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AUGUSTUS AND THE EVOLUTION OF ROMAN CONCEPTS OF LEADERSHIP

Tom Hillard

The competitive ethos of the Roman nobility

"Ego — is not a Dirty Word", sang the Skyhooks in 1975. Indeed, it’s not. In fact, it’s a Latin one. And as much as the Romans may have buried the word within their inflected verbs, Latin speakers were not thereby expected to hide their light under a bushel. Light was sought. It was claritas, or renown. This was only a slightly more rhetorical form of nobilitas. Roman princes sought fame, and to get to the top. Self-advertisement and the proclamation of achievement were essential tools in the armoury. Students are often struck by the superabundance of first-person pronouns in the English translations of Augustus’ Res Gestae (there is no way around that in English), but they come to see that there is nothing unusual in it (except its length [?])—and, of course, the extraordinary achievement of Augustus. The inscription is simply a climax of the Roman Republic’s eulogistic tradition.7

---

1 Much of this paper was delivered at a conference on Velutius Patersculus at the University of Leicester in 2009. I wish to thank the other participants both for comments and for three exciting days of intellectual stimulation, and Lea Bienen for the attention she has subsequently given to my thoughts and to the submitted manuscript. I would also like to pay tribute, Margaret, to Edwin Judge who was critical of this line of thought when I first voiced it some decades ago in a postgraduate presentation. I remain fundamentally in his debt. It was with unalloyed joy that I saw the publication of many of his earlier papers in Jim Hamilton’s collection E. A. Judge: The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustine and New Testament Essays (Tübingen 2008) after I had returned from the Velutius conference, and I am delighted to be able to incorporate references to so much previously unpublished (or virtually inaccessible) work here. I know that you were as excited as was I, Margaret, at the appearance of the book. It has allowed us to relive ‘old times’.

Since the delivery of this paper, Cooley’s excellent new commentary on the Res Gestae (Res Gestae Divi Augustae: Text, Translation and Commentary [Cambridge 2009]) has appeared. A copy came into my hands only after this chapter was in proof, and whilst I have taken the opportunity to add references to Cooley’s observations at various places, this has not been effected systematically.

2 This is dealt with in the earlier article on Marius and Sulla (in the foregoing issue of Ancient History, Resources for Teachers).

But something had happened on the way to Rome’s ‘imperial’ period. Augustus was a master of self-advertisement and wanted to be celebrated for his successes, but claimed not to have wanted much of the power that others saw him as possessing. The classic statement of this, of course, is the one that comes almost at the very end of the Res Gestae, just before his proud concluding memory that he had been formally hailed in 2 BC (“in my thirteenth consulship”), by the Senate, the Equestrian Order and the People, Father of the Fatherland (pater patriae).1

After this time (“my sixth and seventh consulships”; i.e., 28 and 27 BC), I excelled all in auctoritas, though I had no more potestas than did the others who shared with me various magistracies. (RG 34.3)

With that reference to auctoritas, Augustus alluded to a form of moral authority based upon his ‘station’ as acknowledged by the community. Though this is an often-quoted passage, we must never be dulled by its familiarity to the point where we fail to recognize how remarkable a formulation it was. It was a claim to superiority that led quite naturally to the next (and climactic) item: the acclamation of him as Father. It was a claim not based on the tenure of any competitively won magistracies with their inbuilt powers; it was not a statement of pride in the accumulation of honors, the usual goal of Rome’s political elite—though the Res Gestae certainly did not ignore these (see, by way of example, RG 4 and 7). The latter are simply superseded. Here Augustus is explicitly rejecting the notion of his potestas, and asserts only an influence that comes with high standing whether in the wider community or family, an influence stemming from the fact that others would not question that authority.4 This would be a
desideratum of most, but the competition between members of the office-seeking political elite was such that it entailed, as noted above, the accumulation of posts that they called honors. It is well known that their ‘race’ to the top was the cursus honorum, not a cursus officiorum (by which word, i.e., office, the Romans have understood duties). The application of the word cursus to a career of service would have seemed nonsensical.

The honors were awarded by Rome’s People which automatically made the holders greater than others. This is implicit in the very word magistrare, as opposed to minister. Winning meant defeating others (electorally) and accumulating the greatest number of honors (and other trappings of success).

Most will agree with the observation that Augustus was a master of what shall we call it? Spin? There will be disagreement as to the integrity of his claims. I prefer to follow the teachings of Edwin Judge that Augustus was so much in control of language that he could bend its specificity to say precisely what he wanted to say and to say what could not be gainsaid. Others, as I have acknowledged, will disagree; and it will have to remain a matter of judgement and opinion.2 But it is the shift in tone that I want to explore in this paper. Augustus disclaims power.


We know how affected by this honor Augustus was. Suetonius (Aug. 55) tells us that he shed tears. The inclusion here of reference to the Ordo Equester shows how keen Augustus was to underline the universal nature of the acclamation. In the fasti Praenestini (the calendrical lists which register the events, meetings celebration in the Augustan period, we find that February 22nd was a holiday by sacred resolution because on that day [in 2 BC], Augustus had been acclimased Pater by the Senate and People. This probably reflects the official formulation.

Alison Cooley, Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation and Commentary (Cambridge 2009) 274, also draws attention to this ‘striking modification of the traditional phrase’, suggesting that it reflects the increasing importance of the equestrian order under Augustus.

In The Anatomy of Power (Boston 1983), John Kenneth Galbraith discerns three major ways in which an individual or party might effect his, her or its will. The first is by force (or threat of force) (this, Galbraith defines as “condign power”), the second by the offer of compensation or reward, and the third is by the kind of authority with which we are dealing here. This, he defines as “conditioned power”. “Conditioned power, in contrast [to condign and compensatory power], is exercised by changing belief, persuasion, education, or the social commitment to what seems natural, proper, or right causes the individual to submit to the will of another or of others. The submission reflects the preferred course; the fact of submission is not recognized.” I can see ways in which this tripartite definition might be augmented and nuanced, but it serves here to clarify the point being made above in the text.

See, for example, the recent work of our friend Ron Ridley, over the sharp critics of those who abuse power. The Emperor’s Retrospect: Augustus’ Res gestae in Epigraphy, Historiography and Commentary (Leuven 2003). The book is dedicated to Edwin Judge, but Ridley choose to take a fundamentally different line of interpretation. The tradition remains strong at the University of Melbourne. He has been succeeded by Dr Frederik Verweij who remains fundamentally suspicious of Augustus; cf. the recent publication (offering the proceedings of a stimulating symposium at that university), Andrew J. Turner, James H. Kim On Chong-Goosand and Frederik Julian Verweij (eds), Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Deception and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World (Impact of Empire series 11, Leiden 2010), a book which sports the image of a veiled Augustus on the front cover. Frederik provides his own unambiguous chapter to that collection; “Arrogating despotic power through deceit: the Pompeian model for Augustus desumulatus” (133–166). Perhaps we can go so far as to agree with John Rich in his contribution to the same volume (“Deception, lies, and economy with the truth: Augustus and the establishment of the principate”) that Augustus was indeed “eccentric with the truth”. Actually, Rich goes further: at one point at least Augustus crosses the line. He is willing to talk of Augustus’ “strategies of deception”.

1
The obsession amongst scions of the Roman nobility with unprecedented achievement and self-advancement is well known, and I have elaborated on it in a forthcoming paper. They wanted to ‘equal the deeds of their fathers’, to ‘surpass the exploits of their ancestors’, to be the first or the only individual to have done something and to outstrip the records set by others. It was an obsession that underlay the success of Rome’s imperial Republic, but it would also have dire consequences for the Republic’s political survival. They sought, in fact, principatus: the recognition of being Rome’s First Man. I am obviously not saying that a sense of officium was absent from the discourse of public life; and I am not denying commitments to ideology. But I am saying that Scipio Aemilianus, and possibly Cicero, would have found nothing shocking in the motto of our University’s first Chancellor. In 1970, when the latter attained the honour of Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St Michael and St George, along with the mantle of saxon-blue satín and scarlet silk lining—and the gold and enamel collar of the Order (to be returned to the sovereign upon death), he was entitled to a Coat of Arms. He chose as its motto ‘Strive with Courage to Achieve’, leaving a bemused biographer, to ask ‘Strive with Courage to Achieve What?’ How many Roman nobles would have felt constrained to fill in the gap?6


8 D. Marr, Barwick (Sydney, London and Boston 1980), 226. 

9 G.S. Sumi, Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire (Ann Arbor 2003) 3: ‘A Roman aristocrat’s principal objective in his career was to acquire political power and prestige (aggravatus), wealth and status, and to bequeath as much as possible to his descendants. For a Roman aristocrat, the surest path to public distinction was service to the state.’ For the Roman political elite, a life of struggle in the public domain was service to the state. A debate as to what constituted the best form of service was unnecessary. An explosion of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ ambition belongs to the new era.


11 The princes in waiting were aedil for glory. The metaphor which sprang to mind was that of hunting dogs, hungry for the kill.10 They would achieve by damaging others. They were Homeric (and from the period that Rome had embraced Greece so aggressively, the members of the Roman nobility, some of them, at least, knew their Homer). Scipio Aemilianus thought of Homer’s lines instructively; we have specific instances.11 But what was the more general and more profound message that Roman elite youth took from the pages of Greek epic? Was it the image of desolation that more sensitive modern scholars see in the work? I do not think so.12 Was it not rather the sheer joy which the bristling face of war brought back to the swelling breasts of the courageous? This was an elation accompanied by a recognition that now was the time to swallow hard and accept one’s allotted fate, ensuring through one’s individual action that one’s name survived. I am thinking, in particular, of Sarpedon’s exhortation to his cousin Glaukous at Iliad 11.310–28:

‘Why are we two honoured above other men in Lycia... Why do all men look up to us as gods?’

