It is good to find such nuance and debate alongside the necessary conventional material. Albeit with shortcomings in the domain of illustration, this sure-footed and intelligent Companion will serve the student of Roman architecture well.

University of Bath MARK WILSON JONES
m.w.jones@bath.ac.uk

CREATING *DIVI*

KOORTBOJIAN (M.) *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus. Precedents, Consequences, Implications*. Pp. xxiv + 341, ills. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Cased, £65, US$99. ISBN: 978-0-521-19215-6.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002637

How do you know an institution when you see one? This, in very broad terms, is the question that K. addresses in this rich, engaging and sometimes frustrating book. To be more specific, it deals with the problems involved in devising a visual representation for the new institution of divinisation (that is, the creation of *divi*) and with the various attempts at solving those problems from the mid 40s B.C.E. down to the 20s C.E. The fact that it is occasionally frustrating is due primarily, I should stress, to the intractability of the problems, so that to some extent the experience of the reader simply reflects that of the contemporary actors who first grappled with them.

As K. points out, the book is 'organized as a sequence of relatively distinct studies as opposed to a continuous, overall narrative' (p. 13). The first chapter outlines his main arguments and approaches (with sections entitled 'Three Claims' and 'Four Assumptions'), and introduces a leitmotif that will run throughout the book, the contrast between two potential statue types of Divus Julius that appear on coins of Octavian from 36 B.C.E.: although both depict him holding a *lituus*, the distinctive cult instrument of an augur, in one he appears as a priest, *capite velato*, and in the other wears a 'hipmantle', leaving the upper part of his body nude. The subsequent chapters parse this difference by exploring the resonances of these two image types across a wide range of precedents and parallels and by connecting them to the larger set of issues and options that swirled around the nascent institution of making men gods. Chapter 2 deals with the divine and semi-divine honours proposed for Caesar both during his lifetime and after his death. In the third chapter K. explores the tradition of augural representation, and in the fourth he demonstrates how it links Divus Julius to the *Genius Populi Romani*, Romulus and Quirinus. Chapter 5 takes up the problem of Caesar's portraits which, in sharp contrast to those of Augustus, never seem to have been regimented according to fixed types and which surprisingly lack, in all extant examples, the two most distinctive attributes attested in literary sources: the crown voted him while alive and the star that Octavian added after his death. In the sixth chapter K. investigates the roles proper to living emperors and to gods: the former auspicious, guaranteeing divine favour, and the latter propitious, granting divine favour. In Chapters 7 and 8 he traces the spread of the new imagery that had been devised to represent the new institution of the *divi*: how it was appropriated locally for both public and private cults of the emperor and then, crucially, how it was adopted for the representation of private individuals. As a result, 'the differing statue types – for men as well as for the *divi* – crossed the boundaries of the categories for which they were originally devised, *in*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X14002637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both directions: the new gods continued to look like men, and men began to look like these new gods' (p. 221).

This brief summary merely suggests the book's range of topics and richness of analysis. I was particularly struck by K.'s skill in teasing out the inconsistencies, ambiguities and uncertainties that arise after a deceased mortal has been made a god, when visual representations that celebrated the living man continued to exist side by side with those that, post-mortem, honoured the deity. Given the Graeco-Roman tradition of representing the gods in human form, how in fact could one distinguish between a mortal and a mortal-made-god? Yet it seems to me that at the heart of the book there is a key problem that remains unresolved and to some extent unaddressed: what in fact constituted the new 'institution' of divinisation? The first of K.'s 'Four Assumptions' is that 'the new institution of *consecratio* profoundly transformed Roman society' (p. 10); by *consecratio* he seems to mean 'the formal senatorial decree of January 42 that proclaimed Caesar a god' (p. 29), to which he makes repeated reference. In doing so he relies on earlier German scholars, who sketched out in some detail the formal legal procedures (see especially S. Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* [1971], pp. 386–91, building on the work of Wissowa and Mommsen). Despite their confident reconstructions, however, it is not clear how much we know about what was actually involved (much less when it took place; Weinstock does not cite any clear evidence for January 42). An inscription from Aesernia (*CIL* IX.2628 = *ILS* 72) that refers to Caesar as one *quem senatus populusque Romanus in deorum numerum rettulit* seems to indicate a senatorial decree confirmed by popular vote, but what was its content? Presumably not 'Caesar is now a god'; the Senate was not in the business of determining whether a particular entity was or was not a god. Their job was instead to determine which entities would receive public cult. Their decree concerning Divus Julius must thus simply have prescribed some or all of the elements of a public cult. In other words, to talk of the Romans 'making' a deceased ruler a god, as some ancient as well as modern writers do, is simply a loose way of saying that they treated him as such in cult.

