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Epigraphical space and imperial power in Athens. 
Altars and statue bases for Augustus and the imperial family*

1. Introduction and state of the art

In this paper, I will consider the theme of public spaces in Athens as locations for the display of imperial power in the Augustan age, with a focus on the statue bases and altars in honor of the emperor and the imperial family, that is to say, those fully or partially preserving the dedication for an imperial honorand. On one hand, inscriptions had strong communicative potential, often equal to that of images\(^1\), and should always be considered jointly with their monuments\(^2\). Moreover, society and space are not only generally related, but they do mirror each other\(^3\). Unfortunately, in most cases, only statue bases survived, so their evidence can be

\(^*\) The study was conceived within the work for my tesi di specializzazione at the Italian Archaeological School at Athens, dealing with the evidence of statue bases of Romans in Athens during the Julio-Claudian age. A special thank goes to Professor F. Camia of Sapienza University of Rome, for his precious suggestions, and to Professor R. Di Cesare from the University of Foggia, with whom I could deeply discuss the topic of this contribution. I thank, moreover, E. Choremi and E. Zavvou of the Epigraphical Museum of Athens, and S. Moschoriasioti of the Ephorate of Athens; C. Papastamati-von Moock, S. Dumont and V. Bardani for their help with the inscriptions stored in the Acropolis archaeological site and in the Agora deposits. I also thank all the staff of the Italian Archaeological School who has helped me with the permissions of study. Lastly, I thank Irene Berti, Chiara Lasagni and Daniela F. Marchiandi for the opportunity to include my paper to this thematic collection.

\(^1\) On the theme of inscriptions and public space cf. Rizakis 2014.

\(^2\) Dietrich 2020, 5-7.

\(^3\) Hillier - Hanson 1989, 27.
used to provide for the loss of the statuary monuments that they supported. The
reconstruction of the materials and the scheme of the figures is on many occasions
possible from the bases, as the recent studies by R. Krumeich for the Acropolis
have outlined, but this aspect needs further examinations and will not be consid-
ered here due to lack of space. Inscribed statue bases and altars will be specifically
taken into account for the reconstruction of the urban landscape of the city, even
though distinctions will be necessary when accounting for these two typologies
of epigraphical supports. The honorific purpose of both the altars and statues can
bring the two typologies together and permit a comparative analysis of the evi-
dence. My work aims to give a picture of the distribution of the findings of Au-
gustan statue bases and altars, to contribute to the reconstruction of their original
setting into the ancient city. The pre-existing scenario of the Classical and Hel-
lenistic buildings and dedications will be also considered to contextualize the Au-
gustan additions in the urban landscape of Athens.

Since the publication in 1993 of the volume of Graecia Capta by S. Alcock,
the studies on “Roman Greece” have made substantial progress. Specific works
were published concerning Augustan politics in Athens, like those by P. Baldassarri\(^4\), F. Lozano\(^5\), M. Kantirêa\(^6\), F. Camia\(^7\), mostly developing the religious and
cultic aspects of the new political power; parallely, the studies by T.L. Shear Jr\(^8\),
J.C. Burden\(^9\), T. Stefanidou-Tiveriou\(^10\) give a special glance on the Augustan set-
ting of the city\(^11\). Some contributions have dealt with some areas of the city, above
all the Acropolis and the Agora, in order to reconstruct the appearance of Athens
during the Hellenistic and Roman times. A massive project focusing on the statue
bases of the Acropolis area was started in 2004 by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel\(^12\)
and has led to the international conference of Bonn in 2006, whose works were
published in the volume Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit in 2010\(^13\). After the publication of the inscriptions found in

---

\(^4\) Baldassarri 1998.
\(^6\) Kantirêa 2007.
\(^7\) Camia 2016.
\(^8\) Shear Jr. 1981.
\(^9\) Burden 1999.
\(^10\) Stefanidou-Tiveriou 2010.
\(^11\) A parallel field of studies has considered the route followed by Pausanias into the city. For
the Acropolis: Scholl 2010; for the Agora: Osanna 2014.
\(^12\) The project has then dealt, from 2006, with the Hellenistic staging of the Agora and, in a
third phase, with the statue bases from the sanctuaries of Attica (Krumeich - Witschel 2010b, 33).
\(^13\) Krumeich - Witschel 2010a. In the same volume in partic. Krumeich - Witschel 2010b;
the Agora excavations by D.J. Geagan\textsuperscript{14}, this area has been lately investigated by S. Leone, who considered the dedications to Romans in the complex setting of the Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic monuments\textsuperscript{15}. A further update on the Athenian inscriptions during the Julio-Claudian age was given by G.C.R. Schmalz\textsuperscript{16}. For the statue bases, the contribution by J. Munk Højte for the time between Augustus and Commodus offers a complete account of the evidence\textsuperscript{17}. In regard to the ara\ae\ Augusti, the paper published in Hesperia by A.S. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek in the late fifties is still the most thorough insight about the topic\textsuperscript{18}.

The Augustan age is a noteworthy period for the city of Athens, when new urban and political frameworks are experienced. About half of all the statue bases mentioning Romans during the Julio-Claudian period can be dated to Augustus’ reign. The same can be said about imperial statue dedications, about half of which can be placed in the Augustan age. A massive amount of ara\ae, quantitatively exceeded only by those to Hadrian, was dedicated to the first Julio-Claudian emperor\textsuperscript{19}. The Augustan age stayed for many instances as an unrivaled comparison for the time onwards.

To my knowledge, no publication has examined the city in its entirety for both the inscribed statue bases and altars of the Augustan time\textsuperscript{20}. No clear distinction has ever been made on the distribution of these two kinds of evidence. Yet, the reuse of inscriptions as building materials and the often-weak information about the finding spots create some difficulties. The exact localization of the evidence was very rarely possible and the different degrees of reliability of the information must be taken into account. Anyway, the collection of all the available data can still give us useful clues about the matter and prepare the field for further examinations. The analysis of the distribution of the findings is a first move for the reconstruction of the spatial arrangement of the dedications and can be considered a preliminary step for anchoring the epigraphical and archaeological evidence of the Augustan statues and altars into the urban landscape.

The findings of statue bases and altars will be first analyzed from a topographical point of view, in consideration of the main places of representation of the imperial family, first and foremost the Acropolis, the Agora of Kerameikos,
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and the Roman Agora. As we will see, the topographical distribution of the evidence leads to a clear distinction between the statue bases and the altars, which seem to follow different rules in their setting within the city. The data will be compared with the remaining documentation, whose place of discovery cannot always be determined, and with ancient routes, in order to contextualize the findings in a complex system of traditions and new cultic practices.

2.1. The Acropolis

At least eight statue bases for Augustus or his family were found in the Acropolis area. In particular, four of them come from the entrance area of the Propylaea. As the only entrance, this spot maintained a deep and meaningful value through the centuries into the Roman age, when the Periclean ramp was substituted by a monumental staircase. From the point of view of who was raising to the Acropolis, the attention was first caught by the imposing pillar rededicated by the demos to Augustus’ friend and son-in-law, Marcus Agrippa [no. 1] (fig. 1). Agrippa might have benefited from the Athenians of his previous marriage with Caecilia Attica, the daughter of Titus Pomponius Atticus, and he was probably in Athens in 23 and again in 17-13 BCE. The pillar, with its height of ca. 13,40 m

21 Among them, it is considered the dedication to Germanicus in the area of the Propylaea, whose traditional dating linked to Germanicus’ visit to Athens in 18 CE was reconsidered on epigraphical grounds (Geagan 1984, 72; Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 132).

22 In opposition to the traditional dating to the time of Claudius, some scholars have proposed Augustus as the promoter of the project (Burden 1999, 74-75; Schmalz 2009, 83-84, no. 104). For the dating during Claudius’ reign: Shear Jr. 1981, 367. The bilingual inscription published by M. Šašel Kos with the number 139 (Šašel Kos 1979, 61, no. 139; SEG XXXI 187) is probably recording this intervention.

23 Within this article, any numerical references enclosed in square brackets are associated with the epigraphic documents collected in Tables 1-3, appended at the conclusion of this paper. Without inv. IG II² 4122. It is the so-called “Eumenes’ Pillar”. Traces of two different chariots and the erasure of a previous inscription let Dinsmoor think of an earlier Hellenistic dedication either for Eumenes II and Attalus II in the occasion of the victory during the Panathenaic festival of 174 BCE or just to Eumenes for the victory of 178 BCE (Dinsmoor 1920, 83). The same author hypothesized a second dedication of the monument to Marcus Antonius and Cleopatra (also Graindor 1927a, 48-49; Heijnen 2018, 97). It is maybe more probable that the two colossal statues of M. Antony and Cleopatra were set instead east of the pillar (Stewart 2004, 198-199; Di Cesare 2010, 235). Another hypothesis takes into account a second Hellenistic dedication, maybe connected to descendants of the Pergamene sovereigns (Parigi 2019, 101). For Agrippa’s pillar: Kopp 2000, 314-319. For the theme of the reuse of ancient monuments: Alcock 1993, 196-198; Keesling 2010; Krumeich 2010.