A review of material benefits follows: food, wine, land and status.

‘Because of these honours we must always be to the fore... in the heat of battle; the Lycians will say ‘Our kings who rule over Lycia enjoy the best meat and wine, but they are indeed glorious and mighty, for they fight in the forefront of the Lycians.’’

Then, an arresting admission:

‘My friend, if a safe escape from this war meant that we should be for ever ageless and immortal, I would not fight in the front line myself nor urge you into the battle where men win glory. But, as it is, death awaits in a thousand forms, no mortal can escape it.’

12 This is not to say that a Roman reading of the Iliad was unreflective. In one of those instances cited above (Polyb. 38.21) we see that Scipio Aemilianus contemplated the passing nature of a civilization’s præmōn (the mortality of human affairs) and was deeply moved by the thought, even whilst exalting over the utter destruction, under his command, of Carthage. The answer was to win lasting fame.
The nub (for Sarpidon):

"Let us go forward then—and either bring glory on some other man or win it ourselves."

It is a zero sum game; Sarpidon, of course, gets killed that day.

The reluctance of Augustus

Contrast the attitude above with Augustus’ professed reluctance to embrace power. He wanted his contemporary public and posterity to believe that he desired neither the trappings of power nor any unnecessary (but real) power of which those trappings were the manifestation. Regard the events of 23 and 22 BC, when Augustus’ nebulous position developed dramatically during a period of crisis. In 23, there was a serious corn shortage in Rome. Augustus stepped in, issuing corn at his own expense. He records this amongst his many benefactions at Res Gestae 15.1.

... in my eleventh consulship I bought grain with my own money and distributed twelve rations apiece ... These distributions of mine never reached less than 250,000 individuals.

The respite provided was temporary, and another shortage occurred into 22 (aggravated by a serious flooding of the Tiber and by widespread disease), and the panic-stricken populace attributed this to Augustus having laid down the consulship. Popular agitation led to the dictatorship being offered to him.

The following year, in which Marcus Marcellus and Lucius Arminius were consuls, the city was again submerged by the overflowing of the river and many objects were struck by thunderbolts ... The pestilence raged throughout all Italy so that no one tilled the land, and I suppose that the same was the case in foreign parts. The Romans, therefore, reduced to dire straits by the disease and the consequent famine, believed that these woes had come upon them for no other reason than that they did not have Augustus for consul at this time also. They accordingly wished to elect him dictator, and shutting the senators up in their meeting place, they forced them to vote this measure by threatening to burn down the building over their heads. Next they took the twenty-four rods [sc. the fasces] and approached Augustus, begging him to


14 For a fuller discussion of the events, and for Augustus’ depiction of his actions, see Cooley (n. 3) 127–130.
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He is talking, in effect, about control of the whole Mediterranean. Dio gives the game away. The post was similar to the overdrawing commission given to Pompey in 57 BC. Back then, such a commission had been highly controversial (and I shall elaborate below). Times had changed. But for Augustus it was all a matter of him being willing to take up a burden.

The reluctant Aeneas

The ideology of service—and something much more, reluctance—was embedded in 'Augustan' projections. The poet Virgil’s portrait of the archetypal Aeneas is central. The survivor of Troy’s fall is, famously, the Roman hero recast. The extent to which Virgil who, it would seem, wrote the epic *Aeneid* at Augustus’ behest, wrote with Augustus looking over his shoulder and was (accommodatingly?) cognizant of that pressure throughout is a matter for debate, but the ‘relevance’ of Aeneas was not in doubt for ancient readers, critics and commentators. Readers were meant to contemplate Aeneas’ attitudes to heroism, leadership and duty (and they were meant to think about Augustus). Virgil’s Aeneas does not attack life with enthusiasm, and he is not avid for glory. He cannot die heroically; he has to live. He is, above all, burdened. He is not, like an Homeric hero, ‘head and shoulders above his fellows’—because he has someone on his shoulders.

17 Suetonius’ *Life of Virgil* (a work found in Tiberius Claudius Donatus’ commentary on Virgil, and often assigned by modern scholars to Suetonius) reports that the epic was a mirror to both epics of Homer, but “contained at the same time an account of the origin of the city of Rome [very obliquely I might add] and of Augustus, which was the poet’s special aim.” (11, transl. J.C. Rolfe). Donatus, in the preface to his commentary on the *Aeneid* Book 1, wrote that Aeneas had to be depicted in such a way that showed him as “a worthy first ancestor of Augustus, to whom others were a poem written.” The fourth-century Maurus Servius Honorus in the introduction to his commentary on the *Aeneid* asserts that one of Virgil’s intentions was “to praise Augustus by means of his ancestors.” On all this, see the still useful paper by R.D. Williams, ‘The Purpose of the *Aeneid*,’ *Antichthon* 1 (1967) 29–41 (both far these references and for a more nuanced interpretation of the poet’s craft). Suetonius’ *Life* (31) reports that Augustus, on campaign in Spain, sent Virgil “requests” “in either entreatry or even ‘poetically’ threatening letters” (subplicibus atque crismi minacibus per oiam litteras) for ‘something’ from the poem. The ancient commentators pointed (sometimes quite adventurously) to a number places in the epic where the reader was meant to think of Augustus (see, e.g., Servius commenting on *Aeneid* 1.292 and 5.556; cf. Jasper Griffin, ‘The Creation of Characters in the *Aeneid*,’ in Barbara Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin 1982) 118–134—again, suggesting a far more nuanced view of Virgil’s intentions, but allowing the unmistakable messages aimed at contemporary audiences. Griffin quotes Syme (with approval): “The poem is not an allegory, but no contemporary could fail to detect in Aeneas a foreshadowing of Augustus.” (Roman Revolution (Oxford 1939) 463) As Griffin rightly insists, this observation should not be pursued in any simplistic and reductionist passion, but the foreshadowing permeates a reading of the *Aeneid.*

Teachers will be familiar with the traditional iconography of Aeneas carrying his aged father out of Troy. The depiction of Aeneas and his ‘precious burden’ is an old one, going back (at least) to the sixth century—and it is Greek. We see him carrying his father on black figure vases. But few would deny that Virgil makes Aeneas over. This hardly needs to be laboured (not pan intended); I take it to be the consensus view (even if no one reading of the *Aeneid* will satisfy all readers). Homeric heroes tend to act according to their nature rather than duty—nature, or a sense of self-interest (as we have seen in the case of Sarpedon above). Aeneas’ journey, as Virgil tells it, is one of suppression of instinct; as a man under ‘holy obligation’, he is characterized by a sense of duty, but more importantly, at the outset of the epic, by a reluctant sense of duty. I am taken by the portrait that Viktor Pöschl offers of a man suffering from historical fate. He can never live the moment, because, in him, we see past, present and future. Aeneas is heroic because his burden (as much psychological as anything) is one that would cripple most men. It is hardly an insight to observe that *pietas* is his distinguishing feature. What needs to be emphasised is his brand of *pietas*. Gaius Gracchus can have been said to have been motivated by *pietas*. For Cicero, that was one of Gracchus’ defining qualities. But Gracchus took to it with a vengeance, so to speak. His *pietas*, in terms of family obligation, led him to seek and to wreak revenge on his enemies, whom he deemed responsible for his brother’s death. Aeneas has been called upon to put vengeance aside. He has, instead, a divinely ordained mission. We first


20 Pöschl (n.19) 38–40; cf. P. Hardie, Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Inspection (Oxford 1966) 135 (‘Aeneas is a man living in a state of siege’).

21 Cic. de har. resp. 42.

22 In Book 2 where, in retrospect, we see Aeneas in his first historical appearance (as opposed to his appearance in the poem), his normal heroic qualities are to the fore. He thirsts for
meet Aeneas, ninety-two lines into the poem, where he offers his first speech (93ff.). Caught in a storm, characteristically all too human, his limbs have gone loose with terror, and he cries out to the heavens, wishing that he was dead. He implores, "Why me?" is a refrain for the first six books. He has, of course, been implicitly introduced on the first line. He is "the man" (arma virumque caro—"Of war and the man I sing")—and all readers knew of whom the poet spoke when he alluded, on the tenth line, to the insignem pietate virum (1.10) and to whose toils he referred—tis labores (on the same line): "a man outstanding in his pietas, facing so many toils, so much labour." I underline that word labores (to which we shall return). And we note too that the unnamed hero has been introduced as a victim.

"Tell me, Muse, the reason, whereby the Queen of the gods, thwarted in her will or in anger, [brought such a good man] to face so many reverses, so many labours. Can there be such anger in Heaven?" (1.8–11; Jackson Knight trans., my italics)

We return to Aeneas' first speech (and his desire for restful death).

"How fortunate were you, thrice fortunate and more, whose luck it was to die under the high walls of Troy, before your parents' eyes!"

revenge; he is ready to kill and to die. This, and his lapse in Book 10 (to which I return below), almost give the impression that they are there to establish his basic flawlessness such as it would be understood by a Republican reader. On that subject generally (and therefore with scarce reference to Aeneas), see M. McDonnell, Roman Morality. Virtus and the Roman Republic (Cambridge 2006); see esp. 181–5 on 'training routines'.

On this passion in Book 2 (which he must learn to suppress or at least to manage), see Jeffrey Fish, 'Anger, Philodemos' Good King, and the Helen Episode of the Aeneid 2.567-589: a new proof of authenticity from Herculaneum', in D. Armstrong, J. Fish, P.A. Johnston and M.B. Skinner (eds), Vergil, Philodemos and the Augustrs (Austin 2004) 111–138.

And it is in his speeches that we can trace the development of the man; C. J. Mackie, The Characterisation of Aeneas (Edinburgh 1988).

