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Roman inscriptions, and others, are usually studied as textual documents that record history. In this traditional approach, specialists in epigraphy literally translate the written text so that it becomes, on its own, the veritable evidence for what it records. Such a reductive function, however, ignores the active aspect of inscriptions as interpretive instruments in forming history. As cultural products, inscriptions have continuous and multiple narratives. Context, different forms of literacy, and memory contribute to the formation of these narratives. The narrative of what we call “history” depends, therefore, not only on who first writes it, but also on the reader. Seen in its role in forming history through the creation of an imperial image, the *Res Gestae* inscription constitutes an extraordinary example. It provides the rare instance of the same inscription found in different locations, all copies of a lost original. Although the intended location is known, our information today comes principally from the copies, all found in Galatia.

The texts of the *Res Gestae* inscriptions and the architectural settings in which they were found have usually been treated separately. While philologists, epigraphists, and historians have worked on problems of verification and textual analysis, archaeologists have concentrated on piecing together the archaeological record, with little interaction between the two groups. However, it is precisely through the overlay of the two types of evidence that a narrative text may be formed to understand better Augustan policies and their impact. Despite copious research on the *Res Gestae*, highlighting its architectonic and contextual character remains a desideratum. What regulates the text of the *Res Gestae* as a master narrative, however, is precisely its monumental character interpreted through changing audiences and different settings. Considering all of these helps explain both the wish of Augustus to have the inscription put in place posthumously and the nature of the connection between Galatia and Rome.

**A Monumental Text**

What is the *Res Gestae*, or more properly, the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*? We learn from Suetonius (*Augustus* 101.4) that in the most literal sense, it is basically a catalogue of the achievements of the Divine Augustus. Looking at it another way, we could say that it starts off as an altruistic record of the first Roman emperor and his performance designed by a “memory entrepreneur,” to use a term coined by James Young. Following the last injunction of the emperor, who died on 19 August A.D. 14, the list was to be inscribed on bronze tablets and installed before his mausoleum in Rome. Although the original inscription is lost, the purpose and the intended location are explicitly stated in introduction to a copy in Ankara: “A copy is set out below of ‘The Achievements of the Divine Augustus, by which he brought the world under the empire of the Roman people, and of the expenses which he bore for the state and people of Rome’; the original is engraved on two bronze pillars set up at Rome.”

Composed entirely in the first person, it presented the life of Augustus the way he wished to be remembered. Neither a perfunctory oratory nor a brazen show of power, the inscription was intended to ensure the continuity of empire spawned and nurtured by Augustus. This purpose explains the design of the *Res Gestae* as a posthumous project by its author. Ironically, today the inscription is known only from the surviving copies of it, not in Rome but all in Galatia, a distant province of the Roman Empire in the highlands of Anatolia. As a result, and partly because of this, the *Res Gestae* inscription serves a function beyond that of the written word with extraordinary power and lucidity. It becomes a textual monument in the service of imperial ideology. The potency of the content stems precisely from monumental context, and the inscription loses much of its meaning when read simply as a written text.

**Augustus and the Res Gestae**

Closer examination of the *Res Gestae* inscription reveals an appeal to the hearts and minds of the Roman people. It is a representation of contemporary history through the eyes of Augustus. In thirty-five paragraphs, the creation of an empire and a golden age, *saeculum aureum*, under his rule unfolds before our eyes like a historical film. It opens and closes with Augustus’s words, beginning, “At the age of nineteen on my own responsibility and at my own expense I raised an army..."
and ending, "At the time of writing, I am in my seventy-sixth year." Momentous occasions, such as those when Augustus became Pontifex Maximus in 12 B.C. at the age of fifty and Pater Patriae (Father of the Country) a decade later, blend with a wide spectrum of other accomplishments, including distributions of grain and money, a lengthy list of entertainments for the people of Rome, extensive building programs, army reforms, artistic patronage, campaigns at home and abroad, all forcefully and vividly recounted.

Perhaps the greatest pride of Augustus may be detected in his achievement of universal peace and the honors bestowed on him by the decree of the Roman people. In paragraph 13, he declares:

It was the will of our ancestors that the gateway of Janus Quirinus should be shut when victories had secured peace by land and sea throughout the whole empire of the Roman people; from the foundation of the city down to my birth, tradition records that it was shut only twice, but while I was the leading citizen the senate resolved that it should be shut on three occasions.

