JULIUS CAESAR IN AUGUSTAN ROME

PETER WHITE

IN 1843, HORACE'S SWISS COMMENTATOR Johann Kaspar von Orelli noted in an *obiter dictum* that the Augustan poets made little fanfare over the name of Julius Caesar. He assumed that they had shied away instinctively from praising a man whose accomplishments might threaten to overshadow Augustus' own.[1] Other critics took the point about the low visibility of Caesar, but suspected that the initiative must have proceeded directly from Augustus. Various hypotheses were bruited: perhaps Augustus was jealous of Caesar's superior military gifts; perhaps he was uncomfortable about Caesar's destruction of the Republic; anxious to divert attention from similarities between Caesar's methods and his own; and so on. In this way, during the course of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, the poets' silence about Caesar became a minor motif of scholarly discussion.[2]

In 1988, the idea is familiar to all as one of the distinctive emphases of Sir Ronald Syme. Syme took up the suggestion that the Augustan poets had downplayed Caesar and lent it much greater currency than it had had before, partly by force of personal authority and partly by the assiduity with which he preached it.[3] But a still more important factor in his presentation of the

The substance of this paper was presented in a seminar in the Graduate Department of Classics at the University of Toronto on March 25, 1988. I am grateful to the Department for having contrived a situation in which it was necessary for me to think of something to say, and for then taking good care that it did not turn out to be a one-way conversation. Catherine Rubincam and James Zetzel subsequently gave me further advice about my argument; to both I owe a particular debt.

[1] "Memorabile est Divi Iulii claram certamque mentionem nusquam [ab Horatio] factam esse praeterquam Od. 1,2,44, *Caesaris ultor* sine ullo epitheto, nullam a Propertio, tribus locis dumtaxat a Virgilio (Ecl. 9,47, Ge. 1,466, Aen. 6,790) quasi timuissent, ne illo magnifice celebrato Augusti laudibus officerent easque obscurarent. Ac pariter Iulium sub Augustum deprimit Ovidius Met. 15,750," at *Carm.* 1.12.47. This note appears, not in Orelli's first edition (1837–1838), but in the second edition of the *editio minor* (1843). In the third edition of the *editio maior* (1850), a complementary note was inserted at *Carm.* 1.2.44.

[2] Echoed in F. Plessis, *La poésie latine* (Paris 1909) 231; R. Pichon, "Virgile et César," *REA* 19 (1917) 193–198; F. Gundolf, *Caesar: Geschichte seines Ruhms* (Berlin 1924) 24–26; W. M. Green, "Julius Caesar in the Augustan Poets," *CJ* 27 (1932) 405–411; J. W. Spaeth, "Caesar's Friends and Enemies among the Poets," *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 64 (1933) lx.

[3] By my count, the idea comes up ten times in his writings, beginning with "Caesar, the Senate, and Italy," *PBSR* 14 (1938) 2 = *Roman Papers* 1.89, and continuing right down to *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986) 443. The works which Syme regularly cites as containing his fullest statement on this point are *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 317–318, and *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 1.432–434. It is also worth consulting his 1951 Todd Lecture "A Roman Post-Mortem," *Roman Papers* 1.212–214, and *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978) 140–141.

PHOENIX, VOL. 42 (1988) 4.

idea, and the reason it is now justifiably identified with him, is that he fitted it into a broad and dynamic framework. He pointed to other signs of Augustus' discomfort with Caesar, and showed how the treatment of Caesar in poetry could be seen as one phase in a massive orchestration of public opinion. Syme's assumptions and the steps by which he argued his case can be quickly set out in his own words with the help of three extracts. They are from different writings, but the following sequence fairly conveys his thought:

> One of the essential Augustan ambiguities is the attitude of Caesar's heir toward Caesar. Though "Divi filius," he seeks his legitimation in and from the Republic: like the Triumvir, the Dictator was better forgotten. The writers who most faithfully reflect governmental opinion, namely Virgil, Horace, and Livy, agree in what they say (or do not say) about Caesar the Dictator. (*Tacitus* 1.432–433)

> Livy was moved to grave doubts—was the birth of Caesar a blessing or a curse? Augustus twitted him with being a Pompeian. The Emperor and his historian understood each other. The authentic Pompeius was politically forgotten, buried in fraudulent laudations of the dead. What they required was not the ambitious and perfidious dynast but that Pompeius who had fallen as Caesar's enemy, as a champion of the Free State against military despotism. Virgil in the *Aeneid*, when he matched the rival leaders, made Aeneas' guide exhort Caesar to disarm before Pompeius . . . Save for that veiled rebuke, no word of Caesar in all the epic record of Rome's glorious past . . . the shield of Aeneas allows a brief glimpse of the future life, on the one side Catilina in hell, tormented by furies for ever, on the other an ideal Cato, usefully legislating among the blessed dead . . . Virgil did not need to say where Caesar belonged—with his revolutionary ally or with the venerable adversary whose memory he had traduced after death. Again, Horace in the *Odes* omits all mention of Caesar the Dictator. Only the *Iulium sidus* is there—the soul of Caesar purged of all earthly stain, transmuted into a comet. (*The Roman Revolution* 317–318)

> It was expedient for Augustus to dissociate himself from Caesar: the one destroyed the Republic, the other restored it. How could that be done? Easily, and with the fairest pretext. Caesar had been deified, he was no longer a mortal man. When Caesar's heir himself died at the term of his long presidency of the Roman State, there were carried in the funeral procession the images of his ancestors, and also those of the great generals of the past. Pompeius Magnus was among them, but not Caesar. The artifice of Augustus is patent. He exploited the divinity of his parent and paraded the titulature of "Divi filius." For all else, Caesar the proconsul and Dictator was better forgotten. (*Roman Papers* 1.214)

In the following pages I will challenge this interpretation and offer a different assessment of Caesar's public image in Rome. Syme's argument sets the boundaries of my discussion. I am concerned not with the years from 44 to 31, when almost everyone accepts that Octavian maximized his

association with Julius Caesar,[4] but with the principate proper, since according to Syme, Augustus began to dissociate himself from Caesar only after he had become "undisputed master of Rome."[5] Furthermore, if his argument is that Augustus himself, as one might say, dehabilitated Caesar, then what Augustus' successors made of Caesar has only secondary bearing on the case. Whether Caesar was regarded as the first *princeps* or not, and when and by whom, and whether or when his name was added to the litany of emperors in the imperial oath—these are not questions I will address. Finally, I will focus on public opinion in the capital to the exclusion of towns and regions outside, since even a strong case for Caesar's credit in the hinterland could not offset claims that he was felt to be an embarrassment in the political center.

I AUGUSTUS' TREATMENT OF CAESAR

The most direct indication of Caesar's status during the Augustan period is a series of official actions honoring him. In 42 B.C. the triumvirs had insisted that a temple of *Divus Iulius* be raised where his body had been cremated near the Regia. It is not clear whether Octavian had sole or only shared responsibility for the ultimate design. But by the time Caesar's temple was dedicated in the year 29, it had become the anchor structure of a virtual propylaea that was being extended across the eastern end of the Roman Forum.[6] Augustus erected the triumphal arch honoring his own Actian victory on the south flank of the temple—a site which he considered so important to retain that when he was voted a second arch ten years later, he preferred to demolish the first structure and rebuild, rather than appropriate a new location.[7] Within the temple chamber, the new god's statue occupied a vantage-point which made it conspicuous to people passing through the Forum, as we know from remarks by Ovid and Statius.[8]

[4]The significant exception is E. S. Ramage ("Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar," *Historia* 34 [1985] 223–245), who contends that Augustus' effort to dissociate himself from Caesar began from the moment he attained power in the forties.

[5]"Post-Mortem," *Roman Papers* 1.213. Syme has left the commencement of the official silence somewhat vague: "The claims of *Divus Iulius* . . . prevalent for some years in the aftermath of Actium, gradually recede and lose ground," *The Roman Revolution* 318.

[6]P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum*. Monumenta Artis Antiquae 5 (Tübingen 1972) 12–14; P. Gros, Aurea Templa: *Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste* (Rome 1976) 84–91.

