monuments. By examining the purpose of these structures, I present the primary meanings of the Mausoleum. I then consider how these meanings were expanded with the addition of the Horologium and the Ara Pacis. These monuments completed the Augustan complex on the northern

⁶ Although the name Augustus had not been conferred upon Octavian when construction on the Mausoleum began, I will be referring to him by this name (Augustus) throughout this work.

Campus Martius. I also discuss what additional meanings were applied to the monument after the death of Augustus.

I continue my discussion of the Mausoleum by exploring the history of the monument from the fall of Rome in the fifth century to the early twentieth century. During these centuries, the tomb was used as a fortress, vineyard, statue garden, bullring, and concert hall. An examination of each of these periods and their treatment of the Mausoleum reveals the general cultural view of the significance of ancient monuments.

Finally, I discuss the role of the tomb in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. I include an evaluation of the excavation and isolation of the Mausoleum under Mussolini and how it was used in Fascist propaganda. While Mussolini's excavation of the tomb heightened scholarly interest in the structure, it also resulted in it fading from public attention for it was often seen as an eyesore. I then examine how the new Meier complex for the Ara Pacis is renewing public interest in the Mausoleum.

Since the time of its construction, the history and meaning of the Mausoleum has been directly associated with the city in which it was constructed. The excavation and isolation of the monument broke this connection. Renewed interest in the Mausoleum should result in a renovation of

the monument and its surrounding piazza, thus, reviving its role in the life of Rome.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS: HISTORICAL VIEWS OF ITS APPEARANCE, PLAN, AND RECONSTRUCTION

Description of the Mausoleum

Most worth seeing is the so-called Mausoleion, a large mound set upon a tall socle by the river, planted with evergreen trees up to the top. Above stands the bronze statue of the Emperor Augustus. Within the mound are the graves intended for him, his relatives and friends. Behind there is a large grove with splendid walks, in the midst of which is an elevated place (the *ustrinum*), where Augustus's corpse was burnt.⁷

This account by Strabo is the most complete ancient description of the Mausoleum of Augustus. The centuries have been unkind to the structure, leaving but a shell of its former grandeur (Figures 2.1 and 2.2). Pondering the remains, it is possible to gain a sense of what it once was. Descending from the current level to the ancient street level, one can get a better understanding of the scale of the monument. The Mausoleum has a diameter of over 85 meters (300 Roman feet) and it is estimated that the original height was 45 meters

⁷ Strabo, *Geography*, 5.3.9. Translation by Penelope Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 13-14.

(150 Roman feet).⁸ The unimpressive walls of *opus reticulatum* and tufa that one sees today are misleading, for the Mausoleum was once faced with blocks of white travertine. In antiquity the entrance, which is on the south side, would have overlooked the open plain of the Campus Martius.

Even in its current ruinous state the plan of the Mausoleum can be discerned.⁹ The structure consists of five concentric walls that encircle a central pillar on which would have stood a statue of Augustus (Figures 2.3 and 2.4). A vaulted entrance corridor takes one past the first three ring walls (5-3) to an annular passageway constructed between walls 3 and 2. Wall 2, one of the thickest, was faced with travertine on both sides suggesting that both were meant to be seen. Two openings in wall 2 provided access to a second annular passageway between walls 2 and 1. Like wall 2, wall 1 was faced with travertine on both sides. An opening on the same axis as the entrance corridor allowed access to the central burial chamber. Echoing the two spaces before it, this chamber is essentially an annular passageway encircling the central pillar. There are niches at three of the cardinal points in wall 1 which were intended to house the cinerary urns of Augustus's family. The central pillar, which has a diameter

⁸ Diane Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 117.

⁹ Unless otherwise noted the following description of the Mausoleum is taken *passim* from Henner von Hesberg and Silvio Panciera, *Das Mausoleum des Augustus. Der Bau und seine Inschriften* (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994) which is the most recent and thorough architectural study of the monument.

of nine meters and which contains a small chamber inside, once held the cinerary urn of Augustus.

The structure of the Mausoleum can be seen as consisting of two parts. The innermost ring walls, 0-2¹⁰, are separated from one another by the annular passages. The external ring walls, 3-5, are connected by the radial walls which form inaccessible chambers. These external walls perform a different function than the innermost walls. The combination of the ring and radial walls between walls 3-5 create a support system capable of withstanding the weight of an earthen mound believed to have been placed above them and of receiving the thrust which the mound created. In addition to the radial walls, walls 5 and 4 are also connected by semi-circular walls. These walls (semi-circular, radial and ring) are all roughly finished and are not consistently covered with *opus reticulatum*. It is believed that the areas between walls 5 and 4 were originally filled with earth. The radial walls between 4 and 3 are more finished and the spaces between appear to have been vaulted. Twelve hollow chambers would thus have been created, although none were accessible.¹¹

While walls 3-5 formed the support system for the mausoleum, walls 0-2 formed the functional center. These walls were reveted with travertine

¹⁰ The use of 0 as the number for the central wall of the tomb began with Hesberg. His numbering system has been followed in publications ever since.

¹¹ Hesberg and Panciera 6.

indicating that they were visible to those entering the tomb. The thickness of wall 2 suggests it once supported a wall of much greater height, possibly the tallest of all the walls. The annular passages between the walls may have had ceremonial purposes. Since the openings leading from one annular passageway to the next were not on the same axis, a mourner or visitor to the tomb would have to decide whether to go to the left or right in order to locate the next opening and proceed toward the central chamber of the tomb. Such an arrangement may have encouraged the visitor to make complete circuits around the tomb before proceeding to the next annular passageway. This circuitous route to the funerary chamber is similar to the Roman funerary ritual of circumambulation in which men from a Roman legion would circle their deceased general three times as a symbolic gesture of honor.¹²

The actual appearance of the Mausoleum in antiquity is not known. Even Strabo's description is minimal. Since the Renaissance, artists and architects have attempted to reconstruct the original appearance of the Mausoleum. In the sixteenth century excavations were conducted in the area of the tomb which revealed a portion of its outer ring wall. Architects drew detailed studies of the area that was revealed and made some of the first reconstruction drawings based

¹² The hypothesis that the annular passageways were used for ritual purposes such as circumambulation is convincingly discussed by Jane Clark Reeder in her article, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulus and Tholos," *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992): 265-307.

upon what they saw.¹³ Even though these studies were made, they were never published and did not contribute to the study of the Mausoleum until the twentieth century.¹⁴ Instead, a more fantastical view of the monument developed only slightly based upon the plan of the tomb. Images of the monument in the sixteenth century depict a multi-tiered structure with niches and sculpture. The image of the Mausoleum most commonly reproduced is that which is seen in the *Vision of Constantine* fresco in the Stanze di Raffaello in the Vatican (Figure 2.5). It is probable that this popular reconstruction derived from knowledge of the tomb's ring walls. The artist may have thought that the surviving interior walls were the footings of walls that increased in height as they decreased in diameter as one moved toward the center of the tomb. This misinterpretation of the Mausoleum's plan resulted in the tower-like structure seen in this fresco and other illustrations of the tomb from this period.

The sculptures depicted in the reconstructions may actually have been a result of discoveries made in the vicinity of the monument during excavations in the area surrounding the Mausoleum. It is generally acknowledged today that they were not originally from the tomb.¹⁵ It is probable that they were brought to

¹³ See discussion of these studies in chapter five.

¹⁴ Anna Maria Riccomini, *La ruina di sì bela cosa: vicende e trasformazioni del Mausoleo di Augusto* (Rome: Electa, 1996) 56-58

¹⁵ Riccomini 58-60.

a limekiln that was once in operation on or next to the Mausoleum.¹⁶ These ancient sculptures were brought to the site to be broken and burnt for the production of mortar. Therefore, these reconstructions were not purely the result of flights of fancy as they may first appear but were created based upon the limited information available.

By the end of the sixteenth century, interest in the tomb and its reconstruction began to wane. During the seventeenth century, the Mausoleum was completely surrounded by new buildings which made it difficult to find and nearly impossible to study. Hence, there were few seventeenth-century illustrations or reconstructions of the tomb. The few that were done relied on the earlier erroneous engravings and descriptions. One important publication from the end of the seventeenth century, though, did feature the Mausoleum and seems to represent a revived interest in the monument. Pietro Sante Bartoli's *Gli antichi sepolcri. Overo Mausolei Romani et Etruschi* (1697)¹⁷ contains remarkably accurate engravings of the plan of the tomb as well as of the appearance of the Mausoleum at that time (Figures 2.6-2.8). He does not, however, include reconstructions of the monument.

¹⁶ R. A. Cordingley and I. A. Richmond state in their article "Mausoleum of Augustus" *Papers of the British School at Rome* X (1927): 24 that in 1452 Guiliano Ser Roberti built lime-kilns and an inn near the Mausoleum.

¹⁷ This volume has recently been republished, see Pietro Santi Bartoli, *Gli Antichi Sepolcri overo Mausolei Romani et Etruschi* (Bologna: Arnaldo Forni Editore, 1979).

Reconstructions of the Mausoleum began to appear once again by the mid-eighteenth century. These illustrations continued the sixteenth-century tradition of a multi-tiered structure. An engraving by Gregorio Roisecco depicts the tomb as having four levels which are topped by a stepped dome and a statue presumably of Augustus (Figure 2.9). In an attempt to have his reconstruction correlate with the description by Strabo, Roisecco has a few trees standing on each level.

More intriguing engravings from the same period are those by Giovanni Battista Piranesi. The engravings, published in *Antichità Romane II*, suggest Piranesi had an opportunity to study the monument and its wall construction. In one engraving he depicts the *opus reticulatum* used in constructing the walls as well as what appears to be a cross-section of the Mausoleum's entrance corridor (Figure 2.10). Another engraving depicts the remaining visible structure of the tomb, both of the obelisks that would have flanked the entrance, the base for the funerary urn of Agrippina and other objects believed to have come from the monument (Figure 2.11).¹⁸ These engravings are done with such precision that it seems very probable that Piranesi had first-hand knowledge of the tomb, its structure, and its associated artifacts. It is therefore all the more intriguing that his plan for the Mausoleum is so inaccurate (Figure 2.12). He reconstructs the

¹⁸ As discussed *passim* by Riccomini.

plan with a temple portico for the entrance along with twelve niches equally placed around the exterior of the outer wall. The interior of the structure then becomes a complex arrangement of circular and rectangular rooms, radial walls, and annular passages.

Piranesi's plan is important in the history of reconstruction of the Mausoleum for its influence on the work of later artists. In the mid-nineteenth century Luigi Canina produced an engraving for his publication *Vedute dei principali monumenti di Roma antica* (1851). Unlike the reconstructions discussed earlier, Canina depicts the Mausoleum with a conical mound of earth covered with trees similar to Strabo's description (Figure 2.13). The masonry wall below the mound illustrates the influence of Piranesi for it also has a temple portico marking the entrance to the tomb. This combination of a circular wall and portico is reminiscent of the Pantheon, albeit hexastyle. It is probable that Canina used this ancient monument as a source for understanding how to combine the different architectural elements that he was depicting in his illustration of the tomb. Also in his reconstruction of the Mausoleum, Canina places niches and statuary around the exterior of the tomb, again showing the influence of Piranesi's plan. This nineteenth-century engraving seems to mark a move away from the elaborate reconstructions from the earlier centuries to ones

that are simpler and adhere more closely to Strabo's description and the visible remains of the tomb.

In the early twentieth century new architectural studies of the Mausoleum were conducted. From 1914-1922 Alfonso Bartoli published *I Monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze* which contained engravings and drawings. While he was compiling these images from the Uffizi collection, he rediscovered the drawings of the Mausoleum made during the sixteenth-century excavations. Bartoli was particularly interested in the work of Peruzzi whose drawings and measurements of the lower, outer wall of the tomb have proven to be quite accurate. In his article "L'architettura del mausoleo di Augusto" published in the *Bollettino d'Arte* (1927)¹⁹, Bartoli discusses Peruzzi's drawings and compares them to the remaining structure of the Mausoleum. This study of the monument and the drawings allowed Bartoli to develop a new theory regarding the reconstruction of the tomb which he discusses in his article.

Using Bartoli's discussion of the Mausoleum as a guide, Fiorilli published a reconstruction drawing in his article "A proposito del Mausoleo di Augusto"²⁰ in the same issue of the journal. In this drawing the Mausoleum consists of a plain lower wall topped by an upper wall of a slightly smaller diameter (Figure 2.14). The upper wall was shown as being decorated with lesene, which are

¹⁹ A. Bartoli (1927) 30-46.

²⁰ *Bollettino d'Arte* 7 (1927): 214-19.

pilasters without a base or capital, much in the style of Roman circular temples. The tomb is then crowned by a conical mound of earth on which stands the statue of Augustus. The earthen mound is reminiscent of that illustrated in Canina's engraving though not of the same height.

In the same year as Bartoli's and Fiorilli's publications, R. A. Cordingley and I. A. Richmond published their reconstruction of the Mausoleum in *Papers of the British School at Rome*.²¹ Their reconstruction is based upon studies of the structure that was still visible above ground as well as portions of the tomb that were uncovered during minor excavations that took place in 1926 (Figure 2.15). Some of the lower wall was also visible in the cellars of surrounding buildings. Cordingley and Richmond reconstruct the tomb as having multiple stories, each of decreasing diameter toward the center. They do not crown the monument with a mound of earth but have each story separated by earthen fill that is planted with trees and shrubs. They show the lower wall as having greater height than Bartoli and Fiorilli. The plan of this wall is depicted as being broken by a string course that encircles the tomb halfway up the height of the wall. The uppermost story, similar to the reconstruction by Bartoli and Fiorilli, is decorated with lesene.

²¹ Cordingley and Richmond, "The Mausoleum of Augustus." *Papers of the British School at Rome* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1927), 23-35.

Both of the reconstructions in 1927 were done without complete knowledge and understanding the plan of the Mausoleum. Over the centuries damage had been done to the tomb and it was not possible to access the central core because a collapsed wall blocked access. Plans from these publications provide very little detail and information about walls 1-3. Investigations into the tomb from 1926 to 1930 revealed more of the interior structure. From this information, G. Gatti was able to provide three possible reconstructions (Figures 2.16 a-c) of the Mausoleum in his article "Il Mausoleo di Augusto: studio di ricostruzione".²²

Each of the three reconstructions is a combination of architectural elements and earthen mounds. The lowest section of the tomb is a large circular wall with a projecting base and cornice. Above this wall is a mound of earth planted with trees and shrubs. Rising from this mound is a low wall which secures the earth within the mound by creating a terraced effect. This mound is then crowned by the second architectural element which is of a significantly smaller diameter than the lower wall. Like Bartoli and Fiorilli's reconstruction, this top architectural element is similar to Roman circular temples. Gatti's reconstruction is different, though, in the fact that this element is topped by more earth and plantings, in the middle of which stands the statue of Augustus.

²² G. Gatti, "Il Mausoleo di Augusto. Studio di ricostruzione." *Capitolium* 10 (1934): 457-64.

It is this second architectural element that is different in each of the three reconstructions. The first and second reconstruction drawings (Figures 2.16 a and b) have the third wall creating a portico with a Doric entablature. In the first reconstruction the portico is formed by a series of arches each separated by engaged columns. The reconstruction drawing replaces the arcade with a colonnade. In the third reconstruction (Figure 2.16 b), the third internal wall forms a podium from which rises the second wall, creating a temple-like structure. The second wall is decorated with lesene and a simple Doric entablature. The third reconstruction became the most widely accepted view of the Mausoleum after the excavation of the monument was completed in the 1930s.

A more recent architectural examination of the tomb conducted by Henner von Hesberg resulted in a new reconstruction.²³ He depicts the mausoleum as having two basic elements—the lower portion, comprised of walls 5-3, contains the earthen mound described by Strabo and the upper portion, comprised of walls 2-0, creates a second architectural element topped by the statue of Augustus (Figure 2.17). Unlike Gatti, this second element is depicted without columns or lesene though the Doric entablature is still present.

²³Hesberg and Panciera

Thus far this discussion has focused on the reconstruction of the exterior of the Mausoleum. Hesberg offers an interior reconstruction of the tomb (Figure 18). Like the exterior, the interior also consists of multi-levels though there is no evidence that the upper levels were accessible. Walls 2 and 1 were three stories high and, therefore were of the greatest height. The lowest level, which is discussed above, contained two vaulted annular passageways with a height of 11.50 meters. The two levels above contained vaulted passageways of the same height. He believes that the passageways on each level would have been of the same height so the same scaffolding could have been used from one level to the next. While earlier excavators reconstructed the interior with stairways to these upper stories, there is no structural evidence to indicate that these stairways once existed. It is more probable that the vaulted passages, mimicking those below, had a structural function. These annular vaults would have lightened the weight of the structure and would have helped in directing the thrust of the building to the outer walls.²⁴

Over the centuries the most consistent reconstruction of the Mausoleum has been that of a multi-level structure which combined architectural elements with the earthen mound of a tumulus. If this combination was the true form of the tomb in antiquity, one may question why Strabo's description of the

²⁴ Hesberg and Panciera 7.

monument does not mention the upper levels. There has not been a satisfactory answer to this question. All that can be said with certainty about the Mausoleum is that its original design, like so many factors that will be discussed in the following chapters, has been obscured by the passage of time.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS: LOCATION, DATE, AND ANTECEDENTS

In chapter two, the many interpretations of the Mausoleum's original appearance and plan were presented. While there is some consensus among scholars concerning these issues, many questions still remain. A larger debate within Augustan scholarship focuses on the tomb's possible antecedents. The location of the tomb in the Campus Martius and the date of its construction are both factors in discussing the derivation of the Mausoleum.

Why choose the Campus Martius?

Suetonius states that Augustus constructed his Mausoleum during his sixth consulship (28 BCE).²⁵ This monument was the first of several that Augustus would construct on the Campus Martius (Figure 3.1). He was not the first to use this area as a stage for self-aggrandizement, but his monuments had a cohesiveness not previously seen. In antiquity the Campus was a distinct district along the western edge of the city. Located outside the *pomerium* of Rome, it was

²⁵ *Augustus*, 100.4.

freed from the restrictions that governed the city's religious, social and civic activities. The boundaries of the Campus were marked by the river to the west and north, the Via Flaminia to the east, and the Capitoline Hill to the south. The frequent flooding of the plain by the Tiber River resulted in limited building in the area during the early Republic, especially to the north, leaving an open area central to the life of the city.

The name of the area is generally associated with the altar of Mars which is believed to have been located in the Campus.²⁶ Generally associated with Romulus's apotheosis, the special status of the Campus Martius goes back to the founding days of the city.²⁷ Later, the Etruscan kings took possession of the area and many of them were buried there. After the expulsion of the Etruscans, the Campus became public property and was rededicated to the god Mars.

It did not take long for the leading citizens of Rome to see the opportunities that the Campus Martius provided. Since it was the area in which the election of the consuls and censors took place, as well as the starting point for triumphal processions, the plain was an ideal location for temples and monuments in honor of noble families and in memory of the deeds they had

²⁶ Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*, ed. John G. Younger, (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 11.

²⁷ The association of the area with the apotheosis of Romulus is explored in Coarelli's article, "Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo" *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici (Supplementum)* 10 (1983): 41-46.

performed for the state.²⁸ Many of the temples dedicated during the middle Republic were on, or near, the route taken by triumphal processions and also would have been seen by citizens on their way to the *ovile*, later the *saepta*, to cast their votes in the consulship and censorship elections. This could not have been a coincidence. In hopes of influencing the vote, the dedicator constructed these temples and triumphal monuments as reminders of the great deeds and prestige of his family.²⁹

Similar motives must have been behind the construction of temporary theaters and amphitheaters in the Campus Martius. Tradition discouraged the building of structures for theatrical and gladiatorial performances within the city. The level plain of the Campus, and the fact that it was outside the *pomerium* of the city, made it suitable for these structures. While these temporary but often very elaborate structures were constructed to house funerary games, it was the beneficence of the builder that was to be remembered at election time. One of the clearest examples of this was in 52 BCE when Gaius Curio constructed a pair of theaters back to back to honor his deceased father. The ingenuity of these theaters was demonstrated part way through the funerary celebration when the theaters were turned to face one another to create an amphitheater. The

²⁸ The construction of temples as a form of aristocratic competition for electoral votes is discussed in John R. Patterson's article, "Survey Article The City of Rome: From Republic to Empire," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992): 186-215; specifically 194-200.

²⁹ Patterson 194-196.

spectacle of those theaters helped guarantee Curio's election to tribune later that year.³⁰

Three years earlier Pompey had rejected tradition and constructed Rome's first permanent theater in the Campus under the guise of a temple constructed in honor of *Venus Victrix*. Next to the theater he provided an enclosed public garden, the *Porticus Pompei*, which was filled with trees, fountains and Greek statuary. Importantly, this new theater and Porticus were visible when the Roman citizens would gather to cast their votes, and surely these structures would have encouraged the citizens to support Pompey and his followers in many future elections.

Not to be outdone by his rival, Julius Caesar had even greater plans for the Campus Martius. Caesar made use of monumental architecture to influence voting more directly than his predecessors had by beginning the construction of the *Saepta Iulia* to replace the original *ovile*. The *Saepta*, which was completed in 26 BCE by Agrippa, was a large unroofed portico with colonnades that were a mile long. This immense structure could only have been meant to impress the citizens of Rome when they came to cast their votes. His plans for the Campus Martius went beyond the construction of monuments. It was his intent to enlarge the Campus and to create a new city center by diverting the Tiber River

³⁰ Favro 24.

to the west.³¹ The benefit of this plan was the reduction of flooding and the creation of an open, flat plain on which to build a more regularized center based upon examples from the Hellenized East.³² Caesar was unable to carry out this plan for the enlargement of the Campus before his assassination in 44 BCE.

Augustus, like his adoptive father, recognized the possibilities that the unencumbered space of the western and northern Campus presented. Although Caesar's plan to create a new center for Rome would have gone against Augustus's expressed desire to maintain the traditions of the Republic, Augustus could still create a complex of monuments both religious and secular in the area. As his status in Rome increased in the 30s BCE, Augustus, with the help of Agrippa, began the various projects that would create the new Augustan complex on the Campus. In 25 BCE, next to the *Saepta Iulia* Agrippa constructed the *Thermae Agrippa* surrounded by public gardens. This bath complex was one of the first large public baths for the city of Rome. Their full use was made possible with the construction of an aqueduct, the *aqua Virgo*, in 19 BCE which supplied an abundance of water for the city.³³

Just to the north of the baths, still near the *Saepta Iulia*, Agrippa constructed his Pantheon in the 20s BCE. While the plan of the Agrippan

³¹ Cicero, *Ad Att.* 13.33a.1, Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 44 (*The Twelve Caesars* trans. Robert Graves (London: Penguin Classics, 1979) 33).

³² Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1988) 19-20.

³³ Favro 115.

Pantheon is uncertain, a proposal presented by William Loerke places the entrance porch of Agrippa's temple on the northern side.³⁴ Therefore, if Loerke's proposal is correct, a visitor standing at the entrance and facing northward would see a horizon dominated by the Mausoleum of Augustus which was constructed at the northernmost point of the Campus Martius.³⁵

The Mausoleum was not the first tomb to be constructed in this field for, as mentioned above, the Campus had been used as a burial site for the Etruscan kings. During the Republic, the Senate, on occasion, granted the special honor of burial within the Campus. Sulla, the two consuls A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, and Julius Caesar, with his daughter Julia, were all granted this last honor. By constructing his Mausoleum on the Campus Martius, Augustus established an association between himself and the *summi viri* of Rome's past. It was understood that this field was a place of honor on which the great protectors of Rome were buried; therefore, Augustus, with his tomb on this site, would have been seen as having the same status.³⁶

³⁴ William Loerke, "Georges Chédanne and the Pantheon: A Beaux Arts Contribution to the History of Roman Architecture," *Modulus. The University of Virginia School of Architecture Review* (1982): 40-55.

³⁵ T.P. Wiseman states in the *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae* vol. I, ed. Eva Steinby (Rome: Edizioni Qasar, 1993-2000), 220-224 that the mausoleum was actually just to the north of the Campus Martius and not actually within its boundaries. He explains that the only ancient source that places the mausoleum within the Campus Martius is Strabo. Whether or not Wiseman's conclusions are correct, the size of the mausoleum would result in it visually dominating the area of the Campus Martius.

³⁶ Davies 139.

A more direct correlation between the tombs of Augustus and Julius Caesar has been proposed by Pietro Caligari.³⁷ By surveying what appear to be artificial hills in the area of the ancient Campus Martius and studying ancient inscriptions, Caligari has isolated the area of Monte Cenci as the site of the tomb of Julius Caesar. This location would place the tombs of Augustus and Julius Caesar on either end of a north-south axis passing through the Campus. He further states that the distance between the two monuments is equivalent to a Roman mile (1480 m.). If Caligari's theory on the location of the tomb of Julius Caesar is accurate, it would suggest that the choice of location for the Mausoleum of Augustus was based upon a desire to establish a sight-line between the two tombs. The goal would have been to reaffirm the familial and political ties between the two rulers.³⁸

As mentioned above, there was also a direct line of sight between the Mausoleum and the Agrippan Pantheon. Originally Agrippa planned to have a statue of Augustus inside his Pantheon along with those of Julius Caesar and all the gods. Augustus refused this honor, not wanting it to be presumed that he thought himself as equal to the gods. Instead, Agrippa placed statues of both

³⁷ Pietro Caligari, *Il Mausoleo di Giulio Cesare nel Campo Marzio* (Rome: Vetera Edizioni, 2001).

