Dio Cassius’ anachronisms are well-known (Swan 1987, Millar 1964), but this paper argues that his descriptions of the Pantheon and its statuary (53.27.2-3 and 54.1.1) use specific language and imagery to report the Agrippan monument to his third-century readers. This argument seeks to prove two points: that Dio’s language clarifies his layout of the statues, and that the named gods mark the Agrippan version of the temple.

A word-study of ἀγαλμα, ἀνδρίας, and εἰκών follows the design of Estienne’s (2010) analysis of Latin words for statuary: 60% of Dio’s applications of ἀγαλμα refer to divine statues, with 23% describing imperial (mostly divi), but never regular mortals; 54% of uses of ἀνδρίας refer to imperial statues and 34% to mortals, but never singularly uses for divine; εἰκών is the most common, with 50% of uses describing imperial statues, 40% percent to mortals, and less than 1% percent are divine.

These data show that Dio never applies certain words for specific types of statues, and context reveals more about overlapping and uncertain images. For example, he never utilizes ἀνδρίας for the divine, but the context of Dio’s five uncertain uses of the plural ἀνδριάντες indicates groups of statues, which included gods, emperors, and men (37.9.1, 54.1.1, 60.6.8, 74.5.3, 74.12.5). Dio then applies the plural broadly as a collective term, where the context of the grouping would elucidate his meaning.

In the Pantheon, Dio presents all three types of images sharing the temple (53.27.2-3). The locations and combinations of these statues has confused many scholars; some believe Augustus and Agrippa’s ἀνδριάντες in the pronaos were isolated from the temple’s sacred space (Fishwick 1992; Price 1984), and others that they were something between honorific and cult
statues (La Rocca 2015; Stewart 2003). The author’s use of the plural and the passage itself, however, explains the layout. Dio states that Agrippa originally intended Augustus’ image to be a cult statue, so its relocation from the *cella* to the *pronaos* alone would not have made his ἄνδρίας honorific; the *pronaos* was the proper place for the statue of a not-yet deified emperor, since it was still set in sacred space yet separated from the official gods (Derks 1998). Moreover, ἄνδριάντες refers to both Agrippa’s and Augustus’ statues, that of a man and an emperor. This plural-grouping is repeated in Dio’s second mention of the Pantheon at 54.1.1, when in 22 BCE lightning struck the ἄνδριάντες in the temple. Dio does not limit the damage to only the statues in the *pronaos*, but instead uses the plural for all of the statuary, which included gods, an emperor, and a man.

The final section of this paper argues for an Agrippan rather than Hadrianic version of the Pantheon based on the gods named. At 53.27.2-3, the only gods in the *cella* are Mars, Venus, and *Divus* Julius. Thomas (2017) believes this confirms Dio’s thorough research; he only listed the gods he knew were present in Agrippa’s temple. Contrary to Thomas, I believe Dio specifically named these statues because they played a prominent role in Augustan Rome and the cult of *Divus* Julius. Stamper (2005) comes close to this conclusion, but does not link the themes to Dio’s effort for exactitude. The fact that these are the only mentioned statuary marks the temple as the Agrippan iteration. A mortal Agrippa and not-yet divine Augustus stand at the threshold of divinity, and the gods of the *gens Iulia* await them inside.
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