Greek Images of Monarchy and their influence on Rome from Alexander to Augustus

In Two Volumes

Volume 1

PhD: Ancient History
Department of Classics
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

January 1999

Philip Jonathan Smith

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
098 23754 9
Thesis L6382

Abstract

This inter-disciplinary thesis traces the influence of Greek images of monarchy on Rome, between 323 B.C. and A.D. 14. The first chapter examines the evidence for Greek perceptions of kings, tyrants, good citizens and ideal rulers in the fourth century B.C. The second chapter considers some developments in political theory during the Hellenistic period, and the practice of Hellenistic kingship. The visual media used for representing Hellenistic monarchy are discussed.

The first section of the third chapter reviews the evidence for the points of contact between Romans of the Republican era, and the monarchs, artworks and political thought of the Greek world. A second section analyses the evidence both for the evolution of Roman attitudes towards monarchs and monarchy, over this period of interaction, and changes in Roman political and military leadership. The conventional notion that Romans had been consistently hostile to kings since the fall of Tarquinius Superbus is questioned. The increasing resort to proven individuals (e.g. Pompey) for solving domestic and external crises is documented. The final section of this chapter charts developments in the positive representation of Republican leaders in both rhetoric and art, including favourable portrayals of both Caesar and Octavian. It is suggested that the transformation of Roman thought and practice, under Greek influence, facilitated the successful establishment of a monarchical regime after Actium.

The creation of the Augustan dynasty is documented in the final chapter. In addition, ideals of leadership, and Augustan ideas about war, peace and empire, are discussed. A chronological treatment of the contemporary (visual and textual) evidence suggests the heterogeneity of Augustus' principate. New identifications are proposed for certain figures in the 'procession friezes' of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***.

Acknowledgements

The writing of this thesis would not have been possible without maintenance and travel grants from the British Academy, the patience of my friends and family, and the encouragement of my supervisor, Dr A. J. S. Spawforth.

Particular thanks must also go to Mr S. Rudd, and Mrs L. Neave for their computing support.

I remain indebted both to Mr B. Haines, for sparking my interest in Ancient History, and to Mr H S Heath, whose late 17th Century book on the monumental arches of Rome first set me thinking about the socio-political contexts of ancient public art.

Contents list

(Volume 1)

Abstract ii

Acknowledgements iii

Contents List iv-vi

Introduction 1-34

1 Kings, Tyrants, Good Citizens and Ideal Rulers in Greek Thought 35-67

a) Traditional Perceptions: the monarch 36-47

i) unrestrained power, ***hubris***, and suspicion 36

ii) wealth, luxury, extravagance and bribery 39

iii) enslavement to passions 42

iv) effeminacy, transgressive female power, and the subordination of subjects 44

b) Traditional Perceptions: the citizen 47-66

i) Cardinal Civic Virtues 47

Andreia 48

Sophrosyne/Enkrateia/Karteria 50

Dikaiosyne 50

Sophia, Eusebeia, Philopatria, and Megalopsychia 55

ii) Virtues of Social Intercourse 61

c) Summary 66-67

2 The Ideal Ruler in a world of Kings 68-127

a) Historical introduction: the creation of the Hellenistic kingdoms 323-281 B.C. 68-75

b) Aspects of Hellenistic philosophy and kingship theory 75-88

i) rectificatory and distributive justice 76

ii) splendour and the royal image 81

iii) kingship literature and the dutiful king 85

c) Military leadership and the practice of Hellenistic kingship 88-98

d) Representing Hellenistic kingship 98-123

i) Introduction 98

ii) Typology of Artworks 103

Ruler Portraits 103

large scale sculpture 104
painting 110
coin obverses 112
other media 114
Alexander the Great and other heroic ancestors 115
Gods around the king 117
Representations of Conflict 121
Other architectural monuments 123
(2) **e)** summary 124-127

3 Greek images of Monarchy and the Roman Republic 128-247
a) 'Imperialism' and 'Hellenism' in the mid and late Republic 128-147
i) initial points of contact; warfare and diplomacy in the third century B.C. 128
ii) access to Greek art; gifts and honours, plunder and purchase 134
iii) access to Greek thought; drama, history, rhetoric and political theory 142

b) Kings, Tyrants, and Good Citizens in Roman thought 147-214
i) Roman attitudes to Roman kings 148
ii) Roman attitudes to tyrants and the politicisation of "***libertas***" 153
iii) Roman attitudes to Republican magistrates and generals 163
iv) References to historical foreign kings and their significance 170
v) Roman attitudes to Hellenistic monarchs 181

c) Roman leadership ideals - ***Imperatores*** and the rise of the "***unus***" 214-243
i) Positive representations of Republican leaders in rhetoric 214
ii) Positive representations of Republican leaders in art 224

d) Summary 243-247

4 Monarchical aspects of the Augustan Principate 248-301
a) The creation of a dynasty 249-263

b) Virtues and Qualities of a ***Princeps*** 264-275

c) War, Peace and Empire under Augustus: International relations and civic life 275-297

d) Summary 297-301

Epilogue		302-313
(Volume 2)		
Appendix 1	Table showing the relative positions of adult members of the ***Princeps***' extended family represented in the foreground of the procession friezes of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***	1
List of Illustrations		2-4
Illustrations		5-34
List of References to the Introduction		35-46
List of References to Chapter 1		47-64
List of References to Chapter 2		65-90
List of References to Chapter 3		91-136
List of References to Chapter 4		137-154
List of References to the Epilogue		155-159
List of cited Classical Texts		160-168
Bibliography		169-244

Introduction

The phrase 'Greek images of monarchy' used in the title of this thesis deserves a little explanation. The most ambiguous of its component words is 'images'. Here it is used not only to refer to visual and textual representations but the visualised (unrepresented) pictures of the mind's eye; in the context of the terms 'Greek' and 'monarchy' this means that the writer is not only interested in the royal iconography of the Hellenistic visual arts, but both the Greek stereotypes of the tyrant and the oriental despot, and the ideal (and idealised) rulers of political philosophy, fiction, and rhetoric (hence the plural - images). The ***topoi*** associated with these negative and positive conventional monarchical types colour the 'event-history' passed down to us in the Greek accounts of actual monarchs whether Persian (like Xerxes), Spartan (like Agesilaus), Sicilian (like Dionysius), or Macedonian (like Philip II or Alexander III). This puts the modern historian at a further distance from what actually happened, and the use of the term 'images' allows for the possibility of a disjunction between that and what has been represented.

Our contemporary culture is accustomed to the idea that monarchs and dynasties (like other individuals and collective institutions) have 'images' of themselves which they wish others to share. It is also clear that subjects have 'images' of their rulers, to which they wish them to conform (or appear to conform). Billig's sociological study of the British royal family in the domestic conversations of 63 households revealed some subjects who, aware of the disjunction between 'images' and reality, claimed that they would have preferred not to know about the latter. A "touch of hypocrisy" and the spinning of a "fairy story" for public consumption had dignified past monarchs in their lifetimes, their marital infidelities (for example) concealed from the gaze of the majority of their contemporaries. It was to be lamented that the modern world's mass communications media had spoilt the 'images' of an ideal united family by revealing what had doubtless always gone on in private[1].

This is not the place to discuss the extent to which 'images' of British monarchy had been tarnished in earlier generations; one might note however the public protests (in London) at the treatment of Queen Caroline and *The Times*' confident assertion on the death of George IV that "There never was an individual less regretted by his fellow-creatures"[2]. The Tacitean representation of Tiberius and the Augusta hiding from the public gaze after the death of Germanicus has a certain resonance for those who witnessed the British royal family's response to the death of the Princess of Wales (in 1997). Was a public display of mourning beneath the dignity of a family that openly "blubbed" (as Hitchens noted) when the royal yacht was decommissioned, or did those who initially planned for Diana's body to rest at a private mortuary and to receive no public funeral, fear that the public would spot insincerity in their tears?[3] Tacitus' questioning of motives was doubtless as unfair in its insinuations but the Tiberius of his Annals is portrayed as a master of dissimulation, capable of seeming to be what he was not (for years on end). Tacitus represents a confrontation between Tiberius and Agrippina (Germanicus' widow) in which what one might term the 'image' of ***pius*** Tiberius was contrasted with the 'reality' of the persecution of Augustus' descendants; later again, the people's 'image' of Tiberius is shown to have been at odds with his written denunciations of Agrippina and Nero Caesar, the crowds gathered outside the senate-house shouting that Tiberius could not have approved the destruction of his family[4].

Tacitus' Domitian, in the Agricola, is said to have been aware that his "***falsus triumphus***", which (allegedly) saw slaves dressed up as prisoners to make up the numbers, had been the subject of derision; Suetonius similarly claimed that Gaius (Caligula) intended to augment the number of German captives to be displayed in his triumph by compelling Gauls (inhabitants of Roman provinces) to adopt German names, learn German, and to grow and to dye their hair. In these cases the gap between the 'images' of the two emperors as competent generals and victors, and the 'reality' appears to have been so great that (ultimately unsuccessful) attempts were made to deceive the observers of their triumphs;

the failure to convince viewers that the Gauls or slaves were real prisoners from Rome's German wars permitted them to notice that the 'images' did not conform to 'reality', and Tacitus alleges that Domitian feared the return of Agricola following his genuine victories in Britain[5]. The fact that both Gaius and Domitian were understood as 'bad' emperors ought to prompt us to ask whether such deceptions were commonplace (winked at under the rule of 'good' emperors), or whether the allegations of deception were the invention of biographers intent on representing consistent textual 'images' of 'bad' emperors.

Having elaborated on the usage of the term 'images' in this thesis, it remains to establish the time parameters implied in the title. The first chapter discusses the positive and negative images of monarchy portrayed in the texts of Greek writers of the fourth century B.C. (and earlier). The second chapter begins with the posthumous division of Alexander's empire among the Successors (rather than with the kingship of Alexander himself). Alexander's 'images', which have been accorded extensive treatment by Stewart, were available as models for the Macedonian generals who founded the Antigonid, Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties, alongside Sardanapalus, the Platonic philosopher-king, and Xenophon's Cyrus (amongst others)[6]. The 'Greekness' of the Successor dynasties (and other Hellenistic monarchies from Bithynia to India) is to be understood for the purposes of this study. Cleopatra (VII) was the last monarch of the final Successor dynasty to fall to Rome and the third chapter discusses the 250 year period of 'Greek' contact with the Roman Republic between the arrival in Italy of Alexander's younger cousin, Pyrrhus of Epirus, and Cleopatra's death. The material and textual evidence for Roman life in this period is discussed in the context of the following hypothesis: Roman contacts with Hellenistic kings and Greek images of monarchy (in art and texts) influenced not only Roman thinking about monarchical rule but the practice of Roman rulership. In the context of the same hypothesis, the final chapter discusses the material and textual evidence from the Rome of Augustus, the first of the emperors. The year of his death (A.D. 14) supplies a somewhat arbitrary terminal date for the thesis, which should not be

understood as suggesting that the hypothesised influences ended at that date. Indeed, the epilogue strays far beyond that date to suggest future areas of research into the influences of Greek images of monarchy on post-Augustan Rome.

The Roman reversion to monarchy under Augustus, was considered by Syme to be a "revolution" no less than the deposition of Louis XVI and the establishment of the First French Republic. Historians believe that revolutions, like wars, have causes but there has been little agreement amongst them as to what were the causes of either the Roman or the French Revolution. With regard to the latter, this century has seen research into its 'literary' and 'cultural' origins, as well as political and economic ones[7]. The mass literacy born of the printed word makes it easier to think of recovering, from its texts, something of French (Parisian?) 'Public Opinion' before the Revolution, particularly when evidence survives not only to suggest what was read, but the way it was used by readers. Oral discourses may once have existed outside those which were accorded the coherence and permanence of incorporation into printed texts. However, handwritten ('ear-witness') accounts of street and society discourses have sometimes survived in diaries, letters, police notebooks, and so on, and sufficient coherence has been found between the printed and manuscript texts for Darnton to suggest that readers talked to non-readers about what they had read, and that writers reported and responded to what they heard others saying (readers and non-readers alike)[8]. Ginzburg has suggested, on the basis of the reported speech of exceptional sixteenth century literates like the millers Menocchio and Pighino, that there was an inter-relationship between "basic currents in the peasant culture... and those in the most progressive circles". Whitehead has noted that knowledge of Richard Harvey's astrological prophecy regarding the year 1583 "spread even to 'the common sort of people' who could not read, let alone understand the arguments of the *Discourse*"; Nalle similarly cites a French tailor who, claiming to be illiterate (in 1568), claimed to know that Charles IX had broken with the Huguenots "because he saw it in some verses brought from France"[9].

For the historian of the Classical world, parallelling much of the evidence available to 'modern world' historians is impossible; for instance Arrian's Epictetus refers to 'plain clothes' soldiers acting as ***agents provocateurs***, both encouraging and silencing seditious comment, but no 'police reports' have survived[10]. Given the limitations placed on literacy by the absence of printing technology and cheap paper, it is similarly difficult to imagine ancient equivalents of those well read Welsh miners from the turn of the present century (recalled by Walter Haydn Davies) whose shifts were enlivened by discussions of "the changing religious trend, the theory of evolution, the nature of spiritualism, Christian Socialism, and all the other isms...", rooted in books that they had not only read and remembered, but owned. Nevertheless Pliny could imagine 'common' farmers and artisans reading his Naturalis Historia, and there are occasional glimpses of shared 'mentalities' between persons of different social classes, most notably the Stoicism of the (freed?) slave Epictetus which had attractions for the emperor Marcus Aurelius; even the latter, it should be noted, appears to have required a loan of Arrian's Discourses of Epictetus[11].

There is little doubt that the spoken word had great importance in the city of Rome, a fact that offered non-reading persons the opportunity to learn 'news', the character of electoral candidates, the benefits of proposed legislation, and so on. Educated (rich) orators, though important 'gatekeepers', were far from the only sources of information and indeed Yavetz has noted the importance of rumour in formulating "popular opinion". Dio Chrysostom's wielding of (Greek) stereotypes in the Alexandrian Oration suggests that, all too often, the "***demos***" was heedless of the orators' advice; to cite one Roman example, the rhetoric of Caesar's assassins sometimes failed to win an audience, let alone popular approval for their act of 'tyrannicide', and their persons and property were at risk for as long as they remained in the city[12]. Historians interested in the 'lower classes' of antiquity as well as its emperors, aristocrats and kings are considerably hampered by the prejudices of the educated men who penned the texts that (occasionally) refer to them. Even if social or political comment could be made through graffiti, there is little reason to suppose that the

writers were anything other than the "***aristoi***" credited by Appian's Cassius with writing slogans against Caesar in the final months of his life[13].

Nevertheless, the evidence (such as it is) does not support the notion that the poorer inhabitants of Rome were disinterested in 'politics', even under the empire when the Roman people's preoccupation with 'bread and circuses' was satirised by Juvenal; the Alexandrians, it should be noted, are also condemned by Dio Chrysostom for their present frivolous collective behaviour which could be similarly contrasted with that of the Ptolemaic past when they had made and broken kings (see below, chapter 2)[14]. Juvenal objects to the shallow loyalty of a populace eager to praise current emperors (regardless of their identity); Gaius' popularity with non-senators however, survived his reign intact to puzzle successive generations of biographers and historians[15]. Juvenal's description of the posthumous mistreatment of Sejanus' statues, is similarly misleading as stories have survived of 'mobs' attacking statues of the living (including emperors, despite threats of execution), and even (in Caesar's case) defending statues of a deceased 'tyrant'. Tiberius' replacement of the original Lysippan ***Apoxyomenos*** with a replica is said to have provoked vocal demonstrations in the theatre and such stories suggest that publicly displayed art was noticed and valued by a broader section of the population than the educated élite[16]. Just as the audience for spoken texts could include non-readers, many viewers of artworks may also have been illiterate (or literate only to the extent of being able to read standard inscriptions, like Petronius' Hermeros). Nepos' description of the Syracusans erecting a funerary monument to Dion "***in urbe celeberrimo loco***", and Pliny's description of Augustus' installation of paintings "***in celeberrima parte***" (of the Forum of Augustus) both suggest awareness of the potential existence of a 'mass audience' for artworks and it is noteworthy that Pliny's reference to the accessibility of the paintings follows his report that Agrippa had planned to make all statues and paintings public property (to widen access to them)[17].

Artworks representing rulers are an important source of evidence for the 'mental images' of monarchy held by artists, patrons and viewers in Hellenistic and Roman society; despite the probable existence of 'lower class' viewers for such works, in the absence of written evidence for their understandings of individual artworks it remains difficult to discern in any detail the 'images' of monarchy held by the (unlettered) majority of the population, who never had the opportunity to read philosophical treatises, poetry, or history. In other words Gregory's idea of using such artworks as supplementary texts may not, after all, tell us very much about the "views of art, imagery and politics" held by "common people". However, it is important to make the attempt, and the usage of 'Rome' in the title of this thesis should be understood as referring to its inhabitants of all classes (to whatever extent the 'influence' of the 'Greek images of monarchy' can be detected)[18]. Visitors to Rome ('shoppers', traders, ambassadors, etc) would also have had the opportunity to view the publicly displayed art of the city, but whilst such audiences were perhaps important in dispersing Roman 'images' of monarchy to the provinces and beyond, they fall outside the scope of this study (which focusses on evidence for Greek influence in the city of Rome alone)[19].

Treating ancient artworks as evidence for ancient history (rather than art history) is still relatively new; Wallace-Hadrill, when reviewing Zanker's 'The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus', was prompted to remark that the book "will make it necessary for anyone who wishes to discuss Augustus to take the art-historical material seriously". The significance of that remark may be judged by the absence of a single plate or figure from Syme's 'The Roman Revolution' which, by contrast, freely quotes from the Augustan poets; Galinsky's 'Augustan Culture', an attempt at a "unified and intelligent overview of Augustan culture in its various manifestations" is the clearest fulfilment of Wallace-Hadrill's prophecy[20]. Stewart's 'Faces of Power, Alexander's Image in Hellenistic Politics' went further than Galinsky in linking art history to 'event history', but was concentrated on portrait images[21]. Kuttner's study of the Boscoreale cups goes so far as to suggest that

their iconography offers the modern viewer the opportunity to reconstruct "Lost Episodes in Augustan History", as well as to imagine the commemorative monument that inspired their creation[22].