³⁸ Rehak disagrees with this theory. He suggests that the reason for the distance between Augustus's tomb and the tomb of Julius Caesar was to disassociate himself from his adoptive father (*Cosmos and Imperium*, 36).

himself and Augustus on the porch.³⁹ With this arrangement, one could stand on the porch of the Pantheon next to the statue of Augustus and see his bronze statue rising above the Mausoleum. Combining this idea with Caligari's theory on the location of the tomb of Julius Caesar, a grouping would emerge with the Pantheon at or near the mid-point of the axis between the two tombs. The Agrippan Pantheon would then serve as a link between the Deified Julius Caesar, whose tomb was to the south, and his adopted son Augustus, whose tomb was to the north.

When was the Mausoleum constructed?

It is not precisely known when construction on the Mausoleum began. It is generally agreed that it was either just before or just after the Battle of Actium and the conquest of Egypt (31-30 BCE). The ancient sources do little to clarify the confusion. One of the earliest accounts of the Mausoleum comes from Virgil's *Aeneid*. While Aeneas visits his father Anchises in Elysium (Book VI, 853-1222), he sees Augustus's nephew and son-in-law, Marcellus. When Aeneas asks his father about the young man he is informed of Marcellus's untimely death and the sorrow of Rome at his passing. Anchises then states, "How many groans/ Will be sent up from that great Field of Mars/ To Mars' proud city, and what sad

³⁹ Cassius Dio 53.27

rites you'll see,/ Tiber, as you flow past the new-built tomb."⁴⁰ This quote, the only reference to the Mausoleum in the *Aeneid*, provides no information regarding the actual construction of the tomb. Since the death of Marcellus was in 23 BCE and the death of Virgil was in 19 BCE, this reference to the Mausoleum must have been written sometime during this four year span.

Only two other ancient sources refer to the construction of the Mausoleum. These references are found in the works of Suetonius and Cassius Dio. Suetonius provides in his description of Augustus's burial the following information in regard to the Mausoleum:

Leading knights, barefoot, and wearing unbelted tunics, ten collected his [Augustus's] ashes and placed them in the family Mausoleum. He had built this himself during his sixth consulship, between the Flaminian Way and the Tiber; at the same time converting the neighborhood into a public park. (*Augustus* 100.4)⁴¹

Cassius Dio writes, in his description of Marcellus's death and burial, "Augustus delivered a eulogy in the traditional manner, gave him a public burial and placed his body in the tomb which he [Augustus] was building" (53.30).⁴² Suetonius and Virgil use the past tense form of the word *build* (*built*) which is understood to mean the work was complete, in their description of the Mausoleum. Cassius

⁴⁰ "Quanto ille virum magnam Mavortis ad urbem/ campus aget gemitus, vel quae, libertine, videbis/ funera, cum tumulum praeterlabere recentem!" (Book VI) Translated by Robert Fitzgerald, New York: Vintage Classics, 1990, lines 1184-1187.

⁴¹ Suetonius, *The Twelve Caesars* trans. Robert Graves (London: Penguin Classics, 1979), 111.

⁴² Cassius Dio, *The Roman History: The Reign of Augustus*, trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert (London: Penguin Classics, 1987), 152.

Dio, on the other hand, uses the imperfect form of the verb (*was building*) which suggests that the tomb was not yet complete in 23 BCE when the ashes of Marcellus were placed inside the tomb.

Konrad Kraft, in his article "Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus," examines the Virgilian reference focusing on the last phrase of the quote, "*cum tumulum praeterlabere recentem*" ["as you flow past the new-built tomb"].⁴³ The significant term in this quote for Kraft is *recentem* for he wonders what may have qualified as new or recent for Virgil. He suggests that it could include up to a span of five years which could place the completion of the tomb in 28 BCE, agreeing with the date provided by Suetonius. Kraft also proposes that Virgil may have intended the term *recentem* to refer to the fact that Marcellus was recently placed in the tomb and not that the tomb was recently constructed. This reading of the quote, though, employs a more unusual understanding of the word *recentem* and one not likely to have been intended by Virgil.⁴⁴

In his discussion of the quote from Suetonius, Kraft observes that the scale and complexity of the tomb make it improbable that the monument was begun and completed within one year.⁴⁵ One is left with the question, then, of what

⁴³ *Historia* XVI 1967: 189-206. The pages that pertain to this discussion are 190-193.

⁴⁴ In the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 1579 the fourth meaning of *recens* is "fresh or newly come (from a condition, action place, etc.);" while the first, and most common, meaning is "That is of recent origin or occurrence." In fact, the line from Virgil quoted above is used as an example for the first meaning.

⁴⁵ Kraft 191.

Suetonius meant by the statement, "He had built this himself during his sixth consulship," In order to answer this question, Kraft refers to other architectural writings and literary statements in which a single date is given for a structure. He found that typically when a single date is used it refers to the year the structure was completed and not the year construction began.⁴⁶ He also points out that it is possible that in 28 BCE the Mausoleum was basically complete but that work on its ornamentation was still underway.⁴⁶ According to Kraft, this interpretation would help alleviate the apparent contradiction between the account given by Suetonius and that provided by Cassius Dio which suggests that the tomb was not yet complete in 23 BCE, the year of Marcellus's death.

Kraft finally concludes that construction of the tomb began around 32 BCE, which would coincide with Augustus's reading of Antony's will in the Senate.⁴⁷ According to Cassius Dio, Augustus forcibly acquired Antony's will after being told of its existence by two former Antonine followers, Munatius Plancus, his senior consular, and Titius, Plancus' nephew. Both men had been witnesses for the will and were aware of its damaging contents.⁴⁸ Although it was illegal to open and read the will of a living man, Octavian used his influence to acquire the document from the Vestal Virgins and read its contents to the

⁴⁶ Kraft 192.

⁴⁷ Kraft 200.

⁴⁸ Cassius Dio 50.3.

Senate. In the will Antony recognized Caesarion as Julius Caesar's son, made generous bequeathals to his children by Cleopatra, and, lastly, requested that he be buried alongside Cleopatra in Alexandria. The recognition of children by a foreign woman and the desire to be buried in Alexandria seemed to add validity to the rumors that Antony would have moved the capital from Rome to Alexandria and hand rule over to Cleopatra.⁴⁹

Thus, according to Kraft, Augustus's decision to begin the construction of his tomb at this time was an act of political maneuvering against Antony. When the Roman citizens saw the construction of the Mausoleum on the Campus Martius, it would confirm for them that Augustus was a true Roman with no intentions of abandoning the city to a foreign influence.⁵⁰

The early, pre-Actian date for the Mausoleum is tentatively accepted by Hesberg in his architectural study of the monument.⁵¹ He states the plan for and initial construction of the tomb was in 31 BCE. According to Hesberg it seems impossible for the construction of the Mausoleum to have begun after the Battle of Actium. Therefore, he must mean, though he does not explicitly state, that the tomb was begun in the early months of 31 BCE. He supports this theory by asserting that the date of 28 BCE provided by Suetonius is the completion date

⁴⁹ Cassius Dio 50.3-4.

⁵⁰ Kraft 200-206.

⁵¹ Hesberg and Panciera 54-55.

for the construction of the monument. By "complete", Hesberg is referring only to the completion of the concrete structure for he then states that the stone facing must have been completed by 8 BCE at the latest. He determines this date based on the observation that the inscription to Drusus Major, who died in 9 BCE, was set in the Doric entablature. Therefore, he concludes that the Mausoleum had to have been constructed between 31 and 10 BCE and that the peculiarities of its style and typology prevent a more precise timeframe.

Thus, according to Kraft and Hesberg the initial construction of the Mausoleum must be placed before the Battle of Actium either in the year 32 or 31 BCE. Their theories, though, are difficult to accept when one looks back at the accounts of these years in the primary sources, especially that provided by Cassius Dio. Hesberg states that the construction of the Mausoleum must be dated to 31 BCE. This dating is problematic since that is the same year as the Battle of Actium. One is left concluding, as mentioned above, that he means that construction was initiated prior the battle. Cassius Dio, in his account of the events leading up to Actium, relates that Augustus attempted to make a surprise attack on Antony's fleet in the late winter or early spring of 31 BCE. This attempted attack was not successful because the Augustan fleet had to withdraw due to a storm. He then assembled his troops in Brundisium and with them

crossed the Ionian Sea to set up camp at Actium.⁵² According to this account, then, there would have only been a few months in 31 BCE when Augustus would have been in Rome. This activity in the months prior to the Battle of Actium makes it difficult to accept the theory that this was the time that Augustus began constructing his tomb.

Kraft provides the earlier date of 32 BCE for the construction of the tomb but again this date proves to be problematic. It was not long after Antony's will was read before the Senate that war was declared against Cleopatra. In an attempt to gain greater support, Antony began to send bribes throughout Italy and, especially, to the city of Rome. To counteract this action, Augustus began to distribute money to his troops.⁵³ Thus, on purely practical terms, I do not believe Augustus would have begun the construction of his tomb when he busy preparing for battle, solidifying support, and distributing a large sum of money to maintain his troops.

While it is possible that Augustus may have been planning his tomb in 31 BCE, it seems improbable that in the midst of preparing for the Battle at Actium that he would have begun its construction. I believe that the Mausoleum was begun once Augustus returned to Rome in 29 BCE. The wealth that he acquired from the conquest of Egypt would have provided him with the funds to

⁵² Cassius Dio 50.11-12.

⁵³ Cassius Dio 50.7.

construct such a monumental tomb. It was also in this year that Augustus celebrated his triple triumph for victories in Dalmatia, Actium, and Alexandria. It would be appropriate, then, for him to construct a large monument in relationship to this victory celebration.⁵⁴

What was the source for design of the Mausoleum?

One of the main focuses of scholarly publication on the Mausoleum of Augustus since the mid-twentieth century has concerned the debate over its possible antecedents. Earlier, it was generally accepted that the tumulus form was derived from Etruscan tumuli, such as those found in the necropolis at Caere (Cerveteri). The proximity of the Etruscan site (approximately 28 miles from Rome) along with Augustus' desire to maintain the traditions of the Republic would seem to support this assumption. In 1966, R. R. Holloway posed a new possibility for the Mausoleum's antecedent in his article "The Tomb of Augustus and the Princes of Troy."⁵⁵ Holloway dismisses the idea that Augustus would wish to associate himself with the Etruscans. He asserts that Augustus would not choose such an association for, "[w]hatever his pretensions, they were not to pose as [the Etruscan kings] Tarquin or Lars Porsenna."⁵⁶ He also argues with

⁵⁴ This connection between Mausoleum and Augustus's victory in Egypt will be explored more thoroughly in the next chapter.

⁵⁵ Holloway, *American Journal of Archaeology* 70 (1966): 171-173.

⁵⁶ Holloway 173.

the theory that the Mausoleum follows a Republican tradition of tomb architecture. He suggests that the two tumuli most often seen as precursors to the Mausoleum, the Torrione di Micara at Tusculum and the tomb of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia, do not pre-date the Augustan monument. Traditionally, the Torrione di Micara had been dated to 56 BCE based upon its identification as the tomb of L. Licinius Lucullus. Holloway posits that the monument should be dated to the last decades of the first century BCE based on its use of brick facing. A study of the sculptural decoration of the tomb of Caecilia Metella has suggested to Holloway that the tomb was erected for Caecilia Metella not by her father or husband but by her son. As a result of this new identification, a change of date from the mid-first century BCE to after 28 BCE is suggested.

In search of an antecedent for Augustus's tomb, Holloway moves away from Italy to earthen mounds on the coast of Anatolia. Although archaeological investigations of these mounds in the early twentieth century revealed that they were the remains of pre-historic villages, in antiquity they were believed to have been the tombs of Trojan princes.⁵⁷ He believes that the use of the mounds as models for the Mausoleum would have exemplified Augustus's claim of Trojan ancestry through the Julii.

⁵⁷ See J.L. Myres, "The Cretan Labyrinth: A Retrospect of Aegean Research," *The Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 63 (July, 1933): 301.

While the symbolism of the mounds suggested by Holloway is enticing, their actual structures offer little similarity to the Mausoleum. The Trojan "tumuli" are just earthen mounds lacking any architectural features, especially the stone retaining wall found in the Etruscan tumuli and in the tomb of Augustus. While agreeing with Holloway's evidence for the Mausoleum of Augustus being the first Roman circular tomb, J. M. C. Toynbee rejects the theory that the monument was derived from the tumuli at Troy.⁵⁸ Instead, she states that in order to find an antecedent for the Mausoleum one need not look any further than the Etruscan tumuli at Caere.

More recently Mark Johnson in "The Mausoleum of Augustus: Etruscan and Other Influences on Its Design,"⁵⁹ states that the tomb of Augustus was derived from Etruscan influences. He also believes that the Mausoleum is a part of a Republican tradition of circular tombs and not the first of a series as presented by Toynbee and Holloway. Johnson cites several examples of Republican tumuli that pre-date the Augustan era. Though its dating has not been conclusively established, the southern Tomb of the Horatii on the Via Appia may actually be the oldest Roman tumulus possibly dating to the

⁵⁸ *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1971) 143-144.

⁵⁹ Mark Johnson, "The Mausoleum of Augustus: Etruscan and Other Influences on Its Design," *Etruscan Italy: Etruscan Influences on the Civilizations of Italy from Antiquity to the Modern Era*, ed. John F. Hall (Utah: Brigham Young University, 1996), 217-239.

fifth century BCE.⁶⁰ Other than being a tumulus with a stone retaining wall, the tomb of the Horatii bears no similarity to the Mausoleum. This older tomb does not have an entrance corridor or internal burial chamber, for the mound was erected above an existing burial.

Johnson discusses other tombs, all dating from the first century BCE, that offer still greater similarities to the Mausoleum of Augustus. The Casal Rotondo (40-30 BCE) on the Via Appia has a tall travertine retaining wall topped by an earthen mound though smaller than that of the Mausoleum.⁶¹ The tomb of the Vigna Pepoli and the tomb of the Servilii, both located in Rome offer interior structures similar to that of the Mausoleum. The tomb of the Vigna Pepoli has an entrance corridor that leads to an annular passageway which encircles a central pillar. In this case there are five niches for ash urns rather than three as in the Mausoleum.⁶² Though the tomb of the Servilii is square, it contains a circular corridor that surrounds the burial chamber. Like the Mausoleum, this corridor may have been used for circumambulation.⁶³ Neither of these tombs, though, can be securely dated before the construction of the Mausoleum of Augustus. Johnson proposes that the tomb of the Vigna Pepoli may date to c. 55 BCE based

⁶⁰ Johnson 222. There are two tombs that are identified as the tomb of the Horatii on the Via Appia; the tomb to the north is dated to the first half of the 1st century BCE and it is the tomb further south that has the possible date of the 5th century BCE (see Rehak 45).

⁶¹ Johnson 224.

⁶² Johnson 225.

⁶³ Johnson 227.

upon its use of *opus reticulatum*.⁶⁴ Since this construction technique began in the first half of the first century BCE and continued until the second century CE, the use of *opus reticulatum* does not provide a secure date for the tomb.

Even though these tombs cannot be securely identified as antecedents for the Mausoleum, it is clear that the tumulus form was popular during the last decades of the Republic. Johnson suggests that this tomb style may not have been derived solely from Etruscan sources. Like Holloway, Johnson refers to the Julian family's, and Rome's, claimed Trojan ancestry through Aeneas.⁶⁵ As recorded by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Aeneas disappeared after a battle near Lavinium and in his honor a hero-shrine was built and dedicated to him. The shrine is described as a small mound surrounded by planted rows of trees.⁶⁶ In the late sixties and early seventies, a tumulus was discovered in the area of Pratica di Mare (ancient Lavinium) that has been identified by some as the heroon of Aeneas.⁶⁷ The structure, which is an earthen mound with a stone foundation, closely adheres to the description provided by Dionysius.⁶⁸ It is

⁶⁴ Johnson 225.

⁶⁵ Johnson 231-234.

⁶⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.64.4-5.

⁶⁷ For excavation reports and identification of the site as the heroon of Aeneas see P. Sommella, "Heroon di Enea a Lavinium: Recenti scavi a Pratica di Mare," *Rendiconti della Pontificia accademia romana di archeologia* 44 (1971-72): 47-74, and Sommella, "Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium," *Gymnasium* 81 (1974): 273-297. For an opposing view on the identification of the structure see M. Pena, "El santuario y la tumba de Eneas," *Estudios Clásicos* 71 (1974): 1-26.

⁶⁸ Johnson 232.

Johnson's theory that Augustus used this heroon as a model for his own tomb thus creating a visual connection between himself and Aeneas.⁶⁹ While the heroon of Aeneas, as well as the Etruscan and Republican tumuli, may have been antecedents for the tumulus form of the Mausoleum, they lack the immense scale and multi-level architectural features of the Augustan monument.

Another theory holds that the dynastic tombs of the Hellenistic East may have provided a source for the Mausoleum. The use of the term *mausoleum* to describe the tomb of Augustus is given as one reason for looking to the East.⁷⁰ The term was derived from the fourth century BCE tomb of Mausolus in Halicarnassos (c. 350) but by the Roman era was used in reference to any large tomb.⁷¹ Therefore, in the case of the Mausoleum of Augustus, the term may have been applied in reference to its size rather than any connotation of dynastic ambitions.

Another possibility that has attracted scholars is that the tomb (or Sema) of Alexander in Alexandria influenced the tomb of Augustus.⁷² This theory is

⁶⁹ Johnson 234.

⁷⁰ J.-Cl. Richard provides a thorough discussion of the meaning and usage of the term *mausoleum* in reference to the tomb of Augustus in his article, " 'Mausoleum': D'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie," *Latomus* XXIX (1970): 370-388.

⁷¹ Janos Fedak, *Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 23.

⁷² One of the first to introduce this theory was Marie-Louise Bernard in an article entitled, "Topographie d'Alexandrie et le Mausolée d'Auguste," *Revue Archeologique* 47 (1956): 127-156. Bernard proposes that the port scenes of Alexandria on oil lamps from Poznan and the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad include a view of the Sema of Alexander which she identifies

both intriguing and problematic. Since the tomb of Alexander has not been located, one is dependent upon the ancient sources for information.

Unfortunately, these sources provide little useful information concerning the tomb's appearance. Strabo, in his *Geography*, states that the Sema was part of the royal palace and was an enclosure containing both the resting place of the Ptolemaic kings and of Alexander the Great.⁷³ Suetonius relates that the mummified remains of Alexander were brought from their shrine to Augustus for viewing.⁷⁴ This statement has been interpreted to suggest that the sarcophagus of Alexander was located in a small, interior room that was difficult to reach.⁷⁵

It has been proposed by Filippo Coarelli and Yvon Thébert that two tombs in modern Algeria may have been derived from the Sema of Alexander.⁷⁶ The tomb at Medracen (late 3rd to early 2nd century BCE) and the "Tomb of the Christian" at Kbour-er-Roumia (late 2nd to early 1st century BCE) are both circular monuments with stone drums. Instead of earthen mounds, each is topped by cut stones placed to create a stepped cone which is similar to Macedonian tumuli. The drum of each tomb is decorated with false doors and sixty engaged

as a tumulus form topped by a pyramid. Bernard goes on to suggest that the Sema was the inspiration for the Mausoleum in both its design and its placement near water (the Tiber River).

⁷³ Strabo 17.1.8

⁷⁴ Suetonius, *Augustus* 18.1

⁷⁵ Davies 60

⁷⁶ "Architecture Funéraire et Pouvoir: Réflexions sur l'Hellénisme Numide," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome Antiquité* 100.2 (1988): 761-818.

columns.⁷⁷ Egyptian elements within the tombs' ornamentation have led Coarelli and Thébert to conclude that these tombs follow the precedent set by the Sema of Alexander. Thus, according to the authors, these Algerian tombs may have been the source for relaying the design of the Sema of Alexander to the builder of the Mausoleum of Augustus.⁷⁸

While the ancient sources, discussed above, do not provide much information concerning the structure of the Sema, they do relate Augustus's admiration for Alexander. According to Cassius Dio, in a speech to the Egyptians after the fall of Alexandria, Augustus announced clemency for all Egyptians and Alexandrians in part because of the legacy of Alexander the Great.⁷⁹ For a while, he even used a portrait of Alexander as his seal for official documents and private letters.⁸⁰

This *imitatio Alexandri* by Augustus offers strong support for the theory that the Sema of Alexander was an antecedent for the tomb of Augustus. This theory is nevertheless problematic not only because the location of the tomb of Alexander is unknown but also because of chronological discrepancies. There is nothing in the extant ancient sources to suggest that Augustus visited the Sema or Alexandria prior to 30 BCE. Many scholars today accept Kraft's theory that

⁷⁷ Coarelli and Thébert 764-766.

⁷⁸ Coarelli and Thébert 786-800, especially 798-99

⁷⁹ Cassius Dio 51.16

⁸⁰ Suetonius, *Augustus* 50.1

the Mausoleum of Augustus was begun before the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE. This theory suggests, then, that the construction of the tomb would have already been underway when Augustus entered Alexandria and visited the Sema of Alexander. Thus, I do not believe that this visit influenced the plan and construction of the Mausoleum. Penelope Davies attempts to reconcile these theories on the date and precipitating events for the construction of Augustus's tomb and the use of the Sema as an antecedent. She suggests that the Mausoleum was not planned in 32 BCE in response to the reading of Mark Antony's will, per Kraft's argument, but after the death of Antony, "promoting Augustus's commitment to Rome in opposition to the late Mark Antony's disloyalty."⁸¹

Davies recognizes that it is problematic to accept the Sema of Alexander as an antecedent for the Mausoleum since it has not been found. She also acknowledges that inspiration for its design may have come from a variety of different sources including Etruscan and Republican tumuli. Her examination of the Augustan tomb focuses not on the external appearance of the monument but its internal construction. Davies focuses on both the internal buttressing systems found between the outer three walls (wall 5 to 3) and the annular passageways that encircle the base of the central pillar in which the ashes of Augustus were

⁸¹ Davies 64.

placed. It is her claim that there is no precedent in Roman tomb architecture for a structure that has the height of the Mausoleum combined with an internal support that is both solid and light enough to stand in the marshy land of the Campus Martius. The architect of the Mausoleum was able to achieve this feat by creating buttresses through the use of circular rings around the central pillar. Davies finds the closest precedent for this construction technique in Egyptian architecture, specifically the Pharos of Alexandria (early 3rd century BCE). She believes the lighthouse had a square, tapered base from which rose an octagonal drum that is topped by a tholos-like structure. According to her reconstruction, the internal core of the Pharos was hollow while the outer walls and vaults functioned as buttresses to help support the large bronze statue which surmounted the entire structure.⁸² While the Pharos at Alexandria does offer a precedent for the use of the vault as a buttress and a means for lightening the weight of a structure, such techniques were known in Republican Rome. The use of barrel vaults as structural support was common by the end of the Republican era as can be seen in the lower levels of the Temple of Jupiter Anxur at Terracina and the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste.⁸³ It is not much of a leap to

⁸² This paragraph is taken *passim* from Davies 55-58.

⁸³ This view is also taken by Rehak (38-39) in his discussion of Davies' theory on the precedent for the buttressing found in the Mausoleum of Augustus. He also mentions that the end of the Republic is when Roman architects were experimenting with large concrete structures in the building of villas along the Italian coast.

assume that this knowledge was then used to construct the Mausoleum with its circular barrel vaults that lightened the structure and functioned as buttresses.

The use of annular passages and an indirect route to the central burial chamber within the Mausoleum leads Penelope Davis to describe the interior of the tomb as labyrinthine. As discussed in the previous chapter, once a visitor passed through the entrance corridor and entered the first annular passageway, he had to go either to his left or right to find one of the two openings to the next annular passageway. Once he was in the second annular passageway, the visitor would have to locate the single opening to the next annular passageway which would be on the same axis as the entrance corridor. While this movement through the Mausoleum's passageways does not have the complexity that is often associated with labyrinths or mazes, it does require several adjustments in one's chosen direction or route. Davies notes that the earliest labyrinths were constructed in Egypt and were known for their magnificence.⁸⁴ She notes that there may have been one monument in particular that inspired the use of a labyrinthine plan for the Mausoleum—the Sema of Alexander. It is her supposition that Augustus did not enter the Sema to view Alexander's remains, as discussed above, because the route leading to the sarcophagus was a labyrinth

⁸⁴ Davies 59-60.

making it a difficult journey.⁸⁵ If the only reason for bringing the body of Alexander to Augustus was because of the complexity of the labyrinth as suggested by Davies, one is left wondering if it would not have been easier and more efficient to guide Augustus through the maze of corridors.

Davies was not the first scholar to associate the indirect route to the burial chamber of the Mausoleum with a labyrinth. Jane Reeder, in her 1992 article "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulus and Tholos," discusses the labyrinth-like quality of the Mausoleum's annular passageways. It is this internal arrangement of the tomb of Augustus and the tholos-like structure that rests on top of the earthen mound in modern reconstructions that Reeder believes has been relatively ignored in previous studies. To find possible precedent for the tholos form used as the second architectural order of the Mausoleum, she turns to the Hellenistic East, specifically the sanctuaries of Samothrace, Epidauros, and Olympia.

The sanctuary of Samothrace became an important center starting with the Macedonians of Philip II and grew extensively during the Hellenistic period in large part because of the patronage of the Ptolemies. In the early third century a large round temple was dedicated to Arsinoë. The Arsinoeion, as it is known, was a circular drum upon which were placed Doric pilasters and was covered by

⁸⁵ Davies 60.

a domed roof. It is this reconstruction of the Arsinoeion that has led Reeder to perceive a similarity to the tholos structure constructed atop the earthen mound of the Mausoleum of Augustus.⁸⁶ Since the Arsinoeion was a well-known building from Samothrace, it would have provided an association between Augustus and the developers of the sanctuary—the Macedonians and, specifically, Alexander the Great.