For a survey of the seventy-nine times labor appears in the Aeneid, see J. Stanislaw, "Labor as a Key to the Aeneid", Classical Bulletin 50.4 (1974) 49–53. Its most frequent use is in the first Book; it is part of the scene- (and character-) setting; and not surprisingly the labours are qualified as burdensome.

There is nothing original in underlining this aspect of Aeneas' mission. I note that Rose Williams' irreverent but enthusiastic gloss of the epic is entitled The Labours of Aeneas: What a Pain It Was to Found the Roman Race (Wancomb, R. 2003). The cue, of course, comes from Aen. 1.33: tanta mols quot Romanum condere genus ("how heavy the weight of founding the Roman race"). On this line, see Philip Hardie (n.20) 133.

I'm using here, as I do a number of times elsewhere, the prose translation of Jackson Knight; Peter Wiseman has shown us that Jackson Knight knew what Virgil wanted to say (or was at least getting advice along those lines), Talking to Virgil: A Miscellany (Exeter 1992) 171–209; see esp. 199–206.

And so on and so on. Understandably, there were readers in antiquity who were dissatisfied with this, thinking that it was no way to introduce a hero (Servius in his commentary on the Aeneid 1.92 was one of them). Aeneas has to be cajoled, exhorted, goaded and encouraged—because he is just a man.

His readiness to be discouraged is still there in the second half of Book 5. Another storm, and the Trojans have been driven on to the shores of Sicily; the women have set fire to the ships (they are sick of the endless journey). Aeneas is near breaking point. And, at this point, he is again plus because he feels the pressure:

Then plus Aeneas rent the garment off his shoulders, stretched forth the palms of his hands, and called on the gods for aid: "Jupiter Almighty, if you do not yet look on every Trojan with hatred, and if your loving kindness, shown of old [he challenges Jupiter here to remember antiquus piens], can still take note of humanity's suffering (labores), permit our fleet, even now, to escape the flames, O Father, and wors Trou's slender hope from death. Else, if I so deserve, cast the remnant left of us down to death by your own angry bolt; overwhelm me, by your own hand, herc."

Virg. Aen. 5.887–92

Aeneas is virtually saying: "Lord, I've had it!" The prayer is answered with a drenching storm (this time a delivering one), but Aeneas is still shaken to the core.

But sooner Aeneas, deeply shaken ... pondered over his deep anxieties, turning his thought in his heart one way and another. Should he settle in Sicily, forget destiny foretold, or should he press on to Italy? (Virg. Aen. 5.908–913)

A good dose of stoicism dissolved out by aged Naeus (one of Aeneas' companions and considered to be of singular wisdom) gets him moving again, but not without lingering doubts—and uncertainty. Aeneas' abiding reluctance (in the first half of the epic) makes it possible for a modern commentator (and a good one) to say—in two separate instances: "This is the point at which the mission is most nearly abandoned." This merely reflects.
Homerica hero, to the extent that some have seen in him the hero of the epic. But Turnus represents what Aeneas must overcome, psychologically. The heroic Turnus, as a triumphant killer, shines at 10.441-443: "It is time for you [Lausus, son of Mezentius] to rest from battle: I and I alone am going to deal with Pallas, to me and me only is he due—I wish his father were here to see it". He will show no mercy. Virgil indeed offers editorial comment (on the killing and despoiling of Pallas at 10.500-505); Turnus is unaware of fate and fortune, unable to show moderation in triumph. And here is the instinct that the poem challenges Aeneas to put aside. The anguish caused by this very event triggers the killer in Aeneas. He is now himself Homeric. He rages through the battlefield; and he boasts over the dead (10.510-604; 755-820); he lacks down everyone in his path, he cuts a broad swath through the enemy lines:

when once his sword has tasted blood, he rages victorious over the field ... (10.569-70).

It is almost (as noted above, n. 22) as if this episode is there to prove that Aeneas is not, after all, a wimp. If there is an Augustan leader reflected here, it is the young Octavian in his morientium esse mode (Suet. Aug. 15). But by the 20s BC, we have moved on; the world has different needs—and Maccenas has worked his wiles. Likewise, reason returns to Aeneas; he feels revulsion at his own lack of control. He groans deeply in pity, and holds out his hand (10.821-24); he becomes again, in his own consciousness, pius Aeneas (10.826). Aeneas is not perfect—but, significantly, he is shown as flawed when he demonstrates that he can be a Homeric hero. He is 'manful' enough; the tide of battle turns with his re-arrival on the scene at 10.258-75. But so far as Virgil celebrates arma virumque he indicates they are not worthy of celebration if the arms are in the wrong hands. We see the type

29 I borrow here a line of thought from John Bishop (The Cost of Power: Studies in the Aeneid of Virgil [Amsterdam 1989]), though Bishop explores the sense of cost in so many more ways than I do here.

30 "I would conclude with the paradox that the true man of action is he who can measure most nearly the constraints upon him, who chooses to remain within them and even to take advantage of the weight of the inevitable, exerting his own pressure in the same direction. All efforts against the prevailing tide of history—which is not always obvious—are doomed to failure. So when I think of the individual, I am always inclined to see him imprisoned within a destiny in which he himself has little hand, fixed in a landscape in which the infinite perspectives of the long term stretch into the distance both behind him and before. In historical analysis as I see it, rightly or wrongly, the long run always wins in the end. Embattling innumerable events—all those which cannot be accommodated in the main ongoing current and which are therefore ruthlessly swept to one side—it indubitably limits both the freedom of the individual and even the role of chance," P. Braudel, The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of the Philip II Fol. 2 (1949, rev.ed. 1966; Eng. trans. S. Reynolds 1973) 1243-4.

31 I refer to the period in which those who sought mercy from Octavian received the chilling answer: "You must die."

32 I am thinking of the undated occasion upon which Maccenas, observing Augustus in a mode of condemnation, casually tossed into his friend's lap a tablet reading "Rise, at last, executioner" (Dio 55.7)—to great effect, we are told. Dio indicates that such was Maccenas' influence generally. Virgil came from this camp.

33 Hence the impact of the poem's powerful ending (which I am not going to dwell on here). Instructed, and the lack of a superhuman control, are far from easy. It makes the mission all that more hard. That is my reading, and I am aware it will not be shared by all. Servius (ad Aen. 12.940) believed that the killing of Turnus rebounded to Aeneas' credit. Arguing the same, see the weighty article of H.P. Stahl, 'The Death of Turnus: Augustan Vergil and the Political Rival', in K.A. Ratcliff and M. Toler (eds), Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1990) 174-211. For a different interpretation, Bishop (n.29) 241-50, 324-6; cf. 289-11. Lyne (n.19) 188-203 ['—Harrison (n.19) 316-338] sees an 'appreciation' of the necessary conflict between natural instincts and the ideal, whilst giving full recognition to
of man required in Aeneas’ solemn oath before the final battle (12. 176–194); it is the pledge of a resolute statesman-in-waiting. And it is not grasping; he claims no kingdom for himself (nec mihi regna peto; 190).

**Pius Augustus**

This powerful rewriting of what it meant to be great was not one individual’s vision; it was not left to Virgil alone. Augustus worked by its propagation through other media, and he did not leave the portrait of pietas at one of analogy. He had long foregrounded his own. It was recognized by the Senate—and recognized early, in 27 or in 26, when the *clipeus virtutis* (the ‘shield of valor’) was awarded by the Senate and People (RG 34.2), to be set up in the *curia*, possibly alongside the statue of Victory, on account of his *virtus, clementia, iustitia* and *pietas*. As qualities in leadership, *virtus, iustitia* cause no surprise; they are traditional. *Clementia* had become something of a political slogan, and was here requisite. It was in *pietas* that Augustus augmented the image of the leader. And in the marble copy found at Arles, it is *pietas* that is expanded upon: *clipeum virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietatisque erga deos patriamque*. It is *pietas* ‘with regard to the gods and the fatherland.’

The Roman iconography of Aeneas with his precious burden, numismatically attested, preceded any program of Augustus. It can be found, for instance, on a denarius of Caesar dating to 47–46 BC, and advertised Julian ancestry. But under Augustus the imagery became the coinage, so to speak, of the realm. Moreover, the Aeneas-Aeneasidae-Aeneian group appeared on private walls, and was used as a personal symbol of commitment. It was sufficiently established to become the butt of humour.

**The burden-bearing Leader**

This dutiful aspect of Augustus’ great ancestor was a feature of Augustus’ new forum, a veritable showcase of Roman leadership. On the face of it, Augustus chose to look backward; he wanted to be judged by the standards of the past—thus, his own parade of heroes in the Forum Augusti to echo that...

---

34. Hillard: Augurit and the Evolution of Roman Concepts of Leadership

35. For the shield and the chronology, see Scheid (n.16) 88-9. Also on the shield and its copies, see F. Zanker The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (Eng. trans. Alan Shapiro, Ann Arbor 1988) 85-97 (and Figs 79-81); cf. Scheid (n.16) 90-91 for further references. For references and discussions of Augustus pietas, M. S. Spengel, Exemplaria Principis: Untersuchungen zu Einigung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums (Archäologie und Geschichte, ed. Torso Hübener, 9, Heidelberg 1999) 201-204. As Zanker remarks, the shield, a familiar form of honor from the Hellenistic world, became something of a mystic symbol (92). The virtues inscribed thereupon came to define both the ruler and what was expected in a good ruler.

36. For a recent treatment, wherein will be fixed references to earlier works on the subject, M.B. Dowling, *Clementy and Cruelty in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 2006). Chapter 2 provides the most pertinent discussion to the point here, but see also 89-105 for Virgil and his Aeneas.