And in paragraph 34, the tone of well-earned satisfaction is clear:

For this service of mine I was named Augustus by decree of the senate, and the door-posts of my house were publicly wreathed with bay leaves and a civic crown was fixed over my door and a golden shield was set in the Curia Julia, which as attested by the inscription thereon, was given me by the senate and people of Rome on account of my courage, clemency, justice and piety.

All in the Res Gestae is made to appear lucid, simple, and beyond question. But is it? For Augustus it really does not matter. Indeed there is no mention of problems with the settlement of restless veterans (Suetonius, Augustus 13; Vergil, Eclogues 9.28), or some less than glorious incidents involving Augustus (then Octavian) and Antony. Although there seems to be no deliberate falsification of major events, there are calculated omissions in favor of Augustus. As Heinrich Wolfflin wrote, "We only see what we look for, but what we look for is what can be seen." Hence, without sacrificing historical veracity, careful construction served to highlight the desired picture of the Augustan era. After all, the Res Gestae was but an instrument of memory intended for universal presentation. However, it should be conceded that after the tumultuous years of civil strife, Romans enjoyed forty-five years of continuous peace and security under Augustus, enough to establish a general feeling of optimism that was well articulated by contemporary sources (Suetonius, Augustus 100).

Evidence for the placement of the inscription before the mausoleum of Augustus in Rome is spotty. All we know from Suetonius (Augustus 101) is that it was the wish of the emperor. On the other hand, while Strabo (Geography 5.3.8) gives a detailed architectural description of the monument, he does not mention the Res Gestae or its placement before the mausoleum. Whether the inscription was there or not, however, is less relevant than knowing where Augustus himself wanted it to be. Interestingly, his choice was not the site of other renowned and patriotically charged buildings of his reign like the monument of the Ara Pacis (Altar of Peace) or the Temple of Mars Ultor (Mars the Avenger). Instead, Augustus deliberately chose an architectural context that had solely personal yet grandiose and dynastic associations. The unprecedented scale of the monument and its name, Mausoleion (Strabo, Geography 5.3.8), evoked the power and self-aggrandizement of Hellenistic monarchs. Although Augustus eschewed official power of this nature, the connotations of personal glorification with a touch of victory would have been hard to miss, and inappropriate for display elsewhere in Rome.

Another century had to pass before Roman imperial power
was so consolidated that Trajan’s ashes and those of his wife, Plotina, would be placed in the grandest of all Roman fora, surmounted with a towering column of victory. Nevertheless, with the display of the *Res Gestae* before the Mausoleum, the distinction between history and personal achievement was obliterated, resulting in a fusion of public and private memory with the kind of reading that Augustus wished to engineer.

**Roman Galatia and the *Res Gestae***

Our sources for the content of the *Res Gestae* inscription all come from the Roman province of Galatia in Asia Minor, as said earlier. The Temple of Rome and Augustus (hereafter the Temple of Augustus) in Ankara has a Latin copy together with a Greek version. There is a Latin copy in Antioch in Pisidia (modern Yalvaç) and a Greek one in Apollonia (modern Uluborlu), both near Ankara. Although provincial towns in Italy like Arezzo and Pompeii could and did copy inscriptions from Rome with little change in meaning, the message generated by the *Res Gestae* inscription, regardless of the language used, was very different in the remote highlands of Anatolia destined for Romanization. Far from the bustling western and southern coastlands of Asia Minor, these areas had not even become Hellenized. Thus it hardly comes as a surprise that no *Res Gestae* inscriptions are known to have survived in the more established metropolitan centers such as Ephesus or Pergamum.