24 He was proconsul of Syria in 23 until 13 BCE. For sure, he spent the winter between 16-15 BCE in Athens (Graindor 1927a, 49; Baldassarri 1998, 30-33, 247). It is also possible that Agrippa,
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(4.5 foundation and 8.91 shaft)\(^{25}\), lays on a *poros* base, over which a three-stepped marble base was elevated\(^{26}\). The central part of the monument is in Hymettian marble, with moldings in Pentelic marble, and it could be seen from a great distance, as well as from the Peripatos and the Panathenaic Way. The inscription is facing the west side of the Acropolis: its placement shows a privileged view from far rather than the entrance of the rock. But this was probably not the only dedication to Agrippa in this area. Another fragment of a base in Hymettian marble dedicated to Agrippa was found nearby \([\text{no. } 2]^{27}\). Although a much smaller dedication, it could be spatially put in connection with the great dedication of the pillar, for which the same marble was employed\(^{28}\). At the entrance of the Acropolis stands the equestrian dedication reused for Germanicus \([\text{no. } 3]^{29}\), placed in the south *ala* of the Propylaia, near the Temple of Athena Nike. The traditional dating in connection with Germanicus’ visit to Athens in 18 CE was contested on epigraphical grounds by D.J. Geagan, followed by E. Perrin-Saminadayar\(^{30}\). It is possible that the dedication, placed after the adoption of 4 CE, should be dated in the last part of the Augustan reign. The base takes the place of an older equestrian besides having built his new Odeon in the Agora, devoted himself to the reorganization of the finances of the *polis*. He gained honorific titles in Greece and was named patron of some Greek cities (Baldassarri 1998, 30-33). The new dedication of the pillar has brought scholars to draw a relationship between Eumenes and Agrippa, particularly regarding their evergetic policy to the city (Heijnen 2018, 97). On the relationship of Agrippa with Greece: Roddaz 1984, 421-450.


\(^{24}\) Baldassarri 1998, 247-249 n. 1.

\(^{25}\) Inv. MA 13268. *IG* II\(^{2}\) 4123. The first edition is given by Vischer: «[The inscription] is probably unknown and maybe came to light just now during the works on the west side of the Pinacoteca». He also reports the words of the excavator, von Velsen, who locates the find spot of the basis in the vicinities of the pillar (Vischer 1855, 68-69, no. 76).

\(^{26}\) The typology could be probably found in the “Orthostatenbasen”, on which pedestrial or equestrian statues could be set (Schmidt 1995, 83). It is not possible to exclude that also this statue of Agrippa was of the equestrian type, even though its reconstruction is highly tentative.

\(^{27}\) Without inv. *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3260. Cf. Krummelich 2008, 361-362, figs. 18-19. Two other dedications for Germanicus were found in Athens: *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3258 and *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3259. For both we do not know the exact find spot. *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3259, now lost, is said by Dittemberger «Athenis apud Abramiotuno»: the house of D. Abramiotos was located north of modern Monastiraki, at Abramiotou Str., «between a big monastery and the church of Hagia Eirene» (Μαλούχου 2019, 63). The second inscription *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3258 was “rediscovered” at the Museo Oliveriano in Pesaro. According to M.L. Lazzarini, *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3259 could be inscribed on the other face of the same *IG* II\(^{2}\) 3258 (Lazzarini 1985, 35-36). For the epigraphical evidence referring to Germanicus in the Greek and Roman world: Gregori - Camia 2020.

\(^{30}\) Geagan 1984, 72; Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 132. Cf. in particular the dedication formula, with the *demos* enhanced in the first position as the promoter.
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monument for the Attic cavalry (*IG* I 3 551), whose inscription was not erased. In the general reorganization of the area, another base was placed *in pendant* to that of Germanicus in the north *ala* of the Propylaia. Cavalry was, therefore, the protagonist of the space immediately outside the Gate, where the imposing *quadriga* of Agrippa could find a parallel in the double dedication at the two sides of the central passage. The use of Hymettian and Pentelic marble both for the pillar and the two bases could have as well given emphasis to the dedications and created a further link among them. All three dedications clearly recall the past re-using ancient monuments, all the more in the case of Germanicus’ base and its parallel, where archaistic inscriptions were added anew.

Entering the Acropolis’ plateau, other images of members of the imperial family were exhibited. Tiberius is the most celebrated by number of statues, mostly erected before 4 CE. A fragmentary base in Pentelic marble dating before the adoption was found north of the Propylaea [no. 4]. Little portions of the top and bottom surfaces are preserved, so an original height of 17 cm can be reconstructed. An elaborate molding is visible in the lower part of the front side. Another base in Pentelic marble [no. 5], lacking its right side, came to light in

---

31 The monument is referred to by R. Krumeich as a voluntarily *ambiguos* («doppeldeutiges», Krumeich 2010, 358).
32 The dedicatory inscription is not preserved, and we cannot say if it was dedicated to any member of the Augustan family (Krumeich 2010, 356-357). Pausanias imagines the two equestrian dedications could be the sons of Xenophon (Paus. I 22, 4). For the two bases: Raubitschek 1949, 146-152, no. 135, 135a, 135b.
33 The 5th century inscription for the cavalry was set upside-down and the same text was written anew on the other side. On the other low base, the same inscription was added contextually with the Roman setting up (Blanck 1969, 82-83, no. B34).
34 Also, Pausanias mentions some mythological figures whose statues were set at the entrance of the Acropolis (Paus. I 22.8-23.1). Cf. Stevens 1936, 446-458.
35 When he became emperor, Tiberius refused to be honored as a god and prohibited the erection of his portraits in the temples (Suet. *Tib.* 26; D.C. LVII 8, 1-2; 9, 1-3; cf. the answer to Gytheion: *SEG* XI 922). Cf. Hoff 1994, 112. The sources give no information on the visits of Tiberius to Athens. The only chronological criterion for the inscriptions mentioning him is the anteriority or posteriority to 4 CE. He probably did not pass in Athens during his way to the East in 20 BCE (Baldassarri 1998, 34). It is possible nonetheless that Tiberius inherited a patron’s relationship to Athens due to its ancestry from the Claudii Pulchri and the Claudii Nerones (Rawson 1973, 227, 229-233).
36 Inv. EM 2192. *IG* II 3 3247. The inscription is placed by Pittakis “north of the Propylaea, not far from the inscription 2816”, which is placed “northwest of the base of Athena Promachos” (Πιττακῆς 1856, 1399, no. 2817).
37 The support reminds the statue base for Iulius Caesar from the Agora: Raubitschek 1954a, 272 (*SEG* XIV 121); cf. Leone 2020, 163-164, no. 9.
38 *IG* II 3 3246.
the area between the Propylaea and the *Erechteion*. From the same area, a statue base for Drusus the Elder was discovered [no. 6]. The northern area between the Erechteion and the Propylaea was also an important focus for the presence of, among others, public texts, and decrees still in the Augustan age, and possibly the Athena *Promachos*, which has been connected to a fragmentary monument in Pentelic marble probably restored during the Augustan age. The monument has been alternatively identified with a statue base for a member of the Augustan family or an altar. The restoration of the *Erechteion* can be dated to the same period: its moldings were compared to that of the so-called *Promachos* base, and the same workers were postulated for the two monuments.

A round statue base in Hymettian marble of Tiberius before the adoption was found east of the Parthenon, dedicated by the *demos* [no. 7]. In the vicinities, at the north-eastern corner of the Temple, the foundations of a pillar were found. They were interpreted as pertaining to an Attalid monument like that for Eumenes II at the entrance of the Acropolis and the other one for Attalus II in front of the homonymous Stoa in the Agora, later rededicated for Tiberius. Another pillar in front of the Dipylon Gate was probably re-inscribed for an emperor during the 2nd century CE. The inscription of the pillar adjacent to the Parthenon, in honor of a Julio-Claudian emperor, has been connected to Augustus by M. Korres [no. 8].
but another interpretation leans towards Claudius48.

The double adoption of 4 CE can be read in the set-up of the Roman Acropolis: the event was celebrated west of the Parthenon Temple, where a Hellenistic monument was adapted for the imperial family [no. 9]49. Four of the five bases were re-inscribed with the dedication of the demos to Augustus, Tiberius, Germanicus, and Drusus. Agrippa Postumus, Agrippa and Julia’s last son, was maybe left aside50. The dynastic group was placed in a closed court between the Chalkotheke and the back wall of the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia, probably in the northern part of the staircase51. Access was provided by a propylon on the north side (the so-called “Propylon west of the Parthenon”). According to Dinsmoor, the staircase along the west side of the Parthenon, partially carved into the bedrock, served since the 5th century BCE for the display of anathemata52. To this space, maybe originally intended as a natural extension of the Opisthodomos, was later added the Chalkotheke as a roofed annex, maybe in the early 4th century BCE, with successive renovations during the Roman times53. In only one case, an altar might be attested on the Acropolis [no. 45]. The inscription is known only by Pittakis, who describes it as written in large characters. Also the association with Augustus cannot be stated with certainty.