[7]Zanker, *op. cit.* 15–16.

[8]The conspicuousness of the statue is the point of Ovid *Met.* 15.841–842 *semper Capitolia nostra forumque / Divus ab excelsa prospectet Iulius aede*, *Pont.* 2.2.84–85 [*Castor et Pollux*] *quos proxima templa tenentis / divus ab excelsa Iulius aede videt*, and Stat. *Silvae* 1.1.22–24 *hinc obvia limina pandit / qui fessus bellis adscitae munere prolis / primus iter nostris ostendit in aethera divis.*

Although construction was almost certainly over with before the year 29,[9] Augustus held up dedication of the temple until he arrived back in Rome, and carried it out three days after his triple triumph in August.[10] He decorated the temple with treasures he had brought from Egypt, and solemnized the dedication with games lasting for several days.[11] Probably at about the same time, he installed his brother-in-law Sextus Appuleius as the new priest of the Deified Julius.[12]

Once built, Caesar's temple played an unusual part in the conduct of public business in the Forum. The projecting podium served as a tribunal, like the Rostra at the opposite end. This correspondence was emphasized when the beaks of ships captured at Actium were attached to the podium of Caesar's temple (Cass. Dio 51.19.2). The tribes were on occasion convened in legislative assembly here,[13] but the most curious development is that at funerals for members of the palace family, contrapuntal eulogies began to be delivered from the tribunals at either end of the Forum. In the two instances we know about—the funeral of Octavia and Augustus' own funeral—the emperor spoke from the podium of Caesar's temple, while the less distinguished panegyrist spoke from the old Rostra.[14] Whatever intent may have guided the triumvirs in 42, the temple of Caesar ultimately became the seat of a family cult which was at the same time fully integrated into the state religion. It was a public monument corresponding to the Mausoleum which Augustus built outside the pomerium, and which signified his family's grandeur in a more traditional and private way.

Since the temple is incidentally relevant to Syme's point about the absence

[9]Two reasons for thinking so are the apparent reference to work in progress on a coin of the year 36 (M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* 1 [Cambridge 1974] 537, no. 540), and the thirteen-year interval between the laying of the foundation in 42 (προκαταβάλλεσθαι, Cass. Dio 47.18.4) and the dedication. The *aedes Divi Iuli* was much smaller than the roughly contemporary complex associated with the Palatine Temple of Apollo, and unlike that project, it did not entail the acquisition of privately held land. Yet the Temple of Apollo was completed in 28, only eight years after it had been vowed.

[10]A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.2, p. 497; or V. Ehrenberg-A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1955) 35 and 50.

[11]Cass. Dio 51.22, Pliny *HN* 35.27 and 91, Aug. *Anc.* 21.2.

[12]*ILS* 8963. Antony, inaugurated as Caesar's *flamen* in 40 or 39 (Plut. *Ant.* 33.1), would not have vacated the post until his death in the summer of 30.

[13]Front. *Aq.* 129.1–2 (a *lex* of 9 B.C.).

[14]Cass. Dio 54.35.4–5 (funeral of Augustus' sister Octavia) and 56.34.4 (Augustus' funeral). Dio, who is our only source for this practice, does not indicate whether a double eulogy was given for Marcellus (53.30.5) or Agrippa (54.28.3–5—though perhaps his emphasis here on the parallelism with Augustus' funeral implies a double eulogy). He does attest a double eulogy at the funeral of Drusus (55.2.2), but says that Augustus had to deliver his address in the Circus Flaminius because at the time he could not cross the pomerium. (For the funerals of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Dio's full text is unavailable.)

of Caesar's *imago* at Augustus' funeral, this will be as good a place as any to respond to it. For Syme, the omission dramatizes the official silence surrounding Caesar's memory. But there are a number of considerations which stand in the way of this interpretation. In the first place Cassius Dio, our source in this instance (56.34.2), makes plain that the protocol about Caesar's image had an honorific purpose, and that it dated back to the earliest years of the new cult. The reason Caesar could not be represented among anyone's ancestors at funerals was that he was deemed to exist on a higher plane as a god. Policy on this point had been established, not during the era of Augustus' principate, but years before, in 42 B.C., when the triumvirs enacted a whole set of measures tending to the glorification of Caesar (Cass. Dio 47.19.2). Furthermore, after the deification of Augustus, the same policy was extended to him, and his bust too disappeared from Roman funeral processions (56.46.4). Finally, the presence or absence of Caesar's mask at Augustus' funeral must be interpreted in relation to the order of ceremonies overall. The cortege proceeded into the Forum and there paused to hear the eulogies. Augustus' successor, the new emperor, spoke from the porch of Caesar's temple, under the gaze of Caesar's statue, which was visible to all the mourners (56.34). Surely the planners judged correctly that a mummer with Caesar's mask could have added nothing to the impact of this spectacle.

Although the temple of Caesar was the most powerful evocation of the late dictator, it was not Augustus' only monument to him. Before his death, Caesar had begun construction of a new senate-house which was to bear his name. Augustus completed the project, and in the year 29 dedicated the Julian Senate-house, as Dio says, "in honor of his father" (44.5.1–2, 47.19.1, 51.22.1). When Agrippa built the Pantheon on the Campus Martius four years later and wanted to place a statue of Augustus inside, Augustus refused permission, insisting that Caesar's statue be displayed there instead (Cass. Dio 53.27.3).

Early in the following decade, Caesar became the subject of a new series of coin-types advertising his apotheosis. They took three forms: an image of the *sidus Iulium* accompanied by the legend "*Divus Iulius*"; the head of Caesar surmounted by his comet; and a remarkable tableau in which Augustus is shown fixing a star over the head of his deified parent.[15] Only the

[15]The three coin-types are as described most recently by J.-B. Giard, *Bibliothèque Nationale: Catalogue des monnaies de l'empire romain* 1 (Paris 1976) 190–191, nos. 1292–1309 ("Divus Iulius" and comet), p. 87 (head and comet, on coins struck by the moneyer M. Sanquinius), and p. 115, nos. 555–559 (Augustus and Caesar, on coins of the moneyer L. Lentulus), and, more tentatively, by C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, 2nd edition, 1 (London 1984) 44, nos. 37–38; 48, no. 102 ("Divus Julius"); 66, nos. 337–340 (Sanquinius); and 74, no. 415 (Lentulus). Sanquinius' coin, the obverse of which refers to the Secular Games of 17 B.C., is the only one which can be precisely dated, and its reverse type is usually thought to be connected with the appearance of a comet in that same year (see Julius Obsequens, p. 181 Rossbach, and Cass. Dio 54.19.7, who reports the comet under the following year).

second of these types resembles any previous issue; overall, the star or comet is a more insistent focus of the new coins than of pre-Actian coins in Caesar's honor.

In 2 B.C., Augustus dedicated to Mars the Avenger the temple which he had vowed before the battle with his father's assassins in 42. During the interim, the god's penal cognizance had been extended beyond acts against a *parens patriae* to other outrages against the nation. The legionary standards which the Parthians had seized from Crassus' army and which Augustus finally recovered were deposited in Mars' temple, and it became the staging point for manifestations of Roman military might.[16] Nevertheless, Caesar retained an important place in the new design. His sword and probably his statue reposed inside the temple,[17] and images of his Julian kinsmen stood all around a large bay in the portico enclosing temple and forum on the northwest side.[18]

And finally, as Augustus propagated the cult of the new deity who now

---

Since Sanquinius' coin does not explicitly name the figure depicted on the reverse, the identification with Caesar has sometimes been disputed, chiefly on the grounds that the head shown looks too young to be Caesar's; for alternative interpretations, see H. Mattingly, "Rare and Unpublished Roman Coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge," *NC* 6 (1956) 176–177 and A. A. Boyce, "A New Augustan Aureus of 17 B.C.," *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* 153 (1965) 1–11 (arguing that Sanquinius' coin depicts Iulus or the Genius of the new *saeculum* respectively). The figures on the reverse of Lentulus' coin are not named either; here Mattingly somewhat inconsistently concluded that the heroic figure being "crowned" was Agrippa, who died in the year in which the coin is believed to have been issued, at the age of about fifty-one (*Roman Imperial Coinage*, 1st edition, 1 [London 1923] 77, no. 173). In both cases, however, it would seem that official coinage must represent an officially recognized *divus*, and until A.D. 14 there are no candidates but Caesar available. That the youthfulness and semi-nude pose of the figure on Lentulus' coin are conventional attributes of a *divus* is strongly suggested by comparable figures on reliefs from Algiers and Ravenna and on the armored torso from Cherchel: see K. Fittschen, "Zur Panzerstatue in Cherchel," *JDAI* 91 (1976) 175–210, especially 182–189.