Reeder also sees the influence of Alexander and the Macedonians in the combination of the tumulus and tholos in the Mausoleum. She states that the precedents for the tumulus were the tumuli of Macedonia and, possibly, the Sema of Alexander. Furthermore, she proposes that the tholos which forms the second architectural feature of the Mausoleum was derived from the tholos of Olympia, also known as the Philippeion.⁸⁷ Though possibly constructed as a treasury, the Philippeion may have also been a heroon for the Macedonian imperial cult. Thus, Reeder theorizes that the Mausoleum was not simply a tomb but was also the site for the cult of the emperor.⁸⁸

Like Davies, Reeder also examines the internal plan of the Mausoleum which she describes as maze- or labyrinth-like. Again she identifies a precedent for the annular corridors of the tomb of Augustus in a tholos located in a Greek

⁸⁶ Reeder 282-283.

⁸⁷ Reeder 302.

⁸⁸ Reeder 301-302.

sanctuary. The tholos of Epidauros is a circular building located within the Sanctuary of Asclepius. Through an opening in the floor of the tholos one could gain access to the foundations of the structure. It is the foundations which Reeder theorizes were the source for the plan of the Mausoleum.⁸⁹ The foundations of the tholos of Epidauros were constructed as six concentric rings of which only the innermost three contained openings and annular corridors. Each annular corridor contained a partition wall which crossed the corridor. As a result, one could only move in one direction within the annular corridor to find the opening to the next annular corridor. The cross wall in the next corridor would force one to make the same complete circuit around the structure but this time in the opposite direction. The result was a maze-like approach to the center of the building.⁹⁰ The circuitous approach to the center of the building was a form of forced circumambulation that was possibly part of a ritual associated with the heroic cult of Asclepius.⁹¹

While Reeder offers a well researched argument, it is questionable whether she needs to search the Greek east for the antecedents of the Mausoleum of Augustus. As she herself observes, there were tholoi present in and around the city of Rome when Augustus began the construction of his tomb. Reeder also

⁸⁹ Reeder 299.

⁹⁰ Reeder 294-295.

⁹¹ Reeder 299.

mentions that the tholos at the Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste contained annular corridors.⁹² Since primary sources do not mention that Augustus visited any of the previously mentioned Greek sanctuaries, it is difficult to accept the Arsineion, the Philippeion, or the tholos at Epidauros as antecedents for the Mausoleum of Augustus.

The complexity of the Mausoleum of Augustus makes it difficult to identify a single solution for all of its various aspects. As a result, scholars have attempted to understand the monument by searching the eastern Mediterranean for precedents in its design and appearance. The current trend in scholarship on the Mausoleum cites the Sema of Alexander as the antecedent for the Augustan tomb. This theory is repeated by Coarelli and Thébert when they suggest that the Algerian tumuli reflect the design of the Sema and relayed it to the builder of the Mausoleum. Davies not only suggests that the tomb of Alexander was the precedent for the Augustan tomb but also that the Pharos of Alexandria was the source for its interior structure. It is impossible to prove, or disprove, this Alexandrian influence upon the Mausoleum since the Sema of Alexander has yet to be found. Reeder cites the tholi from the Hellenistic sanctuaries of Samothrace, Olympia, and Epidauros as sources for the design of the Mausoleum although there is no evidence that Augustus ever traveled to these locations.

⁹² Reeder 298.

Holloway suggests that the earthen mounds on the coast of Anatolia were the precedent for the tumulus of the Mausoleum although they lack its architectural elements. Toynbee and Johnson do not expand their search beyond the Italian peninsula for they both state that the Etruscan tumuli at Caere are the most probable sources for the design of the Augustan tomb. Johnson also suggests that the Mausoleum follows a Republican tradition that is based not only on Etruscan sources but also upon the heroism of Aeneas. Thus, we can see that these searches and explanations have introduced a wide variety of antecedents that are all plausible but none of which are certain. Instead of broadening the discussion, I suggest that it be refocused on Rome and its environs.

As discussed above, the tumulus form of the Mausoleum is most often associated with Etruscan and Republican tumuli. While there is still much debate over the dates for the Republican tombs, the influence of Etruscan tombs can still be considered very probable. The tombs at the necropolis of Caere would likely have been visible during the Augustan era and the relative proximity of the site suggests that it could have been visited during the late Republican and early Imperial periods.⁹³ Therefore, it is more likely that Augustus and his builder were aware of and had possibly seen the Etruscan tumuli than the tumuli of the eastern Mediterranean.

⁹³ Rehak, *Cosmos and Imperium* 43

The use of archaizing architectural forms is not unique to the Mausoleum of Augustus but is present in many of Augustus's early projects. Among these projects the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine is of particular importance for, though Augustus vowed to build it in 36 BCE, it was dedicated in 28 BCE placing it within the same time frame as the Mausoleum. This temple was constructed with marble capitals of the Corinthian order but in plan seems to have more closely adhered to the ancient Tuscan style with a high podium and columns that are widely spaced.⁹⁴ The archaic plan of the building is emphasized by the exterior sculptural decoration some of which was discovered during the excavation of the temple area in 1968. In front of the temple the excavators found a series of terracotta plaques which have been classified as the Campana type. This group of plaques is of Etruscan derivation and they were first produced in Rome in the mid-first century BCE.⁹⁵ They typically depict mythological scenes and the figures are represented in an archaic style with tip-toe stance and swallowtail drapery.⁹⁶ The Temple of Apollo, like the Mausoleum, illustrates Augustus' use of archaizing art and architectural forms of Etruscan derivation to convey an impression of traditionalism.

⁹⁴ Kellum, Barbara, "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine and the Forum of Augustus" (Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1981), 40-41.

⁹⁵ Kellum, "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda" (1981) 46-47.

⁹⁶ Kellum, "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda" (1981) 49.

The tholos which forms the second architectural order of the Mausoleum of Augustus is yet another reference to a Republican architectural form. While Reeder proposes the tholoi at Samothrace, Delphi, and Epidauros as antecedents for this structure, the city of Rome already offered a number of circular temples from which the Mausoleum's tholos could have been derived. Among these can be included the Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum, the Temple of Hercules Victor (late 2nd century) in the Forum Boarium, and the circular temple (Temple B, late 2nd century) located in the Largo Argentina. It is, therefore, evident that tholoi were already part of the Roman architectural vocabulary by the late first century when Augustus constructed his tomb.

The interior plan and structure of the Mausoleum of Augustus seems to represent the most innovative architectural design of the structure. A closer examination, though, reveals that the use of barrel vaults, buttressing, and annular passageways in the tomb is a combination of construction techniques already well established in Rome. The use of concrete vaults dates back to the construction of the Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste.⁹⁷ The sanctuary is terraced up a hillside and is approached through a series of ramps and stairways. The middle terrace contains two hemicycles with concrete barrel vaults. The highest terrace is a large, open rectangular space above which sits an

⁹⁷ Lancaster, Lynne. *Concrete Vaulted Construction in Imperial Rome: Innovations in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 5.

exedra with a double annular vault.⁹⁸ Behind this structure is a small round temple, or tholos, similar to the circular temples discussed above.

One of the earliest extant examples of concrete vaulting in Rome itself is the Tabularium (78-65 BCE) with its use of pavilion vaults and barrel vaults. Experimentation in the use of concrete vaults increased in the mid-first century with Pompey and the construction of the first permanent theater in Rome (discussed above). This structure helped initiate innovations in the vaulting of substructures.⁹⁹ By the time of Augustus, concrete vaulting was common and more sophisticated vaulting began to appear.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that the architect of the Mausoleum had to refer to Alexandrian architecture, as discussed above, to develop a means by which to construct a massive tomb on the marshy land of the Campus Martius.

As described by Davies, the Mausoleum was constructed of a series of concrete rings placed one on top of the other. These rings were actually circular barrel vaults that could be understood as being terraced one above the other. This building technique, then, would be similar to the terracing seen in the Republican structures discussed above. By using these barrel vaults, the architect was able to accomplish two goals. First, the vaulting lightened the

⁹⁸ Frank Sear, *Roman Architecture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 26

⁹⁹ Lancaster 5.

¹⁰⁰ Lancaster 6.

weight of the structure making it possible to create a tomb of great height. Also, the barrel vaults formed a buttressing system which carried the thrust of the building to the lower, outer walls.

The circular barrel vaulting on the ground level also created the annular corridors that encircled the burial chamber. Davies and Reeder both describe these corridors as labyrinth-like and they looked to Egypt and the Hellenistic east, respectively, for possible antecedents. I believe that the precedent for annular corridors was already established by Republican tumuli. As discussed above, the Tomb of the Servilii in Rome contains an annular corridor that encircles the central burial chamber. While this tomb has only a single annular corridor, it does not discount it as a possible antecedent. It is important to remember that the tomb of the Servilii was a much smaller structure than the Mausoleum. The large size of the tomb of Augustus would allow for additional annular corridors and the prestige of its future occupant would demand it.

While the idea that some elements of the Mausoleum may have been derived from Roman sources is not new, until now no one has presented a detailed analysis of the tomb structure and the various possible Roman antecedents. The techniques used to construct the tomb are not unique or innovative for each can be found in earlier Republican and Etruscan structures. The uniqueness of the Mausoleum is therefore the manner in which the

individual elements are combined to create the massive structure. An antecedent for the complete tomb does not exist, which is why so many antecedents have been cited from Italy, Egypt, and the Hellenistic east. By building a structure that is a hybrid of forms, Augustus and his architect created a monument that could be read and understood in a number of ways by the various classes of the Roman society. It is the multivalence of the Mausoleum of Augustus that is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS ITS EXPANDING MEANING

Interpretations of the meaning of the Mausoleum are often derived from examinations of the monument in its final state after the death of Augustus. As a result, they do not represent the complexity of the monument. Although the Mausoleum was one of Augustus's first projects, it was not truly completed until after his death when his *Res Gestae* was placed before its entrance. Therefore, the meaning of the monument continued to develop throughout his lifetime. I believe the meaning attached to the tomb during the initial phase of construction was never changed but, rather, new meanings were added to it as a result of new Augustan projects that were constructed in its vicinity. Thus, it is more appropriate to view the meaning of the Mausoleum as continuously expanding. Therefore, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the various meanings of the monument, one needs to trace its development from its initial construction to the final additions after the death of Augustus.

The Initial Meaning of the Mausoleum

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the Mausoleum is often cited as continuing in the tradition of the large tombs of the Hellenistic dynasts. As a result, the Mausoleum has been viewed as a statement of monarchical and dynastic ambitions. One is left wondering, though, what qualifies the Mausoleum as a dynastic tomb. The combination of both its size and the fact that it housed the remains of Augustus and his family has provided the basis for this interpretation. The use of the Mausoleum as a family tomb, though, should not be taken as evidence of dynastic connotations. It was an accepted practice in Republican Rome to use a single funerary monument for multiple burials and it was actually less common for a tomb to have been used for a single burial.¹⁰¹ One of the earliest recorded family tombs in Rome is the tomb of the Scipios (3rd century BCE) on the Via Appia. This tomb contained a number of sarcophagi with inscriptions identifying members of the family beginning with Cn. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus. These inscriptions also recorded the military victories and other achievements of the various individuals.¹⁰² Therefore, Augustus was

¹⁰¹ Valerie Hope, "A roof over the dead: communal tombs and family structure," *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, eds. Ray Laurence and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplementary Series no. 22), 71.

¹⁰² John Patterson, "Living and dying in the city of Rome: houses and tombs," *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City* (Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, 2000) 265.

following the Republican tradition of placing the remains of deceased family members in his funerary monument.¹⁰³

Since the burial of family members within a single tomb was not unusual for Republican Rome, it calls into question whether the size of the Mausoleum should be interpreted as dynastic. One must consider whether the monumental size of the tomb may have represented a different idea or meaning. Thus, it is important to understand what might be expressed through the use of large scale architecture. In his article on monumental architecture, Bruce Trigger suggests that monumental tombs may have been "expressions of shifting and competing power."¹⁰⁴ Whether one chooses to accept a pre- or post-Actium date for the construction of the Mausoleum, it is evident that the tomb was constructed during of period of competition and shifting power. This idea seems to reinforce Kraft's and Davies's theories that the Mausoleum was constructed as a counterpoint to Mark Antony's wish to be buried in Alexandria with Cleopatra. The monument, then, was meant to forcefully assert Augustus's position as the true protector of Rome.

A complete understanding of the Mausoleum is only possible once its location on the Campus Martius is taken into consideration. When Augustus

¹⁰³ Boschung shares this view of the Mausoleum following the Republican tradition of family tombs. See "Tumulus Iuliorum—Mausoleum Augusti," *Hefte des Archæologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 6 (1980): 38-39.

¹⁰⁴ "Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behavior," *World Archaeology* 22.2 (1990): 128.

began to plan his Mausoleum, one must imagine that the choice of its site would have been of particular importance. In the late Republican period, it was most common for patrician families to choose a tomb site along one of the prominent roads leading from Rome.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, the selection of a site along the Via Flaminia seems to have followed custom. Against custom, though, Augustus elected to build his tomb in the Campus Martius. As discussed previously, this area was traditionally reserved for honorific burials granted by the Senate. One must question how Augustus was able to build a tomb in this area without suffering any political repercussions. One possibility is that the Mausoleum functioned as more than just a tomb and this additional purpose was appropriate to the Field of Mars.

Since the Campus Martius was an area sacred to the god Mars, it was often chosen during the Republican period as the site for the construction of temples dedicated after a victory in battle, as demonstrated by the four temples in the Largo Argentina. After his victory at Actium and the conquest of Alexandria, Augustus celebrated a three-day triumph for his victories in Dalmatia in 35/34 BCE, Actium and Alexandria.¹⁰⁶ As part of this triumphal celebration it would have been deemed appropriate, if not expected, for Augustus to build a victory monument in commemoration. In her discussion of

¹⁰⁵ Patterson, "Living and Dying" 265.

¹⁰⁶ Cassius Dio 51.21 and Suetonius, *Augustus* 22.

the Mausoleum, Davies provides an intriguing theory concerning the meaning or role of the monument.¹⁰⁷ She proposes that it was meant to be seen as both trophy and tomb. As a trophy, the Mausoleum would glorify Augustus's ability as a general. It also followed the Republican tradition of using a tomb to immortalize one's name and victories, as seen with the sarcophagi from the tomb of the Scipios. Davies suggests that the role of the Mausoleum as a trophy was conveyed by its appearance which resembled the Sema and/or the Pharos. Either of these monuments would have been recognized by citizens of Rome as representing Alexandria and, therefore, Augustus's victory.

While I agree with the identification of the Mausoleum as both tomb and trophy, the prototypes for the Mausoleum could have readily been found in Rome and, therefore, may not have been associated with Alexandria. So how was this role of the tomb as trophy conveyed? I believe that elements of the Mausoleum, both architectural and sculptural, were used to emphasize its function as commemorating Augustus's victories at Actium and Alexandria.

Above the earthen mound of the Mausoleum, a second architectural feature was constructed. Referred to as the tholos, it closely resembled many of the Republican circular temples found in the Campus Martius as well as throughout the city of Rome. Many of these temples were constructed as victory

¹⁰⁷ Davies 62-67.

monuments, such as Temple B in the Largo Argentina, which has been identified as the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei. This circular temple was constructed by Quintus Lutatius Catulus after his victory over the Cimbri and Teutones at the battle of Vercellae in 101 BCE.¹⁰⁸ Thus, citizens of Rome would have been aware of the use of tholoi as victory monuments and could have readily associated the tholos of the Mausoleum with the earlier temples.

The bronze statue of Augustus crowned the tholos of the tomb. The actual appearance of this statue is unknown but it has been suggested that it took the form of a *statua loricata* (a cuirassed figure).¹⁰⁹ From as early as the late 40s and early 30s, statues of Augustus were appearing in Rome. One such statue, known only from coins, was displayed in Rome after the naval victory in Naulochus against Sextus Pompey in 36 BCE. It is believed that this statue was part of a series of monuments set up in commemoration of this victory¹¹⁰ and may have been in the form of a *columna rostrata* which would have placed the statue above the viewers. A prototype for this statue may be the *columna rostrata* of Duilius which was erected in 260 BCE as a commemorative monument for his naval victory at Carthage.¹¹¹ Thus, a precedent had already been established for the use of raised statuary as victory monuments or trophies by the time the bronze statue

¹⁰⁸ Patterson, "The City of Rome" 196.

¹⁰⁹ J.-C. Richard 386.

¹¹⁰ P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990) 39.

¹¹¹ Rehak 41.

of Augustus was placed above the Mausoleum. It is interesting to note that the earlier statues referenced above were for naval victories much like the victory at Actium. The statue above the Mausoleum must have been colossal in size since it would have been placed at a height of around 150 feet.¹¹² This bronze statue in armor would have been a truly powerful image of Augustus as *triumphator*.

Thus, the meaning of the Mausoleum begins to emerge. The tumulus, as a traditional tomb type, reflected Augustus's role as protector of the *mos maiorum* in contrast to Antony who had come under the sway of Eastern influences and was interred in Alexandria. Rising from this tumulus is a trophy in the form of a tholos and *statua loricata*. The Mausoleum as a trophy was further emphasized by the depiction of laurel trees in relief on either side of the entrance to the tomb. In 27 BCE, the Senate voted to grant Augustus the right to place laurel trees in front of his home as well as hang a wreath of oak leaves above his door. He received this privilege in recognition of his "status as victor over his enemies and the saviour of the citizens."¹¹³ Thus, while the living trees stood outside his residence, stone versions were carved on the exterior of his tomb.

¹¹² Davies 14.

¹¹³ Cassius Dio 53.16.

The expanded meaning of the Mausoleum

The theme of victory in the Mausoleum is continued and expanded with the construction of two additional Augustan monuments. The tomb would no longer be viewed as a single monument but as part of a larger program which also included the Ara Pacis and the Horologium (Figure 4.1). While there is no evidence that the plans for the altar and sundial date back to the construction of the Mausoleum, the placement of the monuments emphasizes such an association. The Ara Pacis was constructed along the Via Flaminia approximately one mile from the *pomerium*.¹¹⁴ To the west of the Ara Pacis, Augustus had a large obelisk of red granite erected which served as the gnomon of the Horologium.¹¹⁵ This orientation along the Via Flaminia and the fact that the three Augustan monuments were the only architectural features in the northern Campus Martius would have led a viewer to read the monuments as an ensemble.

The construction of the Ara Pacis was decreed by the Senate in 13 BCE as Augustus records in his *Res Gestae*:

On my return from Spain and Gaul in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and Publius Quintilius after successfully arranging affairs in those provinces, the senate resolved that an altar of the Augustan

¹¹⁴ In the late 1930s, under the auspices of Mussolini, the extant portions of the Ara Pacis were excavated and reassembled with fragments that had been discovered earlier. The reconstructed altar was then relocated to the site of the Mausoleum where it remains today. This reconstruction is discussed further in chapter six.

¹¹⁵ This Egyptian obelisk now stands in the Piazza di Montecitorio in Rome.

Peace should be consecrated next to the Campus Martius in honour of my return, and ordered that the magistrates and priests and Vestal virgins should perform an annual sacrifice there.¹¹⁶

The Altar of Peace, completed in 9 BCE, was one of the few monuments in Augustan Rome to be constructed entirely of marble (Figure 4.2). An outer precinct wall with openings to the east and west surrounds an altar elevated on three steps. Both the interior and exterior of the monument are decorated with intricate relief sculpture.¹¹⁷ The interior of the precinct wall contains imagery associated with sacrifices—garlands, *bucrania*, and *patera*—along the upper level. Below these images the marble is carved to imitate the wooden slats of a fence (Figures 4.3 and 4.4).

The exterior of the precinct wall is decorated with figural panels above and delicately carved floral scrolls below. The four panels that decorate the east and west walls are a combination of mythical and allegorical subjects. The panels on the east side are allegorical scenes representing peace and its fecundity. The right, or northern, panel depicts a seated female figure wearing a helmet and surrounded by arms and armor (Figure 4.5). This figure has been

¹¹⁶ *Res Gestae divi Augusti* 12.2. "Cum ex Hispania Galliaque, rebus in iis provinciis prospere gestis, Romam redi, Ti. Nerone P. Quintilio consulibus, aram Pacis Augustae senatus pro reditu meo consacranda censuit ad campum Martium, in qua magistratus et sacerdotes virginesque Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit." Quote and translation taken from P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967) 24-25.

¹¹⁷ A thorough discussion of the sculptural reliefs on the Ara Pacis and their possible interpretations is provided by Rehak in *Imperium and Cosmos* 101-133.

identified as the personification of Roma. In this representation, Roma is depicted at rest after being victorious in battle, therefore, signifying that Rome has entered a period of peace.

The results of this peace are illustrated in the companion panel to the south. A general consensus on the identity of the figures in this panel has not been reached. A seated female figure holding twin infants dominates the center of the panel (Figure 4.6). She has been identified as Tellus, Pax, Italia, and Ceres among others. On either side of her are two additional female figures. These figures are smaller than the woman in the center and each is seated upon an animal. The figure to the left sits on the back of a large swan and the figure to the right sits on the back of a sea monster. This scene represents the fertility of Rome, both on land (the figure seated on the swan) and sea (the figure seated on the sea monster), as a result of the Augustan peace.

The panels on the west side of the precinct wall have been traditionally viewed as representing the two foundation myths for Rome. The panel to the north, though very fragmented, represents Romulus and Remus suckled by the she-wolf (Figure 4.7). Observing this scene are two male figures one helmeted and the other leaning on a staff. These figures have been generally identified as the god Mars (the helmeted figure) and the shepherd Faustulus. The panel to the south is in a better state of preservation. This scene depicts an altar in the

foreground with two adult male figures on the right and two young male figures and a sow on the left (Figure 4.8). A temple sitting on a hillside is in the background. The traditional interpretation of this scene is Aeneas offering a sacrifice upon his arrival in Latium. Rehak has suggested a different interpretation. He believes that the sacrificant would be better understood as Numa Pompilius, the legendary second king of Rome.¹¹⁸ Numa was known for establishing the Fetial Law, which was the list of rules for waging a just war and terms for establishing peace. Rehak reads the panel as depicting Numa and a foreign king preparing to sacrifice a sow as a means of guaranteeing peace. Therefore, instead of the two panels representing the two foundation myths of Rome, he believes that they represent two models for ruling Rome.¹¹⁹

The north and south walls of the Ara Pacis are covered with friezes at the same height as the panels on the east and west walls. The friezes depict a procession which includes Augustus and his family on the southern side and members of the Senate on the northern side (Figures 4.9 and 4.10). The purpose of the procession has not been definitively identified and multiple theories have been proposed. Some of the theories suggested are that it is the procession in 13 BCE when the altar was decreed by the Senate, that it is the procession that

¹¹⁸ Rehak, *Cosmos and Imperium* 115-120. This theory was also published as an article, "Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae," *Art Bulletin* 83 (2001): 190-208.

¹¹⁹ Rehak, *Cosmos and Imperium* 135.

would occur for the dedication of the altar in 9 BCE and that it represents a general religious procession. While the reliefs themselves do not provide any information that would clarify their meaning, an understanding of the complete Augustan complex in the northern Campus Martius, which will be discussed below, may offer some insight.

Below the panels and friezes the precinct wall is decorated with a continuous relief of scrolling vegetation of acanthus plants, grape vines and ivy (Figure 4.11). Various animals, including swans, nests of birds, snakes, lizards, and insects, are hidden among the lush vegetation. This relief has been interpreted as depicting the abundance in nature that is result of the Augustan peace.

The benefits of peace, as depicted on the Ara Pacis, would have been understood as having been made possible by victories both on land and sea.¹²⁰ This idea is clearly expressed by Augustus in his *Res Gestae* when he states, "victories had secured peace by land and sea throughout the whole empire of the Roman people...".¹²¹ This statement in the *Res Gestae* occurs immediately after Augustus's account of the vote to consecrate an altar to Augustan peace, the Ara Pacis, and just prior to his reference to the closing of the doors of the Temple of

¹²⁰ Karl Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 107 and 141.

¹²¹ *Res Gestae* 13 "Ianus Quirinum, quem clausum esse maiores nostri voluerunt cum per totum imperium populi Romani terra marique esset parata victoriis pax, cum, priusquam nascerer, a condita urbe bis omnino clausum fuisse prodatur memoriae, tunc me principe senatus claudendum esse censuit." "Quote and translation from Brunt and Moore 25-25.

Janus.¹²² According to Roman tradition, the doors of the Temple of Janus were open when Rome was at war and closed when Rome was at peace. In the history of Rome, prior to Augustus, the doors of the temple were only closed twice, as is mentioned in the *Res Gestae*. It is important to note that the first closing during the Augustan age was after the conquest of Alexandria in 29 BCE and it is believed the third closing was in 13 BCE, the year the Ara Pacis was decreed.¹²³

This association of the Ara Pacis with the Temple of Janus is not only made in the *Res Gestae*. With its two doors on the east and west sides, the plan of the altar is reminiscent of Janus temples. As an architectural form, a janus represents the passage from one form of existence to another.¹²⁴ The location of the Ara Pacis relates directly to this idea of passage or transition from one phase to another for it is located on the boundary that marks the shift in a magistrate's authority from *imperium militare* to *imperium domi*.¹²⁵ In other words, it represents the transition from warfare outside the city to peace within the city.

This shift in *imperium* is illustrated by the panels on the north and south side of the Ara Pacis. The northern panels, which face away from the city, depict Roma (to the east) and Romulus and Remus (to the south). Taken as companion pieces, the two panels illustrate military *imperium*. Roma is depicted wearing

¹²² *Res Gestae* 13

¹²³ Rehak 100

¹²⁴ Rehak 100.