49 Inv. nos. MA 13221; 13220; 13222. IG II 2 3253-3256 = IG II 2 3829. Pentelic marble.
50 According to some scholars, the constant absence of Agrippa Postumus in the statue groups celebrating the events of 4 CE could show a deliberate removal of his images after the damnatio of 7 CE (Rose 1997, 138, no. 68; Baldassarri 1998, 38 n. 145). A statue of Trajan was added later (IG II 2 3284).
52 Dinsmoor 1947, 135-136 and n. 141, thinking the staircase was not accessible vs. Stevens, who thought here passed the Panathenaic way (Stevens 1936, 479; Stevens 1940, 24-40). For the staircase: Korres 1999, 85-93; Hurwit 2004, 198-200; Hurwit 2005, 15-16; Monaco 2010, 94. Pausanias mentions numerous dedications on the way between the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia and the Parthenon, of which only the statue of Ge can be placed with certainty, along the northern side of the Parthenon (Paus. I 23, 9 - 24, 4).
53 Hurwit 2004, 198-200; Cama 2010, 95; Stevens 1940, 7-19; La Folette 1986. For an alternative reconstruction: Downey 1997.
2.2. The Agora and the north-western slopes of the Acropolis

In contrast to the conspicuous presence of statue bases on the Acropolis, most of the altars was found in the Agora. For the period here considered, the emperor was the only one to be honored on altars. At least four altars are attested from the Agora. The findings were, in most cases, re-used into later construction during Late Antiquity or in more recent times. An altar was found in a modern context north of the Odeon [no. 24]54, a second one near the “Giants’ Palace” [no. 25]55, and the fragment of a third in a modern wall over the west limit of South Stoa II [no. 26]56. A fourth fragment of an altar was found in a marble pile in the northwest part of the Agora [no. 27]57: it is said to be a possible joining part of IG II2 3226 [no. 28], reused in the area of the Dipylon Gate and thought to be lost by A.S. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek. The altar was “rediscovered” in the Epigraphical Museum by D. Peppas-Delmousou 58. The possibility of joining the two fragments must be excluded after autoptic analysis (2019): the fragment found in the Agora is, in fact, part of a rectangular altar, while IG II2 3226, now at the Epigraphical Museum, is a circular one. Two monuments, whose interpretation as altars or statue bases is not certain, were found in the area of the Hephaisteion [no. 47]59, and west of the Odeon [no. 48]60. A fragment in Pentelic marble of uncertain typology, dating into the 1st century CE, was found in a late context northwest of the Church of the Holy Apostles [no. 50]61.

55 Inv. EM 10357. IG II2 3228 («Bei den Schlangenfüßlern»); Benjamin - Raubitschek 1959, 81-82, no. 11. Pentelic marble.
58 Benjamin - Raubitschek 1959, 80-81, 9; Peppas-Delmousou 1965, 151 (inv. EM 1849). Hymettian marble.
59 Inv. EM 3949. IG II2 3232. Pentelic marble. «In Theseio» (Koehler). A.S. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek do not consider it as an altar (Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 65 n. 6); of a different opinion is D.J. Geagan (Geagan 2011, 144). The inscription reads: [Αὐτοκράτορος / Ὣσιών θεοῦ] / [Σεβαστὸς] Καίσαρος. The genitive recalls the standard dedication formula on altars.
60 Inv. Agora I 4332. Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 76, no. 2 (both possibilities are considered); Schmalz 2011, no. 120 (restored as an altar); Geagan 2011, 158, no. H276 (both possibilities are considered). Hymettian marble. The text reads: Σεβαστὸς / Καίσαρος. The restoration in the accusative case is possible as well.
Concerning the statue bases, at least two were found in the Agora, in the area of the Church of the Panagia Pyrgiotissa, near the south wall of Attalus’ Stoa: a circular one in Hymettian marble for Tiberius [no. 11] and a second rectangular one, also in Hymettian marble, for Lucius Caesar [no. 12]. A third dedication to Agrippa on a Hymettian marble slab comes from a modern context in the industrial area southwest of the Agora [no. 10]. It is not sure if the inscription associated by Thompson to the base in the south room of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios could be considered a statue base for Augustus [no. 13]. Another support, maybe a statue base, was found in an early Roman context in a well on the southeast slopes of Kolonos Agoraios and tentatively dated by D.J. Geagan in the Augustan age [no. 49]. A fragment of Hymettian marble built into a Turkish tomb north of the Southwest Fountain House and broadly dated into the 1st century CE has been interpreted as a base for a Roman emperor [no. 23].

The area of the Eleusinion, between the Agora of Kerameikos and the Acropolis, seems to be a crucial point for the imperial display. A very fragmentary round Hymettian monument [no. 29], probably an altar, was found in some marble piles in the area south of the sanctuary, together with another fragment of a rectangular altar in Pentelic marble [no. 30]. Other two fragmentary altars dedicated to Hadrian have been hypothesized as Augustus’ rededications: a slab in Pentelic marble reused in a wall of a modern house over the southern part of the


62 Without inv. IG II² 3243 = 3932; Geagan 2011, 146-147, no. H252; Leone 2020, 177-178, no. 25.
63 Inv. EM 1855. IG II² 3252.
66 Inv. Agora I 1689. Geagan 2011, 159, no. H281: [ - - - - ] Καίσαρ [ - - - ] / [ - - - - - ] Καίσαρ [ - - - - - ] / [ - - - - - - ] Σεβαστάρα [ - - - - - - - ]. D.J. Geagan underlines it «shares characteristics with imperial altars» and that «an archaizing tailed rho suggests the reign of Augustus». Pentelic marble.
67 Inv. Agora I 1604. Geagan 2011, 153, no. H266. The text reads: [ - - - - - - - - ] / Καίσαρ [ - - - - - - - ].
68 Inv. Agora I 6411 (not found in the Agora deposits in 2019). Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 77, no. 5; Schmalz 2011, 97-98, no. 122; Geagan 2011, 159, no. H280. The text is reconstructed as: [Ἀ]ὔτοκράτορι Καίσαρι / [Θεοῦ υἱὸν Σεβαστάρα].
Sanctuary [no. 31] and a second one, now lost, seen by Pittakis in the Hypapanti Church [no. 32]. This altar has been tentatively identified with IG II² 3232 from the Hephaisteion area, which A.S. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek consider a different kind of monument. Another fragment of an altar, generally dated in the Julio-Claudian time, was found in a late context west of the Post-Herulian wall on the northern slopes of the Acropolis [no. 33]. Finally, a last Augustan altar might be recorded near the Church of St. Dionysius on the Aeropagus [no. 34]. This assertion comes from the erroneous report by Cyriacus, and subsequently by Boeckh, of the inscription IG II² 7155, where the text of a dedication to Augustus has been combined with two other inscriptions. In the first moment, E. Bodnar recognized that the last three lines (2-4) of the inscription preserved as IG II² 7155 were missing on the stone. The finding by E. Vanderpool of another inscription unequivocally bearing only part of the first line, with no possibility of integrations, gave the proof of the not-affinity of the sentence Kaisaros theou, that was therefore probably seen by Cyriacus on another support from the same area.

2.3. The Roman Market and the north-eastern part of the city

The monumental West Gate of the Roman Market was a very special focus for the display of the Roman city. An equestrian statue of Lucius Caesar [no.

---

70 Inv. Agora I 4406. Meritt 1954, 257, no. 43; SEG XIV 123; Benjamin 1963, 68, no. 34; Geagan 2011, 168, H310. Geagan’s restoration reads: [σωτῆρ και] [κτίστῃ] / [Ἀδ] (vac.) Σεβαστοῦ [Ολού] (vac.) / [Πα] (vac.) ντικ. 71 IG II² 3231; Pittakis 1835, 36. The church was placed south of the Eleusinion, on a crossroad between the Panathenaic Way and the so-called “Hypapanti Street” leading towards the east (Ficuciello 2008, 192-194, figs. 60-61). From the area of the church, which is no more extant, many inscriptions and ancient decrees were discovered (Mommsen 1868, 22-24, no. 16; Shear 1939, 220-221; Karvonis 2016, 116).

72 Cf. supra, n. 59.


74 Cyriacus’ text reads: Ἀρχιμνου Παιραμίως Καίσαρος θεοῦ. IG, II² 7155 reports: Ἀρχιμνου Παιραμίως Καίσαρος θεοῦ/Σεβαστοῦ ἀπελευθεροῖς. Ἀντίοχος ἀλαίπτης/παίδων Καίσαρος ἐπεμελήθη Εὐθύς/καὶ Παντοκράτορος συνεξελευθεροί. 75 Bodnar 1960, 180-182; SEG XXI 908. These lines have been erroneously added by Boeckh.