37. Zankir (n.35) 96.
aspect of the Augustan parade which struck later observers. The accompanying eloqia of many, however, point to a highlighting of the fact that these men played fateful roles at various critical junctures in Roman history.43

43 I owe this insight to Edwin Judge, offered orally almost a generation ago. As I said in the first footnote, I rejoice to see it now in wider print circulation. Generally, on the forum, Judge (n.44); the eloqia were "not the innocent product of antistipitatem", but "taught a deliberate doctrine of Roman history" (167). For fateful roles, see Judge, op.cit., 169. "In most cases one can readily see that attention must have been focused not on the magistrates and triumphs as such, but upon some peculiar episode in the man's career. It typically shows him confronted with a crisis of the Roman state itself. Rome's very future may even be in jeopardy. Other magistrates may have failed. Only an unprecedented, personal initiative will save the day. Sometimes the leader must sacrifice time-honoured principle, or personal dignity, for the higher good... This political crisis management and not military victory as such, then, is what makes a man the leader of his age." Cf. M.M. Sage, 'The Eloge of the Augustan Forum and the de Viris Illustris', Historia 28 (1979) 192-210, see esp. 194 (though Sage concentrates on a contribution to Rome's expansion as the criterion for inclusion); J.C. Anderson, The Historical Topography of the Imperial Forum (Coll. Lat. 182, Soc. d'Etudes Latines, Brussel 1984) 85-85 (emphasizing the potential for comparison with Augustus); and B. Scarrow, Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire (New York and London 2003) 165-180. On the degree of Augustus' adherence to the wording of these eloqia, compare also T.J. Luce, 'Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum', in K.A. Rainforth and M. Toher (eds), Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate (Berkley, Los Angeles and London 1990) 127-144 and 137-38. Luce sees the Augustan selection of data as independent of prevailing historical tradition (though this is rather too artificially narrowed to the Livian). Luce envisages Augustus accepting the suggestions of those to whom he had delegated the aggregation of data. I, like Judge, see Augustus' involvement as more hands-on (and for that as a current assumption, see S. Walker, 'The Moral Monuments, Augustus and the city of Rome,' in J. Colston and H. Dodge (eds), Ancient Rome. The Archaeology of the Eternal City [Centre for Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies, Trinity College, Dublin; Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 54, Oxford 2005] 66). Cf. M. Hulsewé, Apicius Claudius Cæcarius. La République accomplie (BEFAR 322, Rome, École Française de Rome 2005) 49-60 on the eloqia of Ap. Cæcarius (assuming that the inscribed reminiscence was a blend of material found in Claudian 'archival sources' [the family's oral tradition and pre-existing monuments] and elements promoting Augustan ideology). For an example of the fine hand at work, see Mary Beard's observation of the expert reticence in the text of the eloqium boasting Marius; "Vita Inscrivita", in W.W. Ehrbs (ed.), La Bibliographie antique, Foundation Hardt Entretiens 44 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1988) 88 (in a study generally devoted to recognizing in inscriptions the very deliberate choices made in the selection of material). Again, observe the eloqium of Ap. Cæcarius, which omitted any reference to electoral reform to the advantage of the libertini (Huanm 60, cf. 54), a controversial contribution to Roman politics.
Aeneas and Romulus, however, presided. Their representations may have provided a model in a number of ways. Emblemata were prominent. There are hints that other statues were similarly ornamented by personal honorae and/or striking attributes. We know that the statue of M. Valerius Maximus Corvus/Corvinus (mul. rih. 349) sported on its helmeted breast the rival name from which the man drew his cognomen. The statue of Scipio Aemilianus probably displayed the corona obsoleti (siege-breaking crown) which he was awarded as a military tribune in 149, that of the 'new man' Marius was possibly conspicuous in the patrician boots specifically mentioned in the surviving inscription; and it is tempting to think that the statue of M. Valerius Maximus (dictator 494) showed him seated in the curule chair, an item also mentioned in his eulogy. The presence of Camillus, Rome's saviour and second founder, would have been especially important to Augustus. He was, in Virgil's parable at Aen. 6.825, referens signa, standards-bearing. Virgil's parade precedes that of the Augustan forum by about two decades, but it evokes the visual image that one might associate with Camillus—and it is tempting to think that this is the way in which Camillus was iconographically depicted in the Forum. (There were any number of ways in which Virgil may have drawn inspiration from material that similarly inspired the Augustan imagery.) If this is true, then each, or at least many, of the statues would have been visually individual. The young Velleius Paterculus, newly arrived at manhood (he must have been about seventeen years old), carried away from the Forum many lessons with regard to the definition of principatus. Visual markers were particularly memorable. Augustus, he said, had dazzled "the minds and eyes of the Roman people" with the accompanying spectacles (2.100.2).

Aeneas' shoulders were burdened; those of Romulus burdened in another sense altogether, one might say adorned. Here (Mars) sees Aeneas laden with his precious burden, and so many ancestors of Julian fame; here he sees Iliá's son (sc. Romulus) bearing on his shoulders the arms of the (conquered) general, and the splendid record of their acts beneath (the staters) of the men arranged in order. (Ovid Fasti 5.563-66)

Note that Ovid chooses to distinguish Aeneas' burden. Aeneas is oneratum ponderes caro ("laden with his precious burden"); Romulus is depicted arma ferensem ("bearing arms"). Aeneas bears the weight. The distinction is apposite. The poet has picked up the cues. Via the visual juxtaposition of Romulus and Aeneas heading their respective lines of heroes, Aeneas' burden has been elevated to an honor, and the traditional notion of honor is not only invidiously subverted.


52 Visualizing the juxtaposition is made all the more easy for us by two frescoes found in Pompeii on a wall of a fuller's shop (Pompeii IX 13.5) representing twin images of Aeneas and Romulus in just these guises—and it has been suggested that the two statues in the Forum served as models for the paintings (V. Spinazzola, Pompei alta luce degli scavi nuovi di Via dell'Abbondanza 1 (Rome 1953) figures 183 and 184) which might most conveniently be found in Hardie (n.20) plate 7 (at end) (cf. his text at 375-6); Zanker (n.35) 202, fig. 126; Flowers (n.46) Plate 4 (a) and (b) (cf. her text at 234-5); Rich (n.46) 71-128, at 94-5, figs 4 & 5; Seevy (n.45) 174, fig. 7.6 (cf. her discussion of the imagery at 172-5) and/or Barchiesi (n.47) 288-87, figs 50-51. M. Hulter, 'Die Statuen der summi viri vom Augustusforum', in M.-D. Helmerzeyer (ed.), Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik, Eine Aussage im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin 7 Juni-14 August 1988 (Berlin 1988), 200, figs 88 (a) and (b). And see also Galinsky (n.19) 8-9, and fig. 5, on the terracotta group (he styles it a "replica") found in Pompeii's forum.

For Aeneas as quintessentially burdened, prompting speculation as to Herculaneum and Atlanticus analogies, see Hardie (n.20) 369ff, esp. 372-3. It would be helpful to know what
But there were still other ways in which Augustus formally articulated, in the most elaborate ways, the burden of leadership—indeed, the costs. Upon his death, twin bronze stelae on his mausoleum proclaimed in around 170 lines what it was that he considered the most memorable features of his public life. The Res Gestae is the shorthand title by which this extensive eulogy goes today. As it is well known, its heading, if we can trust a surviving copy, was considerably longer: Res Gestae divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecti, et imperio quos in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit. That is, even as an abbreviated title, it should read Res Gestae et Imperium: ‘Deeds Done and Expenses Incurred’ (and from this point on, I shall appropriately abbreviate it as RGI).54 The latter—the expenses—were no mere addendum. They occupy nine sections of the inscription (that is, approximately a quarter of the text) and they precede the eight sections in which the military and diplomatic achievements are elaborated. They provide an account book reckoning of Augustus’ principate—the public accounts anyway: largesse; building programs; the number of times he topped up the treasury. In all, according to the ‘appendix’ of the inscription, 2,400 million sestertius to the treasury and the People.

The burden which Augustus wished to be seen as ready to shoulder went beyond the financial. The self-advertisement opens with the fanfare and rhetorical colour that one would expect of self-eulogy—and is, in one way, breath-taking in its embrace of his singularity.

At the age of nineteen, and at my own expense/on my own initiative, I raised an army...

There, by the way, is that word imperium again, privata imperiosa. The vindication of such unilateral action—one might say insurrectionary activity—is cushioned (although cushioned is hardly the word for such assertive language) by party-political vocabulary,55 and by compression and the skilful omission of unnecessary detail.56

Then an interesting thing happens. As soon as the rewards begin to flow (premature enrolment in the senate; the ius senatusiae [the right to give his opinion amongst the consuls]; imperium praefectura [formal recognition of his military command]; the consulship [at the age of nineteen]; and finally membership of the triumvirate), the inscription switches to a passive construction—that is to say, the first person verb gives way, repeatedly, to the third, with himself (sc. Augustus) in the accusative or dative.

(1) ... exercitium ... comparavi ... rem publicam ... vindicavi ... (2) ... senatus ... me adelegit ... imperium mibi dedit.

He was championing the liberty of the state; it is language duly echoed by Veiiulus 2:61: imperat opressarum dominam Antonii. Verbius (2:61–2) offers somewhat of an abbreviated elaboration of the opening claims of the Res Gestae et Imperium, where Augustus claims to be liberating the state from the domination of a faction. On the polemical nature of the verb factio, R. Seager, Tiberius (London 1973) [2nd ed., Oxford 2005] 53–8.