In the second chapter of this thesis, an attempt is made (in one section) to categorise the surviving corpus of artworks relating to the representation of Hellenistic monarchy. One subsection of the third chapter is a chronological survey tracing the apparent increase in the use of art (particularly sculpture) for representing Roman rulers and rulership (at Rome) in the period of Greek influence down to 30 B.C. These discrete treatments are not intended to suggest that art and 'event history' were unconnected (and indeed artworks are discussed elsewhere in these chapters), but rather, in chapter two, to clarify which kinds of artworks were used for the representation of Hellenistic rulers and, in chapter three, to trace any influence exercised by the latter on the development of Roman art in the more than two centuries of contact with the Greek world before the battle of Actium. In the final chapter artworks such as the ***Ara Pacis*** friezes and the ***Gemma Augustea*** are considered as contemporary sources, of all the greater importance because no equivalent to Cicero's literary corpus has survived from the 'reign' of Augustus with which later historical or biographical texts could be compared. Only if what contemporary evidence there is (principally art, poetry, and inscriptions), is treated chronologically, as here, can one verify (or rather challenge) Zanker's assertion that the "serious problems, disasters, and unpopular measures" of Augustus' final two decades failed to "shake... faith in the new era" since "an image was more powerful than the reality"[23].

Since the use of art as material evidence for ancient society at the time of its creation (and of its display) is a comparatively new discipline, it is worth setting out here the theoretical basis for such an approach. First it is important to note current semiological approaches to the description and interpretation of art. The possibility (probability?) that modern viewers see differently from their ancient counterparts should counsel caution, but an effort is made

here to recover something of what Baxandall has termed the 'period eye' by noting textually attested responses to artworks from Classical and Late antiquity[24]. Historians and art historians have considered the relationship between art and rulership in other periods, and a brief critical review of some of their studies is undertaken below. Some comparative evidence is also presented to suggest, for example, what kinds of audiences could be anticipated for artworks, what kinds of influence commissioning patrons could exercise over artists, and so on.

Baxandall notes that Alberti's scheme for analysing figured composition recognised that represented 'members' made up a 'body', and represented 'bodies' a 'picture'[25]. The persisting utility of this simple scheme is indicated by its apparent incorporation into O'Toole's semiotic system. Here the basic unit is the 'member'. 'Figure' has replaced 'body' and an extra subdivision ('episode') can be included between the latter and 'work' (which replaces 'picture'). Some artworks comprise only a single 'member', or a single 'figure', or a single 'episode' whilst others may consist of several 'episodes', each involving several or many 'figures'. For O'Toole, artworks have three intertwined functions, the 'modal', the 'representational', and the 'compositional'. The first refers to the devices used by the artist to attract the attention of the viewer, for example intensity of colour, or the gaze of the represented person, or the relative scale of a sculpture to its viewer, and so on. The second refers to depiction of a narrative (or narratives), a scene, or an individual (a portrayal). At the level of the 'figure' the artist represents its clothes (or nakedness), and its pose (stance and gesture), whilst at the level of the 'episode' the individual 'figures' may be represented interacting with each other by glances, physical contact, and so on. The third function refers to the artist's structuring of all 'modal' and 'representational' elements into a coherent whole by more abstract concepts such as symmetry and 'the Golden Section'[26]. This semiological system for describing an artwork is equally applicable to 'high' and 'low' art, to the 'beautiful' and the 'banal', to the works of acknowledged 'masters' (like Apelles and Lysippus) and those of unknown artists from unknown 'schools'.

Traditional art history has tended to devote itself to uncovering, where possible, the circumstances of the original commission and a continuous record of previous owners (partly, it must be admitted, to establish 'authenticity' as Berger suggested), and secondly to accounting for the 'iconography' by reference to the stories and philosophies current in the artist's day. Whilst the latter, in particular, may go some way towards explaining the artist's (patron's?) choice of subject matter, the viewer may still be unsure of what the artwork 'meant' to contemporary viewers (artist and patron, amongst others). The semiotic system outlined above may similarly help to explain *how* an artwork communicates with the viewer, but revealing *what* was communicated requires the semiotician to look outside the 'text' of the artwork to the '*con*-text' of the society in which it was produced. Whilst this may seem to be what art historians have always done, the semiotician goes further in suggesting that the manner in which the artist depicted his chosen subject depended on factors outside the immediate context of commissioning and display, such as the culturally conditioned attitudes of the artist and his contemporaries (towards women for example)[27]. Whilst the reification of such conventions in an artwork may at first appear to have little to do with 'meaning', an apparently mythological scene may simply be a pretext for the representation of (usually) female ideal beauty; that is to say, a titular Venus can be no more than an unclad woman. Similarly a mythological or historical scene may be intended as an allegory; thus D'Ambra suggests that the representation of Arachne's punishment, in the Forum Transitorium, points to the fate of those who defy Minerva (Domitian's patroness), whilst her more respectful fellow-weavers demonstrate dutiful womanhood[28].

Since such 'meanings' do not reside in the artwork's 'text', but the viewer's 'context', modern semioticians should be wary of backdating the 'meanings' that they read. Possible contemporary 'meanings' may be suggested by the study of both the social and event histories of the periods when an artwork was created and displayed. In addition it will be helpful to consider contemporary (or near contemporary) textual descriptions of viewing art. Baxandall's assessment of the Quattrocento 'period eye' was supported by exactly

contemporary texts (sermons, painters' treatises, dancing manuals, geometry textbooks, etc). Whilst acknowledging that the 'period eye' of the ancient world was, almost certainly, subject to change, the best evidence for ancient viewing practices is supplied by texts written after the death of Augustus, in works like Pliny's Naturalis Historia, and Philostratus' Imagines. Again it should be noted that such textual evidence may not inform us about how uneducated persons viewed art[29].

Laird has suggested that the literary practice of '***ekphrasis***' was understood to represent one person's reading of an artwork (real or imagined) and not the only possible reading of it; if a writer encouraged the reader (of his text) to adopt his ordering of the subject matter represented by the artist, that should be attributed to his skill as a textual artist, rather than the visual artist's skill in directing viewing. Such acknowledgements of the viewer's role in making 'meaning' should encourage us to consider such descriptions, not only as (skilful) literary attempts at creating pictures in the mind's eye of the reader, but as evidence for the practice of viewing[30]. Vergil's Aeneid suggests that one such practice was viewing represented events in the chronological order of their actual (or supposed) occurrence; obviously such a method was unsuitable for subjects not involving narrative (a portrait statue, for example). Although a linear visual representation of the Trojan Wars (a frieze?) might have made it easier for Vergil's Aeneas to view in this way, it should be noted that his familiarity with what happened at Troy could have enabled him to view the battles and wars in chronological order even if the artist had represented them in some other order (or none at all); similarly, even with a linear visual representation it would have been possible to start viewing at the 'end' looking back, or in the centre looking both backwards and forwards, or even to view the whole artwork as representing a single moment rather than the 'highlights' of a decade of warfare[31].

Sharrock has pointed out, with reference to pictorial representations of metamorphosis, that the viewer is required to understand that the figure is undergoing transformation and not a

hybrid freak. An ecphrasis for such a picture might well relate it as a chronological narrative, beginning with what happened before the transient moment captured by the artist, and ending with what occurred after that moment[32]. Certainly it appears to have been common to add to the evidence of the picture when describing it; thus, Philostratus refers to the apparent responses of other senses (smell and hearing). The aromas and noises suggest both the 'realism' of the representation and the 'vividness' with which the scene is portrayed. The viewer may be so convinced that he forgets he is only looking at a representation and not the thing itself; animals and children are not the only ones to make such mistakes[33]. People were thought capable of falling in love with statues, and even paintings; conversely statues could have a life of their own, sweating, bleeding, speaking, turning on their pedestals, and even stepping down to punish the wicked[34].

Although Isocrates had thought portraits to be better at representing beauty than character, and Xenophon's Agesilaus had argued that portraits were testaments to the skill of their creators and the wealth of their dedicators rather than the character of the person represented (see chapter 1, below), human character traits were already felt to be capable of representation in art in the fourth century B.C.; the link with the pseudo-science of physiognomics is suggested by Pliny's story of Apelles having rendered the facial features of his 'sitters' so accurately that a "***metoposcopus***" was able to determine their allotted lifespans[35]. Pliny says that Lysippus claimed to represent men not as they actually were but as they seemed to be; it is unclear what this means, but it is probably not unrelated to his favour with the moderately tall and moderately handsome Alexander. It should be noted however, that Plutarch claimed Lysippus was best at representing Alexander's bodily appearance, and Plutarch's Lysippus criticises Apelles for according the king the thunderbolt (a divine attribute). Elsewhere, Plutarch claims that rulers tended to be represented with divine attributes, rather than divine intelligence ("***dianoia***"), divine virtue ("***arete***"), divine justice ("***dike***"), and so on. Here, Plutarch does not particularly blame the

artists but argues that the gods note and punish the impiety of rulers who permit themselves to be represented in this way[36].

Aelian reports a supposed Theban law imposing fines on artists for rendering portraits that were less attractive than their subjects, suggesting not only that there could be a difference between the portrait's features and those of the 'sitter', but that "warts and all" portraits were not desirable there; Lucian's Panthea refers to 'sitters' demanding of portrait painters that they make so many improvements on reality that the portraits more closely resembled other people[37]. Pliny notes that Apelles painted a profile portrait of Antigonus to hide the fact that the latter had lost an eye; ugliness could be risible as the story of Hipponax shows. Such a response was not ideal, one might imagine, for ruler portraits and Libanius suggested that citizens and foreigners could be (were normally?) attracted to the hair, eyes, cheeks and colouring of imperial statues; Cicero suggested that the beautifully painted portraits of the kings and tyrants of Sicily were doubly attractive because the artists' talents had been used to represent the features of important historical figures[38]. When Fronto speaks of Marcus Aurelius' portraits prompting smiles and daydreams, this is probably attributable to their intimacy as tutor and pupil; similarly Kassander was said to have become terrified of Alexander's portraits because of the breakdown of his relationship with Alexander[39].

Pliny seems to have believed that the earliest honorific portrait statues were those of the Athenian tyrannicides (477/476 B.C.); Pliny suggested that the idea rapidly caught on elsewhere but, if genuine, an unarmed honorific portrait of Gelon (I) in Syracuse (mentioned by Aelian) may even have been dedicated first. By Alexander's day the honorific principle was not limited to material benefactors and 'liberators', but had been extended to "long-dead culture heroes" like Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Socrates[40]. It is far from clear that Demetrius of Phalerum was accorded as many as 360 (or even 300 statues) before his expulsion from Athens in 307 B.C., but local rulers and

foreign kings do appear to have been increasingly frequent recipients in the first century and a half after Alexander's death. Public honorific portraits were expressions of thanks and goodwill, but they could be revoked and demolished if the relationship between the community and the ruler deteriorated. The depth of gratitude and the extent of amity could be expressed by 'representational', 'modal' and 'compositional' functions (for example stance, scale and elevation, and material of construction, respectively)[41].

It is unclear to what extent our modern understanding of relationships between the apparent distance separating the subject and the viewer, and socially constructed perceptions of personal space, was shared by ancient viewers; head and shoulder portraits suggest to us intimacy between viewers and 'sitter' (viewers are family, often including the 'sitter', and friends), whilst a full length portrait reproduces 'far social distance' or even 'public distance' (viewers are merely acquaintances or strangers)[42]. Did the association of a 'head and shoulders' portrait with similar renderings of Isis and Serapis in a painted triptych of unknown provenance (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 74 AP 20-22) indicate intimacy between the 'sitter' and the gods? Did the Severan roundel from Egypt showing the imperial family belong to a private individual who was close to them (or who wished to be thought so) or did it come from a public building? Artemidorus records that a man once dreamt that he saw a painted portrait of himself in the gymnasium; the apparent disintegration of its frame indicated that the man would go lame, because the absence of his legs from the painting meant that their 'disintegration' could not be visualised directly. The appearance of this kind of portrait in the gymnasium was explained by the building's symbolic reference to the health of the whole body, although it is not impossible that such portraits were normally displayed there; the small framed portrait from Hawara (in the British Museum) was probably commissioned for a domestic context prior to its deposition in a tomb[43].

Using Buxton's idea of myths being used by artists and story-tellers to 'think with', one could say that Boardman suggested that myth scenes in Athenian vases and sculptures from the sixth century B.C. were used by artists thinking about contemporary politics (under Peisistratid rule). Osborne criticised Boardman's approach by suggesting that the artists were representing too much if this was all they were interested in, the "excess" veiling any analogies between the mythic past and the present[44]. When considering the significance of centaurs in Classical Greece, Osborne argued that they represented male citizens, who could also behave decently or wildly, and who were also led by equals (unlike satyrs who were led by the god Dionysos); here there was no "excess" because this was a cultural 'given'. Henderson similarly suggested that Amazons were used to explore commonplace hopes and fears about maleness, manliness, heroism and war through "unlikeness" between them and (male) viewers, and "likeness" between their heroic opponents and (male) viewers[45].

Root's study of Achaemenid art has focussed particularly on "official" representations of rulers, the term "official" indicating her belief in the central commissioning of such representations. According to her understanding, artists were not the creators of the 'royal image' but mere craftsmen executing a plan predetermined by others. This idea cut across the previous scholarship which had attached great importance to the nationality of these craftsmen in order to suggest and explain foreign, and particularly Greek, influences on Achaemenid art[46]. There is some evidence to support her hypothesis. First sculptors in wood and stone are known, from the Persepolis treasury texts, to have been employed centrally, on a wage basis, and at a level very much in line with that of other manual labourers. This suggests that they were of low social status and answerable to their employers. Secondly the masons' marks and patterns of workmanship revealed by the sculptures themselves have been thought to point to 'assembly line' production, different teams working on different sections of relief and individuals specialising in the execution of particular details (such as hair, ears, jewellery, etc)[47]. By contrast Alexander's favourite

painter (Apelles) is said to have spent a vast sum on a fellow countryman's painting, as a favour, and to have made disparaging remarks about the capacities of a 'mere' cobbler[48].

A late fifth century B.C. Aramaic text from Egypt states that a certain Hinzani and the "women of his house" were taken into the household of Arsames (assumed to be the satrap of that name); Hinzani appears to be a designer whose works are to be submitted to Arsames for approval[49]. Arsames' undisputed commissioning of artworks allows us to consider the possibility that such officials had their own ideas about the representation of the ruler, which need not coincide with those of the ruler; Reade, Root, and Jamzadeh too easily assumed that art and texts displayed of the king whatever he wanted, for his own pleasure, or the edification of others[50]. Examples of eighth century (B.C.) Assyrian stelae have survived in which the names and achievements of provincial governors are recorded or represented, in addition to, or in place of those of the king. Reade implicitly suggests that these may have been commissioned by the governors themselves; sufficient affront was given to the king, in one instance, for the governor's name to be defaced, although it is not certain that the monument alone was enough to prompt his disgrace[51]. One thinks of Dio's explanation of the fall of Cornelius Gallus[52].

Reade's analysis of Assyrian art furnishes evidence for royal direction of palace construction, with successive monarchs building successive residences; Strabo's suggestion that each of the Achaemenid kings similarly constructed their own palaces and treasuries fits this Assyrian pattern, and the successive residences of the emperors at Rome should also be noted. The construction of new palaces did not, of course, prevent kings from redecorating those of their forefathers, and Russell's study of Sennacherib's 'palace without rival' at Nineveh, for example, has distinguished two periods of reliefs, the second of which appears to have been sponsored by Assurbanipal[53]. Root also drew on evidence for the active royal sponsorship of construction projects, sometimes entailing actual (if symbolic) labour, like that recorded as having been undertaken by both Esarhaddon and

Antiochus I for Babylonian temples; Philostratus' Nero dug the first spit from the isthmus at Corinth, where the canalisation scheme was worthy of Xerxes (see below, chapter 1)[54].

In his palace at Nineveh, Sennacherib was represented supervising the sculpting of colossi and their transportation from the quarries to his palace at Nineveh[55]. Reade quoted ninth century (B.C) inscriptions which appear to have the king stating that he had personally carved his portrait, inscribed the text, and set up the monuments, and Root notes both that Neferhotep I of Egypt claimed to have consulted archives to discover the traditional and accepted method of rendering a cult image of Osiris, and that Darius' Behistun monument claims that the king was responsible for the text of the inscription but its distribution "into all lands". Since there is Babylonian evidence for the copying of the Behistun relief as well, it is possible that this too was a matter of centrally controlled dissemination (rather than locally demanded copying)[56]. Two stories about the direct involvement of Darius (I) in commissioning monuments to celebrate his reign are mentioned by Herodotus, but his apparent interest in such matters may have been exceptional; in any case this Greek evidence is less compelling than the graffito of Akhenaten's chief sculptor claiming that he was the king's apprentice, and the Assyrian correspondence asking the king to choose between several plans for his representation (whether visual or textual is, unfortunately, unclear)[57].

Root was interested in the ways that earlier and foreign representations of the ruler might have influenced the planners and commissioners of "official" Achaemenid art. She saw borrowings as deliberate and thought that it was not only a matter of visual ideas being copied, but of the meanings attached to these models being known and desired for the new dynasty[58]. Nylander went further than Root in ascribing political motives to Achaemenid eclecticism, suggesting that the Persepolis reliefs were intended to be accessible to visitors from across the diverse, but united, empire[59]. Root noted differences between the forms

of representation attempted in the centre and in the provinces, and on the basis of the Egyptian evidence (where the Persian period forms are radically different from those of both the preceding and succeeding centuries) suggested that a centrally conceived programme was centrally 'translated' for the provinces[60].