76 Bodnar 1965, 180.

77 In the final years of the 1st century BCE, houses and little shops were demolished along the way connecting the Agora of the Kerameikos and the new Roman pole. Here was realized a portched street with an Ionian stoa and behind shops that enhanced the way to the Roman Market (Shear 1973; Shear 1975, partic. 354-355).
14] stood above the Athena Archegetis Propylon78. The base was seen by J. Stuart and N. Revett and was preserved in situ at least until 1840, when it appears in a drawing by Wordsworth, but not in that by Moncel in 184379. This statue base has been put in connection with the only known dedication for Gaius Caesar in Athens, IG II² 3250, p. 349 [no. 15]80. The “wandering” provenience of Gaius Caesar’s base is very singular. Long lost and “rediscovered” in 1947 by M. and E. Levensohn in the area of Dionysus’ theatre81, it was apparently seen in the same place by Cyriacus82, then by Pittakis near the church of St. Demetrios Kataphoris, east of the Roman Market83. It seems quite unlikely that Cyriacus saw it near the theatre, as E. Bodnar and M. Chatzidakis state, unless Pittakis is wrong in placing the base near the Roman Market or we do think of the existence of two different bases with the same inscription. But the interpretation of Cyriacus as referring to the theatre area has been made a posteriori after Levensohn (Cyriacus only notes “ad petriam”) and we could easily imagine he saw the inscription in the same place as Pittakis. Moreover, following Cyriacus’ path reconstructed by Bodnar, the inscription seems to be little in line with the localization of the other ones previously or further enumerated84. It is very probable, then, that the base IG II² 3250 was brought to the theatre area in a second time, maybe after the demolition of the church during the 19th century. A recent survey (2019) has confirmed the presence of the statue base near the theatre. The traditional interpretation has considered the dedication to Gaius Caesar in pendant to that of Lucius, placing it either above the interior façade of the West Gate or above the East Gate85. M. Hoff has connected it with the Temple of Ares and has considered both the

78 IG II² 3175 = 3251.
79 Hoff 2002, 586-587. The Church of St. Demetrios Kataphoris was located between Kyr rhetou and Prytaneiou Str. (Mommsen 1868, 78-81, no. 90). For other findings from this area, Krumeich - Witschel 2009, 180 n. 25; Di Cesare 2014c; Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 171 with n. 71.
80 Inv. NK 314. Schmalz 2009, 100-101, no. 129. Hymettian marble. The inscription has been variously dated between the last years of the 1st century BCE and the first years of the 1st century CE: between 2 BCE and 4 CE by P. Graindor, who connects it with Gaius’ East campaign; in 2 BCE by F.E. Romer (followed by M. Hoff), on the occasion of his visit in Athens with Marcus Lollius (IG II² 4139, 4140) and possibly Lucius Domitius Aenobarbus (IG II² 4144). See Romer 1978, 201-202 n. 35. For the dating of Gaius’ campaign, Segenni 2011, 32-33.
81 Levensohn 1947, 68-69.
82 Bodnar 1960, 40, 164-165; Chatzidakis 2017, 202, no. 1.5.
83 Pittakis 1835, 132.
84 These are located at the entrance of the Acropolis or along the Panathenaic Way leading to the Agora (Bodnar 1960, 36, pl. III).
85 Graindor 1927a, 52; Rose 1997, 220 n. 83. Both the locations are contested by M. Hoff because Gaius Caesar would be represented in a less prominent position than the brother; the same argument is in Romer 1978, 198.
dedications made on the same occasion in 2 BCE. Schmalz suggests that Gaius Caesar’s statue could be placed on the Acropolis, «presumably at the Temple of Roma and Augustus».

The new hypothesis of the presence of the base near the Church of St. Demetrios Katiphoris, not far from the East Gate of the Roman Market, makes possible an original placing in the Augustan complex, but a specular position above the East Gate should be excluded. The dimensions of Gaius’ base are in fact much smaller than Lucius’ and the inscription could not be read if placed above the entrance (fig. 2). The hypothesis of the presence of a statue of Gaius Caesar in the vicinities or in the Roman Market would not be in contrast with the archaeological evidence from the area. In addition to the imposing equestrian statue of Lucius Caesar, near the West Gate, a marble head of Augustus in the Prima Porta type and an altar to Augustus Archegetis were found. Furthermore, a statue base set by the agoranomoi to Livia as thea was seen by Stuart and Revett near the West entrance (IG II² 3238)91. The building of the so-called Aghoranomion, south of the Tower of the Winds, was interpreted by M. Hoff as a sebasteion, according to the inscription IG II² 3183 honoring Athena Archegetis and the theoi Sebastoi. Even if an imperial cult cannot be stated, the Roman Market could be a pole for the imperial display already in the Augustan age.

An additional area where antiquities and inscriptions were stored and found in large amounts is the so-called “Little Mitropolis” Church, northeast of the Roman Market, and adjacent to the modern Cathedral. This little church, dedicated to St. Eleutherios or the Panagia Gorgoepikoos, was already in ancient times a

86 According to Hoff, the hypothesis would be supported by the fact that in 2 BCE Lucius adopted the toga virilis; he adds that the consecration of the Temple of Mars Ultor in Rome could have been officiated by the two brothers as duoviri aedis dedicandae (Hoff 2002, 597-598). Cf. also Graindor 1927a, 51 and Romer 1978, 201-202 n. 35. For the association of Gaius’ visit in Athens and Ares’ Temple: Bowersock 1984, 171-173; Hartswick 1990, 267-269.


88 The dimensions of the statue base of Lucius Caesar above the Gate are deduced from J. Stuart and Revett’s drawings (Stuart - Revett 1762, chap. I, pl. 4).

89 Ντάτσουλη-Σταυρίδη 1985, 28 29, no. 3758, pl. 15; Hoff 1994, 112; Di Cesare 2014b, 731 (ph.). The large statue of a Nike found in the area of the Library of Hadrian has been hypothetically placed in front of the West Gate of the Roman Market to commemorate the victory over the Parthians (Karvonis 2016, 124).

90 Ο δήμος / Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου θεοῦ / Ἀρχεγέτου σωτῆρος. IG II² 3237. Known only by Pittakis, who saw it near the Church of Ag. Sotiros, at the entrance of the Roman Agora (Momm- sen 1868, 85, no. 99).


92 Hoff 1994, 114-115. The theoi Sebastei would be Augustus and Livia, deified by Claudius in 42 CE. Although Livia is addressed as thea already before the official deification, an effective cult is attested by the Claudian age (Hoff 1994, 109). For the Roman Market and its ideological and political implications: Torelli 1995, 18-19.
store of antiquities and it was built reusing ancient materials and inscriptions. A circular altar in Hymettian marble bearing the inscription CIA, III 451 [no. 35] found in a wall of a modern house in Pluto Str., east of Monestraki Square, had been probably previously seen by Pittakis near the church. We should therefore consider two different inscriptions: IG II² 3224/3225, identified by U. Koehler for the first time (and opisthographic of CIA, II, 3, 4174) and CIA, III 451. If the second one was probably seen in the Cathedral’s area, IG II² 3224/3225 must be connected to Hadrian’s Library. The distinction between the two inscriptions is further validated by the supports, a circular altar in the case of CIA, III 451, and a rectangular one for IG II² 3224/3225.

Towards north in the same area, in Lekka Str., two other altars probably originally dedicated to Augustus were found [nos. 37-38]. They were both rededicated for Nero as “New Apollo.” The altars were reused in a Late-Roman wall of a complex dating from Classical to Late-Roman times. Between Lekka Str. and the Cathedral was placed the church of the Panaghia Rombi, in the nearby of which...
Mommsen saw a now lost altar to the honor of Roma and Augustus [no. 39]101. A last circular altar in Hymettian marble was found during the excavations for a cellar east of the Roman Market, between Mnesikles and Adrianou Str. [no. 40]102.

2.4. Isolate findings and unknown provenience

In some cases, the findings of statue bases or altars were isolated in other areas of the city and deserve to be discussed separately.

As for the statue bases, the top of a monumental statue base in Pentelic marble honoring Augustus was found in the Asklepieion area [no. 16]103. The inscription differs from the others known for Augustus for the use of a formula for the health of the emperor (ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας), to be connected with the cult of Asklepios. A similar formula will be used for Tiberius on an architrave in the same sanctuary (IG II2 3181). From the Asklepieion, a marble slab dating between the 8/9 BCE and the 14 CE honors Asklepios, Hygeia, and Augustus (IG II2 3176), and another fragmentary epistyle probably recall the same honorand (IG II2 3120)104. It is unclear if the statue base IG II2 4127, found in the same area, belongs to Augustus or to an imperial legatus [no. 17]105. The sanctuary, whose structure is still unclear, was maybe monumentalized through the construction of a propylon between 9 BCE and 14 CE106.

A dedication to Tiberius was found built in the staircase of a modern house at Sepolia [no. 18]107.