[16]Suet. *Aug.* 29.1–2, Ovid *Fasti* 5.545–598, Xiph. 101 = Cass. Dio 55.10.2–5.

[17]For the sword, see Suet. *Vit.* 8.1. The presence of a statue of Divus Iulius depends on Gsell's argument that the three deities shown in an Algiers relief reproduce the statue group from the cella of the Temple of Mars at Rome ("Les statues du temple de Mars Ultor à Rome," *RA* [1899] 37–43; Gsell's argument is accepted by P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum: Das Bildprogramm*, Monumenta Artis Antiquae 2 [Tübingen 1970] 18–20 and P. Gros [above, n. 6] 168, n. 114), and on the broader assumption that an image of Caesar would not be absent from a complex in which even unremarkable members of the Julian *gens* had commemorative statues.

Although the cult of Mars Ultor acquired a nationalistic orientation, the god was not thereby dispensed from his particular responsibilities to the Caesars. The original purpose of the cult is reaffirmed in dedications made or proposed to Mars Ultor when assassination attempts on later emperors are foiled: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.18.2, Suet. *Cal.* 24.3, and Cass. Dio 59.22.6–7. Not that there is any conflict or even discontinuity between the two interests Mars serves: as Ovid noted (*Tr.* 4.4.15), *res est publica Caesar.*

[18]Fragments survive of the *elogia* of Caesar's father and of Caesar Strabo; see Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.3 (Rome 1937) 12–14; Degrassi believed (5) that there was a statue of Caesar too in the northwest exedra.

watched conspicuously over the Roman state, he continued to commemorate Caesar's terrestrial accomplishments. Between the months of March and August the calendars record five *feriae* commemorating decisive battles of the Civil War.[19] A sixth official holiday on July 12th commemorated Caesar's birthday, and eleven days at the end of the month were set aside for the entertainments which comprised the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris*.[20] Not until 19 B.C. did holidays and games in honor of Augustus outstrip those dedicated to his parent. Thus throughout the year the inhabitants of Rome were reminded of Caesar's generalship as well as of his new-found divinity. It was by way of these festivities, in fact, that Ovid worked mention of the Thapsus anniversary into his calendar poem. In Book 4 of the *Fasti* (377–387), he purports to recall a show at which he sat next to one of Caesar's veterans, and was engaged in conversation about the anniversary.

Ovid's interlocutor may be pure invention, but the occasion was not. Roman public life offered any number of holidays, monuments, and images that fostered remembrance of Caesar and that gradually integrated him into the collage of emblems which citizens associated with the idea of the state. And the chief impetus in that process unquestionably came from Augustus, who after Caesar's death enhanced the already extravagant honors Caesar had received in life. Those honors did not keep pace with the adulation poured out upon Augustus himself, of course. The cult of a *divus* could not tap the currents of feeling and calculation which the living strongman attracted, and even Caesar's military reputation was overshadowed by Augustus' broader political successes in projecting Roman authority abroad. But Caesar nevertheless retained an important place in the civic religion of the new regime; he was not displaced in order that Augustus might be more exalted.[21]

[19]March 17 for the victory over Gnaeus Pompey at Munda in 45; March 27 for the victory at Alexandria in 47; April 6 for the victory over Juba and the Pompeians in North Africa in 46; August 2 for the victories over Pompey's army at Ilerda in Spain in 49 and over Pharnaces at Zela in Pontus in 47; August 9 for the victory over Pompey at Pharsalus in 48. For details, see A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.2 (Rome 1963) 368–369, 372–374, and 559–560, and the entries under the dates.

[20]References to Degrassi as in the preceding note, plus pp. 372–374. Degrassi cites evidence independent of the *fasti* for continuing observance of Caesar's birthday, the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris*, and the Thapsus celebration.

[21]There is one form of pious remembrance, however, which on the whole our sources do not show Augustus cultivating *vis-à-vis* his father. Whereas in the next reign Tiberius regularly professed to be carrying on the legacy of Augustus, we rarely hear of Augustus invoking Caesar's policies. It is difficult to know how to assess the lack of lip service to Caesar in this regard. In fact, between Caesar's death and Augustus' ascendancy there was no smooth transition, but a decade and a half of arbitrary and lawless government which Augustus himself disowned in 28 B.C. (Cass. Dio 53.2.5). Perhaps the dearth of references to Caesar's policies is a consequence. Once Augustus had decided to cancel his own triumviral acts, he may have considered that nothing he could salvage from Caesar's legacy was equal to the advantage he

Apart from the official monuments and ceremonies with which Augustus honored his father, he had occasion to speak of him in two published writings. For different reasons, they shed little light on Caesar's status during the period, but some reference must be made to them. The text of the *Res Gestae* was among the papers Augustus reserved to be opened at his death. An adaptation of the inscriptional vaunt by which great men were accustomed to record their public distinctions, it is frankly egocentric, and acknowledges other persons only as they impinge on Augustus' own career. It contains four references to Caesar (identified in each case not by name but as Augustus' "parent" or "father"): to Caesar's murder, which obliged Augustus to exact vengeance from the assassins; to Caesar's high priesthood, to which Augustus might properly have laid claim after Caesar's death; to Caesar's will, whose bequests to citizens Augustus raised money to pay; and to construction which Caesar began and Augustus completed.[22] Obviously Caesar emerges as little more than a foil to Augustus here, but it would be a mistake to see in this presentation a designedly anti-Caesarian slant. The account given in the *Res Gestae* begins with Augustus' activities after Caesar's death, and it conforms to the procedures of a genre which, unlike autobiography or historical narrative, eschews analysis or reflection in favor of facts and figures. Simply from formal considerations, therefore, fuller discussion of Caesar was hardly to be expected. Furthermore, Caesar is not more slighted than other important persons mentioned in the document. Agrippa and Tiberius both played key roles during the reign, yet Agrippa's activities are referred to only twice,[23] and Tiberius' only three times.[24] The style of reference, whereby Caesar is designated by his relationship as father rather than by name, also conforms to a pattern evident throughout the *Res Gestae*. Tiberius is introduced as *filius* (8.4) or *privignus* (27.2, 30.1), Gaius and Lucius as *filii* (14.1, 20.3, 27.2), and Marcellus as *gener* (21.1).[25] That

could gain by proclaiming a wholly new beginning. On the other hand, the absence of testimony to Caesar may be to some extent an illusion created by the nature of our sources. For the Augustan period we have no history packed with speeches by the *princeps*, like Tacitus' account of Tiberius' reign; even Dio's account of the period is incomplete. Yet Dio does report one occasion on which Augustus appealed to Caesar's authority when setting policy. In A.D. 6 the Dictator's notorious private papers were brandished once again in order to justify the imposition of an inheritance tax (Cass. Dio 55.25.5).

[22]The references are in sections 2, 10.2, 15.1, and 20.3. I leave out of the reckoning four references to monuments bearing Caesar's name, in sections 19.1, 21.2, 34.2, and 35.1.

[23]At 8.2 and 22.2, where Agrippa figures in relatively unspectacular capacities as consular colleague and as co-presider at the Secular Games. Agrippa's name does not come up in contexts where it might have, for example at 27.3 and 29.1.

[24]At 8.4 (as consular colleague), 27.2 (Augustus settles the succession in Armenia *per Ti. Neronem*), and 30.1 (Augustus subjugates Pannonia *per Ti. Neronem*); Tiberius is named merely as part of a consular date at 12.2 and 16.2.