Reade studied the relationship between the choice of 'scene' chosen to represent the Assyrian kings and the location of the representation; scenes of battle appear to have occurred only in palaces and at some temples of Ashur, and hunting or 'court' scenes only seem to have been represented in temples. By contrast, the arguably more accessible stelae, used in public or cultic spaces, normally represent the monarch's relationship with specified deities. Reade suggests the existence of three audiences for representations outside the palaces; the gods, the king's contemporaries, and future generations (not least the king's successors). In discussing the palaces he hypothesised that the rooms furthest from the 'presence chambers' were accessible to more viewers and received the more familiar representations of the king undertaking civic and religious duties, protected by the gods and magical guardian figures, whilst both military and hunting expeditions and 'court' scenes were intended for the eyes of kings, their families, friends and guests[61].

More recently Russell has separated out twelve potential audiences for Sennacherib's palace reliefs; Reade had mentioned Ashurbanipal's 'housewarming party' attended by as many as 70,000 guests, and Russell notes that apart from the king's human contemporaries the gods were invited into the palace on such occasions. The palaces are known to have been visited by Assyrian civic dignitaries, provincial governors, foreign envoys, and tributary delegations from subject peoples, and Russell suggests that in Sennacherib's Nineveh palace these viewers were intended to see the consequences of opposition to the king; in the 'public areas' of Sargon's Khorsabad palace such visitors would probably have seen only representations of the peaceful ideal of willing tribute. Whilst it may seem unlikely that the reliefs were intended to communicate the lower status residents of the

palace who served the king and his 'court', Russell notes that the scribes would have found it easier, than almost anyone else, to read the Akkadian texts and epigraphs associated with the reliefs; Porter has suggested that these privileged readers (and writers) were of great significance in mediating to 'courtiers' the "official version of the kings achievements and his policies"[62]. Porter also developed Liverani's idea that Assyrian texts were normally read aloud, to suggest that texts now known only from buried inscriptions on clay prisms and cylinders, were read *to* contemporaries at public ceremonies[63].

Studies of art and society in Medieval, Renaissance and ***ancien régime*** Europe have also benefited from the preservation of correspondence and other records denied the Classical historian. Thus Gordon notes a contract drawn up in (A.D.) 1395 specifying that Richard II's tomb effigy was to portray him "according to a pattern shown to the coppersmiths" which had been approved with the king's personal seal[64]. Commissioning patrons could exercise considerable, and knowledgeable, control over artistic products with contracts sometimes specifying subject, layout, dimensions, materials, technique and models to be followed. Even supposedly backward Northern monarchs like Henry VIII kept pattern books in their palaces, and Welch notes a scheme for the decoration of four rooms elaborated by the Duke of Milan himself in successive drafts (from 1471 onwards), which detailed not only the themes and scenes to be included, but also the gestures of certain figures[65]. Artists themselves were only just beginning to specialise (in portraiture for example) in the sixteenth century, but specialists like Hilliard could command fees for individual works almost equal to the yearly salary of ordinary painter-stainers. As early as 1551 Levina Teerlinc had been paid ten pounds for her portrait of Princess Elizabeth; nevertheless, Cuddy notes that fifty Van Dycks could have been purchased for the price of just one set of tapestries in the 1620s[66].

Strong, Pomeroy, Anglo and Howard all refer to a draft proclamation of 1563, intended to curb further production of portraits of Elizabeth I, until an approved portraitist had

produced an approved model for other artists to follow; in 1596 an order of the Privy Council commanded the destruction of all portraits of her executed by "common painters", and that in future artists should render her portraits only with the permission of the Serjeant Painter. The draft proclamation includes the assertion that "all sortes of subiectes and people both noble and mean" wished to display Elizabeth's portrait in their homes and Pomeroy concluded that the demand for such images was not one which could be met by officially sanctioned production alone[67]. Woodcuts and engravings may have gone some way towards satisfying this demand by the 1590s, and Cuddy claims that "in 1603, mass-produced portraits of Mary Queen of Scots were selling strongly in London" (in anticipation and celebration of her son's accession). Even in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign however, Anglo notes that it had been possible for Thomas Phaer to purchase four (painted?) royal portraits for a single shilling. In earlier generations loyalty appears to have been expressed emblematically as with the white hart brooches worn by the angels in the Wilton Diptych, which were also available in pewter, and Steane notes that individualised portrait features might be unnecessary for identification of a represented monarch if the figure was accorded his individualised heraldic devices and a name label[68]. In the 1530s Clement Urmeston had imagined an England where each householder would own a form of identity document sealed with a "hedde seale" (the monarch's portrait) but his ideas were ignored; in 1547 Bishop Gardiner suggested that honest illiterates were able to identify the royal seal, and paid it due respect when they saw it (doffing their caps)[69].

The case of the Wilton Diptych, which shows Richard II as an apparently prepubescent boy king, illustrates that the apparent age of the ruler in a portrait image is no indication of its date, since the near contemporary tomb effigy, and manuscript representations, portray him as a grown man with a moustache and double pointed beard[70]. Whilst mimetic reproduction of a ruler's actual features was not always considered important, Partridge and Starn have noted that Vasari regarded Raphael's portrait of Pope Julius II as "so wonderfully lifelike and true that it inspired fear as if it were alive"; Bernini, who did not

think it possible to render an accurate portrait from a painting (even if by Van Dyck), professed himself amazed that his bust of Charles I had won admiration "not only for the exquisiteness of the work but the likenesse and nere resemblance itt had to the King's countenance"[71]. Royal portraits were sent out as gifts in diplomatic exchanges, and Elizabeth I's portrait miniatures are known to have been worn by foreign kings as well as favoured courtiers; Sir Henry Unton, having unwillingly surrendered his own locket to the French king (Henry IV) declared that although the "Picture came farr short of the Perfection of her Beauty" the king "behealde it with Passion and Admiration... protesting that he had never seen the like". The idea that the eye was more susceptible than the ear was a commonplace of the day, and the French king was said, by contrast, to have been unmoved by Sir Henry's eloquence[72].

The accessibility of Tudor monarchs to the majority of their subjects has been reconsidered by Anglo, who concludes that public appearances (at coronations, on progresses, at civic entry pageants, at tournaments, etc) would have left most of their fellow-countrymen without even the merest glimpse of their rulers. The idea that such occasions were used for communicating ideas to those outside the Tudor court has little evidence to support it, and Anglo clearly demonstrates that the planning of civic pageantry was not centrally directed, even at "politically sensitive" moments. Both Smuts and Anglo have suggested that the average member of a thronging crowd would have been unable to see or hear what was going on, and unable to understand its political symbolism even if they had[73]. Geertz had already suggested that some civic pageantry was aimed in the other direction (at monarchs and their courts) but although Anglo goes further in suggesting that "these shows had as their principal object, ***Laudando praecipere*** - to teach by praising", he doubts whether rulers ever got beyond the praise; the image of Henry VIII with the bible displayed on the occasion of Queen Mary's entry into London with Philip of Spain in 1554, was spotted by Bishop Gardiner (who called the artist a traitor, and demanded that the bible be painted

out) but there is no evidence that the monarchs themselves had noticed it, and little likelihood that it would have made any difference to policy[74].

This English evidence for civic entry pageantry is in some contrast to the case of Giovanna of Austria's entry into Florence in 1565 where the displays had been planned by the father of her betrothed (Cosimo I) in collaboration with the artists Borghini and Vasari; Starn and Partridge note that fountains dispensing wine were provided "to satisfy the fancy and taste" of the ***populo***, but although the presence of the illiterate poor was expected and, in this way, catered for, the art and texts deployed on this occasion, and more permanently in the Sala Grande, were clearly aimed at a more educated élite[75]. Jouhaud has documented the production of printed texts recording Louis XIII's triumphal entries into Paris and other cities following his victory at La Rochelle in 1628, which describe and interpret (and sometimes misinterpret) the iconography used on those occasions; he rejects the idea that "only a small minority of ***literati***" understood or interested themselves in the political symbolism utilised on such occasions, partly because the sheer volume of printed material produced suggests a wider audience, and partly because recherché aspects of iconography could be *mis*-read in such a way as to produce "correct and legitimate political interpretations". It should be noted that an attempt was said to have been made to keep the poor away from the entry into Troyes[76].

Steane noted that it can be difficult to distinguish between Jesse trees showing David and the kings of Israel, and dynastic assemblages of English kings on the West fronts and screens of cathedrals. A frontal seated pose not unlike that used for Christ Cosmocrator, was accorded to kings of all kinds in manuscript illumination, sculpture, painting and royal seals, but representations of piously kneeling kings (e.g. Richard II in the Wilton Diptych, or the stained glass of Winchester College) do not seem to have been considered inconsistent with them[77]. Current trends in regalia and royal furnishings could be backdated to the ancient past portrayed in manuscript illuminations; thus the late Medieval

canopied throne could be accorded to Herod, or even the Alexander of the ***Secreta Secretorum***. Moreover, the facial features of modern rulers like Henry VIII, Philip II (of Spain), Francis I (of France), and Frederick III of Saxony were accorded to the biblical kings of Israel (e.g. David, Solomon and Hezekiah) in sculpture, paintings, manuscript illuminations, woodcuts and prints[78]. Conversely ancient representations of kings and emperors could be bought or copied for their own sake (Piero de' Medici probably owned a statuette version of the Marcus Aurelius equestrian portrait from Rome at least as early as 1469, for example), or used as inspirations for modern portraits. It is unclear to what extent Titian's equestrian portrait of Charles V owes anything to the statue of Marcus Aurelius, but Partridge and Starn have suggested that the three-quarters seated pose of Raphael's Pope Julius II can be traced back to Roman reliefs on the Arch of Constantine (and elsewhere); the arch had featured in Perugino's 1481 rendering of ***Christ's Charge to Peter*** for the Sistine Chapel, and a temporary replica was erected in front of St. Peter's in 1507, to mark Pope Julius' entry into Rome[79].

Anglo notes that the great hall of Henry VII's Richmond Palace was lined with imaginative 'portraits' of Brutus, Hengist, Arthur and other more recent English kings all "apperyng like bold and valiaunt knightes", and a portrait of Henry VII was placed among them "as worthy that rumme and place with thoes glorious princes, as eny king that ever reigned in this lond"; Anglo also reports that the citizens of Worcester had planned a pageant for Henry's entry into Worcester in 1486 which compared him with Julius Caesar and Scipio Africanus as well as the biblical David and the mythical Arthur. Whilst Constantine had appeared with Arthur and English king-saints in the slightly earlier stained glass of the Old Library at All Soul's College (Oxford), on account of his supposedly British mother, it is only with Henry VIII's confiscation of Hampton Court that we know of an English king acquiring a set of Roman emperor portraits (gilded and painted terracotta roundels, executed by Giovanni da Maiano in 1521). Wendorf has noted that Van Dyck's 1633 portrait of Charles I riding through a triumphal arch was initially hung at the end of a

gallery in St James's Palace "already filled with portraits of the Roman emperors by Titian and Giulio Romano"[80]. Under Louis XIV, casts of the Marcus Aurelius statue and Trajan's column were brought to Paris, and permanent triumphal arches were erected for the first time since antiquity, inspired by, but larger than, the arches of Roman emperors[81]. Although it should be noted that Pisanello had manufactured medallions inspired by Roman models as early as the 1440s (for Alfonso I of Naples and Leonello of Ferrara for example), Voltaire thought that the France of Louis XIV had finally "equalled the ancients" in the production of medallions, which he claimed had only begun to be raised "from mediocrity, towards the end of the reign of Louis XIII"; an 'official' history of the reign based on its medals had finally been printed in 1702, available in both folio and quarto editions, and cabinets in the Louvre displayed the originals in chronological order[82].

Voltaire defended Louis XIV from the charge of "intolerable pride" with respect to statues by noting that the most notorious had been erected by others, in his honour; the inscriptions on the base of the statue in the Place de Vendôme (installed in 1699) are considered the flatteries of the city which had erected it, rather than the king's view of himself, whilst the monument in the Place des Victoires (unveiled in 1686) is thought attributable to "the greatness of soul of the First Marshall La Feuillade and his gratitude towards his sovereign". Voltaire notes that the latter monument had been the subject of unfavourable comment because it showed enchained slaves, and was at pains to show that this was an established, if almost certainly seventeenth century, convention that had been used for representing both Henry IV and Louis XIII (at Paris), and for Ferdinand de' Medici (at Livorno); a fourth statue, of Friedrich Wilhelm of Brandenburg (at Berlin), was not cast until 1700, and was thus not only later than that of the Place des Victoires, but posthumous. Voltaire appears to have agreed that the representation of "free and happy citizens" was to be preferred to such images of subjection, but suggested that the slaves stood for restrained vice, as much as conquered nations (or continents). Burke notes that

the king (and Louvois, the successor to Colbert as the 'august' king's "Maecenas of all the arts") took an interest in both of the honorific sculptural projects noted by Voltaire, and doubts whether even the provincial cities who begged for permission to erect royal portrait statues, in the late 1680s, were acting spontaneously; centrally appointed provincial officials encouraged such displays of loyalty, or even promoted them themselves, and centralised editorial control was exercised over the composition of inscriptional texts[83].

Burke's The Fabrication of Louis XIV explicitly focussed on "the public image of the king" and his place "in the collective imagination" of his contemporaries. Burke's approach was deliberately inter-disciplinary, and he was keen to set his particular study in the more general context of scholarship on "the relations between art and power"; the artworks and texts representing Louis XIV are considered to present a particularly instructive "case study" partly because so much evidence has survived, and secondly because that evidence shows both that the "king himself and his advisers were very much concerned with the royal image" and that "his image-making was a model for other monarchs"[84]. The chronological approach was thought useful for documenting changes in the royal image. Artworks and texts representing past events are considered problematic as they supply evidence both about the occasion portrayed and the time when they were portrayed, and Burke suggests that there was a "mythologisation" of events, as an "authorised version" of the king's "story" was "fabricated" during his lifetime; one may note for example that some medallions, issued without qualms in the immediate aftermath of events were eventually edited out of the 'official' medal history noted above (including that representing the Place des Victoires statue)[85].

Burke noted that over 300 paintings and statues representing Louis XIV have survived, and this may be compared both with Pomeroy's figure of around 135 surviving paintings of Elizabeth I (Strong noted only three sculptures); Strong was only able to assemble a corpus of 33 engravings, 23 woodcuts and 23 medals representing Elizabeth I, whereas

Burke notes nearly 700 engravings of Louis XIV and over 300 medals. Whilst it is true that Elizabeth's reign was only 45 years long compared to Louis' 72 years, these statistics appear to suggest an increasing demand for mass produced portraiture in particular, but also a more general increase in portrait production; the latter appears to be confirmed by Van Dyck's average output of four painted portraits of Charles I in each year of his service to the English Court (1632-1641)[86]. Burke was interested in the "consumption" of Louis' representations, and the three target audience groups identified by Burke were "posterity; the French upper classes, both in Paris and the provinces; and foreigners, especially foreign courts"; in addition, Burke noted an occasion when an official royal letter was read out to "the whole army", and speculated that with 650,000 Frenchmen serving between 1701 and 1713 such communications might have been "a means of diffusing official images of the king throughout the nation". Nevertheless, he rejects the idea of a mass audience, even for publicly displayed visual art, citing the complexity of the iconography and the language of the inscriptions (Latin). Even so, he estimated that 100,000 witnessed Louis' entry into Paris at the time of his wedding, noted that at least 350,000 received the royal touch in the king's lifetime, and suggested that the reproduction of the royal image on "cheap pottery plates" attested to "a certain measure of popular devotion to the king"[87]. Farge has noted the case of an impoverished servant girl who borrowed sufficiently decent clothes to secure entry to Versailles (in 1684) hoping, vainly as it turned out, to get close enough to the king to fall prostrate at his feet and implore his assistance (anticipating a favourable reception)[88].

Burke was also interested in parodic or even hostile portrayals of Louis XIV and noted that the king's reputation could be attacked using the very images with which it had been built up; thus the Victory of the Place des Victoires statue could be represented removing the laurel wreath from Louis' head on a far from official medal, whilst an engraving showed the king's mistresses in place of the slaves at the foot of the same statue, here keeping Louis in subjection with chains[89]. Although, according to Darnton, a mere 2% of the

libelles seized in Paris between 1678 and 1701 "concerned the private life of the king", Darnton himself notes that this was this very period that saw publication of Bussy-Rabutin's ***histoires amoureuses de la cour de Louis XIV***, and it should be noted that more than 60% of the hostile texts identified by Burke were published in those twenty-three years. There was an increasing distance between the heroic image (the Place Vendôme equestrian statue, for example) and the realities of a sickly, ageing monarch; ironically, Louis was as unlucky as Augustus (see chapter four, below) in having few real achievements to celebrate in his last decades, with prolonged and expensive wars and spectacular defeats, food shortages, and the deaths of his immediate heirs[90].

Burke suggested that the allegorical use of classical mythology for representing Louis XIV declined around 1680 in favour of "literal" representations of royal achievements. Jouhaud has contrasted the general emblematic use of the Perseus and Andromeda myth in the sixteenth century (as an allegory of royal deliverance) with the ***placard*** issued in 1594 showing Perseus, for the first known time, with the intentionally identifiable portrait features of a particular monarch (Henry IV of France); the application of modern portrait features to the kings of literature was noted above and under Louis XIV composite images of this kind included Alexander. Such correspondences had become increasingly commonplace in the period before the birth of the 'sun king', with Van Honthorst's 1628 painting ***Apollo and Diana***, for example, representing gods with the facial features of Charles I, Henrietta Maria and the Duke of Buckingham. Although the portrait of Louis XIV as Christ the Good Shepherd seems extraordinary, Wendorf noted Lely's portraits of Barbara Villiers (mistress of Charles II) as the Magdalen, and the Madonna; in the latter her illegitimate offspring took the place of the Christ-child[91]. Jackson noted that even clergymen could speak of French kings as gods, and the anointed sons of God, in the seventeenth century, and he connected this rhetoric with Rubens' painting of royal apotheosis in the Louvre. The central tondo of the Florence ***Sala Grande*** has usually been interpreted as representing the apotheosis of Cosimo I although van Veen, noting the late

introduction of Cosimo's portrait into the design for this roundel, considers that the heavenly setting is that of Florence itself, under Cosimo's rule; Vasari painted the tondo in the Duke's lifetime and in consultation with him, but Marie de' Medici's commissioning of Rubens in 1622 came twelve years after the death of her husband (Henry IV) just as the apotheosis of James I on the ceiling of the Whitehall Banqueting House was painted in the reign of Charles I. In the latter case it seems clear that the idea for representing apotheosis came from the artist rather than his royal patron[92].