101 IG II2 3179. Dittemberger is dubious about its authenticity (CIA III 64). P. Graindor hypothesized it was the altar of the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis (Graindor 1927a, 150-151). Cf. Kajava 2001, 80 n. 40.
104 The mention of the emperor along side a deity does not necessarily imply an imperial cult (Price 1984, 149-150).
105 IG II2 4127. A little concentration of statues for Roman magistrates can be outlined here: at least two statue bases of Romans (of which one dated to the Augustan age and the other generically from Augustus to Claudius), in addition to a statue base to a not-well-identified Marcus (Augustan age) and another Greek honorand with Roman citizenship (maybe Julio-Claudian age): IG II2 4130; IG II2 4172; IG II2 4138; IG II2 4050.
106 Baldassarri 2001, 420, figs. 12-13. It is worth recalling the altar of Augusta Hygeia IG II2 3240 found on the Acropolis (Tiberius’ reign).
107 IG II2 3245. The inscription reads: - - - - - - / [προσβεντή]ν Σεβαστοῦ - - / - - - - / εινοστήρατης / - - / - - - Πα - - - - - / ἐπὶ ιερείας Ιωππο[εννίδος] / τῆς Νικοκλείους.
An Augustan altar comes from the area of the Olympieion [no. 41]108. Suetonius informs us that after Actium the Hellenistic kings wanted to complete the construction of the Temple to dedicate it to Augustus’ genius109. The archaeological evidence of the “Augustan” phase is scarce and limited to a capital and a representation on a coin with the legend IOVI OLV(M), alternatively interpreted as the Athenian Olympieion or as the Temple of Zeus at Olympia110. As M. Kantirėa suggested, the altar here found can be considered another proof of the intervention during Augustus’ reign in this area111. The project could have started during his last visit, in 20/19 BCE112. For sure the association with Zeus, already present in the gemma augustea, will be a choice reiterated by other emperors113. Moreover, the designation of the Olympieion for the celebration of Augustus would perfectly integrate with the new layout of the city and could have set a precedent for the celebration of the emperor in this area, which will be carried out under Hadrian.

Another fragmentary dedication, a base or an altar for Augustus, was found re-used between Antiphanes, Distomos e Drama Str.114 The marble slab presents traces of second use, when a hole was made in the center of the support [no. 51]. The placement on the Acropolis has been suggested on the base of the epithet “Soter” for the emperor.

The finding place of three statue bases (two for Augustus and one for Tiberius) and five Augustan altars could not be defined. The first of these is a statue base for Augustus consisting of a rectangular block in Eleusinian marble, whose top and bottom are preserved and a height of 23 cm can be restored [no. 19]115. A

[Πιραι/ς / Θυγατρ/ς]. «In der Treppe eines Hauses bei H. Dimitrios. Marmorblock ca. 0.80 breit» (Milchhöfer 1888, 347, no. 599).

108 Inv. EM 3910. IG II² 3227. Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 81, no. 10; SEG XVII 80c; Schmalz 2009, 95, no. 116. Pentelic marble.
109 Suet. Aug. 2.60.
110 Kantirėa 2007, 106.
top for a statue base in Hymettian marble for Augustus as “new Apollo” was correctly reconstructed in all its parts by D. Peppas-Delmousou [no. 20]\(^{116}\). Another statue base in Pentelic marble with the erased name of Tiberius has been connected by P. Graindor to the period of the “Rhodian exile” [no. 21]\(^{117}\). A last debated statue base to Livia or Iulia Livilla was alternatively dated to Augustus’ or Caligula’s reign [no. 22]\(^{118}\).

The provenience of some altars is not specified as well: \textit{IG II²} 3229 [no. 42]\(^{119}\), later re-inscribed for Nero, Vespasian and, on the back, for Titus, the slab in Pentelic marble \textit{IG II²} 3230 [no. 43]\(^{120}\), also rededicated for Hadrian, and a round altar in Hymettian marble [no. 44]\(^{121}\). \textit{IG II²} 3233, described as a lost altar generally coming “from Athens”, was re-discovered in the Agora excavations and re-interpreted as a dedication for C. Poppaius Sabinus\(^{122}\).

3. Analysis of the distribution of the evidence

The analysis of the finding spots can be a precious premise for the reconstruction of the urban landscape of the city and it can provide as well interesting hints for the studies on the imperial cult. The two typologies of epigraphical supports here discussed, despite both aiming to celebrate the emperor or his relatives, deeply differ in their nature, and this reflects in the formulas, type of honorands, and topographic distribution.

Statue bases generally present a formula with the dedicant in the nominative and the honorand in the accusative case, while altars normally use the genitive case for the emperor, and more seldom the dative\(^{123}\). Augustan statue base inscriptions are quite thin and essential, the most common formula showing only the \textit{demos} in the nominative in the first line and the honorand in the accusative in the second position. Augustan altars normally present the formulaic dedication

\(^{116}\) Inv. EM 4561 + 2844 + 4929 + 3130. \textit{IG II²} 3262+4725; \textit{SEG} XXIX 167; \textit{AE} 1981, 756; \textit{BE} 1980, 205; Peppas-Delmousou 1979, 127; Munk Højte 2005, 249, no. 127; Schmalz 2009, no. 127

\(^{117}\) Inv. EM 3123. Graindor 1927b, 254-255, no. 18; \textit{IG II²} 3248; Munk Højte 2005, 277, no. 87.

\(^{118}\) Inv. EM 4521. \textit{IG II²} 3241; Schmalz 2009, 113-114, no. 127.


\(^{120}\) Inv. EM 10350. Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 82-83, no. 13.

\(^{121}\) Inv. EM 4935. Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 78, no. 6.


\(^{123}\) This distinction was not made by Kirchner, who often labels altars as “bases” (Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 66-67, 69). In some cases, also inscribed statue bases can express the honorand in dative, maybe due to the influence of Latin language (Veyne 1962, 75-84).
From the distribution of the findings, we can see a clear distinction between the statues, mostly placed on the Acropolis, and the altars, found in great number in the lower city, but not on the Acropolis hill (figs. 3-4). In particular, a concentration of the altars along the Panathenaic Way could be put in connection with the festivals for the emperor (Sebastoi agones), whose starting date is still debated, and the sacrifices on occasion of the imperial visits. In Corinth, the epigraphical evidence leads to date the Kaisareia already in the Augustan age. The link with the first emperor can be corroborated by the almost exclusive dedication of the altars to Augustus, unlike the successive emperors. During the Julio-Claudian period, the only other emperor for whom a certain number of altars was set up was Nero, whose visit to the city was probably planned during his journey in Greece.

The evidence from the area of the Roman Market, and especially from its West entrance, might point to some presence of the imperial family in connection to this spot. Most statue bases for Romans were found on the Acropolis and the Classical Agora, while the area of the Roman Market shows very few traces of honorific portraits in the Augustan age. For this reason, the presence of the equestrian statue of Lucius Caesar, together with the other findings from nearby, suggests the purpose of the imperial display.

The theme of an “Augustan program” in Athens was often brought to the attention of scholars and there is no doubt, many interventions and restorations changed the city during the Augustan age. We should not forget, anyway, that all the dedications to the emperor and his family, including the round temple east of the Parthenon, were made on account of the demos, as also most of the dedications to Romans during the Augustan age. It is worth stressing, therefore, the role of the city as the principal promoter for the celebration of Roman power.

The dedication of statues to the emperor and his family is in continuity with

124 Just in one case dative has been hypothesized [no. 29].
125 We have already mentioned the hypothesis that the altar IG II 2 3179 [no. 39] could be connected to the monopteros of the Acropolis (Graindor 1927a, 150-151); A.J.S. Spawforth has suggested the possibility that the monopteros was an elaborate baldacchino for an altar (Spawforth 1997, 184).
126 West 1931, 64-65.
127 On this topic, Geagan 1984, in partic. 72-78. The only altar for Tiberius in Athens reuses one for Augustus [no. 25].
128 Only two findings come from the area near the Tower of the Winds: IG II 2 4134, for Lucius Cornelius Lentulus, and IG II 2 4240, for an unknown woman. No other statue bases for Romans other than the imperial family were found in the Roman Market in the Julio-Claudian period.
129 In the area was found also a statue base for Livia, dating to the Tiberian age (IG II 2 3238).
130 Later, the dedications by the Aeropagus, boule and demos together (or by two of them) would become more frequent.
the Hellenistic tradition. The Athenian Acropolis acquired a specific character of display for honorific portraits in the Late Hellenistic age. The date of 120 BCE has been considered a turning point in this sense. It has been argued that, from this time on, Roman generals started to be represented side by side with the mythological and historical memories of the past. But the traditional dating for the dedication of a Sex. Pompeius by the demos in 119/118 BCE has been questioned by R.M. Kallet-Marx, who suggests it might be contemporary to the visit of the honoree’s nephew Pompey the Great to Athens in 62 BCE. The dedication to Sextus’ son Cn. Pompeius, possibly the proconsul of Macedonia in 93/2 BCE, should be maybe also post-dated. It seems possible, therefore, for the first portraits of Romans on the Acropolis, to be dated during the Sullan age, as it was already assumed for the Agora area.

The presence of Augustus, and the other emperors after him, on the Acropolis, can be considered as the highest point reached by these honors. But the Augustan interventions in this area, besides the Temple of Roma and Augustus, were, after all, limited. The imposing Attalid pillars were not new constructions, as well as the dynastic statue group west of the Parthenon and Germanicus’ statue in the Propylaia. Most of the building activity can be placed elsewhere, in the lower city.