¹²⁵ M. Torelli, *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982) 29.

the helmet and sword of war with the arms and armor of the vanquished surrounding her. The infant Romulus is the future founder of Rome who established the city through warfare and the defeat of the surrounding communities. The panels to the south, facing the city, depict Tellus/Pax (to the east) and, if Rehak is correct, Numa (to the west) and together they can be understood as representing the peaceful imperium of the city. Whether interpreted as Tellus or Pax, this panel illustrates the fruitfulness of peace. The Numa panel, as interpreted by Rehak, illustrates the founder of the Fetial Laws sacrificing a sow as a guarantee of peace.

The theme of victory is more explicitly declared in the second addition to the Augustan complex, the massive Horologium. The gnomon of the sundial was a red granite obelisk which had been transported from its original site at Heliopolis, Egypt to Rome (Figure 4.12). It was one of a pair of obelisks brought to Rome by Augustus around 10/9 BCE.¹²⁶ The second obelisk was erected on the spina of the Circus Maximus. Not only were these obelisks transported to Rome as a pair, they both have the same inscription which reads, "Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of a god, pontifex maximus, imperator for the twelfth time, consul

¹²⁶ Rehak 81.

for the eleventh, in the fourteenth tribunician power, having brought Egypt into the power of the Roman people, dedicated this to the sun" (Figure 4.13).¹²⁷

This inscription most effectively conveys the meaning of the obelisk. It was not meant to be seen solely as a functional instrument for the sundial but as a trophy from Augustus's conquest of Egypt. More specifically, the inscription would recall his victory at Actium. By the late first century BCE, the god Sol had been assimilated into the imagery of Apollo.¹²⁸ An association between Augustus and Apollo started in the 30s BCE but really began to flourish after Actium. On the promontory that overlooked the site of the naval battle there stood a pre-existing Temple to Apollo.¹²⁹ As a result, Apollo was seen as the god that helped bring Augustus victory at Actium. By dedicating the obelisks to Sol, Augustus was dedicating a portion of the spoils of conquest to the god that enabled the victory.

The obelisk of the Horologium makes another important proclamation for understanding the expanding meaning of the Mausoleum and the complete Augustan complex. Immediately after identifying himself by the now familiar title *Imperator Caesar Augustus divi filius* he adds the new title of *pontifex maximus*,

¹²⁷ "Imp. Caesar divi f. Augustus, pontifex maximus, imp. XII, tr. pot. XIV, Aegypto in potestatem populi Romani redacta Soli donum dedit."

¹²⁸ For an overview of the assimilation of Sol and Apollo see Rehak 93-94.

¹²⁹ Ellen Chruchill Semple, "The Templed Promontories of the Ancient Mediterranean," *Geographical Review* 17.3 (July, 1927): 364. Also Cassius Dio refers to Actium as a site sacred to Apollo (50.12).

or high priest. In 13 BCE, Lepidus, the former triumvir, died in exile having held the title of *pontifex maximus* since acquiring it, if by questionable means, during the civil wars which followed the death of Julius Caesar. With the death of Lepidus, Augustus was finally able to attain this position as he records in his *Res Gestae*:

I declined to be made *pontifex maximus* in the place of my colleague who was still alive, when the people offered me this priesthood which my father had held. Some years later, after the death of the man who had taken the opportunity of civil disturbance to seize it for himself, I received this priesthood, in the consulship of Publius Sulpicius and Gaius Valgius, and such a concourse poured in from the whole of Italy to my election as has never been recorded at Rome before that time.¹³⁰

The death of Lepidus and Augustus's assumption of the title of *pontifex maximus* (12 BCE) occurred during the planning of the Ara Pacis. It was a fateful event that Augustus was not going to let pass without recognition. As already mentioned, he proclaimed this title on the obelisk of the Horologium. According to G. W. Bowerstock, a more subtle reference may be found on the Ara Pacis.¹³¹ He identifies the altar's processional frieze as that of Augustus and his family on the day he received the title of *pontifex maximus*. In part, this interpretation is

¹³⁰ *Res Gestae* 10.2. "Pontifex maximus ne fierem in vivi conlegae mei locum, populo id sacerdotium deferente mihi quod pater meus habuerat, recusavi. Quod sacerdotium aliquod post annos, eo mortuo qui civilis motus occasione occupaverat, cuncta ex Italia ad comitia mea confluente multitudine, quanta Romae nunquam fertur ante id tempus fuisse, recepi, P. Sulpicio C. Valgio consulibus." Brunt and Moore 22-23.

¹³¹ "The Pontificate of Augustus," *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990) 380-394.

based on the depiction of Augustus veiled in the guise of a priest. It is also based on the identification of certain figures, namely Agrippa and Drusus. If the scene represents the procession when the Ara Pacis was decreed, Drusus would not have been depicted for he was still in Gaul continuing the settling of affairs begun by Augustus (16-13 BCE). The identification of the procession as that on the day of the altar's dedication in 9 BCE is also problematic because Agrippa, who is clearly represented, died in 12 BCE a few weeks after Augustus's attainment of the high priesthood. According to Bowersock, the only recorded historical event that would place Drusus and Agrippa together with Augustus veiled as high priest within one procession would have been the ceremony when Augustus assumed the title *pontifex maximus*.

Augustus's new role as high priest added a new meaning to the Mausoleum. As *pontifex maximus*, he had the role of a priest of Vesta. A circular temple in the Forum Romanum housed the sacred flame of the goddess. This flame was symbolic of the hearth of Rome, both as a city and the capital of the Empire. Thus, the tholos of the Mausoleum might be seen as reflecting the circular Temple of Vesta.

One important function that Augustus would have to perform as high priest was the revision of the Roman calendar. By doing so, he would be continuing the work begun by Romulus and Numa and revised by Julius

Caesar.¹³² Romulus established the first Roman calendar which had a ten month year beginning on the vernal equinox. Numa revised this calendar by adding the months of January and February which increased the length of the year to 355 days. In order to keep this calendar in line with the solar calendar, additional days had to be added yearly. This responsibility was given to the *pontifices* under the supervision of the *pontifex maximus*. Therefore, when Julius Caesar assumed this title, he reformed the calendar for it was already three months behind the solar calendar. His new calendar was based upon the length of the solar year which is 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days.¹³³ The new calendar began on 1 January and had months with the same number of days they have now.

The final revisions carried out by Augustus were probably complete by 9/8 BCE coinciding with the erection of the obelisk and the construction of the Horologium.¹³⁴ It cannot be mere circumstance that the revision of the Roman civic calendar was completed when Augustus was creating a large sundial to mark the passage of the solar year. Calculations and excavations conducted by E. Buchner have contributed greatly to our understanding of the Horologium.¹³⁵

¹³² This discussion of the Roman calendar is taken *passim* from Rehak 79-80.

¹³³ Suetonius, *Divi Julius* 40.

¹³⁴ According to Suetonius, when Augustus took the title of *pontifex maximus* the calendar had fallen into a state of confusion as the result of neglect. It was also at this time that the month of Sextilis was renamed August. *Augustus* 31.

¹³⁵ *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus: Nachdruck aus RM 1976 und 1980 und Nachtrag über die Ausgrabung 1980/1981* (Mainz: von Zabern, 1982). For opposing views on some of Buchner's theories see M. Schütz, "Zur Sonnenuhr des Augustus auf dem Marsfeld: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit

The limited excavations conducted in the 1970s led to the discovery of the meridian line, which marked midday, in the basement of a cafeteria at Via di Campo Marzio 48. The portion of the meridian line which was excavated revealed a bronze strip, which extended northward from the obelisk, set in pavement (Figure 4.14). Parallel to the meridian line are the Greek words for the twelve signs of the zodiac (six along each side) and in smaller Greek letters the names for the four seasonal winds. The midday line is also bisected by small bronze strips which seem to relate to each month.

Buchner's calculations of the shadow cast by the gnomon, which is believed to have been 100' in height, further emphasizes the programmatic unity of the three Augustan monuments. He suggests that the site of the Ara Pacis was precisely aligned with the Horologium so that on September 23, the autumnal equinox and Augustus's birthday, the shadow from the gnomon would reach the western door of the precinct wall and, possibly, the altar inside (Figure 4.15). He interprets this as illustrating the idea that Augustus was born to bring peace to Rome. This idea is combined with the possibility that the shadow cast by the gnomon on the winter solstice, approximately December 21, would extend northward past the zodiac sign of Capricorn toward the Mausoleum. This date

E. Buchner's *Rekonstruktion und der Ausgrabungsergebnisse, aus der Sicht eines Physikers*," *Gymnasium* 97 (1990): 432-57 and Tamsyn Barton, "Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995): 33-51.

was important for Augustan ideology for it is the date generally accepted as Augustus's conception.¹³⁶ Also as the winter solstice, it marks the shortest day of the year. Thus, it can be interpreted as signifying the death and rebirth of the sun; a fitting association for the future tomb of Augustus. The gnomon of the sundial provided a visual unification of the complex signifying the important phases of Augustus's life—his conception, birth, and his eventual death and apotheosis.

It would be beneficial at this point to view the complex in the northern Campus Martius as it would have appeared shortly after the death of Augustus. The land to the north of the Mausoleum was a large public garden filled with trees and shaded pathways. The Mausoleum was surrounded by and separated from this park by a heavy chain that hung from metal posts placed around the perimeter. A paved area that extended from the entrance façade to the perimeter marked by the posts and chain established a path leading to the entrance of the Mausoleum.¹³⁷ Augustus had left instructions in his will that his account of his great deeds was to be displayed outside his tomb. Consequently, two pillars were erected near the entrance to hold bronze plaques engraved with the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Two Egyptian obelisks were placed within the area

¹³⁶ It is believed that this is why the sign of Capricorn appears so frequently in Augustan imagery. For further discussion of the association of Capricorn with Augustus, see Tamsyn Brown, "Augustus and Capricorn."

¹³⁷ Hesberg and Panciera 31.

surrounding the Mausoleum. Little is known about the exact location and date of their erection. Hesberg believes that they were on the east and west sides of the Mausoleum near, or possibly outside, the chain fence.¹³⁸ It is uncertain whether these obelisks were erected during Augustus's lifetime to commemorate his victory in Alexandria, after his death coinciding with the display of the *Res Gestae*, or during the reign of Domitian as a special honor for the first emperor of Rome.¹³⁹

Together the monuments in Augustus's complex present his greatest accomplishments. They signify his victories at Actium and Alexandria, the closing of the doors of the Temple of Janus with the establishment of the Augustan peace and, finally, the attainment of the title of *pontifex maximus*. In total, the Mausoleum, Ara Pacis, and Horologium provide a visual *res gestae*. Each event of Augustus's life that the monuments memorialize were then repeated in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* placed before the entrance to the Mausoleum.

¹³⁸ Hesberg and Panciera 32.

¹³⁹ One of the obelisks now stands in the Piazza dell'Esquilino and the other in the Piazza del Quirinale. For the placement of the obelisks during the reign of Domitian see Javier Arce, *Funus imperatorum. Los funerals de los emperadores romanos* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1988) 63. As a result of recent excavations around the Mausoleum, Buchner places the erection of the obelisks within the Augustan age in his article, "Ein Kanal für Obelisk: Neues vom Mausoleum des Augustus in Rom," *Antike Welt* 27 (1996): 161-168.

The *Res Gestae* has been interpreted as a document meant for the citizens of the city of Rome rather than for the Empire at large.¹⁴⁰ The list of the gifts given by Augustus to Rome as well as the honors voted him by the Senate would really only have been relevant for the residents of Rome itself. In the same manner, the Mausoleum, Ara Pacis, and Horologium were monuments for the city of Rome rather than for the Empire as a whole. The themes of victory conveyed by the monuments were victories that protected the supremacy of the city against a foreign queen. In the years preceding the Battle of Actium it was rumored that if Antony and Cleopatra were victorious, the capital would be transferred from Rome to Alexandria. A more subtle meaning, understood by the citizens of Rome who had lived through the tumultuous years of the second Triumvirate, would have been the commemoration of the victory of Augustus over his fellow *triumviri*. The tholos of the Mausoleum and the obelisk of the Horologium boldly expressed his triumph over Antony at Actium and Alexandria. In addition, the Mausoleum's tholos and the procession frieze of the Ara Pacis referenced Augustus's attainment of the title *pontifex maximus* after the death of Lepidus.

¹⁴⁰ Brunt and Moore 3-4.

The Mausoleum as the tomb of the Julio-Claudians

The remains of Marcellus were the first to be placed in the Mausoleum in 23 BCE. The interment of Marcellus would not be the only time that Augustus would see a family member placed in his Mausoleum. In 12 BCE Augustus oversaw the funeral of his long-time friend, supporter, and son-in-law, Agrippa. Even though Agrippa had begun construction on his own tomb in the Campus Martius, Augustus had his ashes placed within the Mausoleum.¹⁴¹ Just three years later (9 BCE) Drusus the Elder, the youngest son of Livia, was interred in his step-father's tomb.¹⁴² The last two burials that Augustus oversaw were possibly the most difficult for him—those of Lucius (2 CE) and Gaius (4 CE) Caesar, his grandsons and heirs.¹⁴³

After an elaborate funeral, Augustus was laid to rest in his Mausoleum in 14 CE, some 40 years after he began its construction.¹⁴⁴ Over the next century the Mausoleum continued to be the family tomb for the Julio-Claudians.

Germanicus¹⁴⁵, Livia¹⁴⁶, Tiberius¹⁴⁷, Agrippina (mother of Caligula), Nero and

¹⁴¹ Cassius Dio 54.28.5.

¹⁴² Cassius Dio 55.2.3.

¹⁴³ The deaths of Lucius and Gaius are mentioned by Cassius Dio (10 A) but not their placement in the Mausoleum of Augustus. It is generally accepted, though, that they would have been buried in the same tomb as their father, Agrippa, and Augustus.

¹⁴⁴ Cassius Dio 56.42.

¹⁴⁵ Tacitus, *Annals*, 3.4.

¹⁴⁶ Cassius Dio 58.2.3.

¹⁴⁷ It is generally believed that Tiberius's ashes were placed in the Mausoleum, even though there are no ancient references, for their exclusion would most assuredly have been mentioned. For a discussion of the problem of where the ashes of Tiberius were placed see Javier Arce 72-73.

Drusus (brothers of Caligula)¹⁴⁸, and Poppea (wife of Nero)¹⁴⁹ were all buried in the Mausoleum. It is with these burials of the extended family of Augustus that the Mausoleum can finally be seen as a dynastic monument.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ The gathering and placement of the remains of Caligula's mother and brothers is discussed by Cassius Dio, 59.3.5.

¹⁴⁹ Tacitus 16.6. Tacitus states that Poppaea was buried in the "tumuloque Iuliorum" ["tumulus of the Julii"] which is believed to be the Mausoleum of Augustus.

¹⁵⁰ The final interment in the Mausoleum was in 96 CE when the ashes of the Emperor Nerva were placed in the tomb although he was not of the Julio-Claudian line. His was the last burial that can be definitely associated with the Mausoleum. Sextus Aurelius Victor, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 12.12.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE POST-ANTIQUE HISTORY OF THE MAUSOLEUM OF AUGUSTUS FROM THE FALL OF ROME TO THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

Throughout the centuries of imperial Rome, the Mausoleum of Augustus was an honored monument to the first emperor and his family. As happened with so many monuments in Rome, the collapse of the western empire changed the fate of the Mausoleum. Over the centuries the tomb underwent a series of transformations that changed its appearance and incorporated it into the new city center that developed along the Tiber on the ancient Campus Martius. This chapter traces these changes in the Mausoleum from the Middle Ages to the early Twentieth century.

The Sack of Rome and the slow decline of the city

As the city of Rome began to decline in size and importance in the fourth century, sources referring to the Mausoleum of Augustus become increasingly scarce. It is possible that the first destruction of the tomb occurred when the

Visigoths, led by Alaric in the first decade of the fifth century, invaded Rome.¹⁵¹ Although the city had been fortified with the Aurelian Walls to protect it against attacks, the city did not have the forces to adequately defend it. As a result, the Visigoths had little difficulty penetrating the fortifications and entering the city. Rome was sacked and looted for three days and many mansions on the Aventine, Quirinal, and Celian Hills were set aflame. While some of the treasures of the Lateran Basilica were taken, St. Peter's and St. Paul's were spared.¹⁵² After this attack by the Visigoths, Rome suffered from further sieges and sacks by other Gothic tribes. In 455 the Vandals sacked and looted Rome for fourteen days.¹⁵³ Then in 472 the city was attacked and looted by a band of mixed Barbarian tribes led by Ricimer.¹⁵⁴ By the end of the fifth century, many of the ancient monuments had been robbed of their precious metals, and statuary had been destroyed or mutilated. It is very possible that it was during this time

¹⁵¹ Sabatini, *Il Mausoleo di Augusto (Anfiteatro Corèa)* (Rome: Tipografia L. Filipucci, 1907) 13. Lanciani in his work *Pagan and Christian Rome* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1895) disagrees with Sabatini and states that while the vaults were raided, it seems the tomb was not damaged during this attack on Rome (p. 177).

¹⁵² For ancient reference to Alaric's invasion of Rome refer to Procopius of Caesarea, *History of the Wars*, III, ii, 7-39 and Jordanes, *The Origins and Deeds of the Goths*, XXX, 156. Additional references can be found in Giuseppe Lugli, *I Monumenti Antichi di Roma e Suburbio*, vol. III (Roma: Dott. G. Bardi, 1938) 201; Torgil Magnuson, *The Urban Transformation of Medieval Rome, 312-1420* (Stockholm: Suecoromana, 2004) 50; Richard Krauthimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312-1308* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980) 45; and Bertrand Lançon, trans. Antonia Nevill, *Rome in Late Antiquity* (New York: Routledge, 2000) 36-37.

¹⁵³ For ancient reference to the Vandal attack on Rome refer to Procopius of Caesarea, *History of the Wars*, III, iii-vii. For secondary sources refer to Magnuson 50 and Lançon 40-41.

¹⁵⁴ Lançon 42.

that the bronze statue of the emperor that once crowned the Mausoleum of Augustus was taken for its metal.

Damage and destruction of the monuments of ancient Rome continued in the sixth century as a result of the Gothic Wars between the Ostrogoths and Justinian.¹⁵⁵ In 534 Justinian began a campaign against the Arian king Theodoric in order to regain the Western Roman Empire for the East. The battles occurred throughout much of Italy but Rome was the central focus. In 536 Justinian's general Belisarius captured Rome without conflict and was generally welcomed by the population.¹⁵⁶ This did not end the conflicts over Rome however; in fact, the city was lost, retaken, lost again and finally taken for the third and last time by Belisarius's successor Narses in 552.¹⁵⁷

During the Gothic Wars, the population of Rome had greatly decreased, possibly to little more than 30,000.¹⁵⁸ Soon after 552 Rome began a slow recovery process. The infrastructure was repaired so that water was more readily available and the roads and bridges were made more passable. This process came to a halt a little over a decade after it had started with the arrival of the Lombards who were conquering and occupying large portions of Italy north of Rome. Refugees from these areas and from the countryside surrounding Rome arrived in the city

¹⁵⁵ The events of the Gothic War are recounted by Procopius in *The Gothic Wars* V-VIII.

¹⁵⁶ Ferdinand Gregorovius, trans. Mrs. Gustavus W. Hamilton, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1967) vol. 1 373-374.

¹⁵⁷ Krautheimer 62.

¹⁵⁸ Krautheimer 65.

to escape the newest invaders. As a result the population of Rome increased by as much as 60,000.¹⁵⁹ The sudden growth in population strained the limited resources of the city and actually hastened its collapse.

The northern, eastern, and southern areas of the city that had once been the location of insulae and mansions were abandoned as the new, medieval Rome developed on either side of the Tiber Island.¹⁶⁰ As a result of this movement of the population, the Mausoleum was largely abandoned and neglected. It is possible that it was during this time the tomb was robbed of its travertine revetment. Spoliation was frequent in Rome and many of the early churches were constructed from the columns and capitals of Rome's ancient temples. Since so many of the ancient structures, especially colonnades and private dwellings, had been abandoned, the taking of their materials for reuse increased and slowly much of ancient Rome began to disappear. During this period of conflict and decline, the citizens had little interest in the meaning, or preservation, of the city's ancient monuments. Therefore, it is not surprising that during this period the Mausoleum fades from the written record and its meaning becomes obscured by the passage of time.

¹⁵⁹ Krautheimer 65.

¹⁶⁰ Krautheimer 68. The area being discussed here would be Trastevere on the west bank of the Tiber and the land between the Theater of Marcellus and the Capitol on the east bank.

The Mausoleum of Augustus and the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*

Although the Mausoleum was neglected and robbed of much of its former grandeur, it never faded into obscurity and its original name was retained through the centuries.¹⁶¹ In fact, a diploma of Agapitus II from 955 records that on or next to the Mausoleum stood a small church called Sant'Angelo de Agosto, making reference to its location.¹⁶² The *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*¹⁶³, a guidebook for Rome written around the twelfth century, makes reference to the Mausoleum:

At the Porta Flaminia Octavian made a castle called Augustum to be the burying place of the emperors. It was encased in different kinds of stone. Inside there is a hollow leading into the circle by hidden passageways. In the lower circle are the sepulchers of emperors and on each sepulcher are inscriptions saying in this manner: "These are the bones and ashes of the Emperor Nerva and such and such was the victory he won." In front of the sepulcher stood the image of the emperor's god, just as with all the other sepulchers. In the middle of the sepulchers is a recess where Octavian used to sit, and the priests there performed their ceremonies. From every kingdom of the world he commanded that one basketful of earth be brought, which he put atop the temple as a reminder to all nations coming to Rome.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Riccomini, *La ruina* 24 and Sabatini 13.

¹⁶² Cordingley and Richmond, 23 and Paola Virgili, "Mausoleo d'Augusto: Funzioni sociali di un edificio storico," *Archeologia nel Centroll: La "Città Murata* (Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985) 565.

¹⁶³ It is believed that the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* was written c. 1143 by Benedict, a canon of St. Peter's and became one of the most important guides to Rome for pilgrims and travelers alike. (Francis Morgan Nichols, *The Marvels of Rome: Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, second edition with Eileen Gardiner (New York: Italica Press, 1986) xxv-xxvii.) Additional references to the *Mirabilia* can be found in Gregorovius vol. 4, pt. 2, 653-665 and Krauthair 198-199.

¹⁶⁴ Translation by Francis Morgan Nichols, *The Marvels of Rome: Mirabilia Urbis Romae* 36.

Ad portam Flammineam fecit Octavianus quoddam castellum quod vocatur Augustum, ubi sepelirentur imperatores, quod tabulatum fuit diversis lapidibus. Intus in girum est concavum per occultas vias. In inferiori giro sunt sepulture imperatorum. In unaquaque sepultura sunt littere ita dicentes: "Hec sunt ossa et cinis Nerve imperatoris et Victoria quam fecit". Ante quos stabat statua dei sui, sicut in aliis omnibus sepulcris. In medio sepulcrorum est absida ubi sepe

The name *Augustum* in the *Mirabilia* was the common name for the Mausoleum from the eighth to the twelfth centuries.¹⁶⁵ In the tenth century it was referred to as *Mons Augustus*, which was corrupted into *Austa* or *L'austa*.¹⁶⁶ This use of the term *mons*, which means mountain, suggests that the lower wall of the Mausoleum was covered in earth and possibly overgrown with trees. This appearance could explain the anecdote mentioned in the *Mirabilia* that Augustus had ordered that a basketful of earth from all regions of his empire be brought to Rome and placed atop his tomb. In fact, the accumulation of earth and sediment was likely the result of the frequent flooding of the Tiber. Flooding in the area of the Campus Martius continued to be a problem until the 1900s when embankments were constructed along the river.¹⁶⁷

The author of the *Mirabilia* seems to have had some knowledge of the interior of the Mausoleum for he is able to describe the circular passageways and the tomb chamber along with the now lost ash urn of Nerva. Again, though, there is a misinterpretation of the structure. The central chamber, which once would have held the remains of Augustus, is interpreted by the *Mirabilia* writer

sedebat Octavianus; ibique errant sacerdotes facientes sua cerimonia. De omnibus regnis totius orbis iussit venire unum cirothecam plenum de terra, quam posuit super templum, ut esset in memoriam omnibus gentibus Romam venientibus. *Mirabilia urbis Romae*, IntraText Library November 2007 <http://www.intratext.com/IXT/LAT0463/_PM.HTM>.

¹⁶⁵ Nichols 76.

¹⁶⁶ Nichols 76 and Gregorovius vol. III, p. 350.

¹⁶⁷ Krautheimer 64.

as a ceremonial chamber in which Augustus would sit during religious ceremonies. Since the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* was one of the most popular medieval guide books to focus on the antiquities of Rome, its description of the Mausoleum became the standard for several centuries.

The twelfth century was a period of revived interest in the arts, literature, and sciences of antiquity. With this revival came an interest and pride in the history of Rome and its power as capital of an empire. The medieval legend reported in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, about the Mausoleum being covered by earth from all regions of the Roman world, reflects a knowledge of, and interest in, Augustus's role in establishing and securing that empire. Thus, the Mausoleum became a symbol of the city's past glories.

Prestige and Fortification: The Mausoleum in the later Middle Ages

The later Middle Ages were a time of increased competition and conflict between the noble families of Rome. Because of frequent interfamilial conflicts, each family constructed a fortress and tower which functioned as a base from which to launch their assaults.¹⁶⁸ Several of these medieval fortress towers are still standing in Rome such as the Torre delle Milizie which stands above the

¹⁶⁸ Paul Hetherington, *Medieval Rome: A Portrait of the City and its Life* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994) 39.