This is a subject taken up in some detail by Riley (n.5) though in his elaboration of Augustus’ hesi (159–227), he points company in a considerable way from the ‘peerless analysis’ of Edwin Judge to which he pays homage in his preface (xx). Rich (n.5) puts slightly more emphasis on the ‘bending’ of, and—to take Edmund Burke’s phrase—‘economy with’, the truth. Taking a cue from Beard’s observation of one of the ‘expertly written’ eulogia in the Augustan Forum (Board [n.45] 88), Gowing draws the obvious parallel with the RGI at this point (n.44 143).
In effect, Augustus is claiming to have done all that the populace demanded of him, without taking up power. It is all to be expressed in terms of expense and cura. But lest there be any doubt as to what was entailed in his ‘administration’ of this problem, it is as well to remember the special commission that was awarded to Pompey in September, 57—and the controversy which was aroused by handing over such control of Rome’s supplies and Mediterranean shipping lanes to one man. On that occasion, there was hot debate. Cicero had accused Cicero of betraying the auctoritas senatus (Cic. Dom. 4) and of proposing extraordinary powers to Pompey (Cic. Dom. 18–21). Nor was Ciclius alone in his concern (he had a personal reason for resenting Pompey’s intrusion upon the corn supply). Only two cedendae presented themselves in the Senate for the debate. Cicero wrote to Atticus (4.1.7) that the others were afraid to attend; perhaps, but that did not prevent a senatus frequentis (a packed House) the next day. (The leading members of the Senate had surely wished to avoid being compromised.) Plutarch (Pompey 49.4) saw this for what it was: command over all the sea and land under Roman dominion. This is not an overstatement. The consular law drawn up in accordance with the senatorial resolution gave Pompey full control over the corn supply of the world for five years (per quinquennium omnis potestas rei frumentariae toti orbis terrarum). It got worse. The tribune C. Messius proposed before the people an alternative plebiscite giving Pompey control over the treasury (omnis pecuniae ... potestatem), a fleet, an army and maius imperium in proviniciis (“superior powers of command in the provinces”). Even Cicero baulked at that (Cic. Att. 4.1.7). But Messius’ extravagant proposal had its benefits. ‘Our’ bill, Cicero says (illa nostra lex consularis), now seemed modest by comparison (modestius videtur). In private correspondence with Atticus, and with that now, Cicero admits much. Prevailing feeling on this occasion ensured that Messius’ promulgated bill was allowed to drop. But the grand command, the cura annonae per quinquennium, went ahead (Liv. Per. 104).61

Such was the ‘burden’ which Augustus did not refuse to take up. But by any other name...”

57 (1) I raised an army, ... I chanced the State; (2) the Senate enrolled me, ... gave me command; (3) the Senate ordered me as procurator, ... (4) the People elected me consul and triumvir.

58 Judge in Harrison (n.15) 193.

59 On these passages, see now Cooley (n.3) 127-131.

60 C. Bömer (n.7) 190, with an extended discussion of the text and the nuances of cura at 192-3; and Scheid (n.16).


62 The collocation of items in section 5 of the RGI stand notably apart, and it is worthwhile reflecting on the fact that the paragraphing of the document is, from the Anatolian copies that survive, part of the original design—they are not imposed by modern editorialism. (I thank John Rich for the observation.) The position of RGI 5 and 6 is stark. Augustus in his arrangement of material wanted these items to stand alone. See the useful discussion of these passages by Judge (in Harrison [n.15] 190-3), particularly for the speculation that we have here an insert into the (hypothetical) third version of the text which would previously have jumped from 4.4 to 7.1, an insert that reflected on the limits of the power of Augustus.
This projection of his image (his reluctance to grasp at honores, but readiness to shoulder burdens) was not one of Augustus' reflective and revisionist old age; it was, as we saw at the beginning of this essay, projected at the time.\(^{50}\)

The same tone was employed by Augustus in the following section of the Res Gestae et Imperares (6) with regard to the honores and powers of 19, 18 and 11 BC.

In the consulate of M. Vinicius and Q. Lucretius, and afterwards in that of P. and Cn. Lentulus, and thirdly in that of Paulus Fabius Maximus and Q. Tubero, faced with a consensus of the Senate and people of Rome that I be appointed curator legum et morum summa poestate solus (sole supervisor of laws and morals with supreme power), no magistracy, offered contrary to the ways of our ancestors, would I accept (nullum magistratum contra morum maieron maiorem delatum recipio).

Those things (the tasks) which the senate wished me to bear, wished me to carry the weight of, I undertook by virtue of tribunician power, in which

\(^{50}\) The crisis of a grain shortage, to which Augustus makes implicit reference at RG 5, had arisen the year before (i.e., in 23), and we may pause here to contemplate the lessons being served up to Augustus' eventual successor (successor, that is, in terms of historical continuity). It was a year Tiburiae would have remembered well. He was a quaestor—and partially responsible for whatever actions were taken. A noisy sector of the populace, as we saw, associated the problem with the fact that Augustus had virtually, or at least apparently, abdicated in that year (though he had taken control of the immediate crisis by distributing grain—bought at this own expense (privatum eoomptum; RG 15.1)). In the face of food shortage, libertas was the last concern of the populace. (How far we have come from 73 BC, cf. Sallust Historiae 2.47M.) Violent protests lay behind the Senate's pressured offer to Augustus of the dictatorship (and perpetual consulate). Augustus, on the other hand, sought to dissuade popular enthusiasm for demanding such an elevation, and he went to some dramatic lengths (as we saw earlier), cf. Suet. Aug. 52; Dio 54.1. Recurrentia floriuished in 22 BC—and the nineteen-year-old Tiburiae was on hand to take careful note. He also saw what lay behind (in the terms of the infrastructure required to alleviate public concerns). Vellevius Paterculus, so admiring of Tiburiae, has, when covering this incident, nothing to say of the political theatre, but much to say of 'liberius' administration of the crisis. Acting on the orders of his septempere (mandati circuli), Tiburiae so skilfully managed the difficulties of the autuum, so that he relieved the inopia at Ostia. His service 'illuminated' (and thus presaged) his future greatness. (Vell. 2.94.5)

Fulcrum Verotiius (6.5) would go so far as to say that Augustus had manipulated and/or aggrandized the crisis cau grain shortage (based on the speed with which the situation was turned around and upon Clodius' suspicions [or at least, we might say, Clodius' allegations] that such an artificial crisis had been manufactured in 57 BC by those who wanted to see power in Perseus' hands. It is not an implausible thesis, but it cannot be proven, cf. P. Garnsey, 'Lam螅e in Rome', in Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker (eds), Trade and Finance in Classical Antiquity (Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. Vol. 8, Cambridge 1983), 59 and 61. If the allegation is correct, Tiburiae must have been an accomplice. There are ramifications, therefore, for the way in which we read Tiburiae's subsequent recompensation.

There we have, at last, acceptance, but representing voluntary disempowerment.\(^{50}\) And there we have the new discourse of principatuum.

Reluctant heroes in the past

I am not claiming that there were no Republican predecessors for such reluctance—or that Republican luminaries did not see themselves

\(^{50}\) Cf. Judge's commentary (in Harrison [n.13] 191-3): Augustus has tied himself up in a complexity of explanation.

\(^{50}\) There has been some suggestion that Augustus has been less than honest here, but it depends on which way the account is spun, and read. See Peter Brunt's satisfactory explanation of the way in which Augustus could be telling the truth here: P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore, Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus (Oxford 1987) 45-6; cf. Brunt's note (n.7) 207 (strengthening the nuances of Augustus' wording); Scheid (n.16) 36-7; and Radley (n.5) 101-3 (stressing the ambiguities, implicitly deceitful, that require a guarded reading).

\(^{51}\) These passages have been noted, of course, by others; cf. A. Powell, 'The Arnèld and the embarrassments of Augustus', in Powell (ed.), Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus (London 1992) 141-73, n.30 (adding for consideration RG 19.2).

In the short term, the Res Gestae et Imperares captured the record, and it is interesting to chart its relationship with the next generation of historians. Vellevius Paterculus seems to have imbued it. It is highly likely that he was familiar with the document and more than probable that he was familiar with its text, cf. J. Hellegeziuur and C. Jodry, 'Les Res Gestae d'Auguste et l'Historia Romana de Velleiuus Paterculus', Latomus 39 (1980) 803-16, pointing to certain echoes of Augustus' formulae, and drawing particular attention (815-16) to a chronological error of Vellevius (at 2.81.1) when he refers to Octavian's levying of an army (privo consilio: the same phrase occurs in RG 1.1) as Octavian entered his nineteenth year. Some editors have preferred to emend the text (cf. M. Elefante, Velleius Paterculus: Ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo (Hildesheim 1987) ad loc., rejecting that option), but Hellegenziuur and Jodry see Vellevius as having been led into that error by an all too hasty reading of the RG.

\(^{52}\) Perhaps one of the earliest for which we have record is that of L. Aselliis Flavus in 169 BC, professing reluctance to run for the consulate with the expectation that he would take command of the Macedonian war; cf. U. Huttner, Recursus Imperii: Ein politisches Ritual zwischen Ethik und Tatik, Studia Justiniana 93 (Hildesheim 2004) 440 n.93. Pressed by the multitude, the sixty-year-old protested that he had no obsession with honour (philimisma), Phil. Ann. Paed. 10.2-3. Ultimately, he capitulated, consenting to stand (and being accompanied to the campus as if already the victor). Thereafter, Gaius Gracchus famously professed an initial reluctance to engage in public life. He claimed that in a dream his brother appeared to him, observing that however much he wished to hesitate, there was no escape: his fate beckoned. Gaius relented with resignation. The evidence is contemporary—and firsthand (Cicero Antistatus, HRR 1, 174, Bk. 30 [= Cic. Div. 1.56; Val. Max. 1.76]): cf. Huetue, loc.cit. (though I would not date Gracchus' resignation to his fate as late as deos Huetue; Gracchus was active in 129).
shouldeering burdens by way of officium.\textsuperscript{68} Nor am I claiming that Republican luminaries had not used feigned reluctance as a subterfuge—or as a way of deflecting the invidia which dogged high achievement. At least two examples will surely spring to mind (and they serve to further underline the type of contexts in which such reluctance will be performed). One is the twilight of Marius’ controversial third consulship—controversial in the sense that it had been awarded in absentia as had the second which had immediately preceded it (and which itself had followed on without a break from Marius’ first three-year tenure of consulat imperium) and in the sense that it was drawing to a close without any decisive action having been fought against the northern tribes, the ostensible reason why this extraordinary break from tradition had been countenanced in the first place. Controversy was compounded by the fact that Marius might be seen to be making himself available for the immediate tenure of a fourth consulship. On this occasion, however, Marius had come himself to Rome—to preside over the elections at which “many good men had professed candidature” (Plut. Mar. 14.7). Marius’ plans required subterfuge, at least according to Plutarch. He had suborned the services of Saturninus who pressed the case for a reiterated consulship. Marius affected to decline the office, whilst Saturninus denounced him as a traitor for refusing command when the fatherland was in such grave danger. Plutarch says that the charade was obvious but that the People recognized Marius’ ability and good fortune were what were required at this juncture (allowing to honi polluti more nous than Plutarch normally would). Here Plutarch (or his source) is in no doubt that this was a piece of theatre; all we can safely say is that Marius publicly professed reluctance and was pressed to take up an extraordinary post.\textsuperscript{69} (Interestingly, Velleius Paternus, writing in the era of Tiberius [who, as we shall see at the close of this paper], refused principates for as long as he could (a fact of which Velleius, again as we shall see, makes much), does not treat this aspect of Marius’ continued tenure of imperium; in his account, it is a simple case of