The Athenian Agora can be considered the main setting for the celebration of freedom and democracy. For a long time, no other image than the Tyrannicides was allowed here. Their ‘loneliness’ was first assaulted by the Attalid kings, then again eloquently by Brutus and Cassius; their image was minted on coins by Sulla, who was the first Roman (with Lutatius Catulus) to be honored with a statue in the Agora. The celebration of the emperor in the Athenian Agora could suggest as well a parallel in the restitutio Rei Publicae realized by Augustus at the beginning of his reign. The northern part of the Agora might have assumed a preeminent role in the celebration of the imperial power (at least three altars were found here). The cult of Zeus Eleutherios, traditionally associated with the victory over the Persians at Plataea, strongly asserted the exaltation of freedom already expressed by the Tyrannicides. Two rooms were added in the back wall of the Stoa between the last years of the 1st century BCE and the first years of the 1st

131 Krumeich - Witschel 2009, 186-189; the only two honorific statues for citizens on the Acropolis in the early Hellenistic age were those to Olympiodoros and Demetrios Phalereus (Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 154-155).

132 Krumeich - Witschel 2009, 189 n. 61.

133 The statue of L. Licinius Lucullus (IG, II² 4104), from the Acropolis, can be dated between the eighties and the seventies of the 1st century BCE.

134 Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 169 n. 71.

135 Leone 2020, 108.
century CE: the finding of a large statue base probably intended for three figures and an inscription maybe of Augustan time have arisen the hypothesis of an imperial cult\textsuperscript{136}. Not far was rebuilt the Temple of Ares, probably dismantled from an Athenian deme (Acharnae? Pallene?) and connected to two statue bases celebrating Gaius Caesar and then Drusus the Younger as “new Ares”\textsuperscript{137}, while north of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios, the little Sanctuary of Demos and the Graces on the Sacred Way hosted the cult of the goddess Roma\textsuperscript{138}. The north-western corner of the Agora, where the Sacred Way entered the square, was a focus point in the topography of the area and it seems possible it had a special link with the emperor\textsuperscript{139}. We do not know the exact purpose of the araegin{document}	extae Augusti and not necessarily the celebration of the emperor, as well as that of the members of the imperial family, must relate to an effective imperial cult. Yet, images and inscriptions aimed at creating an ambiguous parallel between the dedicants and the divinities and they could prelude to an effective imperial cult. The possible presence of an image of Augustus (with two other members of his family?) in the southern back room of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios seems to recall an “imperial cult” but, as in

\textsuperscript{136} The fragmentary inscription with the inv. Agora 14268, broadly dated between the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, has been connected to the monument by H.A. Thompson and interpreted as a dedication to Augustus (Thompson 1937, 61-63, figs. 37-38; Thompson 1966, 174, 181, figs. 2-3, pls. 56-57; Torelli 1995, 21-22; Baldassarri 1998, 145; Kantiréa 2007, 119-122; Di Cesare 2014a, 996). Cf. Geagan 2011, 251, no. H470. An ephebic list found in the Agora dating to 84/85 CE celebrates the emperor Domitian as “Zeus Eleutherios” (Kantiréa 2007, 121). Cf. Karvonis 2016, 101-102.

\textsuperscript{137} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3250 [no. 15] and IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3257. The inscription to Drusus dates around 20 CE. For the temple: Di Cesare 2014e.

\textsuperscript{138} Maybe already in the Late Hellenistic age (Travlos 1971, 79, figs. 102-105; Torelli 1995, 20; Stefanidou-Tiveriou 2008, 13; Karvonis 2016, 100; Monaco 2014). M. Kantiréa suggests the cult of Roma was added at the end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE (Kantiréa 2007, 122).

\textsuperscript{139} Other places linked with the imperial cult in the Agora are the Southwest Temple, near which a statue of Livia as Artemis or Hestia Boulaia dating to Tiberius’ reign was found (Crosby 1937, 464-465, no. 12 (ph.); AE 1938, 83; Wycherley 1957, 136, no. 247; Oliver 1965; SEG XXII 152; Schmalz 2009, 107, no. 135; Geagan 2011, 148, no. H254). Shear reports a statue base of Lucius Caesar was found together with it (Shear 1937, 354). This statue base has not been identified with certainty. “Tempting as it is to identify the Southwest Temple with Athena or with the Imperial family, there is no proof of a connection with either cult, and the identification of the building must remain obscure” (Dinsmoor Jr. 1982, 438). For the Southwest Temple: Rignanese 2014; the Southeast Temple, whose traditional chronology in the first years of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE has been recently post-dated to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century (Carando 2014, 1124-1125). For both the temples the reuse of 5\textsuperscript{th} century architectonical members has been hypothesized (Torelli 1995, 28-29; Osanna 1995, 104-118) and considered part of an architectural program by Augustus including the transfer of the Temple of Ares and the altar of Zeus Agoraios (Karvonis 2016, 105).
the case of the Acropolis, possibly shared (Roma?)\textsuperscript{140}. Moreover, emperors and members of the imperial family were frequently associated with gods on statue bases without a clear stating of divine status.

A connection between the Panathenaic Way and Augustus’ altars was already postulated by D.J. Geagan, then again accessorily by A. Chaniotis and F. Queyrel\textsuperscript{141}. F. Queyrel has stressed the relationship between the Panathenaic procession and the Attalid pillars, all four located on the Sacred Way and reused in the imperial time\textsuperscript{142}. In the Hellenistic age, the function of processions as the main moment for exhibition during religious ceremonies grew, together with their rich scenography; at the same time, no religious ceremony was lacking its political component\textsuperscript{143}. A link between imperial celebrations and panhellenic festivals seems to be found also in Corinth\textsuperscript{144}. Augustus’ policy in Athens must be inserted into a strong pattern of habits and traditions that, although originated in the Classical age, was highly affected by the Hellenistic experience.

Another focus for the findings of Augustan altars is the Sanctuary of the Eleusinion, placed along the Sacred Way between the Agora and the Acropolis, and a special reference point for the Panathenaic procession and other religious and agonistic occasions\textsuperscript{145}. During the Augustan age, it was restored and monumentalized,

\textsuperscript{140} The charge of ἱερεύς θεᾶς ἹΡώμης καὶ Σεβαστοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπ’ ἀκροτόλαι mentioned in the epistyle of the Temple of Roma and Augustus (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3173) was associated by P. Graindor to an analogous charge “not” on the Acropolis (Graindor 1927a, 151-152; Torelli 1995, 21; Hoff 1994, 110; Kajava 2001, 80 n. 40). The “other” cult in the Agora has been identified with that in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios by H.A. Thompson (Thompson 1966, 181; Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, 159-160). The hypothesis of a “reduplication” of the cult of Roma and Augustus has been contested by F. Lozano in favor of a cult of Roma and Augustus and another of Augustus alone. He also stresses the existence of only one seat for the cult of Roma and Augustus in Dionysos’ Theatre (Lozano 2002, 26). The identification of Zeus Eleutherios with Zeus Soter could be an interesting clue for the cult of the emperor, celebrated as Soter on the Acropolis (Thompson 1966, 180 n. 11; Torelli 1995, 21;). Graindor also mentions a cult of “Hestia on the Acropolis” that has been identified by M. Kajava with the same monopteros for Roma and Augustus (Graindor 1927a, 152-157; Kajava 2001, 79).

\textsuperscript{141} Geagan 1984, 77; Chaniotis 1995, 162-163; Queyrel 2003, 308.

\textsuperscript{142} Besides the two Attalid pillars on the Acropolis, a third pillar was in front of Attalus’ Stoa and a last, anonymous, one was found at the Dipylon (Queyrel 2003, 299, 306-308; for the Dipylon pillar cf. Stroszeck 2014, 83, no. 14b).

\textsuperscript{143} Chaniotis 1995, 152-155. Specific festivities were instituted for Demetrios Poliorcettes and the Macedonian general Diogenes (Chaniotis 1995, 64).

\textsuperscript{144} West 1931, 64; Kajava 2002, 172.

\textsuperscript{145} The boule met here the day after the celebration of the Mysteries and a specific round building was probably built in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE for the purpose of food consumption, together with a general rearrangement of the sanctuary (Malacrino 2010, 145-147; Karvonis 2016, 116). The section of the Panathenaic Way in front of the Eleusinion was paved in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE (Ficuciello 2008, 144-146). According to Philostratos, the Panathenaic ship rounded the Sanctuary (Vitae Sophistarum
Valentina Vari

as its homologous temple in Eleusis. A porch with Caryatids dated between Augustus and Hadrian decorated the entrance Propylon, open on the Panathenaic Way, while a four-aisled building, probably for storage, was added on the lower terrace. A stoa was built south of the Sanctuary, originally dated to the first quarter of the 1st century CE (but a new dating in the age of Claudius and the 2nd century CE has been suggested). It is worth remembering that Augustus was initiated to the Mysteries after Actium and he was present again for the celebrations of 19 BCE, when the traditional festive day was changed on the occasion of the emperor’s visit. The Sanctuary could have therefore assumed a particular meaning within the religious occasions held during Augustus’ reign.