K. is too sophisticated a scholar to be unaware of these complexities, and he rightly insists, in the second of his four assumptions, that 'institutions not only require representations, in the conventional sense, but they are themselves representations, and must be so regarded' (p. 11). Nevertheless, there is a recurring assumption throughout that divinisation was primarily a political and religious institution, and that representations in the conventional sense were secondary, attempts to come to terms with a reality already established in another sphere. To take an example more or less at random, he says of a post-Actium coin representing Octavian as a 'bringer of victory' that it 'represents how, as the visual language of the late Republic was transformed under the pressure of changing institutions – institutions both political and religious – the imagery of the monuments required different symbolism that reveals a new significance' (p. 143). Yet as K. himself has indicated, these political and religious institutions are not qualitatively different from the visual representations that, in his analysis, they generate. It thus seems to me that he concedes to them rather too much authority and that as a result, rather surprisingly for an art historian, he does not give full weight to the crucial part played by visual representations in the process of 'making men gods'. The visual representations were not simply a response to the institution of divinisation but were themselves an integral part of that institution, just as much as senatorial decrees and cult practices. If institutions are representations, so too representations are institutions; to see an institution is in fact to know one. This has important implications for K.'s overall argument, since it suggests that the instability in the representation of divine status that he so cogently analyses was a characteristic not merely of its representation, but of the status itself.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X14002637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

K.'s book is a crucial contribution to our understanding of that loose amalgam of practice and imagery that we continue, for the sake of convenience, to label 'imperial cult'. He examines a vitally important element of that amalgam with a degree of subtlety and sophistication that I, at least, have not hitherto encountered. Anyone interested in the problems of divine and human representation in the ancient world or in imperial cult more broadly would be well advised to read this book with care.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill J.B. RIVES
jbrives@email.unc.edu

MONUMENTAL FOUNTAINS

RICHARD (J.) *Water for the City, Fountains for the People. Monumental Fountains in the Roman East. An Archaeological Study of Water Management*. (Studies in Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology 9.) Pp. xvi + 307, ills, maps. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012. Paper. ISBN: 978-2-503-53449-7.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14001929

In this eight-chapter monograph, a revised and translated version of R.'s 2008 doctoral dissertation, he points out that the large-scale fountain has been given relatively short shrift as a research focus (p. 11). In attempting to fill that gap, he argues that these points of public water access should be considered a vital part of the urban hydraulic network, focusing on the extensive remains in the eastern part of the Empire. Assessing the archaeological remains and other scholars' conclusions critically, R. also approaches the material from diachronic and multidisciplinary viewpoints to consider it from a utilitarian point of view (pp. 63–80).

After presenting a 'functional definition' for the Roman monumental fountain (in R.'s preferred terminology, pp. 28–31) he reviews the ancient evidence. In the second chapter, with caveats about previous scholars' typological categorisation in mind, R. gives a chronological summary of public water access points from the Archaic Greek through Roman Imperial periods. While not wanting to let typological categories overpower the archaeological evidence, this summary of types is necessary to understand fully the context of Roman monumental fountains.

R. enters the meat of his study in the third and fourth chapters by analysing the evidence for the functional and chronological relationships between monumental fountains and the larger context of which each was a part, emphasising the supply aqueduct. He then breaks down how the water flowed through the sections of the fountains themselves. R. concludes that most often monumental fountains were added to already extant hydraulic systems rather than being conceived as part of an initial construction phase. This revelation has ramifications for our understanding of the flexibility of these networks. He also suggests that the sequence of fountain and aqueduct building might help to clarify what the archaeological remains cannot by giving a relative chronology to the pieces of the system. R. proceeds to apply a 'systems engineering' (p. 63) methodology, proposing three '[m]odels of spatial affiliation' (pp. 69–71) that attempt to describe the relationship between members of hierarchical distribution systems. R. applies these models diachronically to the preserved evidence in the eastern Empire, as well as considering comparisons with western examples. He concludes that such reasoning is helpful in understanding the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X14002637 Published online by Cambridge University Press