Forum of Nerva.¹⁶⁹ It was during this time that the Mausoleum came into the possession of the powerful Colonna family and became the location of their fortress.¹⁷⁰

In 1167 the citizens of Rome were defeated by the people of Tusculum. The Romans believed that the defeat was the direct result of the treasonous actions of the Colonna family and, in retaliation, they attacked and destroyed the Colonna fortress.¹⁷¹ The family soon rebuilt their fortress, once again on the site of the Mausoleum. In 1241 the Colonna fortress, and thus the monument, again became subject to attack. In July of that year the fortress was held for Cardinal Giovanni Colonna who was supporting Frederick II against Pope Gregory IX. Matteo Russo Orsini, a general under the command of the pope, took the Mausoleum and fortress in August of the same year though the Colonna family soon recovered it.¹⁷² The tomb is mentioned as the possession of Oddo Colonna in a Palestrina deed from 1252 and is called *munitiones Augustae* [Augustan

¹⁶⁹ Gregorovius discusses these building of these towers in vol. 4 pt. 2, 691.

¹⁷⁰ For information on the Colonna family see Biondo Flavio, *Italy Illuminated*, vol. 1, Books I-IV trans. Jeffery A. White (Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press, 2005) 119-201 and Gregorovius, vol. 4.2, 319-320. Among the various sources that cite the family's acquisition of the Mausoleum are Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome* 177, Cordingley and Richmond 24, Krautheimer 157, and Riccomini, *La Ruina* 24.

¹⁷¹ The battle between the counts of Tusculum and the Romans and the destruction of the Mausoleum is vividly described by Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome* 177-179. Sabatini continues this tradition by stating that it was due to this attack that the Mausoleum suffered its greatest destruction which caused the collapse of the central mass. Cordingley and Richmond, "The Mausoleum of Augustus" 24 state that this is an unwarranted tradition.

¹⁷² Cordingley and Richmond 24 and Lugli 201.

fortress].¹⁷³ The Mausoleum remained in the family's possession into the fourteenth century as evidenced by records which show that in 1354 Jugurtha and Sciaretta Colonna ordered the cremation of Cola di Rienzo¹⁷⁴ in the area of the Mausoleum.¹⁷⁵

The Colonna family may have chosen the Mausoleum as the site for their fortress because of its association with Augustus. This connection with Augustus may have heightened the family's prestige. By the fifteenth century, the dominance of the Roman noble families decreased as governance of the city passed to the people of Rome.¹⁷⁶ With this shift in power, the Colonna family may have no longer needed their fortress for it was during this time that Pope Martin V (Oddo Colonna) handed ownership of the Mausoleum to a group of lay brothers.¹⁷⁷ Under the brothers' ownership the site of the tomb was developed into a vineyard. Possession of the tomb then passed to the Orsini family in the first decades of the sixteenth century.

¹⁷³ Cordingley and Richmond 24.

¹⁷⁴ Cola di Rienzo (b. Nicola di Lorenzo) was a popular leader who in the mid-fourteenth century plotted a revolution to return the city of Rome to its ancient glory. In May 1347 he claimed the title of tribune and assumed dictatorial powers. By the end of 1347, Cola was forced out of power through the combined influence of the Roman nobles, led by the Orsini and Colonna families, and the pope. He fled the city but returned in August of 1354 when his power was reinstated. This return to power was short lived for his rule was riddled with financial problems because of his luxurious lifestyle. Severe taxation led the people of Rome to riot in October of 1354 when they seized Cola and killed him. This incident is colorfully described by Lanciani in *Pagan and Christian Rome* 179-180.

¹⁷⁵ Cordingley and Richmond 24.

¹⁷⁶ Hetherington 27.

¹⁷⁷ Cordingley and Richmond 24.

Antiquity Rediscovered: The Mausoleum in the Renaissance

In 1519 all that seems to have been visible of the Mausoleum was a large earthen mound as the Renaissance architect, painter and draughtsman Baldassare Peruzzi refers to the site as a *monte* in his sketch of the area surrounding the Mausoleum (see Figure 5.3).¹⁷⁸ In 1550, in his view of Rome, the German cartographer Sebastian Münster depicts the site of the Mausoleum as a large earthen knoll¹⁷⁹ (Figure 5.1). It was during this time, the sixteenth century, that the papacy began to repopulate and improve the Campus Martius. The most substantial changes to the northern Campus came under Pope Leo X, who had purchased property in this area. In 1517 the Via Ripetta (known at this time as Via Leonina) was straightened and paved to allow easier access to the port of Ripetta. As a result, the Via Leonina became one of the most important and busiest thoroughfares in the city.¹⁸⁰ These factors led to intensified building along this bend in the Tiber. As foundations were dug for new constructions around the Mausoleum, many antiquities came to light including, most significantly for this discussion, the epitaph to Germanicus.¹⁸¹ This inscription was the second artifact from the Mausoleum to be recorded. About two hundred

¹⁷⁸ The term *monte* means mountain and referring to the Mausoleum with this term suggests that little or none of the architectural structure remained visible.

¹⁷⁹ Riccomini, *La ruina*, 36.

¹⁸⁰ Riccomini, *La ruina*, 30 and Ermanno Ponti, "Come sorse e come scompare il quartiere attorno di Mausoleo di Augusto," *Capitolium* X (1935): 239.

¹⁸¹ Riccomini, *La ruina*, 30. This epitaph is also discussed in Hesberg and Paciera 98-108.

years earlier the base for the ash urn of Agrippina had been discovered and for many years had been used as a grain measure before being placed in the Museo dei Conservatori¹⁸² (Figure 5.2).

Part of the excavation that was occurring in the area of the Mausoleum was the result of work on the Church of San Rocco and its nearby hospital. During this work, a portion of the ancient outer wall of the Mausoleum was revealed down to the original ground level. The architects Baldassare Peruzzi and Giovanni Francesco da Sangallo were both present to see and sketch the wall with its remaining revetment before the travertine was removed and the wall was reburied.¹⁸³ The drawings of Peruzzi and da Sangallo record important information about the height of the wall, its decorative features, and each architect's proposed reconstructions. There are several extant sketches firmly attributed to Peruzzi that provide detailed and measured drawings. One sketch provides a plan of the area marking the site of the Church of San Rocco and that of the Mausoleum which he refers to as "monte del Signore Jacomo Ursino"¹⁸⁴ (Figure 5.3). In other sketches Peruzzi shows the profile of the perimeter wall of the Mausoleum (Figures 5.4-5.6). These sketches provide measurements for the various architectural features including the stepped base

¹⁸² Lanciani 183-184.

¹⁸³ Riccomini, *La ruina* 36-39.

¹⁸⁴ This reference to the Mausoleum suggests that it was in the possession of Jacomo Ursino which is confirmed by Ermanno Ponti when he states, "Ottenuta in enfiteusi perpetua una modesta area da Giacomo Orsini, vi fabbricò una casa non grande..." 239.

of the Mausoleum and the height of the exterior walls. An additional sketch of interest is of the Doric cornice and dripstone that once decorated the exterior wall of the tomb. This quick sketch provides the measurements of the fragment and its rosette decoration (Figure 5.7).¹⁸⁵ These drawings provide the only record of the appearance of the exterior wall of the Mausoleum before the remaining travertine blocks were removed and the decorative elements were left in a ruinous state.

A sketch from the same excavation, previously attributed to Peruzzi, has been recently identified as the work of da Sangallo¹⁸⁶ (Figure 5.8). This quick sketch is recognizable as a reconstruction drawing of the Mausoleum because of the placement of two obelisks in front of the entrance. The reconstructed elevation depicts a lower drum with a base that roughly corresponds to the one shown in the Peruzzi drawings. Above this lower outer wall, da Sangallo places a second drum with a diameter only slightly smaller than the one below. Pilasters topped by a heavy cornice encircle this upper wall. Although this freehand sketch greatly influenced early twentieth century reconstructions of the

¹⁸⁵ These sketches of the Doric cornice were studied by Paola Virgili for the article "A Proposito del Mausoleo di Augusto: Baldassare Peruzzi aveva Ragione," *Archeologia Laziale* VI (1984): 209-212 in which Virgili notes that the sketches and their measurements accurately correspond to the few remains of the Doric cornice that are still present in the area of the Mausoleum.

¹⁸⁶ Riccomini, *La ruina*, 39.

Mausoleum it was not known during the intervening centuries because it was never published.¹⁸⁷

The revived interest in the northern Campus Martius attracted the attention of Monsignor Francesco Soderini, who purchased the Mausoleum in 1546.¹⁸⁸ He made this acquisition in order to transform the tomb into a garden museum.¹⁸⁹ In 1549, Soderini applied for and received permission from the Camera Apostolica to conduct an excavation of the monument in hopes of finding ancient sculptures or artifacts. While this endeavor did not result in any significant finds, it did reveal the interior including the niches that once contained the cinerary urns of the Julio-Claudian family. The architect and painter Pirro Ligorio recorded the findings in writing and drawings including his interpretation of the plan and elevation of the Mausoleum. Ligorio's plan (see plan, Figure 5.9) accurately depicts the semi-circular niches with spur walls that exist between the two outermost walls, as well as the enclosed rectangular spaces

¹⁸⁷ The influence of this sketch in the twentieth century can be found in Alfonso Bartoli's article "L'architettura del mausoleo di Augusto," *Bollettino d'Arte* 7 1927: 30-46. Bartoli would have likely seen this sketch while researching drawings at The Uffizi for his publication *I Monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze* (1914-1922).

¹⁸⁸ Riccomini, "A Garden of Statues and Marbles: The Soderini Collection in the Mausoleum of Augustus," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 266. Francesco Soderini was the great nephew of Cardinal Francesco Soderini who was known for his interest in architecture, in particular ancient ruins. The purchase of the Mausoleum seems to have been just one of a series of purchases in Rome made by the Soderini family.

¹⁸⁹ A nice account of this statuary garden can be found in Riccomini's book *La ruina* as well as her article on the subject "A Garden of Statues and Marbles: The Soderini Collection in the Mausoleum of Augustus." The information I am providing on the Soderini Garden comes from both of these sources.

between the next ring walls. Beyond these accuracies, though, his plan becomes fanciful. He depicts seven ring walls rather than five and places spur walls around the burial chamber where none actually exist. Ligorio's imagination played an even greater role in his reconstructed elevations of the Mausoleum. In one (Figure 5.10) he follows some of Strabo's account¹⁹⁰ by including such details as evergreens, the rows of travertine blocks, and the statue of Augustus, but he depicts the Mausoleum as consisting of four drums of diminishing size. Ligorio represents the top two drums as being encircled by a series of niches separated by engaged columns or pilasters. Ligorio's second drawing of the Mausoleum's elevation is even more fanciful (Figure 5.11). In this rendering, he still uses the four drums but each has been heightened. Now each drum contains a series of niches some of which have statues placed inside. Each drum is also crowned by statuary and the final drum is topped by a dome which supports the statue of the emperor.

The urbanization of the Campus Martius continued after the death of Pope Leo X. The garden of the Soderini family made the Mausoleum one of the favorite spots for the educated traveler to Rome in part because of the ancient sculpture placed throughout the garden by the Soderini family. In 1550 the Bolognese naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi described the Mausoleum and its garden

¹⁹⁰ Strabo, 5.3.9, see chapter 2 for full quote.

in his guide *Delle Statue Antiche, che per tutta Roma in diversi luoghi & case si veggono* providing a detailed account of the garden and the placement of the statuary throughout.¹⁹¹ Aldrovandi's description is confirmed by an engraving from 1575 by Etienne du Pérac which offers a wonderful view of the Mausoleum as a sculpture garden (Figure 5.12). The garden is planted with circular rows of plants and shrubbery that mimic the ring walls below. Ancient sculpture and sarcophagi are placed along the interior of the massive circular wall. Along the exterior of the wall, two rooms had been constructed on either side of the entrance.

The end of the sixteenth century saw a decreased interest in developing this area of the Campus Martius as well as a probable decrease in the wealth of Francesco Soderini. The sale of his Pasquino group to Cosimo de' Medici in 1561 perhaps provides evidence of his diminishing resources.¹⁹² Gradually during the end of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth century, pieces of the Soderini collection were sold to various buyers whose identities are obscure. Though the garden continued to exist, its depleted state can be seen in drawings from the seventeenth century, such as the one by the Italian artist Giacomo Lauro

¹⁹¹ Ulisses Aldrovandi, *Delle statue antiche, che per tutta Roma, in diversi luoghi e case si veggono* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1975) 199-201.

¹⁹² Riccomini, "Soderini Collection," 270.

(Figure 5.13). A comparison of his engraving with the one by Du Pèrac reveals that some of the statuary and sarcophagi are no longer present in the garden.

With the advent of the Renaissance, interest in the Mausoleum reached its highest point since the fall of Rome. This interest, though, was not the result of it being the tomb of Augustus but the fact that it was an example of ancient Roman architecture that could be seen and studied. Its transformation into a garden was, also, due more to its antiquity than its association with the first emperor of Rome. The ancient architectural features of the Mausoleum would have been seen as the appropriate backdrop for the ancient sculpture it housed. After the Renaissance and Baroque periods, scholarly interest in the Mausoleum waned and soon many of the sixteenth-century advances in knowledge concerning the tomb's structure and plan were forgotten as it was gradually hidden among numerous dwellings that were constructed around it.¹⁹³

The Tomb and the Life of the City: The late Eighteenth to early Twentieth century

Interest in the Mausoleum was revived in 1777 during the construction of a house at the corner of Via degli Otto Cantoni and Via del Corso. While digging to begin construction, an area paved in travertine was uncovered. This site was identified as the *ustrinum* of members of the Augustan family. Along with the

¹⁹³ Riccomini, *La ruina* 136.

paved area, six cippi and an alabaster urn were found. Inscriptions on the cippi named members of the imperial household—the sons of Germanicus (Nero, Gaius, and Tiberius), Livilla, and Drusus' son Tiberius—and a possible imperial nephew identified as Vespasian, son of T. Flavius Clemens. The cippi were also inscribed with the Latin formula *hic crematus est* or *hic situs est*. It is uncertain why the two different formulas are used in the inscription. The alabaster urn was not associated with the *ustrinum* and it is possible that it was a cinerary urn from the Mausoleum that was removed during one of the Gothic raids.¹⁹⁴ As a result of these new discoveries, the remains of the Soderini garden were removed and an attempt was made to access the burial chamber of the Mausoleum which was now in the possession of the Portuguese Marchese Benedetto Correa de Sylva.¹⁹⁵ This attempt failed since the way was blocked by earlier wall collapses.

After the failed excavation, the Marchese Correa leased the Mausoleum to the Spaniard Bernardo Matas who erected a wooden amphitheater within its

¹⁹⁴ Information on the *ustrinum domus Augustae* can be found in Platner and Ashby's *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929) 545, Giuseppe Lugli's *I Monumenti Antichi di Roma e Suburbio*, vol. III (Rome: Dott. G. Bardi, 1938) 211-212, Rodolfo Lanciani's *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome* (New York: Bell Publishing Company, 1967) 463-464 and Mary Boatwright's "The 'Ara Ditis-Ustrinum of Hadrian' in the Western Campus Martius and Other Problematic Roman Unstrina," *American Journal of Archaeology* 89.3 July (1985): 495.

¹⁹⁵ At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Mausoleum passed into the hands of the Fioravanti family and then in the middle of the century was acquired by the Marchese Correa. Colini, "Il Mausoleo d' Augusto," *Capitolium* IV (1928): 17.

walls. He used it to hold public bullfights.¹⁹⁶ In the late 1780s Marchese Sverio Vivaldi Armentieri became the new owner of the Mausoleum. He continued using it as a place for spectacles that included bullfights and fireworks.¹⁹⁷ These events attracted large audiences consisting of Romans and foreigners alike. The festivities were halted in order to excavate the still unexplored interior of the Mausoleum¹⁹⁸ as well as to allow for the construction of a new brick amphitheater above the third ring wall of the tomb (Figure 5.14). Although the excavation provided neither sculpture nor new information, the new construction gave the Mausoleum a more impressive appearance and created a more ornate structure. The new amphitheater opened in 1797 as the Anfiteatro Correa.¹⁹⁹ Although the Anfiteatro was sold to the Camera Apostolica in 1802, the spectacles continued to be performed.²⁰⁰ Some of the most popular productions were those which involved animal hunts either by men on horseback or by dogs. A day at the Anfiteatro would conclude with a fabulous fireworks show accompanied by music (see Figure 5.15). These shows would

¹⁹⁶ Virgili, "Mausoleo d' Augusto: Funzioni sociali di un edificio storico," *Roma Archeologia nel Centro* vol. II (Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985) 566. Also from the source Carla Benocci, "Il Mausoleo d' Augusto come sede di spettacoli: da anfiteatro Correa ad Augusteo," *Roma Archeologia nel Centro II: La "Città Murata"* (Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985) 576

¹⁹⁷ Virgili 567 and Benocci 576.

¹⁹⁸ Riccomini, *La ruina* 173-174. Interest in conducting an excavation of the Mausoleum was a result of the discovery of ancient sculpture in the vicinity of the Mausoleum.

¹⁹⁹ Sabatini 17 and Virgili 567.

²⁰⁰ Benocci 574. A wonderful account of the festivities that occurred at the Anfiteatro Corèa as well as humorous anecdotes can be found in Prof. Sabatini's *Il Mausoleo di Augusto (Anfiteatro Corèa)*. He provides an account some of the many performances and important performers that appeared at the Anfiteatro.

often be thematic re-enactments of a great historical fire. A very successful production was that of the fall of Troy in which fireworks were used to give the impression of the burning of the Trojan citadel.²⁰¹ On April 21, 1819, the Mausoleum was part of the festivities in honor of Francis I of Austria who was visiting Rome. For the occasion, an attempt was made to cover the Anfiteatro with a *velarium* designed to shelter the attendees of the production from the elements.²⁰²

These spectacles of fireworks and animal hunts continued for nearly four decades before they were determined by the Camera Apostolica to be inappropriate. In 1844 the fireworks were halted and a few years later animal events were replaced by acrobatics.²⁰³ Soon the productions were reduced to matinees of recitation, music and operettas.²⁰⁴ The afternoon productions were attended but not on the scale of the earlier events. Eventually, the Mausoleum came into the possession of the engineer Conte Telfener who, in 1880, covered the structure with a glass dome and changed its name to Anfiteatro Umberto I in honor of the king of Italy. This new structure was not well received because of

²⁰¹ Sabatini 22.

²⁰² Benocci 575.

²⁰³ Sabatini 23 and Benocci 575.

²⁰⁴ Sabtini 24 and Riccomini, *La ruina* 190.

its appearance and because it blocked many of the exits from the Anfiteatro. It was soon closed for the glass dome was believed to be structurally unsound.²⁰⁵

The last decades of the nineteenth century were not only a period of change for the Mausoleum but also for the city of Rome. In the middle of the century, Italy began its movement toward unification, called the Risorgimento. By 1861 many of the Italian states had joined together to create the new Republic of Italy, later called the Kingdom of Italy, and Victor Emmanuel II took the title of king. It was not until 1870 that the city of Rome became part of the new Republic and a year later was made the capital city. King Victor Emmanuel II died in 1878 and his remains were placed in the Pantheon by his son and successor, Umberto I. It was in honor of this new king of Italy that Telfener changed the name of the Mausoleum to Anfiteatro Umberto I. Even after the tomb was closed because of safety concerns, as mentioned above, it continued to be associated with the royal family of Italy. After a failed attempt to turn it into a cast museum for Greek sculpture, the Mausoleum was used by the sculptor Chiaradia for the casting of the bronze horses which decorate the Victor Emmanuel II monument in Rome.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁵ Virgili 568, Sabatini 28-29, and Riccomini, *La ruina*, 190.

²⁰⁶ Spiro Kostof, "The Emperor and the Duce," *Art and Architecture in the Service of Politics*, ed. Henry A. Millon and Linda Nochlin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978) 275.

The new century brought new interest in the Mausoleum and the possibilities it presented. Starting in 1897, at the behest of Conte Enrico di San Martino, president of the Reggia Academia di Santa Cecilia, construction began along the exposed wall of the tomb in order to create a new concert hall for the city.²⁰⁷ In 1907 the concert hall opened as the Augusteo, home of Rome's symphony (Figure 5.16). Once again the Mausoleum became a part of the cultural life of the city. In 1909 a new urban plan, the Piano Regolatore, called for the removal of some of the buildings surrounding the Augusteo to reveal some of the ancient structure of the Mausoleum.²⁰⁸ In this plan, only the Palazzo Correa would remain next to the new concert hall and a small piazza would be created around the tomb. In truth, interest was not as much on the revelation of the ancient monument but in opening up new avenues for the increasing traffic of the growing city. The plan never came to fruition before the beginning of World War I and was forgotten until the emergence of Italy's Fascist government in 1922.²⁰⁹

This period of the Mausoleum's history is one in which its role as an ancient Roman monument and its association with Augustus are no longer relevant. It is the tomb's circular form that seems to have been of the greatest

²⁰⁷ Spiro Kostof 275. For an account of this acquisition of the Mausoleum and its use as the Augusteo see Guido M. Gatti, "The Academy of St. Cecilia and The Augusteo in Rome," *The Musical Quarterly* 8.3 (July 1922), 323-345.

²⁰⁸ Lanciani, *Notes from Rome*, 410-413.

²⁰⁹ Kostof 275.

importance. This structural form gave rise to it being used as an arena for bullfights. Even when excavations were conducted near its central core, the emphasis seemed to be on the construction of new brick walls above the ancient ones to create a more impressive amphitheater, rather than actually discovering ancient artifacts. The changing of its name to Anfiteatro Correa emphasizes this shift in attitude toward the Mausoleum.

While this connection with the monument's ancient history was lost, its role as a public monument was revived. It was now being used as a celebration of Roman life through the various forms of entertainment that it provided. It is interesting to note that some of these entertainments seem to reflect Rome's ancient past. The animal hunts and bullfights held in the Anfiteatro are reminiscent of similar games presented in the ancient Roman amphitheater. Also, the fireworks shows, as discussed above, re-enacted historical fires such as the burning of Troy. Trojan imagery dates back to Republican and Imperial Rome since its legendary founding father was the Trojan prince Aeneas.

When the Mausoleum was acquired by the Academia di Santa Cecilia and renamed the Augusteo, it would appear that it had reclaimed its ancient history. Again, though, its use seems to have been more a matter of practicality than a desire to invoke the memory of Augustus. Rome was in need of a symphony hall and the Mausoleum was available. That said, though, some notions of the

ancient Roman Empire seem to come through. This idea is illustrated best in Guido Gatti's article from 1922 when he states, "...the Augusteo as one of the most important musical institutions in the world, [it is] destined... to shine as a beacon-light from Rome which was the centre of world-civilization—from that Italy which would reconquer the position that is hers of right in the realm of Art...."²¹⁰ This destiny for the Mausoleum was to be short lived for the rise of Mussolini and the Fascist Party in the 1930s changes the fate and role of the monument within the city of Rome.

²¹⁰ Gatti, "Academy of St. Cecilia and the Augusteo in Rome," 345.

CHAPTER SIX

THE MAUSOLEUM IN THE TWENTIETH AND TWENTY-FIRST CENTURIES: A NEW ERA OF MEANING

Mussolini and the Mausoleum

When Mussolini became prime minister in October 1922, Italy, like so many nations during this period, was entering a time of great economic decline. Rome was truly feeling the effects of this collapse. The population of the city had been steadily increasing since the unification of Italy and by the time Mussolini created his one-party government²¹¹ the city's population was rapidly approaching one million.²¹² The combination of increased population and economic collapse created a series of social problems from housing to unemployment. Mussolini, in his dynamic speeches, promised to eradicate these difficulties and create a new, stronger, unified Italy with Imperial Rome as its shining example.

²¹¹ Mussolini created his one-party dictatorship in 1926, see Borden W. Painter, Jr, *Mussolini's Rome: Rebuilding the Eternal City* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) 2.

²¹² Ronald Ridley, "Augusti Manes volitant per auras: The archaeology of Rome under the Fascists," *Xenia* 11 (1986): 41.

Mussolini's Fascist Party was not the first Italian government to use Italy's glorious past as political propaganda. The government of unified Italy (1870-1922) and the Fascists each created a myth that presented ancient Rome as the ideal state which they wished to emulate. This mythic Rome was presented as having developed of a strong unified Italy, having created civilization, and having generated the ideal population that put the state before the individual.²¹³ Fascist propaganda, though, glorified this myth to an extent not seen before. Peter Aicher effectively summarizes the pervasiveness of the Fascist identification with ancient Rome when he states:

The sheer intensiveness of the Fascist attempt to link itself with ancient Rome, promulgated in wide sectors of the population using all media—print (both popular and academic), architecture, archaeology, public ceremony, stamps, symbols, cinema, school instruction—constituted a new distinctive phase of the myth of Rome; always present, it now took center stage.²¹⁴

It was Mussolini's use of architecture and archaeology that had the greatest visual effect on the city of Rome. Mussolini isolated ancient monuments and built new architectural complexes to the glory of Italy and the Fascist party. As early as December 31, 1925, Mussolini gave a brief account of the ancient monuments he wished to isolate within open piazzas. Included on the list were the imperial fora, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Theater of Marcellus, and the

²¹³ Peter Aicher, "Mussolini's Forum and the Myth of Augustan Rome," *Classical Bulletin* 76.2 (2000): 118.

²¹⁴ Aicher 119.

Pantheon.²¹⁵ These large, easily recognizable monuments evoked the glory of ancient Rome and they could be used to advance his program of creating a new Rome out of the glories of the past. The reasons behind this work were not just aesthetic or scholarly; actually they were far from it. The clearing away of old buildings allowed for the opening up of space in which wider streets could be constructed to accommodate the increase in traffic. The new piazzas created around imperial monuments also attracted tourism and, most importantly, resulted in the creation of new jobs for the growing number of unemployed. A final benefit was that Mussolini's government was seen as one of action, one that completed proposed projects, unlike the previous government that often discussed these same ideas but never carried them out.