Burke himself mentioned the egalitarian image of the post-revolutionary French king Louis-Philippe (1830-1848), and Marrinan's survey of "Art and Ideology in Orléanist France" will be discussed briefly below[93]. However, it is worth pausing to note the fact that the attempted escape of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette from house arrest in the Tuileries (in 1791) was foiled when the postmaster at St. Menehoud recognised the king from the portrait of him printed on promissory notes[94]. Darnton notes that the popular utopian fantasy ***L'An 2440***, printed in various editions from 1771 onwards had envisaged a pedestrian monarch walking the streets of Paris, and Marrinan quotes an anonymous biographer of Louis-Philippe who advised readers who noticed a tall man walking alone "dressed in a simple overcoat with an umbrella tucked under his arm" to approach the man and shake him by the hand because this was the king[95]. This 'man in the street' royal style was in some (deliberate) contrast to that of his immediate Bourbon predecessor Charles X who had touched for scrofula at his coronation in 1825, and Marrinan points out that the two kings' portrait images were equally different. The last Bourbon king was shown with the ermine and silk stockings of conventional ***ancien régime*** state portraiture, so little removed from Rigaud's ***Portrait of Louis XIV***, for example, that one might think that the revolution had sought only to replace royal wigs with plumed hats; the 'Citizen-King' portraits exhibited at the Salon of 1831 show a man in the simple uniform of a National Guard commander, complete with the (revolutionary) tricolor ribbon in his hat, and the picture spaces of these paintings included neither a crown, nor the baton, nor the hand of

justice, and Hersent's even includes a glimpse of "a group of dark-suited bourgeois citizens... being admitted to the king's presence"[96].

As early as October 1831 however, the new king had been persuaded to take up residence in the Tuileries. When Vernet painted the king in 1832 the formerly simple uniform was embellished with brocade, and crown, baton and hand of justice had returned to the picture space. Despite the fact that alterations had been made to the painting in accordance with Louis-Philippe's wishes, it was never copied or issued as an engraving[97]. The previous year it had been rumoured that Champmartin was to paint a "model portrait which would be recopied eighty-six times and sent to the administrative headquarters of every département in France" in accordance with Napoleonic practice. In 1833 Gérard's portrait of the king acquired official recognition when duplicate originals were requested and copies commissioned from art students (at 800 francs a time); the brocade had gone from the uniform, and the old royal symbols were reduced to ornaments for his throne[98]. Marrinan notes that Winterhalter's portrait displayed at the Salon of 1839 was adopted as the next 'official' (reproduced) portrait, and here the royal symbols returned to the foreground whilst the Charter of 1830, held up to view in Vernet's painting and an open book in Gérard's, was now identifiable only by the title on its spine; a contemporary art critic noted that the king, already in his late sixties was not made to seem "older or younger", but was rather represented "as he is: solid and upright, robust and unambiguous"[99].

If Louis-Philippe the pedestrian 'citizen king' had seemed close to Mercier's ideal in 1830, the multiple equestrian portrait of Louis-Philippe and his sons at Versailles, commissioned in 1846, suggested that there had been a move away from egalitarianism. Mercier's supposed dream of the future ended at Versailles, the vain palace reduced to tumbledown and half-forgotten ruins, but in Vernet's painting the buildings stand as a museum, in accordance with Louis-Philippe's instructions, and an equestrian statue of Louis XIV,

safely atop its pedestal, is clearly visible between the shoulders of the king and the duc d'Orléans, permitting the former "to bask in the glow of the Sun King"; by contrast, an earlier commission (Cogniet's ***The Parisian National Guard Leaves for the Front in September 1792***) had represented the base of a statue of the popular Henry IV (the model king of ***L'An 2440***) sporting the tricolor flag in place of its statue. Fleurs-de-lys, absent from both public monuments in France, and royal portraits, since the fall of the Bourbon dynasty were also represented on the ornamental gateway which framed the king and his eldest son in Vernet's composition[100]. De Calonne's suggestion that the, as yet unseen, painting was to be a "bulletin of health", in response to charges that Louis-Philippe had become frail in his old age, is undercut only when it is remembered that the portrayed 'event', if ever it occurred at all, must have taken place at least four years earlier, as the crown prince had died in 1842[101].

Marrinan notes that Court's painting of Louis-Philippe distributing standards to the National Guard had hidden Lafayette in the background, although in fact it was the latter who had done the distribution, the king's actual function on the day in question having been to pass the standards to Lafayette; Schama has similarly noted that David's contemporary painting of Josephine's coronation by the emperor Napoleon in 1804 (installed by Louis-Philippe in the Salle du Sacre at Versailles in 1834) is historically inaccurate in portraying Letitia Bonaparte amongst the spectators in Notre Dame, as she was actually in Rome at the time[102]. By 1830, Napoleon himself had become a folk-hero, represented, in popular literature and prints, as an accessible man of the people. In one such print a peasant's enthusiasm for the late emperor was demonstrated by ownership of a printed portrait placed at the fireside focus of his humble dwelling, and the presumed veteran of Napoleon's campaigns is supposed to be telling a visiting priest that the picture shows his ***Père Eternel***. A painting exhibited at the Salon in 1833 showed a peasant family admiring plaster figurines, a number of which are clearly portraits of Napoleon[103]. In the months after a statue of Napoleon was restored to the top of the Vendôme Column, a

cheap print was issued representing the great conqueror's apotheosis; his reception in a cloud-world Valhalla was observed by, amongst others, Sesostris, Julius Caesar and Alexander the Great[104].

It would obviously be possible to pursue beyond 1848 a survey of scholarship about the relationship between art and rulership. Whilst it is not to be understood that Paris in the early nineteenth century (for example), should be considered a close model for Seleucid Antioch (for example), whatever the apparent similarities (e.g. a capital city's role in making and breaking kings), the emergence of the 'nation-state', increasing literacy levels amongst the 'lower classes', and technological advances (from photography, to broadcasting and computing) have since transformed society to such an extent that it is unclear how relevant any comparative evidence would be. Although the term 'propaganda' has been consistently used by Classical historians since at least the 1920s to describe (amongst other things) the communications of ancient rulers about themselves, their duties, and their achievements, Burke's uncertainty about its applicability to the communications of even a seventeenth century monarch must urge greater caution[105].

The entrance into common English usage of the word propaganda occurred only in the second decade of the present century. In the English-speaking world, despite the Bolshevik distinction between agitation and propaganda (the latter being reserved for the literate minority), the term became associated with the mass communications of totalitarian regimes[106]. As a working definition of propaganda, 'the lies which our enemies tell about themselves and us' had a particular point in wartime but, despite the acknowledgement of its usefulness and legitimacy in democracies, the association of propaganda with mendacity has persisted[107]. Whilst modern dictionary definitions speak of an 'organised scheme for propagation of a doctrine or practice' and the ideas disseminated in this way (OED), in practice the term propaganda is now used in two almost contradictory ways; for some, including some ancient historians, it describes only the official communication of a

subject public by those in power[108], whilst others more loosely apply the term to the arguments and statements of any one party or interest group, in competition with others[109]. In both cases however, there is an assumption that 'propaganda' disregards rational argument, in favour of emotional appeals to the desires and fears of the audience, and is therefore inimical to debate[110]; also it is usually thought that the complexity of 'real life' is not reflected in such communications, which use simple images and phrases, frequently repeated with minor variations, to relay simple messages about an advertised product, person or event[111].

Totalitarian ('propaganda') art in the present century was created so as to be understandable to the masses and its contemporary popular appeal stood in contrast to the unpopularity of the 'true' art of the modernist schools; one group of genres that could bear frequent repetition with minor variation was common to both Fascist and Communist art and includes ruler portraits, representations of warfare (both straightforward battle scenes and allegorisations of conflict, with references to past history and myth), and representations of victory and its celebration[112]. The commonality of subject matter between the Hellenistic and Roman artworks discussed below and 20th century totalitarian art is suggestive and, indeed, a mass viewing public for some ancient artworks has already been noted, even if there was no concept of 'public opinion'[113]. It is also worth noting that, despite the political impotence of the artisanal classes and the urban 'mob' of 18th century Paris, 'ordinary people' could be sufficiently interested in the visual communications of the Bourbon kings to attend the installation of a new portrait statue; those citizens who mocked one such event in 1763, giving voice to their pre-existing negative views about the king's conduct (at some risk to their own freedom), appear to have done so with some knowledge of the (equestrian) statue's intended meaning, and the difference between the image of a militarily successful king, and the realities of recent military defeat and the king's 'disgraceful subjection' to his latest mistress[114]. Nevertheless, the term propaganda is not used again in this thesis.

The inter-disciplinary nature of the present study owes a debt to Burke's approach to the various media used to represent Louis XIV in his lifetime. Its longer time-frame is really shared only by Starn and Partridge's study of three Italian "Halls of State" created between 1300 and 1600. Its interest in tracing the impact of one culture's images of monarchy on another is most closely parallelled in Root's study of Achaemenid art[115]. In conventional ancient historical terms, this thesis is an investigation of Hellenism at Rome before the death of Augustus. In previous studies of the Hellenisation of Rome, philhellenism has been discussed at length, but there the focus is usually on the minority of aristocratic enthusiasts for Greek culture in the second century B.C., and their diplomatic consideration for contemporary Greece and the Greeks. Here, the long-term changes to material and intellectual culture experienced by Rome, under Greek influence, are reviewed (in the context of 'event history') as evidence for changes to the city's political culture. It is hoped that a balance has been created between the old established, though long criticised, extremes of 'Greek' historians treating Rome as "an unimportant step-child of Greece", and 'Roman' historians regarding the Greek influence on Rome as "a superficial coating"[116].

Finally, a few words should be said about the layout of the thesis. Each chapter is followed by a summary of the main arguments and findings, and no further summary is included in the Epilogue. All four chapters and the Epilogue are to be found in this volume. The second volume comprises an Appendix, the Illustrations, the Lists of References for each chapter, a full list of cited Classical sources, and the Bibliography. By no means all the artworks and monuments discussed in the text are illustrated in the second volume, and the reader is, where necessary, referred in the endnotes to standard works. Similarly, no Stemma is provided for the somewhat confusing extended family of Augustus, but the textual references to family relationships in Chapter 4 are drawn from Syme's The Roman Aristocracy, and the puzzled reader is advised to consult the family trees in that volume. In most cases the Loeb Classics editions of the ancient textual

sources have been consulted, but the use of other versions and translations is indicated in the list of cited Classical sources.

1) Kings, Tyrants, Good Citizens and Ideal Rulers in Greek Thought

In order to understand the development and character of Hellenistic Kingship it is necessary to understand something of the political philosopy of the Greek world before the reign of Alexander the Great. The best evidence for Greek political thought in the Fourth Century is to be found in the surviving texts of Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, Isocrates and Demosthenes. Despite the close association of all five men with the city of Athens, the political ideas manifested in their texts were partly shaped by personal experience of different forms of government not only in mainland Greece, but throughout the known world (from Sicily to Achaemenid Babylonia). Before their time, however, the stories of Greek myth and history had already produced stereotyped representations of monarchs and monarchy which often related closely to Greek perceptions of the uncivilised, barbarian "other"[1]. In addition to the hereditary foreign kings of past and present, and the Greek kings of the heroic era, the previous two to three centuries had provided these fourth century commentators with examples of ***tyrannoi***[2] in many of the city-states of the Greek world (including Athens).

As a solution to particular emergencies the absolute authority provided by such rulers had certain virtues but, although contemporary Greek tyrants could still be found on the periphery of the Greek world, tyrannical regimes had more usually been superseded by aristocracies and democracies, the politicised populations soon having become unwilling to submit to masters who did not prove their superiors in merit or judgement[3]. Although historical judgements of individual tyrants were not entirely critical, it appears that by the fourth century this "unconstitutional" monarchy was beginning to be regarded as inferior to "constitutional" kingship[4], where ruler and ruled were both subject to constraint; many of the vices conventionally associated with kingship had become associated instead with tyrants, and even the Persian Great King could be held up as a paragon to emulate (so long

as he was Cyrus[5]). When a thinker like Plato propounded the notion that the ideal constitution was (after all) rule by an individual[6], it was assumed that this ideal ruler would manifest the virtues of a good citizen to a greater extent than any of his subjects (virtues which prevented him from indulging in the vices that had been traditionally associated with monarchy). This chapter therefore discusses both the traditional Greek perceptions of monarchy, and secondly the traditional civic virtues of the Greek citizen.

In addition, however, political leadership within a city-state was already considered to demand certain skills (discussed below), comparable to those of a physician, ship's captain or herdsman,[7] which only the good and wise man could effectively employ for the benefit of all. Such an ideal individual was unlikely to exist in the real world, and indeed experience appeared to demonstrate that powerful individuals constituted a threat to, rather than the salvation of, civic society since the ambitious men who achieved power were deemed incapable of acting in the best interests of the state[8]. Even for Plato the equation of persuasive orators with tyrants was natural, not simply because, given certain circumstances, the former might be transformed into the latter (with the approval of the people), but more fundamentally because their political supremacy allowed both to act as they pleased[9]. Existing and potential rulers might more nearly approach the ideal, only if they knew how to exercise the functions of a statesman with the mind-set of the philosopher[10]; the extent to which the Hellenistic kings approached the ideal, or reverted to stereotype, is discussed in the next chapter.

a) Traditional Perceptions: the monarch

i) unrestrained power, ***hubris***, and suspicion

To an Athenian citizen the rule of written law constituted both a proof and a defence of the equality associated with democracy; such equality was impossible under a political system which gave the mere word of the ruler the force of law, particularly when that ruler governed without "reason", and his orders depended on caprice[11]. By definition, the "law"

of the absolute monarch's word is beyond the scrutiny of his subjects and, therefore, the ruled must either trust that superior power has actually been vested in a man of superior character and wisdom, or fear for their safety; according to the Eleatic Stranger in Plato's **Politicus** even the subjects of the ideal ruler would incline to fear because it was not easy to distinguish between the "surgical" harm inflicted on them (for their own good) by the true statesman, and the more arbitrary strikes of his imperfect counterfeit[12].

This fear of harm doubtless reflects the conventional linkage of unrestrained power with the vice of ***hubris***[13]; this was considered to be an overweening pride that caused its possessor to believe in his own superiority to the rules of human custom and thus, despising both the prospect of divine retribution and the welfare of his fellow-men, to act with injustice and cruelty. The Persian Great Kings were particularly associated with the vice, since it was supposed to stem from repletion with social and physical goods (see below) and, given their empire, these rulers were particularly well placed to experience satiety; from the Greek perspective it was ***hubris*** that had led Xerxes to aim at the subjection of European Greeks (claiming mastery over all peoples from the rising of the sun to its setting)[14].

In Herodotus' formulation of Otanes' argument against kingship, ***hubris*** is claimed as the prime cause of the excesses of Cambyses (which Herodotus shows to have ranged from consanguineous marriage and the assassination of relatives, to the desecration of tombs and temples)[15], and Otanes' opposition to monarchy in general stems from his assumption that Cambyses had not been an exceptionally bad ruler, but a conventional monarch. The ***theophilia*** and ***philanthropia*** of Evagoras (see below), mentioned in Isocrates' encomium, made him an admirable exception amongst absolute monarchs (to the extent that he appeared to be a god amongst men, or a mortal ***daimon***); in his case those innate virtues, which his education had served to amplify, caused him both to seek the counsel of good men before making decisions of state, and to respect the existing law when exacting

punishments[16]. Such restraint in punishment was not to be expected of barbarian kings whose habitually cruel physical punishments (impalement, disfigurement, etc) were considered outrageous by Greeks; the punishment of Prometheus is worthy only of a tyrannical Zeus, hostile to the establishment of civilisation amongst mankind[17].

Coupled with ***hubris***, in Otanes' examination of monarchy, was the vice of envy which, according to Aristotle, developed when men perceived others to be equal to themselves in some way, rivalling their claims to precedence; a ruler's envy would be aroused when other men appeared better and wiser than himself, and monarchs were thus thought to seek for their friends, not worthy men, but servile flatterers[18]. Over time many rulers, under the suspicion that prominent ***aristoi*** constituted a threat to monarchy, had shown themselves followers of Thrasybulus, who famously advised Periander to act against his most prominent citizens by trimming back the tallest ears of wheat in a field[19]. Indeed, it was something of a common-place to refer to the ruler's obligation to eliminate his friends and relations (by assassination, execution or exile), and when monarchs failed to act in accordance with this apparent obligation it is considered worthy of remark[20].

Owing to the ruler's fear that violent action might be taken against his rule by individuals from the subject population, it was natural for a ruler to take a bodyguard for his defence; Aristotle admits that even a constitutional monarch needs a bodyguard for the defence of the law, whilst Xenophon's Simonides urges Hiero to reconstitute his bodyguard as a defender of the citizen body (rather than merely of his person)[21]. According to the conventions of stereotype the absolute ruler's bodyguard was comprised of foreign mercenaries (***misthophoroi***). rather than the ruler's fellow-countrymen, and indeed Xenophon's discussion of Hiero's bodyguard revolves around the fact that, whilst a ruler himself has every right to be suspicious of such a guard, his citizen population is very likely to be hostile towards the ***misthophoroi,*** and any ruler who would employ them .