[25]That Marcellus, Tiberius, Gaius, and Lucius are identified by name as well as relationship is due to the fact that they cannot be unambiguously specified by designations like *filius* and

Caesar has been brought down to the same scale as everybody else is more a reflection of the literary strategy pursued in this document than of a policy *vis-à-vis* Caesar.

About the other work in which Augustus had occasion to speak of Caesar less can be said because less is known, but there can be no question that Caesar figured more prominently in it. In the late twenties Augustus published a thirteen-book autobiography, of which the first book covered his years down to the time of Caesar's assassination.[26] His public activities to that point had been shaped almost entirely by the patronage of his great-uncle. At the age of twelve he made his debut as a speaker by delivering the eulogy of Caesar's sister Julia, and following Caesar's *coup d'état* he came in for a succession of honors: a priesthood when he was fifteen, installation as City Prefect during the Latin Festival a year later, military decorations on the occasion of Caesar's African triumph, a role as show-giver during holidays, elevation to the patriciate. In the last year of Caesar's life, Augustus managed to cut loose from the custody of his mother and stepfather, and to establish himself permanently in Caesar's entourage.[27] When he dedicated one book to this period of his life, therefore, he inevitably committed himself to publicizing some interpretation of Caesar as well.

How Caesar was treated in this portion of the autobiography we do not know. But the few citations from later portions which refer to Caesar do not reflect unfavorably on him,[28] and we have no reason to presuppose that the tenor of Book 1 was negative. On the contrary, there may be some reason to think that it was positive. At an unknown date, but almost certainly within the lifetime of Augustus, Nicolaus of Damascus published a Greek life of Augustus of which substantial portions (dealing with his youth and with the assassination of Caesar) have survived in Byzantine compilations.[29] Partly because Nicolaus recounts several domestic particulars of his protagonist's early life, it is widely supposed that Augustus' autobiography was his princi-

---

gener, as becomes evident from two passages where Augustus does use kinship terms without naming names (at 22.1 and 22.3). *pater*, on the other hand, can refer to no one but Caesar. The use of kinship terms in the *Res Gestae* is part of Augustus' strategy of presenting all data in relation to himself, and in that sense it is true that he downplays everyone else he mentions. But it is only by virtue of being related to him that Tiberius, Marcellus, and others gain any mention in the text at all. Augustan notables who were not part of the family do not make even a bowing appearance; compare, for example, 26.3, 26.5, and 30.2.

[26]For the extent of the autobiography, see Suet. *Aug.* 85.1 and the *Suda* s.v. Αὔγουστος Καῖσαρ 1.410 Adler; Servius Auctus' note on Verg. *Ecl.* 9.46 indicates that Book 2 covered the period immediately following the assassination.

[27]The sources are most conveniently assembled in *PIR*^{2} I 215.

[28]Cass. Dio 44.35.3, Pliny *HN* 2.93–94, and Servius Auctus on Verg. *Ecl.* 9.46.

[29]Nicolaus is no. 90 in *FGrHist*, Teil 2A; the *Bios Kaisaros* comprises FF 125–130, pp. 391–420.

pal source.[30] If that is the case, the very partisan interpretation Nicolaus gives of Caesar may also follow lines laid down in the autobiography.

II CAESAR IN LIVY AND OTHER PROSE ACCOUNTS

If one can point to no overt action by which Augustus sought to veil or diminish Caesar, the case for an anti-Caesarian policy has to take the form that effects of the policy come to light elsewhere. That is in fact Syme's strategy. It will be apparent that he argues on the basis, not of what Augustus did, but of what contemporaries said or failed to say about Caesar. His lead witness is Livy.

In Livy's history of Rome, the narrative of Caesar's career took up the bulk of fourteen books (103–116). For the most part, their content is known only from short summaries, ranging from seventy-five to one-hundred-and-fifty words, which virtually exclude interpretative comment. But another writer happens to report one judgment on Caesar passed in Livy's history. Discussing natural phenomena, the younger Seneca (*QN* 5.18.4) expatiates on the wind:

ingens naturae beneficium, si illud in iniuriam suam non vertat hominum furor: nunc quod de Caesare maiori vulgo dictatum est et a Tito Livio positum, in incerto esse, utrum illum magis nasci an non nasci reipublicae profuerit, dici etiam de ventis potest; adeo quicquid ex illis utile et necessarium est, non potest his repensari, quae in perniciem suam generis humani dementia excogitat.

It was mainly on the basis of this passage that Syme claimed Livy as spokesman for the anti-Caesarian current which he thinks set in after Actium. But even if we could assume that this remark crystallized the whole tendency of Livy's narrative, it does not quite yield the substance which is required of it. In the first place, the conundrum about Caesar appears to be an utterance which Livy reports, not one which he originated—*vulgo dictatum est et a Tito Livio positum*. From what Seneca tells us, we cannot even be sure that Livy endorsed the formulation. Furthermore, if the context in which Seneca quotes it retains anything of the original context, it was not a basically negative assessment. Seneca's point about the wind is that it is a blessing in itself, and brings harm only because it is exploited for bad ends. If those were the lines along which Livy interpreted Caesar's career, his

[30]The *communis opinio* was propagated if not conceived by Jacoby, *FGrHist*, Teil 2C, pp. 263–265, and has been reaffirmed at length by G. Dobesch, "Nikolaos von Damaskus und die Selbstbiographie des Augustus," *GB* 7 (1978) 91–174. It has recently been contested by M. Toher, "The Date of Nicolaus' *Bios Kaisaros*," *GRBS* 26 (1985) 199–206, who directs his fire mainly against the conventional dating of the *Bios* to the late twenties, but also questions its derivation from Augustus' autobiography. Toher rightly insists that the prevailing view has weak underpinnings, but the case he advocates seems to me no less frailly founded.

treatment would have to be considered more apologetic than censorious.[31] But it is unnecessary to see in Livy's formula anything more than compositional artifice. Surely the context in which he is most likely to have weighed the dictator's impact for good or ill is in a necrological notice after the story of the assassination.[32] In that case, the question would be no more than a framing device which allowed Livy to set out considerations on both sides. Roman historians typically construct obituary vignettes so as to balance good and bad aspects of a man's career.[33] If Livy was merely following that convention, it implies little about his final judgment of Caesar, and certainly not that he had come round to thinking that the birth of Caesar was a curse.[34]

Although Livy's bias remains indeterminable, it is worth emphasizing that the fourteen books he devoted to the Caesarian period represented a major treatment of it, and that his account was produced during Augustus' lifetime. During the twenties or soon afterward, Asinius Pollio as well published a seventeen-book account of the civil-war period.[35] Augustus himself dealt with the Caesarian years in the first book of his autobiography, as noted above. Nicolaus of Damascus inserted a long account of Caesar's end into a biography of Augustus which was also published during Augustus' reign.[36] In whatever light Caesar appeared in these accounts, it does not

[31]One possible point of contact for such an interpretation would be a motif shared by several sources that flatterers led Caesar into excess: Cass. Dio 44.3, 44.7.3, Plut. *Caes.* 57.2–3, *Brut.* 9.8, *Ant.* 12, Nic. Dam., *FGrHist* 90, Teil 2A, F 130, sec. 67. Compare also the remark Dio puts in the mouth of Tiberius, that Caesar's associates violated the sound policy he tried to follow himself (56.38.4).

[32]According to Seneca the Elder, Livy wrote such sketches *omnibus magnis viris* (*Suas.* 6.21).

[33]Note especially the formula *si quis virtutibus vitia pensaret* in the Livian *epitaphion* of Cicero which Seneca quotes.

[34]Here again Seneca's information is relevant: *est natura candidissimus omnium magnorum ingeniorum aestimator T. Livius*, *Suas.* 6.22. Livy's remark about Caesar has most recently been discussed by H. Strasburger in an article that covers all aspects of the theme "Livius über Caesar," in *Livius: Werk und Rezeption. Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Lefèvre and E. Olshausen (Munich 1983) 265–291. Strasburger recognizes that the quote must derive from Livy's *Schlussurteil* on Caesar, but he does not try to relate it to the form and tone of other necrologies. Overall he takes the position that Livy offered a negative interpretation of Caesar, arguing ultimately from the conviction that Lucan's epic reflects Livy's point of view as well as Livy's supply of facts.