It would be tempting to connect these festivities with the Sebasta, whose first agonothetes could be the Gaius Iulius Nikanor of IG II² 1069, dated by S. Follet between 4-14 CE, or with the celebrations in honor of the dies natalis of Augustus. The chronology of the institution of the Sebasta is debated and the agonothetes Gaius Iulius Nikanor has been alternatively dated in the Augustan time or in the second half of the 1st century CE. The main reason is the charge of protos agonothetes of the Sebasta held by Ti. Claudius Novius in IG II² 3270 and dated to 40/41 CE. But the attribute of protos agonothetes for Novius does not necessarily imply that Nikanor could not have previously assumed the agonothesia. The term protos is in fact often connected in the Greek East to a magistrate in charge in the first year of the new emperor. The prote agonothesia of Novius in 40/41 CE is therefore not in contrast with the existence of the same charge in the Augustan time. C.P. Jones has underlined the possibility that the

2.1.5): for the reconstruction of the way east of the Eleusinion (Travlos 1971, 422, fig. 540); for the reconstruction of the way west of the Sanctuary: Ficuciello 2008, 136; Di Cesare 2014d, 975. The race of the apobatai probably ended at the Sanctuary (Reed 1990; cf. Ficuciello 2008, 147). Pausanias says in front of the temple were a statue of Triptolemos, a bronze ox and a seated statue of Epimenis of Knossos (Paus. 1.4.4).

146 Malacrino 2010, 147. Caryatids were set also in the Augustan forum and in the Pantheon in Rome.


150 Attested in the decree IG II² 1071 (Stamires 1957, 260-265, no. 98; Woodhead 1997, 475-477, no. 337).


celebrations of the Sebasta were occasional during Augustus’ reign: the charge of first agonothetes could mark, in his opinion, a new, recurrent, character of the festivities\textsuperscript{154}. The agonothetesia of the Sebasta is connected to the Panathenaic Festival with Ti. Claudius Novius, who was agonothetes τῶν μεγάλων Παναθηναίων Σεβαστῶν καὶ Καισαρήων Σεβαστῶν in 47/8 or 51/2 CE\textsuperscript{155}. Although not much is known about the organization of the festivals in honor of the emperor in the Augustan time, I would not exclude that a connection with the Panathenaic festival could already exist. “Iso-Pythian” celebrations were held in Athens for Augustus’ birthday on Boedromion 12, shortly after the annual celebrations for Apollo\textsuperscript{156}. It has been assumed that the Athenians made sacrifices on an altar on this occasion; a reference to this practice could be found in the fragmentary inscription IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1071, linked to the celebrations for the emperor’s birthday, mentioning a bomos\textsuperscript{157}.

If A.S. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek hypothetically placed the arae Augusti in the Roman Market\textsuperscript{158}, I would better appeal to the Agora of Kerameikos as the main set for these monuments. Just an altar has in fact been connected to the area near the Roman Agora, in particular the Hadrian’s Library [no. 36], to which we could add the other one only known by Pittakis [no. 46]. Of course, the presence of altars in the Roman Market is possible and a number of those reused in the Little Mitropolis Church could come from this area. But the distribution of the findings better relates with the way that led from the Dipylon to the Acropolis, passing through the Eleusinion. Even though a ‘decadence’ of the Agora of Kerameikos during the Roman age has been stated, I would stress its persisting symbolic importance and its role as a “place of the memory”\textsuperscript{159}. Some statue bases could be set in connection with the way between the Agora of Kerameikos and the Roman Market. The Church of Panaghia Pyrgiotissa, where two statue bases respectively for Tiberius and Lucius Caesar were found, is placed at the exact point where the street starts from the Agora of Kerameikos and where the so-called “Arched Gate” will be later placed during Trajan’s reign\textsuperscript{160}. The street, maybe identical to the Demosia plateia named on a horos found in the nearby\textsuperscript{161},

\textsuperscript{154} He stresses the use of the article before the festivities (Jones 1978, 228).
\textsuperscript{155} Follet 1976, 160-161; Spawforth 1997, 192-194.
\textsuperscript{156} Schmalz 2009, 17-18, no. 8; cf. 99, no. 127; Woodhead 1997, 472-474, no. 336. It is noteworthy the epithet of “New Apollo” on the base IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3262 + 4725 [no. 20] and the charge of ἱερεὺς Δηλίου Ἀπόλλωνος hold by Novius with the agonothetesia (Follet 1976, 161; Hoff 1994, 111).
\textsuperscript{157} Stamires 1957, 260-265, no. 98, l. 16; cf. Spawforth 1997, 186 n. 20.
\textsuperscript{158} Benjamin - Raubitschek 1959, 85.
\textsuperscript{160} Ficuciello 2008, 179.
\textsuperscript{161} Ficuciello 2008, 181.
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and flanked by Ionic stoas, led to the west Entrance of the Roman Market, above which the equestrian statue of Lucius Caesar stood. The street passed through the square and continued towards the east after the East Gate: the Church of Demetrius Katiphoris, where the statue base of Gaius Caesar was possibly seen by Pitakis, is placed on the same street (fig. 5).

4. Conclusions

Starting from the evidence of statue bases and altars, it was possible to attempt the reconstruction of a “topography of the honors” within the Roman city, to be inserted into a more general evolution of the spaces, which took the steps from the Classical and Hellenistic times, and echoed into the Roman age.

Linking the shreds of evidence to specific areas was not an easy purpose, mostly because of the frequent reuse of the inscriptions and the often-fragmentary information about the discoveries. Nonetheless, some considerations could arise from this picture, especially from the different distribution of statue bases and altars within the city. The noteworthy presence of Augustan altars in the Agora and generally on the sides of the Sacred Way could indicate a connection with the religious ceremonies taking place in the city, and with those in honor of Augustus. A peculiar concentration stands out in the northern area of the square, where the Sacred Way entered the Agora and most of the clues for the imperial cult are placed. The exclusive destination to the emperor marks the difference between altars and statue bases, which were instead erected to various members of the imperial family. It is tempting to connect the great presence of Augustan altars with the visits of the emperor to the city, as suggested by Geagan\textsuperscript{162}, and to draw a parallel between the route along the lower city and the Sebastoi agonés, whose chronology is still debated, or the celebrations for Augustus’ birthday. The relatively big number of altars in connection with the Eleusinion, placed along the Sacred Way at the middle point between the Agora and the Acropolis, might connect the demonstrations towards the emperor and the traditional worship.

Statues for the imperial family were instead mostly set on the Acropolis, with only sporadic findings in the lower city. The Acropolis stayed as the maximum point for the display of statues still in the Roman age, with frequent phenomena of reuse of the ancient monuments. In the Julio-Claudian period, the statue bases for Romans found on the Acropolis are about double of those found in the Agora and the same can be stated for the imperial dedications. The major presence of statue bases on the Acropolis in the Augustan period confirms this trend.

\textsuperscript{162} Geagan 1984, 73-74.
Excepting the Propylaea area, statue bases for the imperial family could be mostly placed on the northern and north-western sides of the Acropolis, linked with the ancient cult of Athena Polias; another important pole was set west of the Parthenon, on the staircase leading to the Temple.

Despite the not conspicuous number of findings from the Roman Market, this area could be as well a focus point for the celebration of the imperial family, physically and ideally connected to the ancient Agora by a porched road culminating with the equestrian statue of Lucius Caesar. Little evidence has come from the area of the Asklepieion and the Olympieion, but it cannot be excluded that these spots were also deputed to the celebration of the imperial family.

As underlined by M. Torelli, the city of Athens probably wanted to show gratitude towards Augustus to repair the past sympathies to Caesar’s murderers and Marcus Antonius. It is emblematic, in this regard, the episode of the statue of Athena on the Acropolis that turned towards the west and wept blood. A program celebrating the emperor and the imperial family would have helped to restore the critical relationship between the city and Augustus. The same monopterros on the Acropolis has been connected to the passage of the emperor leading to Rome from the East in 19 BCE, when he participated to the Eleusinian Mysteries for the second time.

The comparative analysis of the findings of statue bases and altars can be considered a starting point in defining the meanings of the urban landscape of Athens during the Augustan age. On one hand, Athens maintained its specific “Greek” character as civitas libera, on the other, it needed to rewrite its spaces according to the current political era. This was accomplished both by creating new areas for the display of the imperial family and, mostly, adapting the ancient historical structures to new meanings, creating a link between the past memories of the city and the present Roman domination.