Work to isolate the monuments of ancient Rome began almost immediately. In 1926 work began around the Theater of Marcellus. Plans did not only include removal of the buildings that crowded around the Theater so that it would be visible to all but also included the creation of a new, major thoroughfare that would link the city of Rome to the ancient port city of Ostia.

²¹⁵ "I dati sintetici del vostro bilancio biennale eccoli: strade nuove, aumentati i mezzi di comunicazione, miglioramento di tutti i servizi pubblici, scuole, parchi, giardini, assistenza sanitaria, organizzazione igienica in difesa della salute del popolo. Nello stesso tempo, riscattati dal silenzio oblioso, i Fori, come quelli di Augusto, e i Templi come quello della Fortuna Virile. ... Voi continuerete a liberare il tronco della grande quercia da tutto ciò che ancora l'aduggia. Farete largo intorno all'Augusteo, al teatro di Marcello, al Campidoglio, al Pantheon. Tutto ciò che vi crebbe attorno nei secoli della decadenza deve scomparire. Entro cinque anni da piazza Colonna, per un grande varco deve essere visibile la mole del Pantheon." As quoted by Antonio Cederna in *Roma fascista nelle fotografie dell'Istituto Luce* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 2001) 8.

This new road, appropriately named Via del Mare (now Via del Teatro di Marcello) provided the citizens of Rome with an easy route to the coast. The new Via del Mare also opened up the area between the Capitoline Hill and the Palazzo Venezia allowing easier traffic flow and the gathering of large crowds. It is this last point that was important for Mussolini, since in 1929 he moved his office from the Palazzo Chigi to the Palazzo Venezia. It was from the balcony of this building that Mussolini made his frequent speeches to the large crowds gathered below.²¹⁶

Also in 1926 two archaeologists, A. M. Colini and G. Q. Giglioli,²¹⁷ published their archaeological report on the Mausoleum of Augustus.²¹⁸ This archaeological study of the monument was more an exploration than a systematic excavation. By entering through the original entrance of the Mausoleum which had been re-discovered in 1907, they were able to examine the ancient structure without disrupting the upper parts which still functioned as a concert hall. Colini and Giglioli were able to gain some understanding of the tomb's structure by examining its walls which were often only accessible through the basements of the surrounding buildings.²¹⁹ Their article is divided

²¹⁶ Painter 2 and 35.

²¹⁷ Antonio Maria Colini, a noted Roman archaeologist, is known for his work on the Severan plan and Giglioli is possibly best known for his excavation of Etruscan sites.

²¹⁸ A. M. Colini and G. Q. Giglioli, "Relazione della prima campagna di scavo nel Mausoleo di Augusto." *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 54 (1926): 191-237.

²¹⁹ The majority of these buildings were constructed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

into two parts: Colini provides the bulk of information which includes a discussion of the findings, while Giglioli provides the summarizing conclusion. In his report, Colini provides a thorough discussion of each section of the Mausoleum including the materials used in construction, how much structure still remained, and any extant inscriptions or sculptural reliefs. This information has proved to be invaluable to later archaeologists as they have attempted to reconstruct the tomb and evaluate how much has been lost since its excavation.

The most interesting aspect of the archaeological report is the conclusion written by Giglioli. In his opening paragraph, he states that:

To this resolution I will immediately say that, in my opinion, the present noble use of the monument should be maintained, because otherwise it will be a shapeless ruin in the center of Rome, but principally because only in this way can we hope to have all the means necessary to have an arrangement that will guarantee its conservation and allow for its study.²²⁰

He then notes the destruction that had occurred to the monument over the centuries because of its many transformations and how it had resulted in inaccurate plans and reconstructions.

In 1930 Colini and Giglioli published a second report on the Mausoleum which included all of the additional information they had gathered over the

²²⁰ "A questo proposito dirò subito che, a mio parere, l'attuale nobilissimo uso del monumento ova mantenuto, sia perchè altrimenti nel centro di Roma si avrebbe un informe rudero, sia principalmente perchè solo così si può sperare di avere tutti i mezzi occorrenti a una sistemazione che ne garantisca la conservazione e ne permetta lo studio." As quoted in Colini and Giglioli, "Relazione della prima campagna di scavo nel Mausoleo di Augusto" 228 (translated by S. Fugate Brangers).

previous four years.²²¹ While this examination of the tomb only served to clarify and confirm their earlier report, it did uncover some fragments of inscriptions and funerary urns. While in 1926 Giglioli argued for maintaining the present use of the Mausoleum as a concert hall, over the course of the next four years he became an important member of the group pushing for the isolation and excavation of the Mausoleum. He began to espouse the value of the monument and recognized its potential as a symbol for Mussolini and his growing association with Augustus. In fact, it was Giglioli who developed the idea of having an exhibit on ancient Rome as part of a celebration of the two thousand year anniversary of Augustus's birth.²²² In his concluding paragraph, Giglioli writes:

We have faith that on 23 September 1938 the Duce of the new Italy could, on the bimillennial of the birth of Augustus, admire the great ruin [of the Mausoleum], completely isolated and surrounded anew by those groves that Augustus bequeathed to his good people of Rome.²²³

This idea of celebrating the birth of Augustus was just a part of a growing national trend associating Mussolini with the first emperor of Rome. In the 1930s books were being published that presented delineated arguments of how

²²¹ Giglioli and Colini, *Il Mausoleo d'Augusto* (Milan and Rome: Bestetti e Tumminelli, 1930).

²²² Kostof 285.

²²³ Translation by Kostof 285. "Noi abbiamo fede che il 23 settembre 1938 il Duce dell'Italia Nuova, che ora rientrerà per primo nella cripta risorta, potrà, nel secondo millenario dalla nascita di Augusto, mirare il gran rudero, completamente isolato e circondato di nuovo da quei boschetti, che Augusto concesse al suo buon popolo di Roma." Giglioli and Colini, 42.

Mussolini should be seen as the re-embodiment of the Roman emperors, especially of Augustus.²²⁴ It was also in the 1930s that stamps began to appear with the image of Augustus and quotes from the *Res Gestae*.²²⁵ In the early years of Mussolini's government, there was equal evocation of Julius Caesar and Augustus. As the Fascists gained more power and stability was established, the image of Julius Caesar as dictator and creator of social unrest was judged to be inappropriate. Augustus was presented as the champion of the Republic restoring order after the years of civil war, just as Mussolini was being represented as the hero of Italy who had rescued the land from a politically and morally corrupt government.²²⁶ With these developments, the time was perfect for beginning the work to isolate and excavate the Mausoleum of Augustus.

On October 22, 1934, the twelfth anniversary of the March on Rome, Mussolini stood on a rooftop on the Vicolo Soderini to announce the beginning of the liberation of the Mausoleum of Augustus from the buildings that surrounded it (Figure 6.1). Standing ready with the infamous pickaxe nearby and surrounded by a multitude of photographers and journalists, Mussolini declared:

²²⁴ Examples of this type of publications are Emilio Balbo's *Augusto e Mussolini* (Rome: Pinciana 1937), his *Protagonisti dei due imperi di Roma: Augusto e Mussolini* (Rome: Casa editrice Pinciana 1940) and Giovanni Viganoni's *Mussolini e i cesari* (Milan: Edizioni "Ultra" 1933).

²²⁵ Aicher 123.

²²⁶ Aicher 121-22.

Companions!

The work of isolating the Augusteo, which today I initiate and that must be finished within three years for the bimillennium of Augustus, has a triple usefulness: that of history and beauty, that of the traffic, that of hygiene.

To isolate the grave of the first Emperor of Rome, many streets must be demolished. I remember that to create the Via dell'Impero the following were leveled to the ground: Via Alessandrina, Via S. Lorenzo, Via del Lauro, Via Salara Vecchia, Via della Croce Bianca, Via Bonella, Via del Priorato, Via delle Marmorelle, Via Cermona, Via dei Carbonari, Via S. Lorenzo ai Monti, covering an area of 40,000 square meters. Now that all is done on the Via dell'Impero it is necessary to use considerable effort to recall the location of the roads that disappeared.

To isolate the Augusteo will require the demolition of the Via dei Pontefici, Via delle Colonnate (in part), vicolo Soderini, vicolo degli Schiavoni, vicolo del Grottino. This will include one hundred twenty houses that cover an area of 27,000 square meters. Also the isolation of the Augusteo, with the creation of a large square and of a wide passage towards the Corso Umberto I, will be of great benefit to urban traffic. As had been the case with the Via dell'Impero on which now pass from twenty-five to thirty thousand automobiles in twenty-four hours.

Therefore, we are bit speaking here of purely archaeological pathways, but of large roads on which flow the grand and continuous life of the town.

As for the houses that are demolished they represent a grave backwardness with respect to hygiene. I have ordered that their exteriors and interiors be collected in a large album of photography, photography to be eventually dedicated to some rare nostalgic survivor of the so-called local color.

The fourth and not least benefit: with the intense activities of demolition and the new building construction work will be given for a period of three years to numerous laborers of every category. And now I yield the word to the pickaxe.²²⁷

²²⁷ "Camerati!

I lavori per l'isolamento dell'Augusteo ai quali oggi io dò l'avvio e che dovranno essere ultimati entro tre anni per il bimillenario di Augusto hanno una triplice utilità: quella della storia e della bellezza, quella del traffico, quella dell'igiene.

Although Mussolini's pickaxe struck a roof near the Mausoleum, the actual demolition started along the outer edges of the zone. Therefore, the monument could continue to function as the city's concert hall until May 13, 1936. Many of the structures that were demolished during the process of isolating the tomb had been constructed after the eighteenth century to replace buildings lost in a devastating fire in 1734.²²⁸ Three churches that were located on two of the corners of the demolition zone were to remain standing and in the process their complete structures were also revealed. The churches were S. Girolamo degli

Per isolare la tomba del primo Imperatore di Roma, si demoliscono molte vie. Ricordo che per fare via dell'Impero furono rase al suolo le seguenti: via Alessandrina, via S. Lorenzo, via del Lauro, via Salara Vecchia, via della Croce Bianca, via Bonella, via del Priorato, via delle Marmorelle, via Cermona, via dei Carbonari, via S. Lorenzo ai Monti, scoprendo un'area di mq. 40.000. Quando ora si passa per via dell'Impero bisogna fare un considerevole sforzo mnemonico per ubicare le vie scomparse.

Per isolare l'Augusteo verranno demolite la via dei Pontefici, via delle Colonnate (in parte), vicolo Soderini, vicolo degli Schiavoni, vicolo del Grottino. Si tratta di centoventi case che coprono un'area di mq. 27.000. Anche l'isolamento dell'Augusteo, con la creazione di una grande piazza e di un largo varco verso il Corso Umberto I sarà di grandissimo giovamento al traffico urbano. Così com'è accaduto per via dell'Impero dove passano da venticinque a trentamila autoveicoli nelle ventiquattro ore.

Non si tratta dunque di arterie puramente archeologiche, ma di grandi strade dove fluisce la vita imponente e continua della città.

Quanto alle case che si demoliscono esse rappresentano un arretrato gravissimo in fatto d'igiene. Ho ordinato che siano raccolte in grandi album moltissime fotografie degli esterni e di interni da demolire, fotografie da dedicare eventualmente a qualche raro superstite nostalgico del cosiddetto "colore locale".

Quarta e non ultima utilità: con questi lavori di demolizione e di costruzione di nuovi edifici si dà lavoro per un triennio a numerosissimi operai di ogni categoria. Ed ora cedo la parola al piccone." As quoted in Antonio Cederna, *"L'isolamento dell'Augusteo," Roma fascista nelle fotografie dell'Istituto Luce* (Rome: Editori Riuniti 2001): 161. Translation by S. Fugate Brangers.

²²⁸ Kostof 278.

Illirici (or degli Schiavoni) built in 1453, S. Rocco built in 1499 and S. Carlo al Corso constructed between 1612 and 1672.

Surprisingly, there are few published accounts of the liberation of the Mausoleum and its subsequent excavation. In 1934, Guglielmo Gatti published an article "Il Mausoleo di Augusto: Studio di Ricostruzione"²²⁹ in which he studied past written accounts and drawings of the tomb's structure in order to develop possible reconstructions. He followed this with a second article in 1938 in which he presented a reconstruction of the monument which is still widely accepted (Figure 6.2).²³⁰ In 1935 two additional articles on the Mausoleum were published in the journal *Capitolium*²³¹ neither of which provided much new information. The first article dealt solely with the history of the tomb, while the second article discussed the plans for the new piazza.

Antonio Muñoz, the director of antiquities and fine arts as well as the director of the Mausoleum's excavation, albeit briefly, wrote the only account of the excavation, in 1938.²³² From the beginning of the article, there is a sense of disappointment in the results of the excavation. He states that it was hoped that the isolation and excavation of the monument would help resolve the problem of its original appearance and decoration. Muñoz acknowledges that although

²²⁹ *Capitolium* X (1934): 457-464.

²³⁰ "Nuove Osservazioni sul Mausoleo di Augusto," *L'Urbe* 3.8 (1938): 1-17.

²³¹ Ponti, "Come sorse e come scomparire il quartiere attorno al Mausoleo di Augusto," and (author unknown) "La sistemazione del Mausoleo di Augusto," *Capitolium* XI (1935): 235-260.

²³² Muñoz, "La sistemazione del Mausoleo di Augusto," *Capitolium* XIII (1938): 491-508.

their hopes were not realized they were able to establish the plan of the large exterior wall and document the structure and thickness of the semi-circular niches between the two outer walls.

Much of the disappointment in the Mausoleum was due to the severe devastation that the tomb had suffered over the centuries. As a result of the tomb's condition, it was necessary to reconsider the project's plans for the monument's reconstruction. The project's engineer, Poscetti, expressed concern, as quoted by Muñoz:

Unfortunately, from what we can suppose, after the intense activities of isolation the mausoleum will not be presented well because the remainders of the ancient construction are meager and mute. It is necessary, therefore, to study a timely resolution; it is not possible to think about a complete reconstruction of the monument realizing one or another hypothesis, but limit ourselves to valuing what remains... The outside base should be partially rebuilt, and the planted tumulus restored.²³³

After isolating and excavating the Mausoleum, there was a desire to retain as much of the original structure as possible but its state required some repairs and securing of the walls. In order to make these repairs, bricks of subtle color that would not conflict with the original color of the wall but would still be distinguishable from the ancient structure were used (Figure 6.3). These repairs

²³³“Purtroppo, as quanto è dato supporre, dopo i lavori di isolamento il mausoleo non si presenterà bene, perchè gli avanzi dell'antica costruzione sono scarsi e muti. Bisogna quindi studiare un'opportuno restauro; non è possibile pensare ad una ricostruzione integrale del monumento, realizzando l'una o l'altra ipotesi, ma ci si dovrà limitare ad una valorizzazione di quanto resta... Dovrebbe ricostruirsi parzialmente il basamento esterno, e ripristinarsi il tumulo arborato a tronco di cono.” Muñoz 504. Translated by S. Fugate Brangers.

were only necessary on the interior for the outer wall was in a nearly complete and stable state. In fact, some of the original travertine blocks were found still in place.²³⁴

Muñoz was still concerned about two facts of the excavation and reconstruction of the tomb. The first concern was over the plan to plant trees and shrubs in the space between the first and third walls. These plantings were planned to recreate the appearance of the Mausoleum in antiquity as reported by Strabo.²³⁵ Muñoz was apprehensive about the potential damage that the plants could cause to the ancient structure.²³⁶ This concern must have been overcome, for the planting of trees and shrubs did occur and can be seen today. The second concern was whether or not to continue the excavation down to the ancient ground level and uncover the base of the exterior wall. Excavating the final distance would reach the current level of the water table thus jeopardizing the standing structure.²³⁷ It must have been decided not to continue excavating because the base of the exterior drum is not visible today (Figure 6.4).

²³⁴ Muñoz 504.

²³⁵ "Most worth seeing is the so-called Mausoleion, a large mound set upon a tall socle by the river, planted with evergreen trees up to the top." (5.3.9)

²³⁶ Muñoz 505.

²³⁷ Muñoz 505-6.

The Piazza Imperatore Augusto

The creation of the piazza that would surround the monument was the second part of the plan to isolate the Mausoleum. The architect Vittorio Morpurgo was chosen to design the piazza and the buildings that would define its periphery. The task set before Morpurgo was daunting for no plan had been fully developed for the area. The relationship of the churches to the Mausoleum and the piazza had not been determined and there was no agreement on how the new buildings would be used.²³⁸ The only certainty that Morpurgo had to work with was that the resulting piazza was to glorify the first emperor of Rome and, more importantly through association, glorify Mussolini and the Fascist party.

After a series of proposals and alterations, final construction was completed in 1940. The Piazza Augusto Imperatore, as it was named, consisted of a large piazza dominated on all four sides by new buildings.²³⁹ The buildings are constructed of travertine and brick and stand five stories tall. To the north of the Mausoleum the largest building was constructed to house office space for the national social security administration, which provided the funding for the project (Figure 6.5).²⁴⁰ On either end of the central portion of this building, insets were constructed around a row of windows. The western inset is decorated with

²³⁸ Kostof 287.

²³⁹ A complete discussion of the development of this piazza can be found in Spiro Kostof's "The Emperor and the Duce."

²⁴⁰ Painter 73-4.

relief sculpture depicting Roman weapons and armor. Below this window is written in raised letters, "A·MCMXL·POST·CHRISTUM NATUM," giving the date in which this building was completed (1940) (Figure 6.6). The eastern inset is decorated with the weapons and armor of twentieth-century Italy. Below this window is written, "ANNO XVIII A FASCIBVS RESTITVTIS," giving the date of completion in terms of the number of years (18 years) since the establishment of the Fascist government in Italy (Figure 6.7). This form of dating became standard during the years of Mussolini's rule and can be found on other monuments and even in published works.²⁴¹

The far eastern end of this building is offset from the rest of the structure and also contains a three story inset. Unlike the other insets, this one occurs over a balcony and is decorated with a mosaic triptych (Figure 6.8). In the center stands the personification of the river Tiber holding the infants Romulus and Remus. Seated at the River's feet is the she-wolf which, according to the legend, suckled the infant twins. Above the head of Tiber, the personification of the sun emerges from the sea with his horses. The two narrow side panels each depict three large figures performing various labors associated with the countryside.

Below this triptych is the inscription, "HIS AB EXIGVIS PROFECTA INITIIS

²⁴¹ The use of the Fascist dating can be found in such published works as Giovanni Viganoni's *Mussolini e I Cesari* which provides the standard date of 1933 which is then followed by XI meaning year 11 of the Fascist government and the catalogue for *Mostra Augustea della Romnità* where the date of the exhibition is given as "23 Settembre 1937-XV - 23 Settembre 1938-XVI (the Roman numerals represent the year of the Fascist government).

ROMA" ["Rome, having started from small and humble beginnings"].²⁴² This mosaic is a wonderful example of the use of mythic Rome to expound Fascist propaganda. In the center of the triptych are images relating to the founding of the ancient city but the figures to the side are the Fascist ideal of laborers working for the good of the state. This ideology is emphasized by the use of artistic style that is purely Fascist. The inscription, mentioned above, further emphasizes the glorification of Rome in the mosaic. It is a paraphrase from Livy's preface to *Ab urbe condita* [The History of Rome], "Res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua;..."²⁴³ ["It goes back beyond 700 years and, *after starting from small and humble beginnings*, it has so grown that it strains under its greatness."]²⁴⁴

Below this mosaic is a Latin inscription in raised letters that reads:

HUNC LOCUM UBI AUGUSTI MANES VOLITANT PER AURAS/ POSTQUAM
IMPERATORIS MAUSOLEUM EX SAECULORUM TENEBRIS/ EST
EXTRACTUM ARAEQUE PACIS DISIECTA MEMBRA REFECTA/ MUSSOLINI
DUX VETERIBUS ANGUSTIIS DELETIS SPLENDIDIORIBUS/ VII AEDIFICIIS
AEDIBUS AD HUMANITATIS MORES APTIS/ ORNANDUM CENSUIT ANNO
MDCCCCXL [AE. F. XVIII].

²⁴² Translated by S. Fugate Brangers.

²⁴³ Preface.4. Citation found on The Latin Library web page, "Livy," Feb. 24, 2006
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/livy/liv.pr.shtml>>.

²⁴⁴ Livy, *The History of Rome*, vol. I trans. Rev. Canon Roberts (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1912) citation found on the University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center web page, B. Butterfield and Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Livy," Feb. 24, 2006
<<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/browse-mixed-new?id=Liv1His&tag=public&images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed>>.

[In 1940, Mussolini, il Duce, ordered this place, where the spirits of Augustus flit about in the air, after the Mausoleum of the Emperor was delivered from the darkness of the centuries, and once the scattered pieces of the Ara Pacis²⁴⁵ were restored and the old confining buildings were torn down, to be adorned by seven more magnificent buildings suited to the current taste of Humanity.]²⁴⁶

This inscription is flanked by two winged victories each holding fasces, the Roman symbol of authority that became the emblem of the Fascist party (Figure 6.9). The façade of this building, then, becomes a combination of warfare (the military reliefs) and labor (the mosaic). It was the combination of these two strengths that made ancient Rome great and that Mussolini wanted to emulate in his New Italy.

This theme is carried over onto the building on the eastern side of the piazza which was also constructed to hold offices of the national social security administration. Above the entrance to the building is a frieze depicting forty-two almost life-size figures in sculptural relief (Figures 6.10 and 6.11). These figures are engaged in the labors of the countryside, such as tending sheep, pressing grapes, working the land, or caring for young children. In the middle of this frieze is an inscription (Figure 6.12) that reads:

IL POPOLO ITALIANO E IL POPOLO IMMORTALE
CHE TROVA SEMPRE VNA PRIMAVERA
PER LE SVE SPERANZE PER LA SVA PASSIONE
PER LA SVA GRANDEZZA

²⁴⁵ The relocation and reconstruction of the Ara Pacis on the site of the Mausoleum is discussed below.

²⁴⁶ Translated by S. Fugate Brangers

[The Italian people and the immortal people
That always find a spring
Because of their hopes because of their passion
Because of their greatness]²⁴⁷

This frieze and inscription promote the common person, the worker of the land and the mother. The combination of the relief and text once again illustrates Mussolini's attempt to associate himself with Augustus. This association with Augustus is most clearly illustrated by the depictions of motherhood on either side of the inscription. The scenes of mothers holding their infants reference the Tellus relief from the Ara Pacis. The Augustan and Fascist reliefs both celebrate fecundity but the modern reliefs suffer from comparison with the ancient relief. The Fascist depictions appear awkward and clumsy next to the grace and beauty of the Tellus relief.

Across the piazza from this building, between the Mausoleum and the Tiber, was an addition proposed by Mussolini, himself. It was a small building of travertine and glass designed by Morpurgo to house the reconstructed Ara Pacis²⁴⁸ (Figure 6.13). Fragments of the Altar had been discovered in 1568 and were scattered among museum collections in Italy, Germany and France.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁷ Translated by S. Fugate Brangers.

²⁴⁸ This building was demolished in 2000 to make room for a new, larger building designed by Meier to house the Ara Pacis as well as contain exhibit spaces and lecture halls. This new building opened to the public in 2006.

²⁴⁹ These collections were found in the Villa Medici in Rome, the Uffizi, the Vatican and the Louvre. Through the use of his power as dictator of Italy, Mussolini was able to acquire all of the relief from the Ara Pacis for the reconstruction of the monument with the exception of the reliefs

Other portions of the Ara Pacis still remained under a section of the Palazzo Fiano, located along the Via del Corso. In order to uncover these remaining pieces of the Altar, an excavation lead by Giovanni Rodio, a hydraulic engineer, was conducted between 1937 and 1938. This ambitious project and amazing feat of engineering involved freezing the moist soil and supporting a section of the Palazzo while the remains of the altar were removed.²⁵⁰ The translation of the Ara Pacis to a site next to the Mausoleum perfectly completed Mussolini's quest of creating a piazza dedicated to Augustus and, by association, to himself.²⁵¹ Morpurgo designed a very simple structure for the Altar that would not compete with its beauty and design. The high podium of the building was inscribed with the *Res Gestae* of Augustus, an account of his accomplishments, which was once inscribed on bronze plaques and mounted on pillars located near the entrance of the Mausoleum. The inscription is an accurate copy of antique lettering. This elegant script offers a striking contrast to the heavy, masculine quality of the Fascist inscriptions on both the northern and eastern buildings. The large, stone letters of these inscriptions are set in high relief casting strong, sharp shadows.

at the Louvre. Plaster casts had to be made of these reliefs to complete the Altar's sculptural decoration.

²⁵⁰ A brief account of this excavation can be found in Linda Ann Nolan's article, "Emulating Augustus: The Fascist-Era Excavation of the Emperor's Peace Altar in Rome," *Archaeology Odyssey* May/June (2005): 38-47.

²⁵¹ For a discussion of the reconstruction of the Ara Pacis and possible inaccuracies in the altar's reconstruction refer to Wayne Andersen's *The Ara Pacis of Augustus and Mussolini: An Archaeological Mystery* (Geneva and Boston: Editions Fabriart, 2003).

As a result, the inscriptions appear forceful and lack the elegance of the copy of the *Res Gestae*.²⁵² Once again Fascist design suffers from comparison with the antique.