[35]See the *Suda* s.v. Ἀσίννιος Πωλίων 1.381 Adler. Pollio began with the year 60 B.C. (Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.1–8) and went down at least to the end of 43 (Sen. *Suas.* 6.24–25).

[36]For a possible fifth treatment, see Cichorius' argument (*Römische Studien* [Leipzig 1922] 261–269) that the "Kornoutos" identified as an Augustan historian in the *Suda* (3.158 Adler) was the author of a work on the civil wars. Another may have been Cremutius Cordus. Cordus was a contemporary of Augustus (Suet. *Tib.* 61.3) who certainly dealt with the triumviral and early Augustan years; Cass. Dio 57.24.3 suggests that his history may also have taken in part of the Caesarian phase of the civil wars.

seem that the subject of his career had become a taboo constraining Augustus or anyone else from writing about it.

But let us pursue the argument a step further. Syme holds that Augustus downplayed Caesar because Caesar's responsibility for the civil war and his dictatorship made him too controversial to be assimilated and celebrated under the restored Republic. Surely that assumption grants too little credit to the cosmetic armory which rhetorically instructed writers had ready for any need. The fact is that Caesar takes up ample space in Nicolaus' life of Augustus, and Nicolaus has no trouble smoothing over his faults and showing him to advantage.[37] Nicolaus is the only one of our four Augustan authors of whose treatment of Caesar any portion is extant, but two popularizing writers of the next generation also handle Caesar with no sign of discomfort. Velleius Paterculus in his precis of Roman history is able to lavish praise on Caesar and later to hail the restoration of the Republic without noticing any inconsistency.[38] And in the treasury of edifying *exempla* which Valerius Maximus compiled, Caesar gets fuller and more fulsome coverage than Augustus himself.[39] Not only, then, are the Caesarian years not ignored by historical writers of the early principate, but there is scant evidence in what is extant of that negative perspective which Syme imputed to the new regime.[40] I would suggest that if the sources point to any image problem which Augustus needed to counteract, it concerned his own conduct during the triumviral period rather than anything Caesar had done. The proscriptions were what everyone remembered about the war.[41]

III CAESAR IN AUGUSTAN POETRY

As so often, our principal record of what Augustus' contemporaries said comes from Augustan poetry, which presents an entirely different aspect

[37]Nicolaus' slant is best seen in his narrative of the assassination, *FGrHist* 90, Teil 2A, F 130, secs. 58–97. As Josephus notes (*AJ* 16.184), Nicolaus showed himself an accomplished propagandist on behalf of a ruler who presented more problems than Caesar.

[38]Vell. 2.41–57 and 89; part of Velleius' strategy in the Caesarian chapters is to lay any possible blame onto scapegoats; cf. 2.48.3–4 and 2.56.4.

[39]As may be seen at a glance from the index of Kempf's edition: compare the entries under "Augustus Caesar" and "C. Iulius Caesar."

[40]Curiously, the only Augustan or early post-Augustan writer whom we know to have expressed definitely negative judgments about Caesar is Asinius Pollio, Caesar's former legate: cf. Suet. *Caes.* 56.4 and Cic. *Fam.* 10.31.2. Presumably Syme does not avail himself of this testimony because in his reconstruction of the Augustan environment Pollio (by contrast with Livy) does not rank among those writers "who most faithfully reflect governmental opinion."

[41]Several of the declamatory themes in the elder Seneca's collection involve civil war scenarios, which I take as a reasonable index of the way people imagined the period years later under Augustus and Tiberius: *Cont.* 4.8, 6.4, 7.2, 10.3, and *Suas.* 6–7. In every case but one the specific phase of the war envisioned is that of the proscriptions. (The exception is *Cont.* 10.3—and even here mention of the proscriptions intrudes in sec. 1.)

from the patchy remains of Augustan historical writing: here, as for no other period of classical literature, we possess almost the complete output of all major authors. How Caesar fared in poetry can be represented most simply in comparative form. In the accompanying table I have collected all references I have found to Caesar, as well as references to others with some claim on public attention: the more notable living members of Augustus' family, and two icons of the Republican past, Pompey and Cato, whom Syme has suggested Augustus sought to rehabilitate.

TABLE I: SOME NOTABLES IN AUGUSTAN VERSE

In the following catalog: (1) authors and the works of any given author are listed so far as possible in chronological order, but no effort has been made to press that arrangement by intermeshing citations from different authors; (2) Tiberian as well as Augustan portions of Ovid and Manilius are included, since in practice a chronological dividing line cannot be neatly drawn; (3) a citation in parentheses indicates a reference that is collective rather than specific: the person in question belongs to a group mentioned (the Caesars, or the sons or stepsons of Augustus, for example), but is not otherwise singled out (the reference therefore being comparatively weak); (4) the rubric "Uncertain" reflects only a personal judgment, not a scholarly consensus, and embraces both more plausible and less plausible references.

Julius Caesar	Verg. *Ecl.* 9.46–50, *G.* 1.466–497, *Aen.* 6.792, 826–835, 8.681, (9.642), Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.5, (1.7.35), 1.9.18, *Carm.* 1.2.44, 1.12.46–48, Prop. 3.11.38, 3.18.34, (4.1.48), 4.6.59–60, Ovid *Am.* (2.14.18), 3.8.52, *Met.* 15.745–818 and 840–851, *Tr.* 3.1.27, *Pont.* 2.2.84, 4.5.21, *Fasti* (1.510), 1.604, 2.144, 3.155–166, (3.202), 3.697–710, (4.22), 4.377–384, 5.569–577, *Epic. Drusi* (245), *Eleg. Maec.* 177–178, Germanicus, at Pliny *HN* 8.155, Man. 1.9, 798–799, 913, 926, 4.57–62, 934. Uncertain: "Gallus" fragment, lines 2–5 (*JRS* 69 [1979] 140), Verg. *Ecl.* 5, *Aen.* 1.286–288, 6.621, 6.789, Tib. 2.5.71–78, Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.17–18, *Epist.* 1.5.9, Ovid *Met.* 1.200–205.
Pompey	Prop. 2.32.11–16, 3.11.35–38 and 68, 4.8.75, Verg. *Aen.* 6.826–835, Ovid *AA* 1.67, 3.387, *Pont.* 4.3.41–42, *Fasti* 1.604–605, (3.202), Man. 1.793–794, 920– 921, 4.50–56, 5.512.
Cato	Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.35, 2.1.24, *Epist.* 1.19.12–14, Verg. *Aen.* 8.670, Man. 1.797, 4.87. Uncertain: Verg. *Aen.* 6.841.
Agrippa	Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.185, *Carm.* 1.6, *Epist.* 1.6.26, 1.12.1 and 26–27, Verg. *Aen.* 8.682–684, *Epic. Drusi* 67–69, Ovid *AA* 3.391–392, Man. 1.797–798. Uncertain: Verg. *Aen.* 1.292–293.