\textsuperscript{68} Duty made demands that could not be avoided. It excused certain actions. See Cicero’s condescending allowances to the men who were attacking M. Cæcilius Robus in 36.

\textit{Aratusius ... has the censure of duty, of necessity or of his age (vel placito vel necessaria vel octavo). If he wanted to bring this accusation, I attribute it to pietas (that is to say, a sense of duty); if he is under orders (massus est), to necessitate; if he had any hopes (of making a go of this), to his youth.” (Cæt. 2).

\textit{In the same speech, Cicero famously claimed reluctance to attack a woman of noble birth when in fact he was about to do so with all the stops pulled out. His duty to his client made him do it (Cæt. 3).}

\textit{CT. Liv. Per. 67. Apparently, Livy expressed scepticism; here was a place where the historian might have played with dangerous nuances. Velleius did not (see above, in the text).}

\textit{We come perhaps a little closer to the historicity of contemporary acquaintance at Cic. de prov. cons. 19. (I thank Frederick Vervaat for drawing this item to my attention.)}

\textsuperscript{69} The Roman People being convinced of Marius’ pre-eminent credentials—“the Roman people believed that no general was better qualified than Marius to confront such great enemies.” (2.12.2) There was only one man for the job in this crisis, and that was that.) But I would suggest that Velleius’ account of Tiberius’ recusatio (see below) indicates that the Assembly was not meant to greet Marius’ profession of reluctance in such a cynical or worldly-wise fashion as Plutarch suggests.\textsuperscript{70} The other example is as instructive. It is provided by two episodes—both setting a show of reluctance in the context of unusually extensive commands. Dio (36.24.5–6) suggests that Pompey performed relentlessness in 67 BC when

\textsuperscript{70} Another unexpected item must be noted. One would not think of Sulla as a shrinking violet, yet Appian (BC 1.103) records that when in 80 (when Sulla was holding the consulship for the second time), the People, to pander to him, would have elected him consul again, Sulla refused, declaring instead Servilius Vatia and Ap. Claudius Pulcher as consuls. (This declaration should probably be taken as the declaration of the presiding electoral officer rather than as an indication that Sulla simply nominated alternatives.) The question of Sulla’s retirement is a vexed one, that need not be settled here; but the incident remains of interest. Hutton (n.67) discusses Sulla’s abdication at 397–403 (references to other scholarship will be found there) — and this particular passage at 400–2. Appian clearly associates Sulla’s refusal to accept a third consulship with his abdication of the dictatorship—which is surely not the issue; Sulla was refusing a consulship, pure and simple. Even if one does not subscribe, with Kaveney (Sulla: The last republican [2nd ed., London and New York 2005] 164–67), to the belief that Sulla had stepped down from the dictatorship by taking up the consulship on January 1st, 80 BC (which is difficult to reconcile, despite Appian’s other confusions here, with Appian’s explicit statement that Sulla remained dictator whilst consul [Loc. cit.]); Sulla’s gesture was a recusatio. All the same, Sulla’s renunciation of office was not such as need concern us here in that it provided no precedent, and so no emulation (except in the rhetorical schools, on which see Quintil. Inst. 3.8.53). Silnes Italicus has Scipio predict in the Underworld that none will follow Sulla’s lead in this regard (Pom. 13.858–60). By the Flavian period, Sulla’s abdication was singular; cf. A. Thais, ‘Sulla the weak tyrant’, in S. Lewis (ed.), Ancient Tyrants (Edinburgh 2008) 240.

A curious and unelaborated item in Dio (40.63.2) records that L. Calpurnius Piso was elected censor for 50 BC “against his will” (statim me beaudierei). One would like to know more. (Hutton registers this item; loc. cit.). It seems to me to be a case of an individual, for whatever personal reasons, genuinely wanting to avoid an appointment in particular circumstances, as with C. Valerius Flaccus, insurged unwillingly (invitus) as flamen Dialis in 239 (Liv. 27.8.4–5). There is more to be said on this, but insufficient space here. It is worth remembering, however, that Piso embraced Epicureanism. The relevance of that observation will become clear six pages on.

Others seem to have had reluctance thrust upon them. It is intriguing to think of a later revisionist historiography imposing a reluctance on leaders who had not professed it at the time. P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Curculio (c. 162, 155) had, according to the author of the de vir. ill. (44) and Ampelius (19.11), refused the title of imperator and rejected the offer of a triumph after victories in Dalmatia in his second consulship. A fragment of the fasti triumphales (S. Paus, I Fasti di Roma I Fatti Trionfali del Popolo Romano [Turin 1930] 196; 338; 345; Degnan (p.53) 82–83; 557) proves that this was not the case.
it was suggested he take up a command against the pirates (and, in effect, military control of the whole Mediterranean). It was, Dio says, Pompey’s habit—and this is accepted by Robin Seager (citing Dio). It is plausible, but Dio is the most likely of the sources to have been contaminated by retrospective assumptions (and exposure to what became the ritual of recursio). He was, we know, sceptical of Augustus’ “game-playing” in 27 BC (53.11.1–5).

Pompey, whilst still in the field (in 66) and informed that he had been awarded another extraordinary command (in highly contentious circumstances), smote his thigh and bemoaned “in the tone of one who was already oppressed and burdened with command” the fact that he could never take his rest. Alas for my endless tasks! How much better it were to be an unknown man, if I am never to cease from military service, and cannot lay aside this load of envy and spend time in the country with my wife. (Plutarch, Pompey 30.6; trans. Perrin)

Plutarch reports that those around him were scarcely taken in by this piece of theatre—and thought it unseemly. They knew his ambition.

71 Cf. Dio 36.27.2, where Dio has Gabinius protest that Pompey is not afool for honour, and that his hesitation is a sign of prudence.

72 Seager (no. 53) 1979, 34 (+ 2002, 44). Two other items might be cited here, one proclaiming the genuine nature of Pompey’s ‘modest’ aims; the other, dissimulation. Sallust puts on the lips of C. Licinius Maecius (trib. pl. 73) the belief that Pompey seeks to be princeps through the wishes of the populace and that he will not partake of the dominion of the post-Sullan (Sall. Hist. 3.48 [rev. Maecius]; 23). In mid-51, Caesar observed that Pompey was wont to think one thing but say something else but that he did not quite have the talent to hide what he was wanted (Caed. Ap. Cis. Fam. 8.1.3); cf. Bérenger (n. 7) 157–8, on the “pose of humility” and “the modest—true of false—dispelling the spectre of tyranny.”

73 As early example of Pompey’s hesitancy might be seen in his slowness to take up the cognomen Magnus (Plut. Pompe. 13). The concern here, Plutarch says, was to avoid giving offence.

74 His lot, he complained, was that of “godless tasks” (see the quotation which follows)—though they are here akoloi, and thus contest a price in sight at the end.

75 Cf. Dio 36.43.1–2 (where Pompey is charged with pretence and is said to have accused his opponents of loading him with tasks in the hope that he would fail). I think Lea Borenz for drawing my attention to this item.

Something similar occurred when Pompey awaited the outcome of the different proposals that would go before the people concerning his great Com Command of 37, discussed above. He persisted; Cicero wrote to Atticus (4.1.7) to prefer the more modest consulship; his friends said he preferred the other (Menexius’ radical bill). Cicero here hints at insincerity.

Another spectacular item beckons. Valerius Maximus reports (4.1.6a) that Scipio Africanus had been offered the perpetual consulship and dictatorship, but that he would not countenance either, showing himself as great in refusal as he was in deserving the honours. This is almost certainly apocryphal. Livy (38.56.1) reports finding much told of Africanus’ later life that he could not bring himself to trust: at 38.56.12, this item surfaces as part of a speech by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus against Scipio. It is surely rhetorical invention, but interesting is that it may well be a reflection of the epoch of transition. All this is discussed in a forthcoming paper by John Marincola (in Cowan [n.6]).

76 On cursus and concern with the public weal, see the extended discussion by Bérenger (n. 7) 169–217, esp. chap. 186–217.


78 Saltare (II.4.7) thought that even this drive of the novi homines had become contumacious; cf. Wiseman (n.77) 116. But the ideology had made its mark. On labor, see also Bérenger (n. 7) 179–183.
stand with him to embrace sweat and dust and the rest of it (suadorem, pulverem et alia; 85.41).  

Marius was seen to have been granted powers by being willing, however reluctantly, to shoulder them. It is as if he were saying: "Come on, give it to me, I can take it! I can bear it!" — the burden of command and the glistening sweat of a novice.  