Apart from bodyguards, Aristotle attests several other methods of preventing the launch of revolutions against absolute monarchy, namely the restriction of private gatherings and free speech, the humiliating subjection of the ruled population (both through the necessity of waiting on the ruler's pleasure and employment in his public works projects), the sowing of mutual distrust amongst them, and the monitoring of their behaviour through the employment of spies[22]. In contrast to the openness of living imposed on his subjects, the absolute monarch himself was imagined to live in a seclusion well suited to unmanly indolence, and shrouded in such secrecy as was only suitable for cloaking the vices of the flesh (see below); whilst Persian kings and their emulators (Pausanias), may indeed have regarded increased social distance as vital to their dignity[23], Xenophon's Agesilaus is represented as fully open to petitions, and lodging in public places rather than private houses, keen for his virtues to be observed by as many people as possible and avoiding the suspicion that he behaved differently in private.

ii) wealth, luxury, extravagance and bribery

The wealth of kings had become proverbial, but both the means of achieving such wealth and the ends for which it had usually been exercised were much criticised[24]; as with private individuals it was recognised that the wealthy were not necessarily just, and therefore that justice might play little (or no) part in either the acquisition or expenditure of their wealth. Aristotle notes that tyrants were known for taxing the rich, until their funds were exhausted, and it also seems that the use of property confiscation as a punishment was not uncommon[25]; neither means of raising revenue was unknown to the tyrannical demagogues of democracy, as Plato appears to confirm in the Republic's analysis of the development of tyranny. Possibly the ruler's envy was at work again here, since depriving rich subjects of their surplus prevented them from acting as civic ***euergetai***, ensuring that the ruler had a monopoly of public benefaction and its rewards[26].

Jason of Pherae is reported (by Xenophon) as noting favourably the fact that Persia's land empire supplied the Great King with unparalleled tribute, but it should be noted that, having created for himself a fearsome land empire of his own, those who assassinated Jason were honoured as tyrannicides[27]; whilst "natural justice" demanded that Greeks should gain mastery over barbarians, it was deemed unnatural that Greeks (genetically and environmentally indisposed to accept the overlordship of others), should lose the freedom of self-determination at the compulsion of a ***despotes*** (whether Artaxerxes of Persia, Jason of Pherae, or Philip (II) of Macedon)[28]. Xenophon also appears to suspect that Jason had designs on the sacred treasure of Delphi, and the impiety of such a misappropriation was not inconsistent with the actions of Cambyses or Xerxes; comparable outrage would no doubt have been aroused by Herodotus' story that Cheops prostituted his own daughter in order to raise funds[29].

The chief consequence of superabundant wealth was the luxurious lifestyle of the ruler. To Greek commentators luxury (***tryphe***) could be merely such sumptuousness as befitted high status[30], or the ostentatious and unseemly display of the outward manifestations of wealth (gold, ivory, purple, precious stones, etc)[31]; in addition it could be used to describe the vicious disregard for the frugality, self-control and self-sufficiency of the wise and good man (see below), that corrupted the body to the point where all physical discomfort was avoided, where the pursuit of pleasure overrode all other considerations, and manliness was undermined (see below)[32]. According to the commonplaces of Greek stereotype, the Asian peoples and their monarchs were associated with all three degrees of luxury[33].

Associated with luxury was the ruler's indifference to the cost of satisfying his desires, which fostered wasteful extravagance, particularly on perishables[34]; Aristotle's consideration of magnificence (***megaloprepeia***) as a virtue, emphasising the appropriateness of each expenditure to each object, contrasts it with the mere display of

awe-inspiring wealth practised by men who ignorantly underspend on worthy objects, and overspend on trivial ones[35]. Aristotle suggests that the most worthy objects are services to the gods and their temples and other public benefactions, although he acknowledges the possibility of a magnificent dwelling (as a civic ornament); it seems clear that monarchical expenditure on, for example, ostentatious palaces (such as that of Darius I at Susa, or that of Mausolus at Halicarnassus)[36], dynastic monuments (such as the Daochos monument at Delphi, or the Philippeion at Olympia)[37] and tombs (such as the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, or the Vergina tumuli)[38], erected to represent the ruler's wealth and power, or to ensure his personal comfort or personal renown, could never be magnificent.

Instead of the selfish accumulation and expenditure associated with actual monarchs, the ideal monarch would strive to enrich his kingdom and his worthiest subjects[39]; thus, Xenophon's Simonides advised Hiero to devote resources to the rewarding of excellence (in military training, warfare, business, agriculture and so on) in apparent contrast with the supposed Persian practice of rewarding those who had discovered or developed new pleasures (see below). For Aristotle the virtue of liberality was a mean between prodigality (an excessive liberality that exhausts one's resources) and meanness (a reluctance to spend coupled with excessive accumulation)[40]; he asserted that "***tyrannoi***" were never termed prodigal (***asotos***), since their great wealth seemed inexhaustible, although he claimed that such rulers were capable of wicked, impious and unjust meanness, as the sackers of cities and looters of temples (see above). The logical conclusion of Aristotle's ethical analysis is that illiberal rulers in the real world might approach the ideal by refusing to take unworthily, whilst willingly giving, of their own private resources, to prosper noble causes, at the right time.

In the Politics Aristotle, emphasising that the raising of revenues should seem to be for the public benefit, advised monarchs not to squander resources on gifts for "***hetairai***", "***xenoi***"

or "***technitai***"[41]; monarchical rulers were also advised to publish accounts of income and expenditure in order to demonstrate that they acted as public stewards (rather than squandering exploiters)[42]. Whilst it is not clear that the "***xenoi***" of this list were anything other than the guest-friends of the king, it is worth noting that one category of gift that was criticised was the bribe, intended to dissuade the representatives of other states from active opposition to the monarch's regime and interests[43]. The idea that monarchs might bestow excessive gifts on such unworthy objects as the courtesans with whom they associated, not only reflects the stereotype of such rulers choosing ignoble companions, and misspending their wealth and energy on gratification, but also male fear of the power that might be exercised by these desired women (see below); later fourth century writers appear particularly interested in the monumental commemoration of such women, although Plato refers to the supposed Persian practice of devoting the revenues from certain districts to the purchase of queenly garments[44]. The opposition of the ruler's subjects to his generosity towards artists and craftsmen is less easily explained; perhaps they were felt to share joint responsibility for the ruler's disreputable building projects (see above), or perhaps, since the artists of earlier generations had patriotically donated public monuments for their home cities, subjects took exception to the buying in of artistic talent, particularly at a time when these mere craftsmen were beginning to be counted amongst the friends of kings[45].

iii) enslavement to passions

The putative link between the unrestrained and luxurious lifestyle of monarchs and the supposed failure of such men to master their passions has already been mentioned; since absolute monarchs were the least subject of all people to those external influences which fostered the continent temperance and moderation ("***enkrateia***", "***sophrosyne***") of the good and wise citizen (see below), and since they had the greatest temptations opened to them and unparallelled facilities for satisfying their desires, it had become apparent that those who ought, for the public good, to have been most in control of their appetites, were more

likely to subordinate reason to passions[46]. Aristotle considers "***sophrosyne***" to be a mean, between the excess of self-indulgence ("***akolasia***") and the rather rarer vice of careless insensibility ("***anaesthesia***"), in respect of those pleasures of taste and touch which were associated with the biological imperatives of survival and reproduction[47].

With regard to "***aphrodisia***" Aristotle says little in the Nicomachean Ethics, but the feared sexual appetites of monarchical rulers feature in the Politics, where the outrage of men whose wives and children (boys as well as girls) have been seduced and violated by the king, or his closest associates, is given as a common cause of revolution[48]; in Xenophon's Hiero, Simonides asserts that the prospect of "***aphrodisia***" was sufficient to inspire a man to desire a tyranny for himself, although Hiero himself ascribes to ordinary citizens the greater enjoyment of women and boys since the ruler is never sure whether his lover's love is genuine, or a pretended affection born of compulsion[49]. Whilst it cannot be denied that foreign kings did, in reality, contract marital unions that were knowingly consanguineous[50] and polygamous[51], Hiero's response to Simonides suggests that as stereotypes of kingly behaviour these marriages could be rationalised as precautions against the doubted responsiveness of an individual, unequal wife.

Sexual intimacy between adult men, which was generally regarded as unnatural, had become associated with the Macedonian "court" by the late fourth century, when in retrospect, the apparently novel fashion of shaving and depilating is represented (by Theopompus) as having effeminised the companions of Philip II to the extent that they seemed to have become (female) concubines, and degraded the whole entourage to the extent that even bearded men promiscuously submitted to penetration[52]; the Persian practice of castrating those boys who were to serve in the king's household, thus preventing their maturation into (bearded) men, may have been similarly interpreted, and indeed the stories of history proved that some eunuchs could win particular favours from the notoriously luxurious and licentious Persian kings[53].

In the Ethics, however, Aristotle's principal examples of self-control relate to eating and drinking; the man whose life was guided by reason did not seek excessive pleasure in the act of consumption, avoiding not only excessive intakes of food and drink, but also the consumption of irresponsibly exotic and varied foodstuffs, since the body's health could be maintained on a little plain food when one was hungry[54]. Kings, however, were famed for over-eating[55] and drunkenness[56], and a dependence on selfishly extravagant consumption (to titillate palates jaded by repletion)[57]; cannibalism, which was associated by Xanthus with King Cambles of Lydia, represented an extreme example of inappropriate dining[58] which continued to haunt the reputation of kings through the Hellenistic period, to judge from Plutarch's Greek rendering of the elder Cato's description of Eumenes (***sarcophagos***).

iv) effeminacy, transgressive female power, and the subordination of subjects

Greek boys in general, although more famously Spartan boys in particular, were educated to soldierly hardihood (***karteria***), in direct contrast to the vast majority of Greek girls whose more sedentary and domestic adult roles were not felt to require the acquisition of such physical stamina; the Greek male perception, already noted above, that kings (particularly Asiatic kings) were effeminised by their luxurious lifestyle, must partly depend upon the common experience that powers of manly endurance developed when discomfort was overcome, an unlikely occurence in the life of a prince whose pampering attendants ensured that he experienced as comfortable a life as possible[59]. In Plato's Laws a contrast is drawn between the education of Cambyses, whose whole life had been spent in a royal household, and the education of Darius as a private individual; the dichotomy depended on the Athenian interlocutor's assumption that a prince would be exempted from those rigours of discipline which made the adolescent boy into a man, calculated as they were to inure his physical body to the stresses of a military campaign (physical toil, extremes of temperature, altered sleep patterns, food shortages, etc) and to build up a mental state of self-sufficiency (***autarkeia***) that permitted the adult man to live without the

comforts of urban domestic life[60]. The pampered princeling, whose lifestyle was founded on the avoidance of such stresses and the provision of home comforts even on campaign, had no opportunity to outgrow the softness (***malakia***) of the mothered infant, particularly when his education had continued to be directed by women beyond the age at which Greek boys were removed from maternal tutelage, to further their development under male tutors, and in the all-male environment of the gymnasium[61].

In Xenophon's Oeconomicus it is explicitly stated that the bodies of manual labourers are effeminised by their sedentary life, and their consequent under-exposure to the elements, and their condition is implicitly contrasted with the "***kalos kagathos***" whose daily routine includes physical exercise in the open air (walking, running, horse-riding); given the already noted stereotype of the monarch who remained inaccessible in the palace, the reader must have been somewhat suprised to read of Socrates advising Critobulus to imitate the Persian king[62]. Those kings who did stir from their palaces were not thought to exercise their bodies by travelling on foot or on horseback, but were driven by charioteers (like the kings of Greek drama)[63], or carried in palanquins[64] whilst even within the palace their footfalls were softened by carpets[65]. The notion that oriental kings avoided exposing themselves to extremes of temperature is most clearly illustrated by the Greek interpretation of the Persian practice of moving the king's residence from one royal capital to another according to the season of the year, as a means of ensuring that the king lived in a perpetual spring[66]; such behaviour was not unexpected among Asians, who were famously intolerant of cold and heat[67].

It has already been noted that the effeminisation of kings could be attributed in part to female dominance over their education, but women could also unman the adult male (as the myth of Heracles and Omphale revealed), particularly if the man spent too much time among them, rather than following manly outdoor pursuits[68]; by the late fourth century at the latest the story of Sardanapalus carding wool with the women of his household was

accessible to Greeks, and it is revealing of Greek perceptions that Aristotle claims that the contempt felt by a male spectator of this womanish behaviour prompted a coup attempt[69]. When such effeminised men were permitted by their subject populations to continue as rulers, Greek spectators were unsurprised that women exploited the situation; apart from the stories of myth and history, contemporary experience revealed that monarchy offered some women real power, not only as rulers in their own right (Omphale, Semiramis, and Artemisia for example)[70], but as the wives and mothers of kings (Atossa, Parysatis and Olympias for example) forcing their notional sovereigns to act against their own better judgement[71]. Even those tyrannies which were said to resemble extreme democracies are condemned by Aristotle as offering too much licence to women, to the extent that the "***hubreis***" of women are said to have contributed to the downfall of many tyrannies; Plato had already associated revolutionary sexual equality with the tyrannical character[72].

To the extent that the "***andreia***" required for a military life was regarded as a particularly masculine characteristic, it was unsurprising that Greeks imagined the effemenised monarch as unsuited to military campaigns, and unused to military success; whilst the hubristically self-asserting monuments of a Sesostris, for example, did not refer to campaigns against Greeks, they nevertheless revealed the concern of such rulers to capitalise on the legitimising potential of conquest[73]. It was clear proof of Asian weakness in leadership, however, that Tomyris could have defeated the otherwise all-conquering Cyrus (as Herodotus claimed), and that Artemisia had fared no worse than her male colleagues in the campaign against Greece; whilst Artemisia is shown giving Xerxes the best strategic advice, she is made to admit that in naval combat Asians are like foolish women in comparison to Greek men, and there is clear irony in Herodotus' placement of Xerxes' remark that his men had turned to women, and his women into men, after describing her audacious tactic in escaping the battle of Salamis[74]. Such weakness of

leadership was all the more remarkable because it ran contrary to the Greeks' own experience that leadership in wartime was best effected by an individual[75].

To Greek observers the ordinary soldiers of the Great King seemed as womanish and cowardly as their commanders and, in the "Hippocratic" treatise De aere, aquis locis, this stereotype was explained by their ancestral subjection to the rule of kings, under which circumstances even the naturally manly male would, it was argued, be uninspired to abandon idleness in favour of military training, or to sacrifice his own life in battles fought for the ruler's benefit[76]. This subjection, and their willing acceptance of it, was exemplified in their humiliating displays of deference to the king, particularly prostration[77], which appeared to elevate the king to divinity, and which seemed likely to inflame his ***hubris*** (see above).

b) Traditional Perceptions: the citizen

i) Cardinal Civic Virtues

The self-definition of Greek citizens opposed them to several "others" namely women (and effeminate men), foreigners, slaves and the dictatorial, each of these "others" contributing something to the stereotypes of monarchy outlined above. Since Greek citizens considered only men like themselves to be capable of aspiring to the ideals of, for example, manly courage or justice, it is not very surprising that the texts considered so far dwell on the failures, weaknesses and vices of people who are perceived by their authors to be unlike themselves[78]; it is all the more astonishing then, that Xenophon and Plato should choose to ascribe to Persians the increasingly cardinal qualities of manly courage[79], justice[80], wisdom[81], and that clutch of interlinked virtues comprising temperance, restraint of appetite and moderation[82]. Whilst it has been noted already that kings and tyrants were urged to act against stereotype, acquiring civic virtues in order to maintain their authority, the potential impact on rulership of particular virtues remains to be discussed.

Andreia

In the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle established "***andreia***" as a mean between cowardice and rash fearlessness, or over-confidence, with respect to those areas of life where fear is appropriate, such as the prospect of imminent battle[83]. He suggested that the best courage was shown when a man faced up to his fear of dying in battle (by entering the fray), and claimed that the noble deaths of such men received public recognition ("***timai***") in kingdoms, as well as in city-states[84]; the citizen soldier's courage, inspired by the prospect of such honours, was felt to be superior both to the compelled bravery of subject troops, and the mercenary's calculated and opportunistic balancing of courage and cowardice[85]. Whilst Xenophon explicitly mentions Persian rewards for bravery in battle, other writers had gone so far as to suggest that royal troops could not expect the rewards accorded to Greek citizen soldiers, perhaps drawing on the idea that kings envied those who appeared to outstrip them (see above)[86]; perhaps also they noted the contrast between the military monuments of Greek city-states (tumuli and civic orations for example), which commemorated collective achievement and collective loss, and royal monuments (the inscriptions and relief sculpture of Persia and Egypt for example) which tended to celebrate the individual achievement of the ruler, a distinction which would further underline the significance of Alexander's lavish memorials for dead soldiers and generals[87].

The monuments of foreign kings ought to have inspired them to courage, in the same way as citizen soldiers could be inspired to self-sacrifice by the prospect of posthumous recognition, but the Greek experience of the Persian wars appears to have inspired stories which tended to distance kings from participation in actual combat, and to interest themselves in representations of disordered and cowardly flight[88]. According to Isocrates, the recent withdrawal of Artaxerxes' extensive forces from Egypt, following his failed attempt to subdue revolt, had not only made the king a laughing-stock, but made him seem unworthy to be king or general[89]. Plutarch's account of such a withdrawal, not

improbably drawn from Ctesias and Dinon, similarly emphasises that such a failure made a king feel despised and more mistrustful of his subordinate generals[90]; it should be remembered that their military successes might prompt acclamations of kingship[91]. Ctesias had apparently represented Artaxerxes as a virtual spectator of the battle of Cunaxa, where his "***basilikotatos***" opponent had been (suicidally) active[92], but Plutarch, when describing the king's retreat from Egypt, represents him (with latent irony), as manly and active for the first time, leading his troops from the front, and experiencing hardship and toil in common with his soldiers, just like Xenophon's ideal generals (see below)[93]

Whilst Xenophon's divergence from the stereotype of the cowardly and unsoldierly king when representing Agesilaus is perhaps to be explained by his subject's Greekness, his representations of the "***andreia***" and concomitant military ability displayed by Persians (the elder and the younger Cyrus), are remarkable[94]. At Cunaxa Cyrus entered battle without even a helmet, and received mortal wounds as a result of his active participation in close cavalry combat[95]. Xenophon admits that Cyrus had lost control of himself as he launched his attack on the king's immediate defenders, a lapse that placed him in more danger than was necessary; during his adolescence a similarly unbridled enthusiasm had blinded him to the dangers of hunting expeditions, and earned him the reputation of being "***philokindunos***"[96]. Demosthenes used this term when contrasting the battlefield boldness of Philip II with the apathetic indolence of Athenian citizens in the face of that king's increasing "***arche***"; whilst in other respects Demosthenes' representations of Philip (hubris, envy, licentiousness, etc) fitted closely with established stereotypes, it was clearly important for him to demonstrate that the Macedonian posed a real threat to Athenian freedom[97]. The adolescent prince in the Cyropaedia also appears to have shared this character trait, but the attempts of Cyrus' guardians to restrain him, and the prince's own advice to Chrysantas, suggest that Xenophon viewed this trait as unsuitable for responsible adulthood[98]; returning to Aristotle's definitions of true fortitude such impetuous

intrepidity more closely approximated to the false bravery of the ignorant, the sanguine, or the impassioned[99].