The only new building to be constructed of brick, the Collegio degli Illirici (the College of Croatia) was built along the third side of the piazza (Figure 6.14). The back of the building faced the Via Tomacelli. Brick was used so that the structure would blend with the older buildings that also lined the street. The decoration of this building also differs from those previously discussed. Along the top story of the building are three mosaics with religious imagery. The central mosaic depicts Christ as the prince of peace, to the left is the emperor Heraclius baptizing Croatians, and to the right the scene of Pope Gregory VII conferring kingship upon Demetrius, the duke of Dalmatia and Croatia. The two historical side panels directly relate to the population of Croatians who used the Collegio and whose national church, San Girolamo degli Illirici, is located next to the College.

In many ways the Piazza Augusto Imperatore did not succeed in meeting its grand expectations. While it is one of the largest, if not the largest, piazzas in Rome, it is also the least well known. The design of the piazza discourages

²⁵² Tim Benton, "Epigraphy and Fascism," *The Afterlife of Inscriptions: Reusing, Rediscovering, Reinventing & Revitalizing Ancient Inscriptions*, Alison Cooley, editor (London: University of London, 2000)183.

visitors from lingering and exploring its space and monuments. While the piazza was originally intended to be part of a major traffic system that would link it with Piazza del Popolo, the roadways were never constructed. As a result, the approach to the Mausoleum is encumbered on three sides by fast-moving traffic while the south side of the piazza is a parking lot for the surrounding businesses and restaurants. This parking lot prevents easy access to the main entrance of the Mausoleum. The true size of the piazza is not apparent as a result of the size and placement of the surrounding buildings. The two levels of the piazza, that of the Mausoleum and of the modern street level, create, in effect, the sense of a piazza within a piazza. The traffic and parked cars further enhance this separation and prevent any interaction between the two areas. The height of the buildings designed by Morpurgo prevents a full appreciation of the expanse of the piazza. If the buildings were lower, a visitor would be able to see the surrounding cityscape. This extended view would enhance, rather than disguise, the size of the piazza. If the buildings were constructed to be taller than the Mausoleum's central core, which is not the case today, they would then effectively frame the piazza unifying the area and allowing a visitor to comprehend its expanse.²⁵³

²⁵³ Kostof 316-322.

The characteristic Fascist design of the Morpurgo buildings combines plain, flat architectural surfaces with simplified colonnades reminiscent of ancient Roman construction. The upper three stories of the buildings appear too heavy for the squat, unfluted columns that support them. The weightiness of the structures overburdens the space of the piazza causing it to feel tight and closed-in. This tightness is further enhanced by the fact that the building fronts are against the streets without pedestrian areas between them. A visitor to the piazza, therefore, is unable to move freely about the space and view either the modern buildings or the ancient monument in the center.

The success of the excavation of the Mausoleum of Augustus is debatable. It can be argued that without the complete isolation and excavation of the Monument its plan would never have been fully known. As Muñoz noted, however, it has not resolved the issue of its original appearance. The current appearance of the Mausoleum is also uninspiring both because of its state of preservation and because of the overpowering presence of the buildings that surround it. The difference in ground level between that of the Piazza and that of the Mausoleum, nearly 5 meters lower, contributes to the fact that the monument seems to be lost in its urban setting. Finally, since the time of its construction, the tomb had been part of the culture and life of the city of Rome whether it was as a monument to the first emperor, a fortress, a statuary garden,

or a center for entertainment. When Mussolini had the Mausoleum isolated from its surrounds, he in effect isolated it from the life of the city.

The Mausoleum Reinterpreted

In 1927, only a year after he established a single-party government, Mussolini announced his plan for the construction of a sport complex just outside the city of Rome below the Milvian Bridge. This complex, to be called the Foro Mussolini (now called the Foro Italico) (Figures 6.15 and 6.16), immediately invokes an association with the Roman emperors who constructed their own forums in the historic center of Rome. The design of the project was handed over to the architect Enrico del Debbio who planned a complex that contained two stadiums, an entrance marked by an obelisk, numerous buildings to house sport facilities, and large, heroic outdoor sculptures.²⁵⁴ It is the monumental entrance that will be the focus of this discussion for it is possibly associated with the Mausoleum of Augustus.

The entrance to the Foro Mussolini consists of an obelisk, a grand walkway covered by mosaic called the Forum Imperii, and the Fountain of the Sphere. Throughout this area there are direct and indirect references to ancient Rome and Augustus. The obelisk immediately prepares a visitor for the frequent connections that will be made between Fascist Italy and ancient Rome, or more

²⁵⁴ Aicher 124.

precisely Augustan Rome. The obelisk was carved from a single block of Cararra marble. The journey of the block of marble from the quarry to the site of the Foro took months and was documented by Italian newspapers. The obelisk was designed by Costantino Costantini to glorify Mussolini. The base of the obelisk contains the inscription DUX (Latin for Duce) and the fasces. The shaft of the obelisk bears the inscription "Mussolini" and is capped by a gilded pyramidion making it visible from a great distance.

This obelisk hints at what lies beyond and the continuous references to Augustus. As mentioned above, Augustus' complex in the Campus Martius contained three obelisks imported to Rome from Egypt. Two of the obelisks stood on either side of the entrance to the Mausoleum and one served as the gnomon for the large Solarium. A more significant, if little known, connection between Mussolini and Augustus is made by the obelisk, or actually by the document that is buried beneath it. This document, called the "Codice del Foro Mussolini," lists the achievements of Mussolini including his construction and restoration of buildings in Rome.²⁵⁵ Certainly, Mussolini is referencing the *Res Gestae*, plaques that were originally placed in front of the Mausoleum.²⁵⁶

Just beyond the obelisk is the Piazza Imperii which is a walkway leading to the two stadiums of the Foro Mussolini. This walkway contains black and

²⁵⁵ This codex and its connection to Augustus is discussed more thoroughly by Aicher 130-134.

²⁵⁶ See my discussion of the *Res Gestae* above.

white mosaics that offer visual parallels between ancient and modern Rome. This piazza was designed by del Debbio's successor Luigi Moretti with the assistance of four artists, Angelo Canevari, Achille Capizzano, Giulio Rosso, and Gino Severini. The mosaics contain images from Roman mythology, such as the figures of Mars and Hercules, and the infant Romulus and Remus. The most striking pair of mosaics to offer a parallel between the two Romes depicts two maps (Figure 6.17). On one side of the walkway there is a map of the ground-plans of ancient monuments revealed during the construction of the Via del Mare. These monuments include the Theater of Marcellus, the three temples at S. Nicola in Carcere and the Temple of Fortuna Virilis. Directly across from this map is the ground-plan for the Foro Mussolini representing its buildings and stadiums. The connection between the two maps is enhanced by the reclining personification of the River Tiber in each and by the use of similar style.²⁵⁷

A direct association with Augustus is found in the mosaic located just before the Fountain of the Sphere. In the center of the mosaic is a figure with the features of Augustus. In his left hand he holds a laurel wreath and his right hand rests on the fasces. The figure is then surrounded by representations of six Muses. By invoking allusions to Apollo through the laurel wreath and the Muses, the mosaic can be seen as referring to Augustus' victory in Egypt. He

²⁵⁷ Aicher 132-134.

attributed his victory there to the special relationship that he claimed to have with Apollo. This disguised reference to Egypt can be seen as paralleling Mussolini's desire to create a new Italian empire which was fulfilled with the conquest of Ethiopia. The Ethiopian victory is represented in another mosaic in the Piazza Imperii which contains the proclamation, "IX MAGGIO XIV E. F. LITALIA HA FINALMENT IL SUO IMPERO" ["9 May 14 Era Fascista [1936] Italy Finally Has Its Empire"].

The most intriguing and rarely discussed portion of the entrance to the Foro Mussolini is the Fountain of the Sphere. The plan for Fountain was part of del Debbio's original plan and was designed by the architects Giulio Pediconi and Mario Paniconi (Figure 6.18). It consists of five concentric rings surrounding a monolithic sphere of Carrara marble that is placed in a basin slightly below ground level. The three outermost rings consist of two rings of white marble pavement framing a ring of black and white figural mosaics. The next ring provides the transition from ground level to the basin containing the sphere. This ring has four separate stairways with raised planters in between. The fifth and innermost ring contains black and white mosaics of marine life reminiscent of fountain mosaics found in the Roman Forum, Pompeii, and Herculaneum.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁸ Memmo Caporilli and Franco Simeoni, *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico: Immagini dalla Storia* (Rome: Tomo Edizioni, 1990) 135.

Finally, there is the sphere that is surrounded by water jets which create the fountain.

This plan presents a striking comparison to the plan of the Mausoleum of Augustus (Figure 6.19). When the plans are placed side by side definite parallels can be seen beyond the common use of five concentric rings. While the plan for the Fountain was designed before the complete excavation of the Mausoleum, the basic plan of the tomb was already known. The location of the sphere in the Fountain can be identified with the location of the central pillar that once held the statue of Augustus in the Mausoleum. The fountain ring which contains the four stairways and planters is very similar to wall 1 of the tomb which contains the four niches that once held the ash urns of Augustus' family. Even the planters which contain low shrubs call to mind the trees which were once planted in the earthen mound atop the Mausoleum. The obelisk which stands at the opposite end of the Piazza Imperii reinforces this association with the tomb of Augustus for it calls to mind both the obelisk from the Solarium and the obelisks that flanked the entrance to the Mausoleum.

A final association with Augustus and his tomb can be found in the inauguration of the area on May 9, 1937. This date was just four months before the Mostra Augustea della Romanità which celebrated the two thousand year anniversary of Augustus' birth. September 1937 also saw the completion of the

isolation and excavation of the Mausoleum. It cannot be coincidence that the plan of the Fountain of the Sphere is so strikingly similar to the tomb of Augustus given that work was being done on both during the same years. As illustrated by this chapter, Mussolini was continuously creating imagery that would associate him and his regime with that of Augustan Rome. The Fountain of the Sphere along with the rest of the grand entrance represents one of the most successful Fascists programs. Its use of Augustan imagery is able to stand on its own due to its subtlety and the fact that it does not suffer from constant comparison with classical examples. In this Foro, Mussolini was able to achieve what he failed to do in the Piazza Imperatore Augusto—to create a zone in which he is glorified by association with Augustus but not overshadowed by him.

The Mausoleum Today

After much controversy, the new building for the Ara Pacis opened to the public on April 21, 2006, Rome's legendary birthday (Figure 6.20). Richard Meier, an American architect, was granted the commission to construct this new building which was to include space not only for the ancient altar but also an auditorium, extra exhibition space, offices, and a bookstore.²⁵⁹ Plans for the project began in 1996 and the original Fascist building was demolished in 2000.

²⁵⁹ Alan Riding, "Richard Meier's New Home for the Ara Pacis, a Roman Treasure, Opens," *The New York Times* April 24, 2006 <<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/24/arts/design/24paci.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/M/Meier,%20Richard>> November 2007.

Meier uses large slabs of travertine on the exterior and interior of the building reflecting an architectural tradition that dates back to ancient Rome. By creating walls of windows that overlook the Piazza Imperatore Augusto with the Mausoleum and the Tiber River, he connects the Ara Pacis with the surrounding cityscape. This connection was essential to the element of the design, for Meier recognized the deteriorated and neglected state of the Piazza and is attempting, through his new building, to revitalize the area. As he explains, "It kind of embraces everything around it... I wanted to make it a public destination, a new piazza space in Rome that people can come to whether they're going to the museum or not, and just sit in the sun—that's what Romans like to do. It's bringing life to what was not a vital or active area before."²⁶⁰

The revitalization of the Piazza Imperatore Augusto is continuing as the result of an international competition conducted by the Commune di Roma.²⁶¹ The competition began in 2006 and the winner was announced later that year. The winning group is from the architecture faculty from the Università di Roma Tre under the direction of Francesco Cellini. The proposed project will convert the paved area of the Piazza into a green garden space to harmonize with the

²⁶⁰ Steve Rose, "When in Rome...", *Guardian Unlimited* May 1, 2006 <<http://artsguardian.co.uk/features/story/0,,1765096,00.html>>.

²⁶¹ The following information was obtained from David Meadows, "Augustus' Mausoleum," *rogueclassicism* <<http://www.atrium-media.com/rogueclassicism/Posts/00004110.html>>, August 26, 2006 and the winning proposal, "Urbs et Civitas," as reprinted by Alessandra Macchioni on the website November 11, 2006 <<http://www.europaconcorsi.com/db/pubrec/scheda.php?id=6601>> November, 2007.

grassy earthen mound of the Mausoleum. The structure of the tomb will undergo renovation to restore some of its ancient qualities. Portions of the casemates and semi-circular walls between the three outermost walls of the Mausoleum will be visible so that one can gain a better understanding of the monument's structure. An underpass will also be constructed so that the traffic that now crowds the Piazza will be removed to create a new expanded pedestrian area. A final benefit of this project is that it will offer an opportunity for the first archaeological excavations of the area since the 1930s. The new area is expected to be open to the public by 2009. Once again the Mausoleum of Augustus is poised to become an integral part of the life of Rome.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

When Augustus constructed his Mausoleum in the northern Campus Martius, he was creating a monument for the people of Rome. With its placement along the Via Flaminia and its surrounding garden, the tomb was meant to be a public, rather than private, monument. It clearly expressed a meaning of victory through its tholos and bronze statue of the emperor. The victories at Actium and Alexandria guaranteed peace for the city of Rome after the conflicts of the civil wars that plagued much of the last century BCE. The tumulus also expressed Augustus's loyalty to the city after its perceived abandonment by Antony.

The Mausoleum as a public monument for the city of Rome was further emphasized with the addition of the Ara Pacis and Horologium. The function of these two monuments was most clearly public. The Ara Pacis, as a sacrificial altar, would have drawn spectators as well as magistrates, priests and Vestal Virgins when the yearly sacrifices to Augustan peace were conducted. The Horologium would have drawn spectators throughout the year since it may have functioned both as a clock and as a calendar that recorded the changing seasons.

Together the Ara Pacis and Horologium reinforced the Mausoleum's message of victory. The obelisk/gnomon of the sundial provided the clearest expression of this message through its inscription. The Ara Pacis further expanded the meaning of the Mausoleum through its reliefs depicting the bounties brought about by Augustan peace. By reading these monuments together as a complete program, the people of Rome would have understood that Augustus, as victor, brought peace to the city as well as the Empire.

The death of Augustus brought new meaning to the complex in the northern Campus Martius. Once the *Res Gestae* was placed before the entrance to the tomb, one could read, both through the monuments and the inscription, the great deeds and achievements of Augustus's life. He was a protector of the city as expressed by the tholos as victory monument on the Mausoleum and declared by the inscription on the obelisk. By bringing peace to Rome, he was able to close the doors to the Temple of Janus three times. This achievement was referenced in the double doors of the precinct wall surrounding the Altar of Peace. He attained the title of high priest, *pontifex maximus*, as attested to by the obelisk's inscription, the procession panels on the Ara Pacis, and, possibly, by the tholos of the Mausoleum. These deeds, or achievements, would have spoken most clearly to the people of Rome for the latter were the direct beneficiaries of Augustan legacy.

A final meaning for the monument was only fully expressed in the generations that followed Augustus's death. When the Mausoleum was constructed, it was viewed as a family tomb in the Republican tradition. The power and supremacy of Augustus's family had not yet been secured and could not have been expressed by the Mausoleum. It was only with the continuation of the Julio-Claudian line of emperors and the burial of later generations of the family within the Mausoleum that it can truly be seen as a dynastic monument.²⁶²

After the fall of Rome, many of the meanings expressed by the Mausoleum were obscured through the passage of time and destruction of the monument. However, its role as a monument for the city of Rome, along with its identification as the tomb of Augustus, was never completely lost. As the fortunes of the city declined and rose, so did those of the Mausoleum. It was during the sacking of Rome in the fifth and sixth centuries that the tomb was first damaged. Once Rome began to stabilize after the tumultuous centuries following the invasions, there was a revived interest in its ancient monuments and its history as a capital city. As expressed in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, the Mausoleum played an important role in this revival for it was seen as an expression of the power of the Roman Empire and its domination of vast territories.

²⁶² c.f. p. 56

It may have been this expression of power and the prestige that could be attained through association with Augustus that brought the Mausoleum to the attention of the Colonna family for the building of their fortress. Although in the private hands of a noble family, the Mausoleum was still an active part of Roman life for the Colonna family was frequently at the center of the political affairs of the city. It was a direct result of this that the Mausoleum was damaged, rather extensively, for the second time. As the role of the noble families of Rome diminished, so, too, did the role of the tomb as fortress. For a brief period of time, the history of the Mausoleum, quite literally, began to disappear. It was during this period that portions of the tomb were buried and it became the location of a vineyard.

During the classical revival of the Renaissance, there was a renewed interest in the Mausoleum. Construction of buildings in the immediate area of the tomb resulted in portions of the wall being exposed. The architects Peruzzi and da Sangallo sketched these wall sections before they were reburied. These studies of the Mausoleum's walls and decorative elements are important to the study of the monument today for some of the features, particularly the travertine facing, which they observed and recorded are no longer extant. It was also during this time that fanciful reconstructions of the Mausoleum began to appear in prints and paintings. These studies, prints, and paintings reflect an interest in

the monument, not as the tomb of Augustus, but as an example of Roman imperial architecture.

The role of the Mausoleum as a public monument was revived with the sixteenth-century Soderini garden. Then, though, instead of the garden surrounding the Monument, it was contained within it. The combination of the garden and antique sculpture created an area attractive to artists and foreigners visiting the city of Rome. During this period, the ancient meaning of the Mausoleum was obscured by its role as a backdrop for the classical sculpture placed within it. Interest in the tomb and its sculpture garden faded as the classical revival of the Renaissance and Baroque periods ended. Gradually the Mausoleum began to disappear from sight as numerous buildings were constructed around it.

The public function of the Mausoleum returned in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when it became a theater for spectacles and musicales. While the monument was once again part of the life of the city, its ancient meaning and purpose were no longer of primary importance as evidenced by the changing of its name to the Anfiteatro Correa. It is interesting, then, that the spectacles performed, such as the animal hunts and bullfights, were reminiscent of the games once held in Roman amphitheaters. Once again the tomb was a celebration of public Roman life. In the early twentieth century, the monument

became a part of Italy's revival of its musical heritage when it was renovated and reopened as Rome's symphony hall, the Augusteo. Although this name change seems to reflect a renewed interest in the antiquity of the monument, in truth, the selection of the Mausoleum as the site for the symphony hall seems to have been more of the result of its availability.

It was with Mussolini and the rise of the Fascist party in Italy that the Mausoleum was once again honored as an ancient Roman monument and, most importantly, as an Augustan monument. In his creation of a Fascist mythology, Mussolini invoked images of ancient Rome. In his quest to establish a Fascist empire, he conjured up the glories of the Roman Empire. To legitimize his power in Italy and his expansionist goals, Mussolini began to associate himself with Augustus. The clearest representation of the Emperor Augustus himself is the Mausoleum. As such, Mussolini initiated the isolation and excavation of the monument as a glorification of Augustus and, in turn, of himself. While the results of these excavations and the construction of the Piazza Imperatore Augusto may be questionable, the reinterpretation of the Mausoleum in the Foro Mussolini is quite successful. In this complex, the invocation of ancient Rome and veneration of its first emperor are merged with Fascist ideology to create a new center for Rome which glorifies Mussolini.

The Mausoleum as part of the life of the city of Rome was almost ended by Mussolini. In his attempt to reclaim the monument from the architectural accretions of previous centuries, he, instead, revealed a skeleton of a monument that did not effectively convey the glories of Rome's first emperor. The remains of the Mausoleum in their sunken piazza became an eyesore to the people of Rome. As such, they seemed to ignore its presence and, eventually, its role within the life of the city faded.

With the advent of the new millennium, there has been renewed interest in the Piazza Imperatore Augusto. This was in large part because of the new building for the Ara Pacis designed by Richard Meier. Although much of the publicity concerning Meier's project was negative, it heightened the public's interest in the area. Once again the Mausoleum has the opportunity to become a vital part of the life of its city. In 2006, an international competition was announced for the renovation of the Piazza Imperatore Augusto and the Mausoleum of Augustus. With the goal to beautify the area and to unite the different architectural styles present in the piazza, it is hoped that a new area dedicated to Augustus will emerge. Once again, the Mausoleum will stand within a public garden returning to its role as a monument for the people of Rome while, at the same time, honoring Augustus.

Thus, we see that the Mausoleum of Augustus has continued to be a monument for the city of Rome from its initial construction to the present. As such, it has had its peaks and valleys reflecting the city's ever changing attitude toward ancient monuments. Over its long history, we find that the Mausoleum has moved from an ancient symbol of victory and glorification to a modern symbol of victory and glorification. As an Augustan monument, it represented his victories at Actium and Alexandria and glorified his great deeds. In its reuse as a Fascist monument, the Mausoleum was used to glorify Mussolini and his Ethiopian victory which he saw as the reestablishment of the Roman Empire.

REFERENCES

- Aicher, Peter. "Mussolini's Forum and the Myth of Augustan Rome," *Classical Bulletin* 76 (2000): 117-39.
- Aldroandi, Ulisses, *Delle statua antiche, che per tutta Roma, in diversi buoghi e case si veggono*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1975.
- Andersen, Wayne. *The Ara Pacis of Augustus and Mussolini*. Geneva and Boston: Éditions Fabriart, 2003.
- Arce, J. *Funus imperatorum. Los funerales de los emperadores romanos*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1988.
- Attilia, L. "Il mausoleo di Augusto." *Roma repubblicana dal 270 a. C. all'età Augustea*. ed. F. Coarelli et al., 29-34. Rome: Quasar, 1987.
- Balbo, Emilio. *Augusto e Mussolini*. Rome: Pinciana, 1937.
- _____. *Protagonisti dei due imperi di Roma: Augusto e Mussolini*. Rome: Casa editrice Pinciana, 1940.
- Bartoli, A. *I monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze*. Florence: Bontempelli, 1914-22.
- _____. "L'architettura del mausoleo di Augusto." *Bollettino d'arte* 7 (1927): 30-46.
- Bartoli, Pietro Santi. *Gli Antichi Sepolcri ovvero Mausolei Romani et Etruschi*. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni Editore, 1979, 1697.
- Barton, Tamsyn. "Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995): 33-51.
- Benton, Tim. "Epigraphy and Fascism," *The Afterlife of Inscriptions: Reusing, Rediscovering, Reinventing & Revitalizing Ancient Inscriptions*, Alison Cooley, editor. London: Univeristy of London, 2000.

- Benocci, Carla. "Il Mausoleo d'Augusto come sede di spettacoli: da anfiteatro Correa ad Augusteo." *Roma Archeologia nel Centro II: La "Città Murata"* 574-77. Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985.
- Bernhard, M. L. "Topographie d'Aléxandrie: Le tombeau d'Alexandre et le mausoleum d'Auguste." *Revue archéologique* 47 (1956).
- Boatwright, Mary. "The 'Ara Ditis-Ustrinum of Hadrian' in the Western Campus and Other Problematic Roman Ustrina," *American Journal of Archaeology* 89.3 (July 1985): 485-97.
- Boschung, D. "Tumulus Iuliorum — Mausoleum Augusti." *Hefte des Archæologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 6 (1980): 38-41.
- Bowersock, G. W. "The Pontificate of Augustus," *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate* 380-394. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Brunt, P. A. and J. M. Moore. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Buchner, Edmund. *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus: Nachdruck aus RM 1976 und 1980 und Nachtrag über die Ausgrabung 1980/1981*. Mainz: von Zabern, 1982.
- Caligari, Pietro. *Il Mausoleo di Giulio Cesare nel Campo Marzio*. Rome: Vetera Edizioni, 2001.
- Canina, Luigi. *Vedute dei principali monumenti di Roma antica: tanto nello stato di rovina quanto nella inter loro architetture, disposte secondo l'ordine tenuto nel volume dell'indicazione topografica*. Rome: Prezzo Scudi Otto, 1851.
- Caporilli, Memmo and Franco Simeoni. *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico: Immagini dalla Storia*. Rome: Tomo Edizioni, 1990.
- Cassius Dio. *The Roman History: The Reign of Augustus* trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert. London: Penguin Classics, 1987.
- Cederna, Antonio. *Roma fascista nelle fotografie dell'Istituto Luce*. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 2001.

- Chugg, Andrew. "The Tomb of Alexander the Great in Alexandria." *American Journal of Ancient History, New Series* 1.2 (2002) [2003], 75-108.
- Cicero. *Ad Atticum*. The Latin Library. November, 2007.
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/att/3.shtml#33a>>
- Clementi, F. *Roma Imperiale nelle XIV Regioni Augustee secondo gli scavi e le ultime scoperte* vol. 1&2. Rome: Ugo Sofia-Moretti, 1935
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Il Campo Marzio dale origini alla Fine della Repubblica*. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1997.
- ____ and Yvon Thébert. "Architecture Funéraire et Pouvoir: Réflexions sur l'Hellénisme Numide," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome Antiquité* 100.2 (1988): 761-818.
- ____. "Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo." *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici (Supplementum)* 10 (1983): 41-46.
- Colini, A. M. "Mausolaeum Augusti." *Bullettione della Commissione Archeologica del Governatorato di Roma* 67 (1939): 206-7.
- ____. "Il Mausoleo d'Augusto." *Capitolium* IV (1928): 11-22.
- ____ and C. Q. Giglioli. "Relazione della prima campagna di scavo nel Mausoleo di Augusto." *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica del Governatorato di Roma* 54 (1926) [1927]: 191-234.
- Cordingley, R. A. and I. A. Richmond. "The Mausoleum of Augustus." *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 23-35. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1927.
- Coulston, Jon and Hazel Dodge (editors). *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology (Monograph 54), 2000.
- Davies, Penelope J. E. *Death and the Emperor: Roman imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Loeb Classical Library* 7 volumes, trans. Earnest Carey, Harvard University Press, 1937-1950.
- Edwards, Catharine and Greg Woolf (editors). *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Eisner, M. "Zur Typologie der Mausoleen des Augustus und des Hadrian." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilungen* 86 (1979): 319-24.
- Elsner, J. "Inventing Imperium: Texts and Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome." *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. J. Elsner, 32-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Evans, Janet DeRose. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Favro, Diane. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Pater urbis: Augustus as City Father of Rome." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* LI (1992): 61-84.
- _____. "Reading the Augustan City." *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Peter Holliday, ed., 230-257. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Fedak, Janos. *Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Fiorilli, E. "A proposito del Mausoleo di Augusto." *Bollettino d'Arte* 7 (1927): 214-19.
- Flavio, Biondo, trans. Jefferey White, *Italy Illuminated*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Fleming, A. "Vision and Design: Approaches to Ceremonial Monument Typology." *Man* 7 (1972): 57-73.
- Forbes, S. Russell. *Rambles in Rome* 8th ed. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1899.