After the defeat of Antony at Actium in 31 B.C., the Greek world began to acknowledge the supremacy of Roman rule. In implementing his *Ostpolitik*, Augustus recognized the need for an economically and politically stable Asia Minor. Galatia, however, was a land sharply divided among mountain, plain, marsh, and salt desert, with a demographic profile no less varied. From Strabo (*Geography* 12.4.4) we learn that the heterogeneous population included Paphlagonians, Galatians, Phrygians, Lycaonians, Isaurians, and Pisidians, in addition to Roman colonists, Hellenistic military foundations, and foreign settlers. Securing the loyalty of peoples so diverse culturally, linguistically, and racially was a titanically ambitious undertaking. Brute force alone would not do. Deference to civic temperature had to be maintained to cobble together a peace. One way of obtaining local cooperation was granting requests for honoring the emperor within the framework of an imperial cult. As Romans gained greater and more permanent control, they began to manipulate permission to express loyalty to the emperor as a political reward. Temples to Rome and Augustus and the *Res Gestae* inscriptions associated with them are a result of this ideological premise. All evidence
concerning emperor worship as an institution indicates that the imperial cult was established in Galatia soon after annexation to the Roman Empire in 25 B.C. Following fashion, the small Galatian cities of Ankara, Antioch in Pisidia, and Apollonia, which had little in common otherwise, became ideologically linked, no matter how tenuously, because each was endowed with a temple of the imperial cult and a copy of the same Res Gestae inscription.

About Apollonia we know little; the Greek version of the Res Gestae there was carved on a monumental base carrying the statues of Augustus; his wife, Livia; his successor, Tiberius; Germanicus; and Drusus.26 But Antioch in Pisidia, having received ius italicum and become a colonia of Latin residents, was a simulacrum of Rome, likewise boasting seven hills.27 No effort was made to soften the forceful image of Rome as victor. On the contrary, the new urban image became a bold and striking means of affirming Roman presence in mountainous terrain far from Rome. In the impressive urban ensemble that was created, the centerpiece was the triumphal arch exhibiting vanquished Pisidian prisoners with hands tied at the back and surrounded by military paraphernalia.28 Unabashedly laudatory, the triple arch was ostentatiously set in a monumental paved plaza—the Platea Augusta—of gleaming marble. It was somewhere in this locality that the Latin copy of the Res Gestae

FIGURE 5: Temple of Augustus, Ankara, location of the Res Gestae in the pronaos
was installed. Beyond it rose the Temple of Augustus in full majesty; it was set frontally on a high podium in the Roman manner and framed by a symmetrical curved colonnade of two stories in the Corinthian order, also in the most “modern” architectural vocabulary (Figures 1, 2). No other “text” could proclaim with such force the central position that emperor worship held in city life and the urban landscape. The canonical conception of Rome as caput mundi was transmitted through this visual rhetoric both for the present and the future, while the Res Gestae inscription became a mouthpiece for history in Antioch.

In Ankara, on the other hand, the ideological function of the Res Gestae inscription was multilayered and more sophisticated. The earliest modern description of it was provided by Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, ambassador of the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I to Süleyman the Magnificent in 1554–1562 and a prolific correspondent. In one of his letters he recounted:

At Angora we saw a very fine inscription, a copy of the tablets upon which Augustus drew-up a succinct account of his public acts. I had it copied out by my people as far as it was legible. It is graven on the marble walls of a building, which was probably the ancient residence of the governor, now ruined and roofless. One half of it is upon the right hand as one enters, the other on the left. The upper paragraphs are almost intact; in the middle difficulties begin owing to the gaps; the lowest portion has been so mutilated by blows of clubs and axes as to be illegible. This is a serious loss to literature and much to be deplored by the learned, especially as it is generally agreed that the city was consecrated to Augustus as a common gift from the province of Asia.

Hans Dernschwam, who traveled with Busbecq, provided the earliest graphic, and, more important, contextual record of the temple and its inscription (Figure 3). Although the temple and its interior are mistaken for the theater, the location of the inscription is clearly indicated on the confused sketch with inconsistent perspective, which may have been drawn from memory.

Since its mid-sixteenth-century identification by Busbecq, the Res Gestae inscription has remained in situ on the walls of the temple of Augustus in the citadel district of Ulus in modern Ankara. Based on what he could see, and, like Richard Pococke and M. Piton de Tournefort, who visited Ankara in the early eighteenth century (Figure 4), Busbecq, not surprisingly, did not think that the building carrying the inscription was a temple. By then, the peristyle had all but disappeared; the opisthodomus was extended and built over after the removal of the back wall; and on the southeast the stone wall of the cela had been cut through by three latticed windows when the temple was converted into a three-aisled congregational basilica after Theodosius prohibited pagan worship in the Byzantine era (Figures 5, 6). Abutting the north wall at an angle was the Haci Bayram mosque (Figures 7, 8) of the fifteenth century, which stands today. The identity of the structure as a temple, and one dedicated to Rome and Augustus, is, however, not in question. During the three hundred years after Busbecq’s visit, the temple and its inscription continued to attract attention, resulting in the first small-scale German excavation in 1926. This was followed by excavations of the Turkish Historical Society more than a decade later when the houses obscuring the temple were cleared. Efforts are now under way to protect and preserve the temple as part of a recently renovated urban plaza in the historical Ulus district of Ankara.