Sophrosyne/Enkrateia/Karteria

Whilst it has been established that these virtues were not thought to govern stereotypical kingly behaviour, they were of central importance to the aspirant ideal ruler, whose authority was justified by just such superior qualities as these[100]. Indeed, at the end of the Oeconomicus, Xenophon asserted that only those rulers who exercised "***sophrosyne***" enjoyed the divine gift of ruling willing subjects[101]; it was not merely that the ruler's self mastery prevented him from committing those outrages which inflamed public hostility (see above), but also that as a pre-eminent paragon of virtue he could expect the obedience due to one so clearly superior[102]. In addition emulation of the ruler's behaviour by his subjects, served to increase their self-control, fostering that civic concord which Plato had envisaged in the Republic[103].

The self-control of Xenophon's "***kalos kagathos***" was said to ensure success and profitability for his domestic economy (enabling him to honour the gods with due magnificence, to help his friends and to adorn his city), and it should therefore be noted that Xenophon's Simonides in the Hiero urged that ruler to regard his fatherland as his estate[104]; the "***sophron***" ruler who wished to fulfil his kingly duty of preserving and increasing the state, might do worse than follow the example of Ischomachus and his wife in imposing (bureaucratic) order on the storage and extraction of his kingdoms' resources[105], in appointing administrators who were themselves self-controlled[106], and in disciplining his subjects with a sophisticated system of rewards and punishments[107].

Dikaiosyne

In Plato's Republic Polemarchus expounds Simonides' appraisal of justice (giving each person his due) as benefiting one's friends and harming one's enemies; Plato's Socrates

rejects this exposition as worthy only of men like Periander (of Corinth), Perdiccas (of Macedonia), Xerxes and Ismenias of Thebes, that is to say of conventional tyrant/kings and their agents[108]. It is worth noting that Xenophon favourably reports a prayer of the younger Cyrus that he might live long enough to repay with interest both his debts of gratitude, and any injuries he had suffered; similarly in the Cyropaedia the dying king is represented rejoicing in the fact that, over his lifetime, he had succeeded both in making his friends happy, and in crushing his enemies[109]. Xenophon elsewhere demonstrates that this attitude towards friends and foes did not constitute their entire grasp of justice; the system of reward and punishment (recommended by Ischomachus in the Oeconomicus) is shown to have been embraced by the younger Cyrus, whilst Cyrus the Great, even in boyhood, recognises the importance of law (see below)[110]. Interestingly, however, Xenophon suggested that Persian boys were educated to understand that ingratitude was the parent of impiety and treachery, and that punishment was justified when someone failed to do all they could to reciprocate the generosity of their benefactors[111]; Xenophon's Agesilaus is also said to have repudiated ingratitude, in a passage which regards his liberality and scrupulous honesty as proofs of his "***dikaiosyne***"[112].

Plato's Thrasymachus, who asserts that justice is merely the satisfaction of the self-interest of the stronger party, insists on the justice of obedience to the stronger party in political life[113]; despite his claim that he is thinking of ideal, infallible rulers, Thrasymachus suggests that rulers acting in their own interests do so at the expense of their subjects, like herdsmen fattening sheep for a profitable sale[114]. It is suggested that society's conventional condemnation of wrongdoing flies in the face of experience which reveals that crime pays better than honesty, and Thrasymachus (like Polus in the Gorgias) presents the reader with the philosophical oxymoron of the happy tyrant[115] whose injustices, enacted in his own interest and justified by his superior power, have led to wealth and security, rather than the punishment and disgrace that would have followed identical injustices committed by a weaker party. Plato's Callicles in the Gorgias, argues similarly

that human custom does not conform to the laws of nature, when attempting to restrict, by mere social conventions, the behaviour of the most powerful; Callicles appears to think that those truly superior deserve more than their inferiors (citing the imperial expansions of Darius and Xerxes), and predicts that one man might yet shatter the social conventions and establish himself as master in accordance with his natural right[116].

Plato's Socrates in the Republic, having argued that ideal rulers (like doctors or ship's captains), act in the best interest of their subjects, asserts that the best men have to be encouraged to undertake the burden of rulership, principally by the fear that they must otherwise endure the rule of inferior men; the conventional rewards offered to rulers, which might otherwise have functioned as inducements apparently carried the risk that their recipients could seem mercenary, unscrupulous and ambitious[117]. Aristotle similarly suggests that tyrants alone rule in their own interests, and considers the recompenses of honour and privilege that should be offered to the man prepared to sacrifice his self-interest in order to exercise the ruler's function as guardian of justice; the ruler Aristotle is imagining belongs to a free and egalitarian society, and is not only satisfied with these merely symbolic recompenses, but is subject to the laws of that society (in further contrast to tyrants)[118]. In his discussion of friendship (see below) Aristotle confirms that justice can exist in monarchies, when kings rule their subjects like fathers rule their children, acting in their interests and conferring benefits upon them[119].

Plato's Glaucon had argued that an individual whose power was sufficient to prevent him from suffering from the unjust actions of others, would not normally wish to curb his own potential for benefitting himself, by submitting to laws that forbade him from acting unjustly[120]; it has already been noted (see above) that rulers who limited their own authority by submission to established laws, were understood to approach the ideal[121]. The commonplace equation of just with lawful actions demonstrates the importance of the corrective aspect of justice, which aimed at punishing wrongdoers in proportion to their

offence[122]. It was just such rectificatory laws that Glaucon had in mind. In addition to compensating victims of injustice, it was hoped that punishment would educate the wrongdoer, and also deter other citizens from similar offences[123]. Such a system of punishment necessitated the existence of judges to determine the extent of the offence and the appropriate level of punishment. Obviously such judges needed to be just, and to adhere to the law, but Aristotle imagines an ideal judge to be a kind of personified justice[124].

Whereas in democracies like Athens collective judgements were reached by jury panels, judicial authority in monarchies could be completely vested in the king. Given the hostility to a ruler that could be provoked by adverse or controversial judgements, monarchs may often have chosen to have cases brought before a council; the punishment of Orontas in Xenophon's Anabasis for example, resulted from the collective decision of the aspirant king (Cyrus), Clearchus and seven Persian nobles[125]. Xenophon's Hiero was recommended to completely delegate the exaction of punishments to others, as a means of distancing himself both from the hostility of litigants who had lost their cases, and from the storybook tyrant whose summary justice (see above) was unjust[126]. Whilst "***dikastike***" had at first seemed a necessary skill to the ideal statesman of the Politicus, Plato appears to have thought that the practical task of judging was subsidiary to law-making, and that ideal rulers would be law-makers who could leave the administration of their laws to subordinates[127]. In the Persia of the Cyropaedia, the king is said to have imagined the good ruler to be a living law, on the lookout for the misdeeds of others, but although Cyrus is shown to deal with petitions, Xenophon seems more interested in Cyrus the legislator, than Cyrus the judge; this is best exemplified by the author's claim that Cyrus legislated that both parties in a lawsuit had to agree on the judge, suggesting that there was a choice[128]. Ideal lawgivers appear to have been recognised by the durability of their legal codes, and Xenophon's claim that the laws of Cyrus were still in effect reflects this idea, even if the practice of injustice had increased under his successors[129].

In fourth century Greek thought the rectificatory justice discussed above, was felt to be complemented by distributive justice. The notion that the most powerful deserved a greater share of the good, already noted in connection with the concept of natural justice, stood in direct opposition to ideals of democratic equality, but was clearly relevant to monarchies[130]. The practice of monarchs rewarding virtue out of their own resources may have gone some way towards establishing an equality of opportunity for all citizens, not only because of the physical redistribution of resources, but also and symbolically by making a man's character more important than the status conferred on him by his birth or wealth[131]. The idea that the ruler who had delegated punishment might still retain to himself the privilege of granting prizes, honours and rewards is found both in Xenophon's Hiero and Aristotle's Politics; Aristotle advised that the recipients of these benefits should be encouraged to think that they were better rewarded by kings than by their fellow-citizens[132]. Isocrates' Nicocles suggests that this would not have been difficult since oligarchies and democracies disadvantage men of merit, whilst monarchies accord proportionate rewards to the best (the king himself) and worst[133].

In the Oeconomicus a man is said to possess a portion of the "***ethos basilikon***" if his workers redouble their efforts on his approach, in a competititive effort to seem most worthy of reward; when the wife of Ischomachus is encouraged to award honours to those of her household who deserve them, it is similarly suggested that such practice would cause her to resemble a "***basilissa***"[134]. Xenophon's Simonides imagined that a king offering rewards to those who practised, for example, good horsemanship, or fair trade, and even successful agriculture, would not only raise standards in these fields (through the stimulus of competition), but cause the subject community to embrace "***sophrosyne***" (as a by-product of the increased industriousness of its citizens)[135]. Just as the ideal ruler looked out for the wrongdoing of others in order to correct them, it was necessary for the ruler to know who was acting rightly in order to reward them. Whilst the kingdom of Isocrates' Evagoras may indeed have been small enough for him to judge the behaviour of

its people for himself, such personal observation was impractical in a large empire, and Xenophon claims that Cyrus sent out trusted men to observe, for example, agricultural practice on his behalf[136]. These inspectors appear to have complemented the spontaneously self-appointed but omni-present informers known to the Greeks as the King's Eyes and Ears[137].

Plato's Socrates suggested that justice was not concerned with human interaction so much as with the internal harmonisation of the individual's reason, spirit and appetites, that generated the other virtues; it was similarly suggested that the principle of doing one's own allotted business without interfering in the business of others alone allowed the other virtues to arise and be preserved in society as a whole[138]. Aristotle, however, appears to have considered justice the chief virtue of human society, because it demanded right behaviour towards others in human interactions, and thus encompassed all virtue[139].

Sophia, Eusebeia, Philopatria, and Megalopsychia

Aristotle's discussion of intellectual virtue in the Nicomachean Ethics, establishes a hierachy between five different kinds of knowledge and understanding; "***sophia***" is said to be first amongst these but heavily dependent on prudence (***phronesis***), a quality which enabled its possessor to determine what was good for himself and others[140]. The practicality of this lesser quality prompted Aristotle to link it to the management of both households and states, suggesting that it was felt to be a quality necessary for leadership[141]. Just as rhetoricians, generals and judges were subordinate to the true statesman in Plato's Politicus, the "***technai***" which leaders might employ to make their subjects compliant, safe, or content (persuasive speech, strategic competence in war, or legal judgement for example), were considered subordinate to prudence, which aims at doing all good things well[142].

In the Politics Aristotle ascribed the quality of "***phronesis***" to rulers alone, arguing that subjects do not need practical knowledge, but merely correct opinion ("***doxa***")[143]. In the Cyropaedia, however, Xenophon represents Cyrus as being advised to seem the possessor of a greater "***phronesis***" than anyone else, in order to secure the obedience of his subjects; it is here claimed that the best way to seem more prudent than everyone else is to be so, and it is also suggested that the only way to improve one's prudence is through communication with the gods[144]. This second idea seems also to be reflected in the assertion of Plato's Socrates that the wisest man ("***sophotatos***") in the Persian empire was employed to teach the heir apparent not only the business of kingship ("***basilika***"), but also the service of the gods ("***therapeia theon***")[145]. In his Memorabilia Xenophon represents Socrates as endorsing the practice of communicating with the gods over important matters such as the management of households and states, as a means of determining which courses of action should be taken, and which avoided; the gods reverenced by Xenophon's Cyrus are said to have advised him in both these ways[146]. It was clearly felt that such divine assistance, like other divine blessings, were afforded only to the prudent ("***phronimoi***"), thus completing a virtuous circle[147].

Xenophon's Agesilaus is said to have governed his own conduct with the remembrance that the gods are as reverenced by righteous acts, as by sacrifices or temples[148]. Similarly Isocrates advised Nicocles that, above and beyond the conventional offerings which ought to be made to the gods, the best "***therapeia***" that could be offered to the gods, and the worthiest sacrifice, was being a most excellent and a most just man ("***beltistos kai dikaiotatos***")[149]. Showing one's respect for the gods by the conduct of one's human relationships (ie honouring one's parents, being just to one's fellow townsmen, and being faithful to one's friends, etc), was an integral part of conventional piety ("***eusebeia***") which, North noted, had "as good a claim as ***phronesis*** or ***sophia***" to be the fourth cardinal virtue[150]. A reputation for this kind of piety is said also to have had practical advantages for Agesilaus, inasmuch as his enemies used to place more trust in his word than in their

own friendships, and would surrender themselves to him, when they lost faith in each other[151].

For Xenophon, the "***sophia***" of Agesilaus was manifested not only in his obedience to his fatherland and its laws, which stimulated the obedience of his fellow-citizens, but also in the strength of his friendships with his companions, and particularly in his generalship[152]. He is said to have won the obedience and discipline, and the affection and readiness of his own troops, and to have become the most sought-after and praiseworthy man ("***poluerastotatos***" and "***poluepainetotatos***") in the estimation of all people[153]. Xenophon goes on to stress the civic and national patriotism of Agesilaus (***"philopolis***", "***philhellen***" and "***misoperses***") that inspired him to do his subjects as much good as possible, to lament the loss of the least of his fellow-citizens, to decry the devastation wrought in the wars between the city-states of Greece, and to seek to do all he could to stop the Persian king from harassing his fellow-Greeks[154]. This last aspect of Hellenic patriotism, reminiscent of Thrasymachean justice (see above), inspired Isocrates, in 346 B.C., to address Philip II of Macedon exhorting him to lead the Hellenic states in a 'crusade' against Persia; in this speech Agesilaus is represented to the reader as a man whose two worthy ambitions of attacking the common enemy of the Greeks, and assisting his own friends, were so much at odds with each other, that his campaigns against Persia failed to inflict real and lasting damage[155].

Ironically, Isocrates' hero Evagoras was honoured at Athens with a statue in the Agora commemorating and illustrating his friendship with the Athenian general Conon, who had assisted Artaxerxes by commanding the Persian fleet that had defeated the Spartans off Cnidus in 394 B.C., rendering the Persian king "***kyrios***" of all Asia[156]. Evagoras had supplied Conon with many vessels from his navy, and thus shared the credit for ending a period of Spartan supremacy, 'freeing the Greeks' and restoring the fortunes of Athens; the presumably paired statues of Conon and Evagoras perhaps resembled the monument to the

tyrannicides (Harmodios and Aristogeiton) apparently located nearby, the new monument's location, close to the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios and the statue of Zeus Soter, further nuancing their image as new liberators[157]. This honouring of Evagoras demonstrates how the prestige of even 'foreign' kings could be enhanced internationally by helping one or another of the 'free' cities of Greece and Asia Minor

Demosthenes' repeated claim that Philip II was the enemy of all Greeks appears to have been made in response to the superlative language used by the Athenian friends of the king ("***hellenikotatos***" and "***philathenaiotatos***" for example), despite the destruction he had wrought in Greece, and the apparent danger he posed to Athenian freedom; at one stage Demosthenes explicitly contrasts Philip's ambassadors with the true "***euergetai***" of Athens who, acting to benefit the city rather than themselves, or their royal paymaster, truly deserved bronzes in the agora[158]. The year after Demosthenes' speech on the embassy, Isocrates wrote to Alexander to approve his budding reputation as a "***philanthropos***", and "***philathenaios***" young man; in his address To Philip four years previously, Isocrates had reminded the king that his supposed ancestor Heracles was regarded as the "***euergetes***" of all Greeks, contrasting the latter's reputation with the current rumours, spread by men like Demosthenes, that the Macedonian king was determined to wage war not on the enemies of Greece but on the Greeks themselves[159].

Despite the assertion of Philip's adversaries that he was a foreigner (a mere barbarian), Isocrates had suggested that he was entitled to claim all Hellas as his homeland, and had urged him to display "***philanthropia***", "***eunoia***", and "***euergesia***" towards the peoples of that homeland; at the end of the speech the king is encouraged to extend his own "***arche***" over as many barbarians as possible so that peoples newly freed from barbaric masters could enjoy the protection of Hellas[160]. Philip is assured that on achieving these goals he can expect to receive more and greater honours than had ever been offered to the statesmen and generals of individual city-states; for Isocrates at least, the creation of Hellenic

concord ("***homonoia***") and the elimination of the Persian threat to the Greek world would together constitute the greatest ever act of "***euergesia***", rendering the "***euergetes***" (whether Philip or, as it turned out, Alexander) the greatest man in history, superior even to demigods like Heracles[161].

Taken on its own, Isocrates dream of Hellenic concord established and preserved by Philip, superficially resembles the Platonic vision of a state woven together by its statesman; Plato had argued that existing states had either proved too peace-loving to defend themselves adequately from aggressors, or too warlike to live peaceably with their neighbours, whose inflamed enmity inspired wars of enslavement and annihilation[162]. A mean between these extremes could be achieved if the ruler were both to reconcile all citizens with common and correct attitudes towards right and wrong, justice and injustice, and good and evil, and to reinforce this intellectual harmony by the arrangement of intermarriages between the lovers of peace and war, thus avoiding the dangers of crippling indolence on the one hand, and aggressive "***mania***" on the other[163]. Indeed the magnificent fabric of state woven by the skill of its ruler was characterised by such harmony and friendship that his subjects enjoyed "***eudaimonia***"[164]. If the task of government did not fall to an ideal ruler, such happiness was impossible because pseudo-statesmen (oligarchs, the demagogues of democracy and the tyrants they sometimes became), set social groups at variance with one another, promoting conflicts and hatred[165]. In the Republic demagogues and tyrants were accused of attempting to establish a pseudo-concord, based on the abolition of the distinctions between slaves and free men, and citizens and foreigners; significantly, such rulers are imagined as being impious, both in their attitude towards the gods, and towards their parents and fellow-citizens[166].