Marcellus	Crinagoras *Anth. Pal.* 9.545, 6.161, Prop. 3.18, Verg. *Aen.* 6.860–886, *Epic. Drusi* 65–68 and 441, Ovid *AA* 1.69–70. Uncertain: Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.45–46.
Gaius and Lucius	Prop. 4.6.81–82, *Eleg. in Maec.* 172–174, Antipater of Thessalonica *Anth. Pal.* 9.59 and 297, Ovid *AA* 1.177–216. Uncertain: *Anth. Pal.* 7.626.6, Honestus (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 1.276, no. 21), Ovid *Rem.* 155–156, *ILS* 137.
Tiberius	Hor. *Epist.* 1.3.2, 1.8.2 and 14, 1.9, 1.12.26–27, 2.2.1, *Carm.* (4.4.28), 4.14.14–34, *Epic. Drusi, Eleg. in Maec.* 176, Ovid *Met.* 15.836–837, *Tr.* (1.2.104), 2.165–178 and 229–230, 3.12.45–48, 4.2, *Pont.* (1.4.55), 2.1, 2.2.70 and 79–80, (2.2.108), (2.6.18), 2.8, 3.1.164, 3.3.86–88, 3.4, 4.5.23, 4.9, 4.13.27–30 and 38, (4.15.3) *Fasti* 1.10, (531), 533, 613–616 and 645–650, Crinagoras *Anth. Plan.* 61. Uncertain: Diodorus *Anth. Pal.* 9.219, Apollonides *Anth. Pal* 9.287, Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 9.178, Honestus (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 1.276, no. 21).
Drusus	Crinagoras *Anth. Pal.* 6.244.5, Diodorus *Anth. Pal.* 9.405, Hor. *Carm.* 4.4, 4.14.9–12, *Epic. Drusi, Eleg. in Maec.* 1, 147–150, 176, Ovid *Fasti* 1.597–598, *Tr.* 4.2.39, *Pont.* 2.8.47–50. Uncertain: Verg. *Aen.* 6.824, Iunior (Kaibel *Epigr. Gr.* 810), Honestus (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 1.276, no. 21).
Livia	Crinagoras *Anth. Pal.* 6.244.5, Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.5–6, *Epic. Drusi, Eleg. in Maec.* 175, Ovid *AA* 1.71–72, 3.391, *Tr.* 2.161, 4.2.11, *Pont.* 1.4.55, 2.2.69, 2.8.4, 29–30, 41–50, 3.1.114–166, 3.3.87, 3.4.95–112, 4.9.107 and 110, 4.13.29–30, *Fasti* 1.536, 649–650, 5.157–158, 6.637–640. Uncertain: Honestus (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 1.276, no. 21).
Julia	Prop. 3.18.12, 4.11.59–60. Uncertain: Honestus (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 1.276, no. 21).

The findings I wish to draw from this table will be immediately apparent. Even if one discounts all those references to Caesar which are labeled "uncertain," he is mentioned in poetry more often than anyone else. His nearest competitors are Tiberius and Livia, whose statistics are boosted by a factor that does not operate for anyone else on the list: a good half of these references consist of desperate blandishments in Ovid's poems from exile. As for Pompey and Cato, their impact on Augustan poetry seems relatively slight. For Pompey, in fact, the figures are less significant than the table might suggest. About a third of the references to him are in passages which deal with him and Caesar both, and several others are purely topographical,

referring to the theater of Pompey and its portico. Finally, it is not just the number of references to Caesar which is noteworthy, but how consistently he comes up in poetry. References to him begin in the forties and continue fairly steadily right down to the end of Augustus' reign. That is not true for anyone else.

It would be absurd to pretend on the basis of these data that Julius Caesar was a major preoccupation of the Augustan poets. Most allusions to him are cursory, which suggests that for poets he had become a conventional point of reference to a discourse that unfolded elsewhere. But I do want to insist that Caesar is not mysteriously absent from Augustan poetry. Orelli and those who accepted his conclusion could not have taken a comprehensive view of the evidence. At the same time, they appeal implicitly to a standard of comparison which has never been scrutinized. Since it is impossible to argue that *no* mention of Caesar occurs in poetry, their position amounts to an argument that Caesar is not mentioned as often as one would expect, or in the way one would expect. The question is, "expect" in comparison with whom, or in relation to what? If Augustus is the implicit term of comparison, the observation is true but trivial. That the living ruler should be more celebrated than a dead one is rather the norm than the exception, and it certainly cannot be equated with a conclusion that the predecessor's memory is under siege. If the point is that the poets tend not to celebrate Caesar in the way we often see him, as an army leader, that is also true, but a similar tendency can be observed in the way the poets deal with Augustus. Although they glance innumerable times at Augustus' military enterprises, very few of their poems are devoted to these subjects, or even treat them at any length, with the one exception of the war against Antony;[42] the poets are clearly less interested in the details of Augustan warfare than in Augustus' role as leader of the nation. But whatever the underlying standard of comparison may be, if the argument about the low visibility of Caesar is to be continued, some clarification would be welcome.[43]

[42]In fact, in those pieces which do dwell on martial subjects (the subject of Actium aside), it is not Augustus who occupies the foreground, but his deputies. In some of these poems it is suggested that Augustus at least inspires or guides events (Hor. *Carm.* 4.4 and 4.14, Ovid *AA* 1.177–208, *Tr.* 2.169–178), but in others he is accorded virtually no role at all (Ovid *Tr.* 4.2, *Pont.* 2.1, 1.8.11–24, 3.4, 4.7.17–54).

[43]It must be said, however, that to insist on comparing what Augustan poets say about Augustus and what they say about Caesar is more than a little misguided, since the one subject was topical whereas the other was not. A properly framed comparison would set the treatment of Caesar in Augustan poetry against the treatment of Augustus in post-Augustan poetry. Obviously that kind of comparison cannot in practice be carried out, for lack of an adequate corpus of post-Augustan poetry. But what would be possible and ought to be done is to study the representation of Divus Caesar in all sources, prose as well as poetry, non-literary as well as literary. For what it is worth, my impression is that after A.D. 14 the silence about Augustus' military enterprises is as great as the silence about Caesar's after 44 B.C.

To try to review all the passages which mention Caesar would be impractical and perhaps even unproductive. But it will be necessary to discuss at least those passages from Vergil and Horace which Syme has emphasized.

Caesar makes his most dramatic appearance in the *Aeneid* when he and Pompey swing into view among the ghostly heroes-to-be of Book 6:

illae autem paribus quas fulgere cernis in armis,
concordes animae nunc et dum nocte prementur,
heu quantum inter se bellum, si lumina vitae
attigerint, quantas acies stragemque ciebunt,
aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci
descendens, gener adversis instructus Eois!
ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella
neu patriae validas in viscera vertite viris;
tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus!

This is the only point in the underworld review at which two characters are introduced who are linked to the same events, but that is not the only peculiarity. Caesar and Pompey are identified not by name but by their old sobriquet as the *socer generque*. Thus Vergil makes the war a clash between adversaries who are kinsmen as well as Romans, although in fact the marital link had dissolved four years before the war began. At the same time, he makes it a concussion of global, or pan-Mediterranean, dimensions. Caesar is brought into the field not by way of Cisalpine Gaul, from which he actually launched his strike, but from the gateway of Rome's dominion in the West. Pompey heads a host from the East rather than the legions one would expect him to lead. And perhaps most curious of all, these unborn souls who will one day clash in the world above are seen consorting amiably in the underworld when Aeneas finds them. What can be the point of insisting that Caesar and Pompey were soul-mates—*concordes animae*—before they were born?

Let me confess here to sharing the experience of those readers who find that Vergil begins to evanesce the more closely his words are studied. Nevertheless, one thing which seems clear is that the antitheses in this vignette are overdrawn and the effect stylized. I suggest that Vergil has written this way because he is inviting us to contemplate a larger significance in the collision between Caesar and Pompey. This is the only moment of Anchises' tour which offers any preview of the civil strife which will afflict Roman history. Vergil has chosen not to bring forward the shades of Marius or Sulla, and he has been careful not to play the note of discord which might have accompanied the appearance of Romulus (at 6.777), the Gracchi (842), or Augustus (789). If he has focused on Caesar and Pompey instead, it is not because he sees them as monsters (they are obviously not villains in the sense, say, that

Catiline at 8.668–669 is a villain) but because he sees in their conflict the climactic manifestation of a destructive tendency. Or perhaps not quite the climactic manifestation. All the details Vergil picks out when speaking of Caesar and Pompey—the marital tie, the alliance that ended at rivalry, and especially the clash of East and West—apply as well or better to the subsequent struggle between Octavian and Anthony. And Anchises' plea *proice tela manu, sanguis meus* can hardly bear less heavily on Octavian than on Caesar.