The Ankara inscription, also known as the Monumentum Ancyranum, was copied in the 1700s and subsequently studied and published by the German historian Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903), who regarded the text as the “Queen of Inscriptions.” The inscription consists of a Latin text with a Greek paraphrase of it, both carved on the walls of the same temple (Figure 9). Although the Latin and Greek texts are effaced in some parts, they have been reliably restored from the two other copies, in Greek and Latin respectively, in Apollonia and Antioch in Pisidia.

Less blatant than the scheme at Antioch in Pisidia, perhaps, that at Ankara was no less ambitious. There, past merged with present, in contrast to the overwhelming contemporary emphasis seen in Antioch. The chief city of the koinon of Galatia and free of a colonial stigma, Ankara was already a melting pot of Celts, Greeks, and Romans. In the Temple of Augustus, the bilingual version of the Res Gestae was presumably used to address the mixed population equally. While the Latin version of the inscription was inscribed on the inner anta walls on both sides of the entrance, the Greek one occupied the full exterior length of the south cela wall for all to see. Today the Ionic peristyle of the temple is not extant, giving a more exposed view of the inscription, whereas the ancient beholder would
FIGURE 7: Temple of Augustus, Ankara, frontal view with minaret of Hacı Bayram mosque, 1830s. Note dedicatory inscription on left anta wall. From Charles Texier, Description de l’Asie Mineure (1839).
have had a more intimate and spatially defined experience of it (Figures 10, 11). Nevertheless, in a memory-oriented society, all the “books” necessary to “read” the imperial narrative of the temple as well as its meaning were thus provided. Consciously or unconsciously, it was left for the beholder to comprehend, internalize, and remember it.

But why was an anachronistic design in the tradition of the past two hundred years preferred as the showcase of the imperial cult, rather than the elevated frontal design that was the vogue in Rome? The pseudodipteral design with a deep opisthodomus (Figure 12) is so reminiscent of Hermogenean work that the temple was, in fact, dated to the second century B.C. at one time. Although it is now more generally accepted that the temple was constructed shortly after Galatia’s annexation in 25 B.C., it is certain that originally it was not intended to receive the Res Gestae inscription, which was “added” later, as the details in the joints of the masonry blocks show. Then to whom was the temple dedicated? If the interpretation of recently discovered evidence is correct, the temple appears to have been dedicated to Meter Theon, the mother goddess of Anatolia. Then it follows that rather than going ahead with a brand-new construction, the existing temple was deliberately chosen to fuse the Augustan Ostpolitik with the authority of the oldest myth in Anatolia. This is all the more significant since it
is well known how the earliest Latin authors sought to reconcile the myth of Troy and the foundation myth of Rome by creating a legitimate lineage for Romulus, the eponymous founder of Rome, and Aeneas, the Greek hero who had escaped from Troy. It should also be pointed out that both Caesar and Augustus appropriated the pedigree to propagate the divine ancestry of the Julian family as descending from Aeneas, the so-called progenitor of the Roman race, and his mother, Venus.43

Hence by associating the cult of Meter Theon with that of Rome and Augustus a sense of shared patrimony was fostered (Figure 13).44 Moreover, by bringing the myth into the present and blending it with the worship of Roma and Augustus through the physical setting of the temple and the Res Gestae inscription, the plurality of memory, with layers of meaning addressing different audiences, could be manipulated—which was a convenient framework for all.

ARCHITECTURE, LITERACY, AND MEMORY
When he was fourteen, Frank Lloyd Wright was struck by the cogency of a prophecy Victor Hugo made in his novel The Hunchback of Notre Dame. The great novelist was convinced that architecture, until then deemed the “great universal writing of humanity,” would be superseded by the “new writing of humanity,” namely, the printed book. More precisely, printing would, according to Hugo, eventually “kill” architecture.45 The fatal confrontation Hugo envisaged has to be understood from the viewpoint of an age when “text” had a wider meaning. Today texts are usually contained in books. Before the age of printing, however, the distinction between “book” and “text” still existed.46 The total number of books in existence was extremely small, which also meant limited circulation for the ones that were available. Rather than being the primary repository for information, books then had the more restricted function of assisting memory. Hence, in contrast to our times, heightened skills of memoria acquired through training were
highly coveted. In Roman culture as well, memory was one of the basic means of communication from one generation to the next. If we bear in mind that by the first century A.D., approximately fifteen percent of Romans could be considered to be literate in our sense of the term, the importance of this mode of transmission becomes clear.