- Fullerton, M. D. "The Domus Augusti in Imperial Iconography of 13-12 BC." *American Journal of Archaeology* 89 (1985): 473-83.
- Galinsky, Karl. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Gardthäusen, V. "Das Mausoleum Augusti." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts Roemische Abteilung* 36-37 (1921-22): 111-144.
- Gatti, G. "Il Mausoleo di Augusto. Studio di ricostruzione." *Capitolium* 10 (1934): 457-64.
- _____. "Nuove osservazioni sul Mausoleo di Augusto." *L'Urbe* 3.8 (1938): 1ff.
- _____. "Mausolaeum Augusti." *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 66 (1938): 273-75.
- Gatti, Guido M. "The Academy of St. Cecilia and The Augusteo in Rome," trans. Theodore Baker. *The Musical Quarterly* 8.3 (July 1992): 323-345.
- Ghirardo, Diane. "Architects, Exhibitions, and the Politics of Culture in Fascist Italy." *Journal of Architectural Education* 45/2 (1992): 67-75.
- Giglioli, G. Q. and A. M. Colini. *Il Mausoleo d'Augusto*. Milan and Rome: Bestetti e Tumminelli, 1930.
- Gregorovius, Ferdinand, trans. Mrs. Gustavus W. Hamilton, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1. London: George Bell & Sons, 1967.
- Glare, P. G. W., ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Güven, S. "Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57 (1998): 30-45.
- Hare, Augustus J. C. *Walks in Rome* 12th ed. New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1900.
- Harris, W. V. editor. *The Transformations of Urbs Roma in Late Antiquity*. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series no. 33, 1999.

- Haselberger, Lothar. "Ein Giebelriss der Vorhalle des Pantheon: die Werkrisse vor dem Augustusmausoleum." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Roemische Abteilung* 101 (1994): 279-308.
- Hesberg, Henner von. "Das Mausoleum des Augustus." *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, 244-51. Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1988.
- _____.and Silvio Panciera. *Das Mausoleum des Augustus. Der Bau und seine inschriften*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994.
- Hetherington, Paul. *Medieval Rome: A Portrait of the City and its Life*. New York: St. Marin's Press, 1994.
- Holloway, R. Ross. "The Tomb of Augustus and the Princes of Troy." *American Journal of Archaeology* 70 (1966): 171-173.
- Hope, Valerie. "A roof over the dead: communal tombs and family structure," *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond* eds. Ray Laurence and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series* no. 22 (1997): 69-88.
- Johnson, Mark J. "The Mausoleum of Augustus: Etruscan and Other Influences on Its Design." *Etruscan Italy: Etruscan Influences on the Civilizations of Italy from Antiquity to the Modern Era*, ed. John F. Hall, 217-239. Utah: Brigham Young University, 1996.
- Jolivet, V. "Les cendres d'Auguste. Note sur la topographie monumentale du Champ de Mars septentrionale." *Archeologia Laziale* 9 (1988): 90-96.
- Jordanes. *The Origins and Deeds of the Goths* ed. 2 trans. Charles C. Mierow. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915.
- Kellum, Barbara. "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine." *Roman Art in Context: An Anthology*, ed. Eva D'Ambra, 75-83. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- _____. *Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine and the Forum of Augustus*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1981.

- Kienast, Dietmar. "Augustus und Alexander." *Gymnasium* 76 (1969): 430-456.
- Kornemann, Ernst. *Mausoleum und Tatenbericht des Augustus*. Leipzig and Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1921.
- _____. "Zum Augustusjahr." *Klio* 31 (1938): 6-11.
- Kostof, Spiro. "The Emperor and the Duce," *Art and Architecture in the Service of Politics*, ed. Henry A. Millon and Linda Nochlin, 270-325. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978.
- Kraft, K. "Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus." *Historia* 16 (1967): 189-206.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Rome Profile of a City, 312-1308*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Kuttner, Ann L. *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus: The Case of the Boscoreale Cups*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- La Rocca, Eugenio. *La Riva a Mezzaluna: Culti, Agoni, Monumenti Funerari Presso il Tevere nel Campo Marzio Occidentale*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1984.
- Lancaster, Lynn. *Concrete Vaulted Construction in Imperial Rome: Innovations in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lançon, Bertrand, trans. Antonia Nevill, *Rome in Late Antiquity*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Lanciani, Rodolfo. *Pagan and Christian Rome*. London: MacMillan and C., 1895.
- _____. *Storia Degli Scavi di Roma* vol. 1-4. Rome: Ermanno Loescher & Co., 1902.
- _____. *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*. New York: Bell Publishing Company, 1967.
- _____. *Notes from Rome*. Great Britain: British School at Rome, 1988.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Livy, *The History of Rome*, trans. Rev. Canon Roberts. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1912. University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center, B. Butterfield and Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Livy," February 24, 2006, <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/browse-mixed-new?id=Liv1His&tag=public&images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed>>.

_____. The Latin Library, "Livy," February 24, 2006
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/livy.liv.pr.shtml>>.

Loerke, William. "Georges Chédanne and the Pantheon: A Beaux Arts Contribution to the History of Roman Architecture," *Modulus. The University of Virginia School of Architecture Review* (1982): 40-55.

Lugli, Giuseppe. *I Monumenti Antichi di Roma e Suburbio*, Rome: Dott. G. Bardi, 1938.

_____. *Itinerario di Roma Antica*. Milan: Periodici Scientifici, 1970.

Macchioni, Alessandra, ed. "Urbs et Civitas," November 11, 2006,
<http://www.europaconcorsi.com/db/pubrec/scheda.php?id=6601>.

Magnuson, Torgil. *The Urban Transformation of Medieval Rome, 312-1420*. Stockholm: Suecoromana, 2004.

Meadows, David. "Augustus' Mausoleum," *rogueclassicism*, August 26, 2006,
(<http://www.atrium-media.com/rogueclassicism/Posts/00004110.html>).

Melis, Stefano. "Ipotesi per un progetto di sistemazione ambientale dell'Augusteo." *Roma Archeologia nel Centro II: La "Citta Murata"* 569-73. Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985.

Mirabilia urbis Romae. IntraText Library
<http://www.intratext.com/IXT/LAT0463/_PM.HTM>

Muñoz, Antonio. "La Sistemazione del Mausoleo di Augusto." *Capitolium* 13 (1938): 491-508.

- Myres, J. L. "The Creatan Labyrinth: A Retrospect of Aegean Research." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 63 (July 1933): 269-312.
- Napa, Christopher. *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian and Rome*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- Nichols, Francis Morgan. *The Marvels of Rome: Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, second edition with Eileen Gardiner. New York: Italica Press, 1986.
- Noland, Linda Ann. "Emulating Augustus: The Fascist-Era Excavation of the Emperor's Peace Altar in Rome." *Odyssey* (May/June) 2005: 38-47.
- Palmer, R. E. A. "Studies in the Northern Campus Martius." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 80.2 (1990): 52-55.
- Parker, John Henry. *The Archaeology of Rome*. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1877.
- Patterson, John. "Living and Dying in the city of Rome: houses and tombs," *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, 2000.
- _____. "Survey Article of the City of Rome: From Republic to Empire," *Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992): 186-215.
- Pena, M. "El santuario y la tumba de Eneas," *Estudios Clásicos* 71 (1974): 1-26.
- Perrin, Yves. *Rome: Paysage urbain et histoire II^e av. J.-C.- II^e siècle apr. J.-C.*. Paris: Hachette Livre: 2001.
- Platner and Ashby. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Ponti, Ermanno. "Come sorse e come scompare il quartiere attorno al Mausoleo di Augusto." *Capitolium* XI (1935): 235-250.
- Procopius of Caesarea. *History of the Wars*. Ancient History Source Book <<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ancient/410alaric.html>>.

- Purcell, Nicholas. "Tomb and Suburb." *Römische Gräberstraßen: Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard* eds. Henner von Hesberg and Paul Zanker, 25-41. München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987.
- Raaflaub, Kurt and Mark Toher (editors). *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Reeder, Jane Clark. "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulus and Tholos." *Classical Antiquity* 11 (October 1992): 265-304.
- Rehak, Paul. "Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the *Ara Pacis Augustae*." *Art Bulletin* 83 (2001): 190-208.
- _____. *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*, ed. John G. Younger. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.
- Riccomini, A. M. *La ruina di sì bela cosa: vicende e trasformazioni del Mausoleo di Augusto*. Rome: Electa, 1996.
- _____. "A Garden of Statues and Marbles: The Soderini Collection in the Mausoleum of Augustus." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 265-284.
- Richard, J.-Cl. "Mausoleum: D'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie." *Latomus* 29 (1970): 370-88.
- _____. "Tombeaux des empereurs et temples des "divi": notes sur la signification religieuse des sépultures imperiales à Rome." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 170 (1966): 127-142.
- Richardson, L., Jr. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Riding, Alan. "Richard Meier's New Home for the Ara Pacis, a Roman Treasure, Opens," *The New York Times*, April 24, 2006.
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2006.04.24.arts.design/24paci.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/M/Meier,%20Richard>>.
- Ridley, R. T. "Augusti Manes Volitant per Auras: The Archaeology of Rome under the Fascists." *Xenia* 11 (1986): 19-46.

- Rose, Steve. "When in Rome...." *Guardian Unlimited*, May 1, 2006
<<http://artsguardian.co.uk/features/story/0,,1765096,00.html>>.
- Rossini, Orietta. *Ara Pacis*. Milan: Electa, 2006.
- Roullet, A. *The Egyptian and Egyptianising Monuments of Imperial Rome*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Sabatini. *Il Mausoleo di Augusto (Anfiteatro Corèa)*. Rome: Tipografia L. Filipucci, 1907.
- Schütz, M. "Zur Sonnenuhr des Augustus auf dem Marsfeld: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit E. Buchner's Rekonstruktion und der Ausgrabungsergebnisse, aus der Sicht eines Physikers." *Gymnasium* 97 (1990): 432-57.
- Sear, Frank. *Roman Architecture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Semple, Ellen Churchill. "The Templed Promontories of the Ancient Mediterranean." *Geographical Review* 17.3 (July, 1927):353-386.
- Severy, Beth. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Shipley, Frederick. "Chronology of the Building Operations in Rome from the Death of Caesar to the Death of Augustus." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 9 (1931): 7-60.
- Scott, K. "The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 56 (1925): 82-105.
- Sextus Aurelius Victor. *Epitome de Caesaribus*. The Latin Library. November 2007. <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/victor.caes2.html>>
- Sommella, P. "Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium," *Gymnasium* 81 (1974): 273-297.
- _____. "Heroon di Enea a Lavinium: Recenti scavi a Practica di Mare," *Rendiconti della Pontificia academia romana di archeologia* 44 (1971-72): 47-74.

- Stambaugh, John. *The Ancient Roman City*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- Steinby, Eva Margareta, editor. *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae, volumes 1-5*. Rome: Edizioni Qusar, 1993-2000.
- Suetonius. *The Twelve Caesars* trans. Robert Graves. London: Penguin Classics, 1979.
- Tacitus. *The Annals*, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Bodribb, ed. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1964.
- Thomas, Edmund. "The Architectural History of the Pantheon in Rome from Agrippa to Septimius Severus via Hadrian." *Hephaistos* 15 (1997): 163-186.
- _____. "From the pantheon of the gods to the Pantheon of Rome." *Pantheons: Transformations of a Monumental Idea*, eds. Richard Wrigley and Matthew Carske. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2004.
- Torelli, M. *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982.
- Toynbee, J. M. C. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- Trigger, Bruce. "Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behavior," *World Archaeology* 22.2 (1990): 119-32.
- Viganoni, Giovanni. *Mussolini e i cesari*. Milan: Edizioni "Ultra", 1933.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid* trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage Classics, 1990.
- Virgili, Paola. "Mausoleo d'Augusto: Funzioni sociali di un edificio storico." *Roma Archeologia nel Centro II: La "Citta Murata"* 565-568. Rome: De Luca Editore, 1985.
- _____. "A Proposito del Mausoleo di Augusto: Baldassare Peruzzi aveva Ragione." *Archeologia Laziale* VI (1984): 209-212.

- Ward-Perkins, Bryan. *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Building in Northern and Central Italy AD 300-850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Waurick, Götz. "Untersuchungen zur Lage der Römischen Kaisergräber in der Zeit von Augustus bis Constantin." *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentral Museums* 20, 1973: 107-146.
- Winkes, Rolf. *The Age of Augustus* (Conference held at Brown University Providence Rhode Island, 1982). Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium): Art and Archaeology Publications Collège Érasme, 1985.
- Wiseman, T. P. "Strabo on the Campus Martius." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* IV (1979): 129-134.
- . "Campus Martius." *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, ed. Eva Steinby. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1993-2000.
- Young, Norwood. *The Story of Rome*. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1907.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1988.
- Ziolkowski, Adam. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1992.
- Zinserling, G. "Die Programmatik der Kunstpolitik des Augustus." *Klio* 67 (1985): 74-80.

Figure 1.1. Exterior view of Mausoleum.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers

Figure 1.2. Entrance corridor from exterior.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers

Figure 1.3. Looking down entrance corridor from inside Mausoleum.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 1.4. View of grassy area showing the
extant portion of first annular corridor.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 1.5. Doric cornice with lion's head.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 1.6. View of niche and window
in third annular corridor.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 1.7. View of inner chamber.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 1.8. View of both openings to the inner chamber.
Photo by S. Fugate Brangers.

Figure 2.1. Exterior of Mausoleum of Augustus. Current view.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 2.2. View of Mausoleum in current state.
(Photo by Henner von Hesberg)

Figure 2.3. Plan of Mausoleum by Antonio Muñoz.

Figure 2.4. Sectional plan of Mausoleum by Henner von Hesberg.

Figure 2.5. Giulio Romano, *Vision of Constantine*, Stanze Vaticane, early 16th century. Depiction of Mausoleum near the upper right side edge across from the bridge.

Figure 2.6. Plan of the Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from *Gli antichi sepolcri. Overo Mausolei Romani et Etruschi* (1697).

A. Porta del primo ordine o sia ingresso del Mausoleo di Augusto, non conoscendosi altro luogo che questo per cui si aueua l'adito nel Sepolcro. B. Corritore di longhezza palmi cento in circa il quale si riconosce essere stato anticamente tutto foderato di grossi macigni di trauertino de quali oggi se ne riconoscono le solo forme impresse ne muri. C. Altro adito nel secondo ordine il quale comunica con le stanze laterali solo auanzo di si marauigliosa Mole.

Figure 2.7. View of the Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from *Gli antichi sepolcri. Overo Mausolei Romani et Etruschi* (1697).

Figure 2.8. View of Mausoleum by Pietro Sante Bartoli from *Gli antichi sepolcri. Overo Mausolei Romani et Etruschi* (1697).

Mausoleo di Augusto .

Figure 2.9. Engraving of reconstructed view of Mausoleum, Gregorio Roisecco, mid-19th century. (Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina di sì Bela Cosa*)

Figure 2.10. Engraving of *opus reticulum* from Mausoleum by Giovan Battista Piranesi, *Antichità Romane II* (1756).
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina di sì Bela Cosa*)

Figure 2.11. Engraving showing Mausoleum and associated artifacts by Giovan Battista Piranesi, *Antichità Romane II* (1756).
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina di sì Bela Cosa*)

Figure 2.12. Hypothetical plan of Mausoleum by Giovan Battista Piranesi, *Antichità Romane II*(1756). (Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina di sì Bela Cosa*)

Figure 2.13. Engraving of reconstruction of Mausoleum by Luigi Canina, *Vedute dei principali monumenti di Roma antica* (1851). (Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina di sì Bela Cosa*)

Figure 2.14. Reconstruction of Mausoleum by E. Fiorilli based upon study by Bartoli in *Bollettino d'Arte* (1927).

Figure 2.15. Reconstruction of Mausoleum, south elevation by R. A. Cordingley and I. A. Richmond, *Papers of the British School at Rome* (1927).

Figure 2.16. Three proposed reconstructions by G. Gatti from "Il Mausoleo di Augusto: studio di ricostruzione" (1934).

Figure 2.17. Reconstruction of Mausoleum by H. von Hesberg from *Das Mausoleum des Augustus. Der Bau und seine inschriften.* (1994)

Figure 2.18. Interior elevation of Mausoleum by H. von Hesberg (1994).

Figure 3.1. Map of Campus Martius.
 (Image from P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*)

Figure 4.1. View of Augustan complex on the northern Campus Martius as reconstructed by Buchner.

Figure 4.2. View of Ara Pacis, 9 BC.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.3. Detail of garland relief from interior wall of Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.4. Interior wall of Ara Pacis.
(Image from Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*)

Figure 4.5. Relief panel of Roma from Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.6. Tellus/Ceres panel from the Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.7. Romulus and Remus panel from Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.8. Aeneas/Numa relif panel from the Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.9. Detail of southern procession relief with Augustus on the far left and Agrippa on the far right.
(Image from Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*)

Figure 4.10. Detail of northern processional relief with Senators.
(Image from Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*)

Figure 4.11. Acanthus relief from Ara Pacis.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 4.12. Egyptian obelisk which once served as the gnomon for the Horologium.
(Photo by Marco Prins and Jona Lendering, Livius.org)

Figure 4.13. Augustan inscription from the obelisk/gnomon of the Horologium.
(Image from Buchner, *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus*)

Figure 4.14. View of Horologium excavation.
(Image from Buchner, *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus*)

Figure 4.15. Illustration of the shadow cast by
Horologium on the autumnal equinox.
(Image from Buchner, *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus*)

Figure 5.1. View of Rome by Sebastian Münster, 1550.
The Mausoleum is shown as a mound of earth between the column and the river.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.2. Ash urn of Agrippina, Museo dei Conservatori.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.3. Sketch showing site plan of Mausoleum and Church of San Rocco, attributed to Peruzzi.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.4. Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.5. Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.6. Sketch of perimeter wall of Mausoleum, attributed to Peruzzi.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.7. Sketch of Doric cornice and dripstone, attributed to Peruzzi.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.8. Sketch with reconstructed view of Mausoleum,
attributed to da Sangallo.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.9. Plan of Mausoleum by Ligorio.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.10. Reconstructed view of Mausoleum by Ligorio.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.12. Engraving of Mausoleum with Soderini garden
by Etienne du Pérac, 1575.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.13. Engraving of Mausoleum showing Soderini garden,
Giacomo Lauro, 17th century.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.14. View of Mausoleum during excavation of central core during the late 18th century.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

Figure 5.15. View of Anfiteatro Correa (the Mausoleum) during a fireshows show in the late 18th century.
(Image from Riccomini, *La Ruina*)

MAVSOLEVM OF AVGVSTVS ROME - ACTVAL STATE
SOUTH ELEVATION

Figure 5.16. Elevation drawing of the Augusteo by Cordingley and Richmond.

Figure 6.1. Mussolini reading his speech announcing the isolation of the Mausoleum.

(Image from Antonio Cederna, *Roma fascista*)

Figure 6.2. G. Gatti's reconstruction of the Mausoleum as published in *Capitolium* X, 1934.

Figure 6.3. View of interior of Mausoleum showing partial wall reconstruction (on the right).
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.4. View of Mausoleum showing current ground level.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.5. View of National Social Security Administration Building.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.6. Western inset window from
National Social Security Administration Building.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.7. Eastern inset window from
National Social Security Administration Building.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.8. Mosaic triptych from
National Social Security Administration Building.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.9. Latin inscription from
National Social Security Administration Building.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.10. View of the eastern building for the
National Social Security Administration.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.11. Detail of frieze from the eastern building for
The National Social Security Administration.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.12. Latin Inscription from the front of the eastern building for the National Social Security Administration.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.13. 1938 view of Morpurgo's building (now demolished) for the Ara Pacis . (Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

Figure 6.14. View of the Collegio degli Illirici.
(Photo by S. Fugate Brangers)

Figure 6.15. Model of Foro Mussolini.
(Image from Caporilli and Simeoni, *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico*)

Figure 6.16. General view of entrance to Foro Mussolini, called the Piazza Imperii. (Image from Caporilli and Simeoni, *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico*)

Figure 6.17. Mosaic of the two Romes from Piazza Imperii.
 Top is the view of ancient Rome and bottom is the view
 of modern Rome with ground-plan for the Foro Mussolini.
 (Image from Caporilli and Simeoni, *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico*)

Figure 6.18. Plan for Piazza Imperii including Fountain of the Sphere, on the left.
(Image from Caporilli and Simeoni, *Il Foro Italico e Lo Stadio Olimpico*).

Figure 6.19. Plan of Mausoleum by Antonio Muñoz.

Figure 6.20. New Ara Pacis Museum by Richard Meier.
(Image from Orietta Rossini, *Ara Pacis*)

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Susan L. Fugate Brangers

ADDRESS: 916 Craig Avenue
Shelbyville, Kentucky 40065

DOB: Ashland, Kentucky—September 17, 1970

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. in Art History, University of Louisville, 1997-2007

Dissertation: *The Mausoleum of Augustus: Expanding Meaning From Its Inception to Present Day*, December 2007; Directors, Dr. Stephanie Maloney and Dr. Karl Kilinski

M.A. in Art History, University of Louisville, 1993-1997

Thesis: *The Roman Baths of Torre de Palma, Monforte, Portugal*, 1997;
Director, Dr. Linda Gigante

B.A., *magna cum laude*, in Literature and Spanish, Western Kentucky University, 1989-1993

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE:

2007 (fall) Adjunct instructor, *Art Survey I* and *Art Appreciation*, Humanities Division, Jefferson Community College Southwest

2006-2007 Adjunct instructor, *Art Appreciation*, Humanities Division, Jefferson Community College Southwest

2005-2007 On-line instructor, *Art Appreciation*, Humanities Division, Jefferson Community College Southwest

- 2003 (spring) Graduate Teaching Assistant, *Masterpieces of World Literature I & II*, Humanities Division, University of Louisville
- 2002 (fall) Graduate Teaching Assistant, *Masterpieces of World Literature*, Humanities Division, University of Louisville
Roman Art and Architecture, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 2002 Instructor, *Greek and Roman Art*, Athens and Rome Summer Program, Kentucky Institute for International Studies
- 2001-2002 Graduate Teaching Assistant, *Masterpieces of World Literature I & II*, Humanities Division, University of Louisville
- 2001 (spring) Part-time Instructor, *Introduction to Art*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 2000 (fall) Instructor in Continuing Education, *Masterworks of Art*, University of Louisville
- 2000 (fall) Part-time Instructor, *Introduction to Art*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1995-2000 Area supervisor, summer excavations at archaeological site of Torre de Palma, Portugal; Director, Dr. Stephanie Maloney
- 1999 (spring) Research Assistant to Dr. Linda Gigante, University of Louisville
- 1994-1999 Co-founder and Editor, *Parnassus: The Allen R. Hite Art Institute Graduate Journal*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1998 (fall) Part-time Instructor, *Art Survey I*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1997-1998 Teaching Assistant, *Art Survey I & II*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1997-1998 Assistant, Visual Resources Center, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville

- 1996 (fall) Research Assistant to Dr. Stephanie Maloney, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1995-1996 Assistant to Slide Curator, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1995 (fall) Part-time Instructor, *Art Survey I*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville
- 1994-1995 Teaching Assistant, *Art Survey I & II*, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville

AWARDS:

Cressman Fellowship, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville, 2004-2005

Morgan Fellowship, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville, 2003-2004

Graduate Teaching Assistantship, Humanities Division, University of Louisville, 2002-2004

Hite Art Institute Travel Award to attend Annual Conference of the Archaeological Institute of America, January 2001

Don Payton Graduate Award in Art History, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville, 2000-2001

Disability Awareness Award, University of Louisville, 2000

Allen R. Hite Teaching and Research Assistantships, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville, 1994-1999

Allen R. Hite Award for summer travel abroad, Hite Art Institute, University of Louisville, 1999

SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS:

A New Look at the Bath Buildings at Torre de Palma, International Colloquium on Roman Baths in the Western Empire, Gijon, Spain; December 1999

The Roman Baths at Torre de Palma, Portugal, Archaeological Institute of America Annual Meeting, Chicago; December 1997

Roman Baths and the Baths at Torre de Palma, Western Kentucky University; October 1997

A Discussion of the Roman Baths at Torre de Palma, Symposium on Torre de Palma for the Fifteenth Anniversary of its Excavation, University of Louisville; January 1996.

PUBLICATIONS:

"A New Look at the Bath Buildings at Torre de Palma," *Il Coloquio Internacional de Arqueología en Gijón; Termas Romanas en el Occidente del Imperio* (ed. Carmen Fernández and Virginia García Entero). Gijón: VTP editorial, 2000, 361-364.

"Interview with Dr. William MacDonald," *Parnassus*, Volume IV/V (2000): 51-54

"The Baths at the Roman Site of Torre de Palma," *American Journal of Archaeology* 102 (1998): 395 (abstract)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

Archaeological Institute of America
College Art Association