Another factor which ought to be taken very seriously (again, not explaining the profession of reluctance, but as a source for the notion of obligation) is the inspiration provided by Hellenistic models of good kingship. This finds expression in too many forms to be registered here; it appears both in official language and in philosophical discourse. With regard to the latter, reference might be made to the works On Kingship by Diogenes and pseudo-

79 It makes source difference to the present discussion if this ideology of novitas was relatively new (cf. McDonald [n.22] 230–322); it was a distinctive part of the discourse by the end of the Hellenistic period. Even Caesar came to speak of his military campaigning as a labor (Caes. B.C. 1.32). In his first address to the Senate, after marching on Italy, he boasted of his patres (I.C.—here a reference to his restraint, but the language of endurance is interesting. In the same passage, he speaks of his readiness to take up the oars of state administration. He invites the Senate to join him but makes it clear that he is ready to go it alone, if they hold back from fear. Ovid (Metam. 4.10.35–7) instinctively associated the senatorial life with labor and patres. Well, perhaps not "instinctively", but he knew what to say. Cf. Büringer (n.7) 176.

The "new man" Cicero, writing when his novitas was still fresh, a quaestorius who was self-confident, imagined himself castigating his rival Hortensius, the latter, in 70 BC, basking in his recent election to the consulship. That election was not enough, says Cicero, honor though it was. Hortensius may feel that he is now free from any concerns regarding his long-term reputation (exsitiatio), but such "ornaments", together with the benefits bestowed by the People, are no less "business" to retain as to win: "ornamenta tuis et beneficia populi Romani non minore negotio retinendae quam comparantur (2Ferr. 5.175). One's good name depends on what one does with offices won, rather than on winning them. The passage echoes Marius' sentiment (which, of course, has not been articulated in the form we have it until well after this). One senses Cicero forging a new way of regarding public office.

80 Marius fell foul of inconsistency. He in fact revelled in the honores, and did not on occasions know when to discontinue. One 'first' he could claim was that of entering the senate house in triumphal dress: Marius triumphal veste in senatum venit, quod nemo ante eum facturus. That was of sufficient note to make it into Levy's epimede (Per. 67). We know why. It caused grave offence (Phil. Mar. 12.5). On that occasion, Marius quickly changed tack—and dress (ibid.). Perhaps the lesson gave rise to the later performances (which, I would suggest, the People took seriously).

81 It is interesting to see in the merging ideology of the new era, through the Compendium of Velius Paterculus, a strong appreciation of industria and labor. For an elaboration of this, see Hillard (n.6).

82 See esp. Diodorus 61 and [Ephesian] 64. These texts illustrating Hellenistic justifications of Kingship can be found most conveniently by teachers in the source collection of Jane Gardner, Leadership and the Cult of Personality (London and Toronto 1974) 63–73. Cf. K. Goodhew, 'The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship', Yale Classical Studies 1 (1928) 59–102, esp. 98–102 (arguing that "the epithets regularly used in the official titles of Hellenistic kings, particularly Soter ['Saviour'], Epiphanes ['Manifest'] and Euergetes ['Benefactor'] not only have both a religious and political significance, but, as it were, epitomize the doctrines espoused in Diogenes and Ephesianus of the king's relation to God and to his people, and his role as both intermediary and as model") (Gardner's gloss).

83 The two works on monarchy cited above were Neoplatonism, even those resistant to the allure of Greek thinking found Pythagoreanism compatible with the Roman moral tradition; cf. Plat. Crito 2.3.

84 Polybius was not one to designate monarchy as a matter of course. Monarchy was indeed 'natural'; and basileia was its polished form, corrected of defects (6.4.7). In this higher state, it was to be judged according to its merits, and in this regard in particular its engagement with the people (6.4.2); cf. Büringer (n.7) 153.

85 For the Cyropaedia as an anticipation of Hellenistic political thought, J.J. Farber, 'The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship', American Journal of Philology 100 (1979) 497–514.

Ephesian (which have, at the very least, Hellenistic roots). But that is not at all by any means; exciting material came to light at Herculaneum (in the 'Villa of the Papyri') in the mid-eighteenth century, and it brings us into more direct contact with Hellenistic texts (see below). With regard to the official discourse, I am thinking in particular of the Memphis Decree of 27th March 196 BC (more popularly known as the Rosetta Stone). Politeny is honoured because of benefactions.

Whereas Politeny has conferred many benefits to the temples, consecrated for the temples revenues in food and wine, has borne great expenses to bring peace to Egypt and to establish order in sacred matters, has been generous to all his forces...etc.

There ought to be no surprise here; the link was established as members of the Roman elite became, if not captive to, enraged by their increasingly Greek education. It was a role of (later) Hellenistic philosophy to accommodate kingship; Roman thinkers could assimilate it. Scipio Aemilianus had the Greek philosopher Panaetius and the Greek statesman/political scientist Polybius constantly by his side, and Xenophon constantly in his hand (Velleius Paterculus 1.13.3; Cicero, Tusculum Disputationes 2.62). Xenophon's work (of which Scipio was so fond) was, we know, the Cyropaedia, and it had had its effect on the thinking of Hellenistic monarchs. It is also worth noting that a passage of which Scipio Aemilianus was particularly fond focussed upon the relative toils of the leader and the soldier. Timed (honours) made toils (ponos) lighter (for the Leader, at least)—or, in Latin gloss, honoros made the laborum imperatorum
levior (Cicero). (The apothegm is from Cyropaedia 1.6.25) Scipio was thus aware of relative burdens (and the consequent responsibilities)—though, as a general, he regarded labores literally.

The inspiration provided by actual models of Hellenistic kingship need not have been direct.\(^{40}\) I have no doubt that when Caesar proclaimed himself non rex sed Caesar it was in a tone of superiority (as regarded his personal stature).\(^{41}\) But the influence of philosophical contemplation of Kingship should not be doubted.\(^{42}\) I have in mind, inter alia, the amount of attention

---

\(^{40}\) The evidence suggests that the Roman nobility found little to admire in the specimens of kingship with which they came into contact in the second and first centuries BC. Prunus of Byzthynia set a tone of abasement in 168 (Polyb. 30.18). In the same year Antiochus IV set one of obedience (Polyb. 29.27; Liv. 45.12.3). If anyone was open to Greek thinking it was Scipio Aemilianus. During his tour of the East, we are told, by contemporary Greek observers, that Ptolemy Philometor’s compliance excited Romanariation; Diodorus Siculus 33.28.1-3. Plato, The Apotheosis of Scipio 13 [ = Moralia 200E-201A]; Justin, Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus 38.8.8-10; Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 12.549d-e [= Poseidonius FrG 87, F 6]. We are asked to believe by W. Heinen that Scipio failed to appreciate that Ptolemy’s obesity was ritual (a Dionysiac embodiment of his country’s prosperity); H. Heinen, ‘Der treibe des Ptolemäus VIII. Euergetes II. Beobachtungen zum proletarischen Herrscherideal und zur römischen Gesellschaft in Ägypten (140/9 v.Chr.)’, in Heinen et al. (eds), Akademische Studien Hermann Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen und Schülern (Historia Einzelschriften 40, Wiesbaden 1983) 116-130, esp. 119 & 127-8. For another (and similar) discussion of Ptolemaic triumph, see F. Damand, ‘Les associations dionysiakes au service du pouvoir lapide’ (Ilex s/a. J-C’; in L’association Dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes. Actes de la table ronde organisé par l’École française de Rome (Rome 24-23 Mai 1984) CEFR 89, Rome 1986) 102-103. As enticing as Heinen’s thesis is, I am not so sure. Even so, Scipio is shown to be unprepared to Hellenistic royalty.


\(^{42}\) See, inter alia, J.A.S. Evans, ‘The Aeneid and the Concept of the Ideal King: The Modification of an Archetype’, in R.M. Wilhelms and H. Jones (eds), The Two Worlds of the Poet. New Perspectives on Vergil (Detroit 1992) 146-56 (wherein will be found further bibliography) One of the important points made by Evans is that the channels of influence ought not to be too tightly defined: ‘I have long suspected that some of this speculation about ideal kings [cf. of Xenophon, Plato, Isocrates and Cicero] helped shape the character of Aeneas, and Francis Cairns’ new book, Vergil’s Augustan Epic, has now placed my suspicion beyond doubt. The problem of making Aeneas into an ideal king, however, is very like the old problem of making him into an ideal Sisic: he does not quite fit either archetype.” (147)

The discussion has moved on considerably since the publication of Evans’ paper (see above, in the text which follows), but the caution of that passage quoted above remains a useful model. (Ultimately, Evans is not all that chary of hypotheses. He has his own solution—that Virgil has used the archetype of the ideal king but made significant alterations to suit his own purpose in having this foreign Eastern king [Aeneas is rex now being awarded to the truc On the Good King According to Homer (PHerc 1507), the charred remains of which were discovered in 1752 in the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum (thought by many to have been the villa of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus [cos. 58 BC], Caesar’s father-in-law)—a work drawing upon Homer for indications of the virtues that a good king should possess and the vices to be avoided. It is identified as the work of the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus.\(^{43}\) The interest in Philodemus’ influence seems to have intensified in the last decade or so—though the surviving part of the text has been available since 1844,\(^{44}\) and an English paraphrase (a ‘synopsis’ with running commentary) was provided in 1965 by Oswyn Murray.\(^{45}\) Murray suggested in that study that the work was an ingenious adaptation of Hellenistic kingship theory to the needs of Roman politicians: (in Murray’s words) ‘a description of the duties and moral behaviour of a princeps in private and public life.’\(^{46}\) A good part of the current interest is generated by a debate, so relevant to the current discussion here, as to the extent of Philodemus’ influence on Virgil himself, and upon Virgil’s depiction of Aeneas.\(^{47}\) At the 112th Annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America (January 6th, 2011), Jeffrey Fish, who has taken leading a role in this debate, delivered a paper entitled ‘Is There an Epicurean’

\(^{43}\) It is not certain, however, that the surviving part is a synopsis of Homer. The text is a treatise in which a number of themes from the Iliad and the Odyssey are discussed.\(^{44}\) Perhaps a question mark might be retained over the authorship of some of the works discovered here; cf. Dirk Obbink, Philodemus. On Picky I (Oxford 1996) 96.