Recent studies and ancient opinion concur on the primacy of the sense of sight in memorial storage, or put differently, the act of remembering. This is largely due to its spatial rather than temporal character. In fact, in the ancient world the process of remembering words, ideas, or objects was actually a visual one. Latin rhetorical authors underscore how training the memory depended heavily on formulating mnemonic images of art and architecture and imagining these in tandem with what was to be remembered. Accordingly, images of various kinds, particularly architecture, were widely “read” as “texts” by large segments of the population. Thus, in a society bestowing a high premium as an accomplishment on the art of memory, the placement of the Res Gestae inscription in at least two temples connected with the imperial cult in Asia Minor and in a funerary context in Rome, more specifically, a mausoleum, gave its message an extraordinary chance of dissemination both synchronically and diachronically.

When the German architect Paul Bonatz went to work in Turkey after the late 1930s, he visited the temple of Augustus in Ankara, where he found the Res Gestae nearly intact. Far from Rome both temporally and spatially and stripped of its funereal setting, the copy possessed an evocative power which led him to remark that it was an exquisite work of propaganda from which even Goebbels could profit. After nearly 2,000
years, the psychological effectiveness and the visual transparency of Augustus’s message was such that it could not only still be “read” for what it was, but also had enough relevance to the twentieth century to serve propagandistic ends. In fact, in 1938, Mussolini had a copy of the Res Gestae installed in modern Rome, in the restored Ara Pacis, as an instrument for his own imperial vision.53

The persuasive and timeless aspect of inscriptions in architectural settings is similarly utilized today. The celebrated address, given in 1927, of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of the modern Republic of Turkey, is a call to national duty engraved in the memory of every Turk of a certain age.54 In spite of the almost unlimited availability of the speech in printed form, parts of it are inscribed in stone in at least two places in Ankara, including the Ministry of Education and the campus of Middle East Technical University (Figures 14, 15).

Like the words of Augustus, the words of Atatürk are given a more enduring reading, made richer with layers of meaning, through placement in architectonic settings.

If the inscription on the walls of a ruined, roofless temple can be so instrumentally transmitted in our century, it should be asked how the Roman beholder, whether in Rome or Galatia, for whom the message was presumably intended, would react. With no newspapers, radio, or television, not even electricity, his life was confined to the daylight hours and revolved around the home, the baths, and the public center of town, where the temple dominated physically with its monumentality.55 Regardless of whether he was literate in our sense or not, he would daily, in Victor Hugo’s sense, have “read” the temple and its
message. Whenever he passed by the temple or visited it on special occasions, the quotidian presence of the monumental building with its inscribed walls would be elevated to something larger than itself through the mingling of abstract and concrete reality. In this way, the beholder was every day brought into contact with the larger reality of the empire of which he was a part, and was linked with its founder, whom he had probably never seen and had little prospect of ever seeing.

To conclude, the Res Gestae was not a static record chiseled in stone to serve recollection. Regardless of the beholder’s degree of verbal literacy, it touched the senses by its architectural design, which gave the narrative persuasive direction. Inscribed words and the architecture on which they were inscribed operated as one visual code in the generation of the desired narrative. Very different architectural contexts in Rome and Galatia monumentalized the written word through representation and organized the perception of the Res Gestae in a visual and spatial manner. As a form of mapping for organizing memory, this was hardly alien to Romans, who valued skills of memoria and trained themselves to “remember” ideas by locating them in space. By means of “visually written” narrative, the desired literacy of all subjects of the empire, the elite and the masses, living in Rome and in far-flung Galatia, could be achieved. These culturally heterogeneous and geographically distant audiences were deftly guided to become related through the common bond of an imperial vision personified by the quintessential emperor, Augustus, and his lofty ideals, a vision made universal through the Res Gestae.
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