valentina.vari@uniroma1.it

163 The episode was connected to the journey of Augustus to the East in 21 BCE, when he decided to spend the winter in Aegina. From there, he wrote to the Athenians that he was resentful (Cass. Dio 54, 7, 1-3; Plut. Mar. 207 E-F).
164 Torelli 1995, 19-20; Di Cesare 2010, 238.
Table 1: Catalogue of the statue bases dedicated in Athens to the imperial family
(the question mark refers to the uncertain chronology/dedicatee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Honorand</th>
<th>Finding place</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Dimensions (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IG II 4122</td>
<td>Agrippa</td>
<td>Acropolis, north of the Propylaea</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Attalid pillar</td>
<td>13.40 x 3.31 x 3.80; l.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IG II 4123</td>
<td>Agrippa</td>
<td>Acropolis, north of the Propylaea</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Orthostate?</td>
<td>0.85 x 0.93 x 0.33; l. 0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>? IG II 3260</td>
<td>Germanicus</td>
<td>Acropolis, south of the Propylaea</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Rectangular?</td>
<td>? x ? x ? l.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IG II 3247</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>Acropolis, north of the Propylaea</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Top base</td>
<td>0.17 x 0.23 x 0.19; l. 0.03-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IG II 3246</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>Acropolis, between the Propylaea and the Erechtheion</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.33 x 0, 70 x 0.60; l. 0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IG II 3249</td>
<td>Drusus the Elder</td>
<td>Acropolis, west of the Erechtheion</td>
<td>Acropolis (old Museum)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.22 x 0.88 x 0.64; l. 0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IG II 3244</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>Acropolis, east of the Parthenon</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>2.37 x 0.49; l. 0.04-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>? IG II 3272</td>
<td>Augustus or Claudius</td>
<td>Acropolis, northeastern corner of the Parthenon</td>
<td>Acropolis (old Museum)</td>
<td>Attalid pillar</td>
<td>? x ? x ? l. 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IG II 3253-3256 = IG II 3829</td>
<td>Augustus, Tiberius, Germanicus, Druus</td>
<td>Acropolis, west of the Parthenon</td>
<td>Acropolis (old Museum)</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0.33 x 0.99 x 0.73; l. 0.021 0.33 x 0.95 x 0.73; l. 0.021 0.33 x 0.85 x 0.73; l. 0.021 0.33 x 0.87 x 0.73; l. 0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Epigraphical space and imperial power in Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Geagan</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Modern context in the industrial area southwest of the Agora</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IG II² 3243 = 3932</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>Agora, reused in the Panagia Pyrgiotissa</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IG II² 3252</td>
<td>Lucius Caesar</td>
<td>Agora, reused in the Panagia Pyrgiotissa</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>? Geagan 2011, 251, no. H470</td>
<td>Augustus?</td>
<td>Agora, Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IG II² 3175 = 3251</td>
<td>Lucius Caesar</td>
<td>Roman Market, West Gate</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IG II² 3250</td>
<td>Gaius Caesar</td>
<td>Near the Church of St. Demetrius Katiphoris</td>
<td>South Slopes of the Acropolis</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Follet - Papas Delmousou 2009, 397-398, 4</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Asklepion</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Top base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>? IG II² 4127</td>
<td>Augustus?</td>
<td>Asklepion</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>IG II² 3245</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>Reused in a modern wall at Sepolia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benjamin-Rubitschek 1959, 67</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>IG II² 3262+4725</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Top base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Catalogue of the altars to Augustus in Athens
 (*the question mark refers to the uncertain chronology/dedicatee or to the inscriptions only recorded by Pittakis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Finding spot</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Dimensions (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H275</td>
<td>Agora, north of the Odeon</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,25 x 0,204 x 0,135; l. 0,03-0,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>IG II² 3228</td>
<td>Agora, near the front of the “Giants’ palace”</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,48 x 0,82 x 0,47; l. 0,035-0,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H278</td>
<td>Agora, in a modern wall over the west limit of South Stoa II</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Pillar monument</td>
<td>0,11 x 0,13 x 0,105; l. 0,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H274</td>
<td>Northwest part of the Agora, in a marble pile</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,275 x 0,165 x 0,19; l. 0,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>IG II² 3226</td>
<td>Dipylon Gate</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0,17 x 0,175 x 0,06; l. 0,025-0,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H280</td>
<td>South of the Eleusinion</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0,20 x 0,22 x 0,17; l. 0,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H279</td>
<td>South of the Eleusinion</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,026 x 0,18 x 0,235; l. 0,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>? Geagan 2011, 168, H310</td>
<td>South of the Eleusinion</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>0,221 x 0,18 x 0,09; l. 0,021-0,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>? IG II² 3231</td>
<td>Hypapanti Church</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>? Geagan 2011, H282</td>
<td>Post-Herulian wall on the northern slopes of the Acropolis</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>0,15 x 0,14 x 0,026; l. 0,04-0,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>? IG II² 7155</td>
<td>Church of St. Dionysius on the Aeropagus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CLA III 451</td>
<td>Little Mitropolis</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0,15 x 0,38 x 0,195; l. 3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>IG II² 3224/3225</td>
<td>Hadrian’s Library</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,16 x 0,39 x 0,29; l. 0,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEG XXXII 252</td>
<td>Lekka Str.</td>
<td>Agora (Academia)</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,58 x 0,81 x 0,29; l. 0,03-0,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Αλεξανδρῆ 1968, 70</td>
<td>Lekka Str.</td>
<td>Agora (Academia)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>? IG II² 3179</td>
<td>Panaghia Rombi</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H277</td>
<td>East of the Roman Market</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0,24 x 0,24; Ø 0,60; l. 0,035-0,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>IG II² 3227</td>
<td>Olympieion</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>0,11 x 0,085 x 0,07; l. 0,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>IG II² 3229</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0,61 x 0,56 x 0,40; l. 0,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>IG II² 3230</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>0,57 x 0,49 x 0,07; l. 0,03-0,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Benjamin-Raubitschek 1959, 6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0,21 x 0,42 x 0,25; Ø 0,50 ca.; l. 0,03-0,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>? IG II² 3234</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>? IG II² 3237</td>
<td>Entrance of the Roman Agora</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Catalogue of the findings of uncertain typology dedicated to Augustus

The question mark refers to the uncertain chronology/dedicatee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Finding spot</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Dimensions (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>? IG II F 3232</td>
<td>Agora, Ephaisteion area</td>
<td>Epigraphical Museum</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0.085 x 0.21 x 0.09; l. 0.025-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H276</td>
<td>Agora, west of the Odeon</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0.33 x 0.48 x 0.155; l. 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Geagan 2011, H281</td>
<td>Agora, southeast slopes of Kolonos Agoraios</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>0.21 x 0.24 x 0.11; l. 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>? Geagan 2011, H267</td>
<td>Agora, northwest of the Church of the Holy Apostles</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>0.07 x 0.13 x 0.06; l. 0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>SEG XXIX 168</td>
<td>Modern context between Antiphanes, Distomos e Drama Str. From the Acropolis?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>0.32 x 0.23 x ? l. ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

In questo articolo si analizzano i modi in cui gli spazi pubblici di Atene vengono utilizzati per esprimere il potere imperiale. L’obiettivo è quello di fornire un quadro completo e aggiornato della documentazione, finora priva di organicità, al fine di ricostruire una tendenza generale del fenomeno e i significati politici del programma augusteo ad Atene. Concentrarsi sugli altari e sulle basi delle statue, spesso confuse tra i reperti archeologici ateniesi, è sicuramente il miglior punto di partenza per capire in che senso si possa parlare di ‘culto imperiale’ ad Atene. Gli altari e le basi delle statue comunicano, per loro natura, con l’osservatore che si muove ogni giorno in uno ‘spazio allusivo’. Le iscrizioni poste sui supporti forniscono un ulteriore elemento in questo processo comunicativo. Il luogo preferito per erigere le basi delle statue era, non a caso, l’Acropoli (ma dovremmo aggiungere anche la base della statua equestre di Lucio Cesare sopra l’ingresso del Portale Ovest dell’Agorà Romana e la dedicà a Tiberio del pilastro di fronte alla Stoa di Attalo), mentre gli altari imperiali sembrano essere distribuiti in modo meno selettivo, essendo stati principalmente ritrovati nell’area dell’Odeon, dell’Eleusinion e attorno all’Agorà Romana. Anche se, nella maggior parte dei casi, essi non si trovavano in situ, è comunque possibile identificare aree particolari in cui la ‘presenza imperiale’ era predominante. Questo studio intende dare un contributo utile alla comprensione del paesaggio urbano ateniese al tempo di Augusto, il quale certamente attuò una ben pianificata politica dinastica finalizzata a trasformare lo spazio pubblico in un significativo palcoscenico su cui esibire e promuovere la nuova autorità di Roma.

In this paper, the ways in which public spaces of Athens are used in the display of imperial power will be analyzed. The aim is to provide a complete and updated outline of the documentation, which lacks, until now, organicity, in order to reconstruct a general trend of the phenomenon and the political meanings of Augustus’ program in Athens. The focus on altars and statue bases, often confused in the Athenian archaeological record, is for sure the best start to understand in which sense we can speak of ‘imperial cult’ in Athens. Altars and statue bases communicate, for their nature, with the observer, that moves every day in an ‘allusive space’. The inscriptions placed on the supports give an additional supply within this communicative process. The favorite place where erecting statue bases was, not by chance, the Acropolis (but we should also add the equestrian statue base of Lucius Caesar above the entrance of the West Gate of the Roman Agora and the dedication to Tiberius of the pillar in front of the Stoa of Attalus), whereas imperial altars seem to be distributed in a less selective way, since they were mostly found in the area of the Odeon, of the Eleusinion, and around the Roman Agora. Even though they were not, in most of the cases, in situ, defining particular areas where the ‘imperial presence’ was predominant is still possible. This study wants to give a useful contribution to the comprehension of the Athenian urban landscape at the time of Augustus, that surely carried out a well-planned dynastic policy, in order to transform the public space in a meaningful stage where was the new authority of Rome exhibited and promoted.