When Isocrates suggested to Philip II that he could benefit the Greeks to an extent that was both unprecedented and unrepeatable, it should probably be understood that the orator considered the king to have previously manifested the quality of "***megalopsychia***" (due

pride); in the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle would assert that the man who knew his own great worth would leave for lesser men those achievements which led to conventional honours, aiming instead to perform truly great services[167]. Even Demosthenes recognised Philip's "***megalopsychia***", although the context both suggests that he was really thinking of victor's clemency, and emphasises the fact that the king was driven to it by the oratory of incorruptible ambassadors; it should be noted, however, that overlooking the faults of others was considered by Aristotle to be characteristic of the 'great-souled' man[168]. Aristotle also suggested that such a man would be pleased by the sincere attempts of good men to accord him honours in proportion to his benefactions, satisfying himself with such honours as it was respectable to receive; whether the effusive honours bestowed on Philip and Alexander after the battle of Chaironeia were truly in proportion to their benefaction, which amounted to no more than the painless clemency of absolute victors, or were even sincerely offered, are clearly open questions[169]. Philip's apparent inability to cope with the honours that accompanied his achievement of peace within Greece and the preparations for his Asian campaign, is suggested by the hubristic association of his own image with those of the twelve gods, on the day of his assassination[170].

Agesilaus by contrast was renowned for the fact that he had refused to allow any statues of himself to be erected, and Xenophon ascribes this refusal to his hero's understanding that statues could do more credit to the sculptor's art than their subject's character; indeed, he explicitly contrasts the good, who strove to be remembered for their character, with the rich, who could afford the expense of commemorative portraits of themselves or their ancestors, whatever their character[171]. Isocrates' encomium of Evagoras contrasts visual representations with texts, to suggest that monuments were only really useful for representing physical beauty, which was not only the least significant of the wise man's attributes but also the hardest of those attributes for the viewer to emulate; Isocrates also states that monuments were too static to gain the widest currency amongst those young men of the Greek world who aspired to "***phronesis***"[172]. The multiplication of images of

Alexander throughout the known world during his lifetime suggests the extent to which the ideals of Agesilaus and Isocrates were overtaken by events; in these portraits a didactic interest in beauty and virtue, seem less important than the negotiation of individual power[173].

ii) Virtues of Social Intercourse

Aristotle believed that people who offered others the character-building benefit of due praise and due criticism (rather than relentless flattery, or relentless animadversion) were behaving like friends, even if there existed no ties of affection between the parties; this middle way had to be adjusted to suit both the status of the audience (king or commoner), and the proximity of the relationship between speaker and listener (strangers, acquaintances, intimates)[174]. The philosophical drive to instruct the rulers of the world with orations and treatises appears to correspond to this kind of friendliness; the differences between the addressees of the To Nicocles and the To Philip (the former a youthful "***philos***", and the latter a potentially hostile stranger of superior rank), perhaps account for the contrast between the straightforwardly didactic argument of the "Cyprian" oration ('become worthy of your ancestry by acting as follows...') and the indirectness of the exhortation To Philip ('I am sure both that your ancestors would advise the things which I have advised, and that you have already determined yourself to continue following these, your by now accustomed, courses of action')[175].

The recipients of such texts were no doubt supposed to behave like Xenophon's Agesilaus, taking pleasure in receiving praise only when it came from those who were prepared to criticise their faults, and preferring candour ("***parrhesia***") to dissimulation; however, such freedom of speech could be dangerous to the 'friendly critics' of a ruler, since their enunciations of painful truths could be rejected as the calumnies of slanderers who deserved the ruler's hatred[176]. Public criticism of a person of superior status could be regarded as belittlement, culturally accepted as a legitimate cause of anger; if the monarch

conformed to stereotype, and was controlled by his passions (rather than being in control over them, see above), even such righteous indignation could be fatal to the critic, as the example of Cleitus proves[177].

Aristotle's pupil failed to live up to the ideal of the good-tempered man, laid out for us in the Ethics, where it was suggested that anger should not merely be proportional to the perceived offence, but further moderated to prevent the moment's rage (with its desire for immediate revenge) from commissioning retaliation that would be repented at leisure[178]. Some years before, Isocrates had gone so far as to suggest that the ruler should never act in anger, but nevertheless, once his anger had abated, and having made a rational decision about punishment, the ruler was advised to simulate anger; for a ruler like Nicocles, whose mildness in judgement appears to have been a matter of due pride (Isocrates has him claim never to have caused anyone to be executed, exiled, or stripped of their possessions), it might have been difficult to maintain his awe-inspiring authority without such a pretence[179]. Xenophon's Agesilaus is similarly praised for the particular gentleness he displayed to his friends, and in his case it is noted that this did not stop his enemies from regarding him as a fearsome adversary[180].

The grace and urbanity of Agesilaus receive considerable attention in Xenophon's account of him; the contrast between the conduct of the Spartan and the Persian king is probably implicit when Xenophon emphasises that, in place of the arrogance expected of the powerful ruler, Agesilaus showed a tenderness of affection for his friends, and a determination to assist them, which ensured that his rule was loved rather than plotted against[181]. In the same section of text Xenophon also describes how Agesilaus refused to read private correspondence from Artaxerxes offering his friendship, until and unless the Persian proved himself a friend of Sparta, and well-disposed towards the Greeks; it is then also suggested that Agesilaus considered the Great King's conventional claims to supremacy (wealth and extent of empire) inferior to his own apparent claim to be the more

valiant leader of a more valiant people[182]. By contrast to Artaxerxes then, Agesilaus is said to have been such pleasant company that people did not only come to him for business purposes, but merely to spend time with him; Xenophon ascribed this not only to his naturally cheerful and optimistic demeanour, but to the ready wit which characterised his conversation[183].

Xenophon's Chrysantas praises Cyrus for his ability to make people laugh, whilst Cyrus himself is represented praising those who can amuse their friends, without hurting others; in this earlier story, when a grouchy officer (Aglaitadas) had complained that another officer's after-dinner story, dependent on the humour of ridiculous exaggeration, was a kind of boasting, Cyrus had argued that boasting was calculated to advance the speaker, whereas conversational wit was intended only to entertain one's friends[184]. Aglaitadas had then reminded his listeners that the education of citizens to "***sophrosyne***" and "***dikaiosyne***", was normally achieved through the tears of contrition that accompanied the punishments inflicted by fathers, tutors and the laws, and suggested that the sciences of economics and politics could never be learnt from laughter; in reply it was suggested both that Aglaitadas should teach the enemy contrition with painful lessons, and that, if he counted smiles and laughter as worthless, he should have no objection to lavishing these on his friends[185].

The importance of wit as a social virtue is similarly demonstrated by the inclusion of Aristotle's thoughts on the subject in the Nicomachean Ethics; Aristotle is particularly interested in good taste which, he suggests, constitutes a mean between vulgar buffoonery and humourless boorishness, the former excess being characterised by an ignorance of decency, and indifference to the feelings of those who are ridiculed, whilst those suffering from the latter disposition are said to take offence too easily, and to contribute nothing to conversation, that most respectable pastime of the relaxing gentleman[186]. When Theopompus described Philip II as a buffoon ("***bomolochos***") this further nuanced his

representation of the high-living, hard-drinking Macedonian as a man far from being a cultivated Greek[187].

Linked to wit and friendliness in Aristotle's discussion of the virtues of social intercourse was a third, a kind of truthfulness that constituted a mean between boasting and self-deprecation; the "***philalethes***" man, it is argued, was not only truthful in business or public affairs (as was only just) but, more radically, in his private life, and to the extent that he could never be other than truthful and just in his public life[188]. This link between lifelong truthfulness, and the individual development of the public virtue of justice, serves to explain why Plato imagined the "***dikaiotatos***" Persian of each generation to have educated the royal heir to be truthful throughout his whole life; in the Cyropaedia, Xenophon represents the young Cyrus as struggling to learn the strategems of deceit needed for the subjugation of enemies, after his conventional civil education, conducted amongst fellow-citizens and friends, had programmed him to abjure dishonesty[189]. Revealingly, Xenophon's Agesilaus is praised for his attitude towards the victims of deceit; if the deceit had been practised by an enemy he reproached them for allowing themselves to be taken in, whereas if it had been practised by a friend, they could not have expected such a betrayal and took no blame for their lack of suspicion[190].

In the Introduction to Book VIII of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle suggested that rich men (including rulers) had a particular need of friends; friends, it was argued, both enabled such men to spend their money worthily, in acts of benefaction ("***euergesia***"), and defended their benefactors to the extent that their prosperity was safeguarded. In addition, "***philanthropia***" in general, and the display of true friendship towards one's friends in particular, were regarded as praiseworthy[191]. According to Aristotle, friendship could only exist between two parties if the goodwill ("***eunoia***") of one party was reciprocated, and then only if each party was aware of the other's goodwill; at one point in the Lysis Plato's Socrates had similarly suggested that the affection of a lover for the person he loved

was insufficient to generate friendship between them, since the loved person might, in fact, hate his attentions, thus rendering the lover an enemy of the loved[192].

Mutual utility, mutual pleasure, and a mutual desire for the good were considered to be the foundations of three types of friendship; of these, the first two types are considered by Aristotle to be essentially self-serving, with the love of one party for the other dependent on the ability of the loved party either to satisfy the lover's needs, or to bring him pleasure (from his presence, appearance, conversation, etc)[193]. The third category of friendship was considered much rarer, since it was only imagined to exist between good men; here the loved person was loved on his own account, because of his noble character (rather than because of the benefits he could confer on the lover)[194]. Resemblance between the two parties in a relationship had been considered by Plato's Socrates to be an impediment to friendships of utility, since neither party could supply what the other lacked if each was equally endowed; relationships between good men had to be more than utilitarian, since neither party had need of the other, but the logic of Plato's composition compels his Socrates to draw instead the conclusion that such men could never be friends[195]. For Aristotle, however, only the friendship of good men was true friendship, with other kinds of friendship labelled as such only by analogy[196].

Although Xenophon's Socrates had advised Critobulus that friendships with other good men are advantageous to those who seek to benefit the state, Aristotle suggests that rich men had no use for friendships of utility, but were very much inclined to establish friendships based on pleasure; whilst princes shared the need to relieve the tedium of life with pleasant and witty companions, they also had need of subordinates to act on their behalf, and Aristotle acknowledges that, consequently, they made friends of practical men[197]. Aristotle judges that good men rarely find themselves the friends of rulers because good men can only undertake friendships with social superiors, if those superiors excel in virtue; it is clearly the prince's friendships with other good men that Xenophon

had in mind when he represented the younger Cyrus making a display of them for the enlightenment of the public[198].

The suggestion that the larger part of friendship lay in the giving of affection sets up Aristotle's representation of the ideal ruler as a paternal benefactor whose goodness compels him to use his superior resources to benefit his subjects and friends; by contrast, the tyrant's selfish pursuit of his own benefit made it difficult for friendships to develop between the autocrat and his enslaved subjects[199]. Xenophon's Cyrus had claimed that gaining the affection of one's subjects is of supreme importance for a ruler; Cambyses suggested that this object is achieved as much by demonstrations of fellow-feeling, as by physical benefits, arguing that Cyrus should learn to share the joys and sorrows of his civilian subjects, just as he should learn to share with his troops the hardships of campaign[200]. In the Cyropaedia it is also suggested that genuine friendship could be developed between the ruler and his vanquished foes, when the penitent offenders, being spared capital punishment, received in their extended lives the greatest benefaction a ruler could offer; in the case of the defeated Armenian king, it should be noted that Xenophon represents him surrendering to his benefactor the disposal of all the resources of his kingdom, to use whenever he had need[201]. Aristotle claims, however, that the recipients of bounty were frequently disinclined to repay their benefactors with proportionate displays of affection, the ruler having to content himself instead with the enduring fame of his noble benefactions[202].

c) Summary

Clearly articulated stereotypes of bad monarchs and good citizens existed in the fourth century B.C.

An ideal ruler, whose superior virtues could justify his monarchical authority, had begun to be conceived by a range of political thinkers.

Statesmen, tyrants and kings were urged to amend their patterns of rulership in accordance with this ideal.

Some Greek political thinkers, despite the traditionally hostile treatment of Persians in Greek discourse, suggested that some Persian kings and princes had possessed (Greek) virtues and, approaching the ideal, could serve as model rulers.

Ideal monarchs did not display the stereotypical characteristics of a tyrant or despot (unrestrained power, ***hubris***, and suspicion; luxury, extravagance and bribery; enslavement to passions; effeminacy).

Ideal monarchs displayed the Cardinal Civic Virtues (***Andreia***; ***Dikaiosyne***; ***Sophrosyne***; and ***Sophia***).

Ideal monarchs had grace, urbanity, and wit

Ideal monarchs were paternal benefactors of their subjects and friends

Rulers aspiring to the ideal should be able to bear due criticism as well as due praise.

Rulers aspiring to the ideal should never act in anger.

2) The ideal ruler in a world of kings

a) Historical Introduction: the creation of the Hellenistic kingdoms 323-281 B.C.

The ultimate division of Alexander's "spear-won" land into the Hellenistic kingdoms was by no means a foregone conclusion in 323 B.C.. Isocrates had envisaged Philip II of Macedon becoming sole ruler over all the barbarians of Asia by virtue of his conquests, and this had doubtless remained the plan for Alexander himself until his death; his subjugation of the Persian empire had, ***de facto***, made the young Macedonian the new Great King, King of Kings and King of Many Lands (including pharaoh of Egypt) whether or not he had undergone the usual succession rituals[1]. The disputed reports of Alexander's own plans for the future tacitly represent him as confident in the security of this newly acquired empire during the indefinite period of further conquest (in Arabia and beyond), when his absence would necessitate reliance on subordinates[2]. Even supposing Alexander had been able to conduct the proposed campaigns, it was always possible that he would never return to the heartland of the former Persian empire, and some plans had presumably been laid for maintaining loyalty to Alexander in this focal territory; not improbably Ptolemy's scheme for the formerly subordinate generals of the late king to rule the empire jointly in his (Alexander's) name partly depended on such pre-existing plans[3].

The installation, at the centre of the fallen empire, of an oligarchic council united around the insignia of the Macedonian king might effectively have dispersed the power he had usurped from Darius, which could easily have attracted a Persian claimant to the latter's throne, in Alexander's absence; the behaviour of Orsines in appropriating for himself the satrapy of Persis (which included the key Achaemenid sites at Persepolis, Pasargadae and Naqsh-i-Rustam) was a dangerous precedent, particularly given his supposed descent from Cyrus[4]. Alexander's replacement of Orsines by Peukestas, in 324 B.C., was doubly symbolic since the new satrap was both a Macedonian of proven loyalty, and a philo-Persian, willing to accommodate himself to the expectations of the native population in his

choice of language and dress[5]; the massed wedding at Susa seems to confirm Alexander's intention of binding the Persian nobility to his Macedonian officers, whilst the public display there of the 'Macedonian-ised' youth of Asia (the "***epigoni***"), perhaps looked forward to an age when the most loyal and capable of these young men could safely be entrusted with positions of regional authority at the former centre of power[6].

In the event, the recognition of the mentally defective Philip III Arrhidaeus and the new-born Alexander IV as figurehead monarchs, under the effective guardianship of Perdikkas, also served to disperse power in the new empire; given the weakness of the actual kings the greatest beneficiaries of this diffusion were the new Chiliarch and his subordinates, a fact which undermined the established patterns of monarchy legitimised by descent (whether Macedonian or Persian)[7]. Perdikkas' apparent plan to return to Macedonia with the kings and Alexander's corpse would have refocussed the empire's attention on Macedonia[8]; the projected union between Perdikkas and Nikaia, the daughter of Antipater, was clearly designed to win the co-operation of the senior Macedonian general who had effectively deputised for Alexander in European affairs during his absence on campaign[9]. At Sardis, however, the prospect of a union between Perdikkas and Olympias' daughter Kleopatra briefly presented itself as an alternative means of bolstering his authority on his arrival in Macedonia; the displeased soldiery compelled Perdikkas to abandon this option, and to proceed instead with the king's wedding to Adeia/Eurydike[10]. By this point Antigonos Monophthalmos, who had shown himself unwilling to respect the chiliarch's authority, was known to have fled from his satrapy to sanctuary with Antipater; then insubordination on the part of Ptolemy (the hijacking of Alexander's hearse) forced a further redrafting of plans, and the grand return to Macedonia was postponed indefinitely whilst Perdikkas attempted to oust the satrap of Egypt[11]. When Antipater and Krateros landed in Asia in 321 B.C. (ostensibly to restore Antigonos and to defend Ptolemy?), Perdikkas' imperial authority as chiliarch had effectively collapsed; within months

Perdikkas was assassinated by members of his own staff, and the most senior Macedonian (Antipater) was in due course acclaimed as his successor[12].

Philip and Eurydike appear to have accompanied Perdikkas' expedition to Egypt, and familiarity perhaps explains the popularity of Eurydike amongst the remnant of his army on the eve of the settlement at Triparadeisos; whilst this popularity had proved a problem for Antipater in his initial attempts to assert his authority over these troops, ultimately no attempt was made to accord real power to the royal couple, who were escorted back to Macedonia by Antipater himself[13]. On the death of Antipater in 319 B.C. the protectorship fell to Polyperchon, who had deputised for Antipater during his absence in Asia, whilst Antipater's son Kassander was appointed as Polyperchon's chiliarch, much to his chagrin; the chief effect of this change of personnel appears to have been the efforts of Antigonos and Ptolemy to establish independence from the notional authority of the kings and their guardians in Macedonia, chiefly by assisting Kassander's campaign to depose Polyperchon[14]. Eurydike makes her next appearance in the account of Diodorus two years later in apparent command of an army hostile to the return to Macedonia, under Polyperchon's protection, of Olympias and her grandson Alexander IV; on the eve of battle, however, Eurydike's soldiers deserted to Olympias and Polyperchon, and having first been imprisoned by them with her husband, and then witnessed his assassination, she committed suicide[15]. The notional head of empire (Alexander IV) was still only six years of age and the authority of Polyperchon was considerably weakened by that of his rival guardian Olympias who, learning of Kassander's approach, fortified herself and her closest relations within the city of Pydna; Kassander's succesful siege lost Olympias the support of the Macedonian population, whose assembly condemned her to death for the campaign of political murders that had followed her return to Macedonia, a sentence which was duly executed before the summer of 316 B.C.[16].