Vergil has also provided clues to his attitude in the lines leading up to our passage. Many commentators[44] have noticed touches which cast shadows over the panorama as soon as the encomium of Augustus is finished in line 807. At lines 815–816 Vergil emphasizes Ancus' lust for popularity even as he awaits rebirth. In the lines immediately following, he imputes to Brutus the *superbia* which is usually associated with Tarquin, and explains Brutus' severity toward his sons by his boundless desire for praise. At line 824, he reminds us that Manlius Torquatus, like Brutus, had the severity to execute his own son. What these sidelights have in common is that they point up excesses or aberrations of that quality of mind and character which enabled the Romans to establish their hegemony—excesses which in Vergil's view may be inseparable from the exercise of Roman *virtus*. That is the dynamic which at its worst results in civil war.

If the passage about Pompey and Caesar is thematically related to the lines immediately before it, the whole section stands under the motto with which Anchises forecasts the establishment of Rome at 781–782: *illa incluta Roma / imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo*. The correlation between *imperium* and *animi* will carry through everything he says about Rome.[45] But even in this initial formulation *animi* has mixed overtones. To aspire as high as heaven is in one sense praiseworthy, an instinct for which the doctrine of the divine fire in the soul (730–731) perhaps affords a metaphysical basis. Anchises' proclamation passes into a simile about the Berecyntian mother with her hundred god and goddess children, which suggests that Vergil is thinking about the possibility of apotheosis and not just lofty aspiration. On the other hand, given the strong current of ancient wisdom against seeking equality with god, Anchises' phrase has to have an ominous tone as well. Although Roma may be a goddess, her children act in the world as men, not gods, and their effort *animos aequare Olympo* is bound to have inhuman consequences. Intensity of ambition distorts the souls of several heroes

[44]Apart from the standard commentaries, see especially R. D. Williams, "The Pageant of Roman Heroes—*Aeneid* 6.756–853," *Cicero and Virgil: Studies in Honour of Harold Hunt*, ed. J. R. C. Martyn (Amsterdam 1972) 207–217, and D. C. Feeney, "History and Revelation in Virgil's Underworld," *PCPhS* NS 32 (1986) 1–24.

[45]In the passage on Caesar and Pompey, for example, note the phraseology in line 832 *ne tanta animis adsuescite bella*.

Anchises shows his son. And his lesson on metempsychosis in 730–751 would seem to imply that all souls to be reborn as Romans have been stained by passions contracted in a previous life.

To return to Syme and Caesar, one may well agree that the *Aeneid* passage contains a veiled rebuke. However, it is not clear that the rebuke is targeted primarily at Caesar, as Syme holds, or likely that it mediates the thinking of Augustus. At any rate, the lines were not written to be read in isolation from the rest of Anchises' discourse, which invites interpretation in terms of considerations larger than Augustan politics.

A further reason for hesitating to put an anti-Caesarian construction on the *Aeneid* passage is that it would represent such a *volte-face* from attitudes Vergil had voiced in earlier work. *Eclogue* 9 contains the prelude of what is virtually a hymn at the rising of Caesar's star: it tells how under the aura of the new sign cereals thrive, grapes ripen, and pear trees produce year after year (46–50). The first book of *Georgics* describes a succession of portents visited upon the impious generation which bore the guilt for Caesar's murder (466–492). These passages too call for analysis on their own terms, but it is no misrepresentation to say that both imply a fundamentally sympathetic view of Caesar.

The other poet I will discuss is Horace, who in his early years took quite a different view of Caesar than Vergil did. Horace declared himself by fighting on the side of the Liberators at Philippi, so there can be no doubt that his outlook at that time was vigorously anti-Caesarian. And even after he obtained pardon and returned to Italy, he let a glint of his old sympathies appear in one of his early poems. *Sermones* 1.7 recounts an anecdote about a court case which came before Brutus as he was organizing the Republican cause in Asia. A member of his entourage named Rupilius Rex was being sued by one of the locals, a Greek named Persius. After a round of vituperation between the litigants, the Greek finally manages to get in the last word: *per magnos, Brute, deos te / oro, qui reges consueris tollere, cur non / hunc Regem iugulas? operum hoc, mihi crede, tuorum est* (*Serm.* 1.7.33–35). Although Horace had had to make his peace with Caesar's partisans, the trouble he takes to resuscitate this crude joke makes it hard to believe that he acquired any real enthusiasm for Caesar himself.

It should come as no surprise, then, if Horace's other references to Caesar are scant and fairly noncommittal. The only definite compliment is found in the lines from *Odes* 1.12 to which Syme refers. But some discussion of the poem as a whole will be necessary, both in order to confirm that Horace is in fact referring to Caesar (a view which many readers do not accept, though Syme does) and to develop an alternative to Syme's interpretation.

Following the program announced in the proem (*quem virum aut heroa . . . sumis celebrare, Clio? quem deum?*), Horace celebrates by turns the Olympian gods, the heroes Hercules, Castor, and Pollux, and then a host of *viri*,

all of whom prove to be Romans. In the fourth stanza of this section on men[46] he reaches the lines in question (45–48):

crescit occulto velut arbor aevo
fama Marcelli: micat inter omnis
Iulium sidus velut inter ignis
luna minores.

Throughout the preceding litany Horace has referred to specific and individual gods and men, never to categories or groups, and so the *Iulium sidus* should stand for a particular person rather than, say, the Julian *gens* at large. And coming where it does, it should not refer to Augustus either. Augustus is saved for the three stanzas following, the climax of the poem, in which he is exalted as the earthly counterpart of Jupiter. The grandiose conception of those lines does not comport with the quiet simile of the moon amid lesser stars in the verses which precede. Horace has also punctuated the poem here in another way. He interrupts the catalog of heroes after the *sidus* stanza and prefaces the line on Augustus with an invocation to Jupiter (49–52):

gentis humanae pater atque custos,
orte Saturno, tibi cura magni
Caesaris fatis data; tu secundo
Caesare regnes.

The *Iulium sidus* of line 47 can only be a figure for Caesar. As in earlier phrases—*quietum Pompili regnum* (33–34), *superbos Tarquini fascis* (34–35), *Catonis nobile letum* (35–36)—Horace has resorted to periphrasis, and labeled the man by an attribute. In the early twenties, no one held surer title to the attribute of a star than Julius Caesar.

But assuming that Caesar is meant here, what is the point of the allusion? Syme thinks that Horace's image (of Caesar "purged of all earthly stain, transmuted into a comet") reflects Augustus' scheme to dispose of Caesar by removing him to heaven. But here again little account is taken of context. If Horace wanted to lodge Caesar among the stars, he had created the perfect opportunity to do it in this very poem. He would have introduced him earlier, among the gods or the deified heroes—in the vicinity of lines 27–32, for example, which describe the benign activity of Castor and Pollux in their post-terrestrial role as stars. But in fact Caesar makes his appearance not among the gods or heroes, but among the earthly strivers Horace names. That should imply that the poet has in view Caesar's accomplishments as a statesman and defender of the state, as he clearly does for every other Roman on his list.

[46]I am unable to accept the analysis into Pindarizing triads which has led Fraenkel (*Horace* [Oxford 1957] 291–296) to determine that the section on *viri* begins with Regulus at line 37 rather than with Romulus at line 33.

It is true that the *Iulium sidus* is the comet which appeared after Caesar's death, certifying his apotheosis. But in the context of this poem, the star is an emblem. It epitomizes Caesar's career; it does not expunge or supersede it, any more than "the noble death of Cato" excludes the life preceding it, or than Marcellus' posthumous fame[47] can be detached from the deeds that earned it. There was an essential connection in Roman thought between apotheosis and activity in public life. In the *Somnium Scipionis* Cicero explains at length how statesmen qualify for heaven by managing well the task of government on earth.[48] Other writers make the connection between deeds and divinity explicit for Caesar. His actions during his life on earth are termed *divina opera* by Valerius Maximus (5.1.10, 9.2.4), who also declares that Caesar "by his deeds built for himself a pathway to heaven."[49] Diodorus of Sicily, writing evidently in Rome during the triumviral period, renders the formula *Divus Caesar* as "Caesar named 'god' on account of the greatness of his deeds."[50] And Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* relates Caesar's apotheosis to a whole series of deeds which he enumerates.[51]

That Horace might have begrudged Caesar the solitary compliment he paid him in *Odes* 1.12 is by no means out of the question. The moon was well known to be a source of spurious light, and Horace also knew that whole-hearted panegyrics invoked the sun to paragon a leader's brilliance.[52] But if there is a touch of coolness here, that is only what one would expect in view of Horace's background. And the fact remains that the lines do convey a compliment, grudgingly or not. To interpret them as Syme does, emptying them of all reference to Caesar's historical actions, and importing instead ideas of purgation and transmutation, is simply anachronistic. The view current in the society for which Horace wrote was that deification certified the greatness of a man's deeds in life. Not even a mystic like Vergil believed that scoundrels were susceptible of apotheosis.