\(^{45}\) A Trebor edition appeared in 1909. Forty-four columns survive and thus more than half of the original.


\(^{47}\) Murray (n.91) 178; and in the general description of Murray’s judgment I have paraphrased D.P. Fowler, ‘Homer and Philodemus: a Review of Dordoni’s Filodemio’, Classical Review 36 (1986) 81-85 with regard to Murray’s characterisation of the tract. For succinct sketches of the work, see also Tiziano Dordoni, ‘Filodemio. Gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale’, in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 36.4 (Berlin and New York 1990) 2238-2368, at 2335 (where it is suggested that Philodemus provides his patron with a specularum principis, enriched with Homeric examples); and Elizabeth Asmis, ‘Philodemus’ Epicureanism’, in ANRW 36.4 (Berlin and New York 1990) 2369-2406, at 2406 (where it is suggested that the work (presses the need for rulers to be gentle and conciliatory, ‘to avoid war, especially externally strife’); Gertrude Raskin, ‘Love Unmasked: Lute Biasa. On the Vicissitudes of an Epicurean Doctrine’ (Leiden and Boston 2007) 123-125 (exploring the relationship between philosopher and politician).
in this Villa? Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus as Epicurean Statesman, in which he argued that he could discern in a new reading of the carbonized remains of Philodemus' treatise Epicurean directives with regard to the pursuit of glory—to the effect that “pleasurable triumph over enemies be avoided and ‘profitable reputation’ replace Homeric glory.” Fish took this further, suggesting that Acmeus’ distress at “war’s famous emotion” might be interpreted in this light.  

No uncompromising statement with regard to the Epicurean presence in the Aeneid is necessary here. Sufficient it to say that Roman contemplation(s) of kingship was (were) enough in circulation to have played a major part in the way that some Romans viewed their leaders. Leadership might entail privileges and responsibilities. Honours were granted and grace was expected.

One of the qualities of the Good King embodied in both Hellenistic ceremony and praised in philosophy was that of the caring shepherd. From the burdens and responsibilities borne by the Royal Benefactor followed divinity.  

Velleius Paterculus certainly depicts Octavian’s return to the city in 29 as that of a saviour god (2.89). I am not suggesting that Velleius has the imagery of Hellenistic monarchy in mind, but it fits glove-like—and Woodman appropriately underlines the fact that Octavian’s benevolence is seen by Velleius as god-like.  

As for Caesar’s return to Italy and to Rome ... all this would be impossible adequately to describe even within the compass of a formal history, to say nothing of a work so circumscribed as this ...  

Octavian’s magnificence outstrips the boundaries of a brevioriam; Velleius offers his own literary recusatio here.  

...There is nothing that man can desire from the gods, nothing that the gods can grant to a man, nothing that wish can conceive, nothing good fortune bring to pass, which Augustus on his return to the city did not bestow upon the republic, the Roman people, and the world. (2.89.2)  

Brian Bosworth goes further: Augustus in the RGI presents a catalogue of achievements and euergetism that is in the best Roman tradition, but simultaneously echoes Hellenistic tales of apotheosis. This serves, Bosworth argues, to justify Augustus’ deification. That goal was to be sought by shouldering the load and dispensing benefaction. It is interesting (but concept of pastoral care followed in its wake. For the notion of a people prospering under a righteous king, see Odyssey 19.107-114; cf. Finley, 112-13).  


Velleius returns to this recusatio at 2.89.6.  

I have basically followed the Loeb translation here, except that Shipley glossed on the overdo of adulatory anaphora—trimming it, no doubt, in the interests of good taste.  


The distinction between human and divine had been blurred already in the Roman political context, and notably within the popular tradition. This paved the way for the imperial cult, and linked it to the notion of popularly-recognized dispensation of benefactions. See the honours paid posthumously to the Gracchi (Plut. CG 18.3). Note that after the victory over the Cimbri that lustrations were poured to Marcus (Val. Max. 8.15.7), a blurring of the line that Marius did not shirk through discouragement (Val. Max. 3.7.6). The celebration of Marius Gratidianus was a significant development in that regard, cf. Brinner in 210-215. T.W. Hillard, “Vespasian’s Death-Bed Attitude to his Impending Deification”, in M. Dillon (ed.), Religion in the Ancient World: New Themes and Approaches (Amsterdam 1996) 195-6; F. Marco Simón and P. Pina Polo, “Marzo Gratidiano, los compiti y la regiosanidad popular a fines de la república”, Klio 82 (2000) 154-170.
hardly surprising) that *beneficentia*, a word which H. Bolkestein asserts was a coinage by Cicero (the chief user of it in surviving Latin literature), is used so frequently by the panegyricists. 103 In the blending of the ideology of *novitas* and the philosophical concepts of the good king as ultimate benefactor, I see a curious chemistry at work. *Beneficentia* imply an unequal relationship: the recipient was the lesser partner in the transaction. The process of giving has a long history in Rome, entrenched as it was in the institution of patronage and clientship. That remained an unavoidable element of Roman life. The lesser party reciprocated with *gratia, fides* and *officium*. 104 It is thus a vertical relationship. Cicero, however, in the *de officiis*, underlines the horizontal aspect of humankind’s sociability, as well as the traditionally vertical aspects of society 105—and we recall the way in which the speech put into the mouth of Marius by Sallust (see above) problematizes the very notion of a *beneficium* for the receiver of an *honos* who has been blessed with the favour of the *populus*. I am not suggesting that this was a thesis of Cicero, but such a fusion of concepts opened the way for those who would lessen the *invidia* of power and high office. Gloria Vivenzia, discussing Roman attitudes to benevolence and the Ciceronian evidence, insists that whilst Cicero was “imbued with Greek philosophy … we cannot forget that he also had the greatest concern for Roman tradition.” 106 All of this is incontestably true, but I would add that we cannot forget that Cicero is also a (highly self-conscious) New Man who was actively engaged in the re-definition of values.

A third factor was, of course, one to which allusion has already been made. And here lay a clear reason for the expression of reluctance. National battle fatigue. The readership to which Horace directed his second ode (Odes 1.2) simply did not want to see a prolongation of aristocratic competition if it was to lead to a continuation of the two decades of bloodshed through which the survivors had lived. 107 It is a poem worth reading and re-reading from an


105 Cf. Vivenzia (n.102) 199, citing in particular Off. 2.11-15 (on the benefit of mutual support) and 2.52-8 (which deals specifically with *beneficentia*, and in which passages *virum* stands side by side with *industria*). A sense of the vertical prevails. Off. 2.85, also cited by Vivenzia here, makes manifest a sense of nobilissim oblige.

106 Vivenzia (n.102) 198.

107 This observation will be a well-recognized one. Christian Meier, for instance, speaks of aristocratic claims to rank and honour elevated to a perversion, and civil war unleashed essentially for Caesar’s personal dignity. Ch. Meier, *Res Publica Amoris* (Wiesbaden 1966).
play-acting—and worse, sinister. Tiberius' contemporaries (and a most sympathetic source), Velleius Paterculus, took it very seriously, and celebrated it.

Tiberius Caesar could also claim a singular distinction. It was in the avoidance of leadership:

There was, however, what we might call a wrestling in the state, as the Senate and the Roman People fought with Caesar to induce him to succeed to the position of his father (fato potens), while he, on his part, strove for permission to play the part of a citizen on a parity with the rest rather than that of Princeps. At last he was prevailed upon by reason rather than by honour (i.e., the honour of the position)—magis ratione quam honoré victus est (he was overcome)—since he saw that whatever he did not undertake to protect was likely to perish ... (Vell. Pat. 2.124.2)

Here was Tiberius' claim to primacy:

He is the only man to whose lot it has fallen to refuse the principate (recusare principatum) for a longer time, almost, than other men had fought—under arms—to secure it. (Vell. Pat. loc.cit.)

That was the way in which Tiberius sought to win the prize: in being the person to have refused power for longer than anyone else. The paradigmatic shift was profound and established.
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WHO WANTS CLASSICS IN A NEW WORLD?

E.A. Judge

A new human culture was predicted for New South Wales by the founder of Altertumswissenschaft.1

potest aliquando cultus generis humani novus ex hac insula ortum et caussas ducere; quid ipse, ut Roma asyno aperto per latrones et fugitivos prima incremmenta cepisse velgo narratur, magi post plura saecula imperii per hos deportatos semina tacta esse possent,

unde relegabantur in Britanniam iudicia Cambriensem damnati.

69. A new human culture may arise and develop its distinctiveness out of this island. We are told the tale that Rome itself first began to grow because of its openness to bandits and fugitives who flocked to it as a place of asylum. The latter-day deportees could now be sowing seeds of a great empire, which will come along centuries later.

70. The courts of this new Wales may well go on to banish their own convicts—to Britain!

C.G. Heyne (1729-1812) was forty-seven years in the chair of Eloquence and Poetry at the then ultra-modern university of Göttingen, and director of its Philological Seminar. He lectured on all the major Greek and Roman poets, editing the texts of Homer and Vergil. He was a celebrated exponent of art history and archaeology.

Heyne took a comprehensive view of the ancient world, stressing its value for the education of the modern one. An admirer of the French Revolution, he formulated the ideals of German humanism for the nineteenth century, the pioneer of "Classical Studies", we may say.2