[47]In a catalog of memorable Romans, the primary reference of *fama Marcelli* must be to the third-century Marcellus, conqueror of Syracuse, five times consul, and winner of the *spolia opima*, rather than to Augustus' teen-aged nephew. That the conqueror of Syracuse could not very well be omitted from such a list is clear from Verg. *Aen.* 6.855–859 and Man. 1.788.

[48]Especially Cic. *Rep.* 6.13–16, 24–26.

[49]*operibus suis aditum sibi ad caelum struxerat*, Val. Max. 1.7.2; cf. the slightly different formulation [*Caesaris*] *virtutes aditum sibi in caelum struxerunt* at 6.9.15.

[50]Diod. Sic. 4.19.2; cf. 1.4.7, 5.21.2, 5.25.4, and 32.27.1 and 3. I am grateful to Catherine Rubincam for calling my attention to the Diodorus passages, and to her article "The Organization and Composition of Diodorus' Bibliotheke," *EMC* 31 (1987) 313–328.

[51]Ovid *Met.* 15.746–758; Ovid cannot resist the conceit that the greatest of these *res gestae* was to have been the father of Augustus.

[52]He offers an example of the orthodox approach by an orthodox practitioner in *Serm.* 1.7.24, and contributes an effort of his own at *Carm.* 4.2.46–47.

IV DEIFICATION AND DISSOCIATION

Syme's reading of the Horace passage corresponds to his conception of the way the cult of Divus Caesar functioned politically: it enabled Augustus to dissociate himself from Caesar the proconsul and Dictator. Presumably Syme would infer the same tendency in many other passages as well, since there is no aspect of Caesar which the poets mention more often than his divinity. But let us consider whether this angle of vision gives a convincing view of the politics of apotheosis.

If Augustus' paramount concern was to dissociate himself from Caesar the man, it is in the first place odd that he would cling so strenuously to Caesar the god. And cling he did, proclaiming his sonship in his titulature, planting his victory arches beside Caesar's temple, and fostering for Caesar a cult which furnished a ready-made framework for his own cult when he died. Poets too sometimes insist on associating him with Caesar. Vergil has Augustus fight the most crucial battle of his career under the aura of Caesar's star.[53] Manilius writes that at Philippi Augustus advanced to victory in the footsteps of his father.[54] And the author of the (second) *Elegy for Maecenas* envisions that at life's end Augustus will come to rest in the bosom of his father.[55] So far from putting distance between himself and Caesar, Augustus was evidently pleased to have their affiliation advertised.

It is also a peculiar notion that Augustus would have promoted the divinity of Caesar in the expectation that it would render Caesar less controversial. When divine honors were decreed for the late dictator in 44 B.C., Cicero protested that he could never countenance the assimilation of a dead man into the cult of the gods (*Phil.* 1.13); some three decades later, Ovid mocked at human vanity for presuming to make gods out of Quirinus, Liber, Hercules, and Caesar (*Am.* 3.8.51–52); and in the next century, Seneca was still registering objections to the deification of men.[56] The consecration of Caesar was a radical innovation in the religion of the Roman state: never before had any man had a cult manufactured for him out of nothing.[57] The fact that by 44 B.C. many Romans knew of Greek cults which deified men (and had even in some cases been recipients of such cults) would hardly have prepared them to see that practice transplanted into their own milieu and defined by

[53]*stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammas / laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice sidus*, Verg. *Aen.* 8.680–681, a context to which Caesar's military prowess is surely relevant.

[54]*perque patris pater Augustus vestigia vicit*, Man. 1.913, alluding to Caesar's victory at Pharsalus.

[55]*te Venus in patrio collocet ipsa sinu*, *Eleg. in Maec.* 178.

[56]Sen. *Apoc.* 9.3. Given this current of protest, one may be permitted to wonder about the implications of Horace's *nil mortalibus ardui est: / caelum ipsum petimus stultitia*, *Carm.* 1.3.37–38.

[57]Not even Romulus, who acquired a cult by being conflated with the pre-existing Quirinus.

their government as a necessary part of their right relations with the gods. At the time Caesar was consecrated, apotheosis was anything but a quiet track onto which troublesome personalities could be shunted.[58]

While these difficulties do not invalidate Syme's dissociation hypothesis, they do prompt suspicion that it is weakly grounded in the realities of Augustan politics. By way of steering discussion toward a more compatible interpretation of Caesar's divinization, I offer two suggestions, with no illusion that they exhaust the possibilities of analysis.

One idea which surfaces repeatedly in the poems is that Caesar's installation as a god in heaven is a token of Roman supremacy in the world.[59] The variety of sources attesting it suggest that it is drawn from the discourse which surrounded poets in real life, and it is consistent both with the resurgent imperialism of the Augustan era and with the key position which Caesar and his temple acquired in the state religion. Perhaps this image of Caesar's godhead as the ultimate triumph of Rome corresponds to a line Augustus devised for promoting the cult among his fellow-citizens.

As for Augustus' personal interest in Caesar's cult, I would suggest that he regarded it as a maquette which he had liberty and time to shape in preparation for his own apotheosis. Not that this is an entirely new idea. Dio writes that when the triumvirs reinvigorated Caesar's cult in 42 B.C., "they eagerly enacted whatever would do him honor in anticipation of one day having such honors conferred upon themselves" (47.18.2). And occasionally the poets acknowledge that Caesar's apotheosis has paved the way for Augustus—most notably Manilius in the line *concessum . . . patri mundum deus ipse mereris* (1.9). Discussions of emperor worship during the Augustan period have given surprisingly little consideration to the opportunity Caesar's cult presented to Augustus of defining a new institution, yet it was an ideal vehicle for that purpose. Since deification was an absolute departure from Roman custom, it called for explanation: to declare a man a god was one thing, but if Augustus expected his countrymen to understand what the cult of a *divus* meant, he had to educate them. At the same time, Augustus was free to develop Caesar's cult in any direction he chose, while

[58]Another measure of the novelty of the idea is furnished by Ovid's four separate statements of the doctrine of civil apotheosis: *Met.* 14.820–851 (Romulus and Hersilia), *Met.* 15.844–850 (Caesar), *Fasti* 3.699–702 (Caesar), and *Pont.* 4.13.23–26 (Augustus).

[59](Apollo to Iulus) *macte nova virtute, puer, sic itur ad astra, / dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella / gente sub Assaraci fato ventura resident*, Verg. *Aen.* 9.642; *vexit . . . ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus, / arma resurgentis portans victricia Troiae: / felix terra tuos cepit, Iule, deos*, Prop. 4.1.46–48; (one of the Parcae, speaking about Romulus and Caesar) *hos debet solos Martia Roma deos, Epic. Drusi* 246; *Caesar in urbe sua deus, quem Marte togaque / praecipuum . . .*, Ovid *Met.* 15.746–747; (Evander on reaching the site of Rome) *dique petitorum dixit salvete locorum / tuque novos caelo terra datura deos, Fasti* 1.509–510; *sit pater invictus patriae, sit Roma sub illo, / cumque deum caelo dederit non quaerat in orbe*, Man. 1.925–926.

he was not free to design a program of divine honors for himself. I believe that encouragement of a vicarious cult is the strategy which above all else determined his public posture toward the deified Julius, and which the poets in various ways reflect.

Department of Classical Languages and Literature
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637