Alexander IV had fallen to Kassander with the city of Pydna, and according to Diodorus the latter refused to recognise the legitimacy of Alexander's claim to the Macedonian throne, disbanding the royal pages and demanding that the boy be treated as a non-royal individual[17]. In the absence of a king legitimated by descent, Kassander subtly established himself as a claimant, supervising the customary obsequies for Philip III and Eurydike, marrying Thessalonike (another daughter of Philip II), enrolling troops and founding cities[18]. The apparently royal burials in Tomb II of the great tumulus at Vergina have sometimes been interpreted as including Philip and Eurydike, and indeed Borza's explanation of the three tombs as housing Philip II, Philip III and Alexander IV respectively has a certain neatness to recommend it; the great tumulus later erected over all three tombs might then have stood as a memorial to the whole Argead house and a virtual cenotaph for the absent Alexander[19]. Certain features of Tomb II and its contents, including the lion hunt fresco, have been considered to demand a later date than the mid-330s B.C., but it must be countered that Kassander's political decision to ensure a royal burial for Philip III and Eurydike would not have required Philip III's remains to lie in a mausoleum of apparently unprecedented size and ornamentation[20]; it is of course just possible that work had commenced on the tomb where Perdikkas had planned to inter Alexander, and that Kassander chose to use this vacant structure, left unfinished following Ptolemy's successful appropriation of Alexander's remains. Eurydike's apparent age at her death, however, appears to preclude her from being the woman whose cremated remains were interred in the antechamber of Tomb II and it therefore remains much more likely both that this tomb housed the mortal remains of Philip II and Cleopatra and consequently that, however royally they were buried, Philip III and Eurydike were not buried in any of these three royal tombs; this in turn, it seems to me, diminishes the likelihood that Alexander IV was the occupant of Tomb III[21].

Whilst Kassander's actions after the siege of Pydna could be said to derive their inspiration from Alexander's proof that kingdoms and civil authority could fall to the military vigour

of a charismatic general, his emotional response to portraits of Alexander strongly suggests that he was incapable of using such images to legitimise his own grasp on Macedonia[22]. Adams, Carney and Stewart have all argued that Kassander's actions can be interpreted as signs that he wished to associate himself with the conventional and mature Macedonian monarch Philip II, rather than the 'orientalising' and youthful Alexander[23]. Perhaps the rumours of Olympias' involvement in the assassination of Philip II crystallised now when the fresh memories of her behaviour towards Philip III, Eurydike and Kassander's associates would have given them credence; Heckel's interpretation of the ***Liber de Morte Testamentumque Alexandri Magni*** as a pro-Polyperchon pamphlet from the immediately preceeding period, which deliberately implicated Kassander and his late brother Iolaos in the supposed poisoning of Alexander the Great, suggests a parallel[24].

Kassander's current position as uncrowned king of Macedonia resembled that of Ptolemy in Egypt who had not only supervised the funeral of Alexander the Great, but contracted a polygamous marriage (a largely royal privilege); in the settlement at Triparadeisos Ptolemy's conquests in Cyrene had been acknowledged and a fragment of Arrian suggests that he was given a mandate for further annexation of Western territories by right of his spear, but he had also (in 319 B.C.) acquired Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, contrary to Antipater's intentions[25]. Antigonos Monophthalmos too, had first given signs of overstepping his role as general of the kings' troops in Asia in 319 B.C. when he reassigned satrapies, and confiscated six hundred talents of silver that had been destined for Macedonia; on his arrival in Persis in 316 B.C. (before news of the death of Philip III and the fall of Pydna could have reached the East) it is suggested that the inhabitants acknowledged his role as distributor of satrapies by treating him in kingly fashion, as befitted the lord of Asia[26]. Grainger's plausible explanation of the events that led to Seleukos fleeing his satrapy, following a disagreement with Antigonus, envisages the latter acting to secure the East with placed men, in the knowledge that Philip III was dead[27].

The fact that the treaty between Kassander, Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Antigonos in 311 B.C. recognised the legitimacy of Alexander IV, by placing the time-limit of his maturation and succession on Kassander's position as general in Europe, should not be understood as suggesting either that Kassander had reinstated the boy, or that the other parties would have gone on to submit to his authority; the assassination of Alexander by his erstwhile regent/general Kassander the following year, conveniently for all the Successors, concluded the prolonged pretense of subordination to the king[28]. Apart from Alexander's illegitimate son Heracles (a short-lived pawn for Polyperchon in 310 B.C., before the latter's reconciliation with Kassander), the only remaining male descendants of Philip II appear to have been Kassander's own sons by Thessalonike (accorded the respectably royal names of Philip, Antipater and Alexander), and Neoptolemus of Epirus (son of Cleopatra and thus nephew to Alexander the Great)[29]; it is not clear why Kassander appears to have been so concerned to eliminate Pyrrhus of Epirus, a refugee boy-king at the court of Glaukias of Illyria, but it was perhaps significant that this cousin of Neoptolemus, was both a nephew of Olympias (and consequently a cousin of Alexander the Great) and the brother of the girl (Deidameia) to whom Alexander IV had been betrothed, presumably on Olympias' instructions[30].

Although none of the Successors was using a royal title at this point Diodorus appears to suggest that now Alexander was dead the hereditary principle for accession to kinghip was shelved when each considered themselves to have the absolute right to rule whatever territory fell under their sway[31]; this generalisation should be nuanced by the recollection of Kassander's efforts to bind his descendants into the Argead dynasty (see above), Ptolemy's apparent willingness in 308 B.C. to contract a marriage with Cleopatra, full sister to Alexander the Great[32], and Seleukos' efforts to establish himself and his half-Bactrian son as successors to Darius and Alexander, initially in Babylonia, Media and the Easternmost satrapies, and eventually (after the battle of Corupedium in 281 B.C.) throughout Asia Minor, Thrace and Macedonia (see below)[33]. In Ptolemy's case, Tarn

suggested that the period leading to his adoption of the royal style saw the emergence of the story that his real father was not Lagos but Philip II[34]. A corresponding story, also identified by Tarn, that Seleukos' wife Apama was not only a descendant of Artaxerxes II (through her mother's family) but actually a daughter of Alexander himself, is almost certainly a later invention[35].

Although Collins has recently redated the story of Ptolemy I's royal parentage to the late 280s B.C. (when Ptolemy Keraunos made his bid for Macedonia), it is Antigonos and Demetrius who most clearly represent the shift noted by Diodorus, apparently content to have constituted the first two generations of a new dynasty without reference to the Argead or Achaemenid past, and it is no surprise that they were the first to accept royal titles as their own (in 307 B.C.)[36]. Lysimachus is more difficult to categorise, but his marriage with Amastris (a niece of Darius III) offered rights to authority, however dubious, in the former Persian empire, whenever the opportunity should arise, whilst ambition for Macedonia perhaps prompted his undated pursuit of a marriage bond with Cleopatra; like Ptolemy and Seleukos, Lysimachus was happy to be known as an associate of Alexander and, after the Battle of Ipsus (see below) had delivered him an Asian empire and when Kassander's death had left Macedonia in the hands of a teenager, the issue of newly devised Alexander portrait coins can be read as representing his claim on Alexander's empire[37].

That the Antigonid claims to kingship in 307 B.C. entailed a vision of authority throughout the whole of Alexander's empire seems clearly to be indicated both by their attempts to undermine the authority of Seleukos, Kassander, and Ptolemy, and the subsequent royal acclamations of Lysimachus and these other Successors; a coalition of the threatened parties resulted in Lysimachus' invasion of Asia Minor in 302 B.C. and the united campaign of Lysimachus and Seleukos eventually climaxed with the battle of Ipsus[38]. With Antigonos dead and the formerly Antigonid territories of Asia divided between

Lysimachus and Seleukos, Demetrius Poliorcetes had few possessions to be king over, until the deaths, in rapid succession, of Kassander and his son Philip IV re-opened the bidding for the control of Macedonia; over the next twenty-five years Macedonia found itself ruled by nine different kings including Demetrius, Lysimachus and Pyrrhus but only the restoration in 272 B.C. of Demetrius' son (Antigonos II Gonatas) saw the successful establishment of a dynasty[39]. By that date Seleukos I, Demetrius Poliorcetes, Ptolemy I and Lysimachus were all dead. The latter's post-Ipsus territories in Asia had been ceded to Seleukos as spear-won land and, following his death in 281 B.C., inherited by Antiochus I; maintaining a Seleucid grasp on this newly enlarged empire was no easy task[40]. By contrast, in the century after the death of Ptolemy I Soter, the apparent stability of the Ptolemaic possessions (once again including Cyprus), was marred only by the repeated wars with the Seleucids over Coele-Syria[41].

b) Aspects of Hellenistic philosophy and kingship theory

Whilst the fourth century ideals of statesmanship explored in the previous chapter facilitated the acceptance of competent Hellenistic kings, and whilst the established stereotypes were useful for characterising royal failures, it should not be forgotten that contemporary Hellenistic thinkers continued to be interested in political, social and ethical questions. Without undertaking a detailed survey of the main schools of Hellenistic philosophy it is important to flag up a few of their ideas, not only because of their impact in the Hellenistic world, but also because of the interest shown in them by Roman philhellenes, from at least the second century B.C. (see below). It should of course be remembered that the inclusion of philosophers amongst the friends of kings, and the existence of treatises written specifically for the edification of current and future rulers, is no proof that a particular king's behaviour was influenced by the intellectual climate[42]; similarly the apparent reversion to stereotype of the later Hellenistic kings (see below) is not to be explained by the (hypothetical) abandonment of philosophical principles,

successfully assimilated by their forefathers. Equally, whilst there is some evidence for an intellectual opposition to the less than ideal monarchs of the real world, it would be unwise to ascribe to that alone the downfalls of particular kings or dynasties.

i) rectificatory and distributive justice

The inter-relationship between kings and the law appears to have remained a topic of interest despite the finality of Anaxarchus' supposed remark to Alexander (that everything done by an earthly ruler is necessarily lawful and just)[43]. For Hecataeus of Abdera, by contrast, the power of the Egyptian rulers of history had been curtailed by a vague but superior force of written law, historical precedent and custom, whose importance was daily inculcated by the priests who circumscribed the royal day. Whilst the details of this account appear to be an unrealistic representation of contemporary practice in Egypt it should nevertheless be remembered that conquerors can choose to rule as they please, and Hecataeus' attribution of his information to Egyptian priestly sources suggests that this was exactly what was feared[44]. Manetho's account of Egyptian history and the Babylonian histories of Berossus may have betrayed similar concerns; in one fragment of Manetho for example a "***deinotatos/saevissimus***" king of the Ninth Dynasty is said to have been punished by madness and killed by a crocodile[45].

When Hellenistic kings accepted the legitimacy of the existing laws and traditions of their kingdoms, they were by no means precluded from overseeing new legislation. Indeed, the newly established cities of the Macedonian regimes would have needed legal codes from their founders, the role of "***ktistes***" requiring kings to be legislators[46]. As was noted earlier, lawgivers were highly regarded in Greek thought and the Hellenistic author of the 'Platonic' dialogue Minos has Socrates and his companion agree that laws are the writings of "***politikoi***" and "***basilikoi***", different kinds of men who know about ruling; in their further discussion the statesmen are slowly forgotten, so that when they define what is

right (***orthos***), they agree it to be the "***nomos basilikos***"[47]. In discussing ancient law-givers the interlocutors distinguish between the Greek stereotype of a king in Attic tragedy (***agrios***, ***chalepos***, ***adikos***) and the characteristics of Minos the Cretan king and lawgiver (***nomothetes***) as he is represented in the texts of Homer and Hesiod; whilst it is not difficult to parallel with Socrates' description of Minos as a son of Zeus who had been entrusted with his father's sceptre Alexander's claims to divine sonship and the divine power of the thunderbolt, it should be remembered that the sceptre suggests the ruler's authority over his subjects, rather than his dynamic power[48]. The thunderbolt of Zeus was associated with his conflicts with enemies such as the Titans and, although Smith notes that Alexander appears to have been the only king to be represented wielding the thunderbolt, this device appears not infrequently on the reverses of Ptolemaic coins in association with the eagle of Zeus, and it should also be remembered that Keraunos was a royal epithet, albeit infrequently used, in the early Hellenistic period[49]. The long sceptre which frequently appears in representations of Zeus enthroned, appears to have been in continuing earthly use in Macedonia down to Alexander's lifetime; the sceptre appears to have become an integral item of Hellenistic royal insignia, but its long association with justice and civil order perhaps explains the under-reporting of its existence in contemporary artworks and literary texts, which were more often interested in the military aspect of rulership (see below)[50]. The fragment of Theophrastos' treatise 'On kingship' which suggests that the sceptre was superior to the spear as a mark of good kingship, represents an early exception not improbably to be associated with Greek opposition to the empire-building ambitions of Alexander and the Successors; it is not unlikely that an unvoiced comparison was intended between Caeneus, the transgendered lapith who had been made an invulnerable man by Poseidon and who offended the gods by setting up his spear for public veneration, and Alexander the "invincible god" of Apelles' painting and Hypereides' speech[51].

The work on laws and justice ascribed to Archytas, and preserved in Stobaeus' Florilegium, describes the king as animate law and yet appears to assert the primacy of written laws, against which the lawfulness of individual monarchs can be measured; the familiar idea of the ruler as a judge of merits and demerits, who correctly distributes rewards and punishments, recurs here but this ideal is further refined by the injunctions that the ruler-judge should have a general affection for all his subjects and such impartiality as the law itself, which is said to act for the sake of those subject to it, rather than for its own advantage[52]. The work on kingship attributed to Diotogenes and excerpted in the same collection, also treats the king as animate law, but goes even further by suggesting that the earthly role of the king in distributing rewards and punishments corresponds to Zeus' task of maintaining the harmony of his universe; it is further asserted that such a ruler as can attune his kingdom to his own virtues (primarily justice) becomes a god among men[53]. The Jewish author of the so-called Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates has one of the seventy-two sages advise Ptolemy II to deal justly with each of his subjects in order to maintain the harmony of a heterogenous kingdom; whilst the author is probably particularly concerned with the rights of the Diaspora Jews, this is by no means the only example of current Greek ideas about justice and the law influencing the author's choices of language and argument[54].

Just as Archytas had advised kings to develop a general and unbiased love for their subjects prior to the distribution of rewards and punishments, pseudo-Aristeas has the third interlocutor advise the king to shower benefits on his subjects, thus demonstrating his concern for their welfare; another speaker counselled that the use of scrupulous fairness to all sides might gain the king-judge the approval of the losing party in court cases whilst others suggested that showing clemency towards offenders, punishing them more leniently than they deserve (in imitation of the goodness of God), would prove him a friend to mankind and ensure that his rule endured[55]. The concept of divine mercy in Jewish thought might be considered sufficient explanation for pseudo-Aristeas' interest in this

quality, but it should be noted that the Greek treatise attributed to Sthenidas of Lokri and briefly excerpted in Stobaeus' collection also emphasises its importance to the ruler who chose to follow the divine pattern of fatherly concern for those subject to him[56]. By contrast, however, the Stoic could not let pity for an offender cause a divergence from the strict letter of the law, or mitigation of punishment[57].

As in more modern times, the idea of distributive justice could have a revolutionary edge and there was a danger that concepts of equality and commonality (*'isegoria'*, *'koinonia'*) might achieve a greater hold on the imagination than the king's practical wisdom in ordering the world[58]. Indeed, the very fact of the monarch's vastly superior wealth could be seen as an example of unjust inequality; only a mere city-state dynast like Agis IV or Cleomenes III of Sparta, however, could consider the redistribution of their own property in a bid to restore equality[59]. As Plutarch reports it, Agis wished to compete with Ptolemies and Seleucids on the international stage but, lacking their resources, he chose to make populist social reform his claim to greatness, proposing redistribution of property and the cancellation of debts; although Agis' co-ruler (Leonidas II) chose to view these proposals as preparatory to Agis' installation as a demagogue-tyrant in the mould of the aspirant tyrant Apollodorus of Cassandreia, and arranged for his arrest and execution in 241 B.C., Leonidas' son Cleomenes appears to have been happy to revive the scheme in the 220s B.C.[60]. Each man's vision of restored equality in Sparta is said to have inspired them to abandon the magnificent trappings of rank and to live according to the simple traditions of their fellow-citizens; in the case of Cleomenes Plutarch expatiates on the contrasts between him and the other Hellenistic kings whose arrogance and superior manner are said to have given even greater offence than their wealth and extravagance, asserting that the Spartan, who was neither distinguished from his fellow citizens by purple robes, nor separated from the public by barrages of doorkeepers and secretaries, had determined to win trust and loyalty not from gifts but ordinary social intercourse[61]. Such simplicity was by no means incompatible with the precepts of Stoicism, a philosophy with

which Cleomenes had presumably become acquainted through the teachings of his childhood mentor Sphaerus of Olbia (a pupil of Zeno); it should be remembered, however, that straightforwardness and affability had characterised the reign of at least one earlier Spartan king (see above), if Xenophon's portrait of Agesilaus is to be believed[62].

Egalitarian ideals also seem to be reflected in the mythical Utopia recorded by Diodorus where "***homonoia***" was realised because of the equality of citizens who were even roughly equal in bodily proportion; supposedly they had been brought up in common rather than within divisive family groups and in adulthood took turns at fishing, manufacture, etc[63]. Although the oldest man in each kin group ruled as if a king during his lifetime, the appointment of an official age for death effectively ensured that power never resided too long in one man's hands, whilst the criterion of age effectively appointed successors at random (like the democratic Athenian lot), preventing the establishment of ruling dynasties; it should be noted that, at least by Polybius' time, the hereditary principle for succession to power was being implicated in the decline of states from kingdoms to tyrannies, and from aristocracies to oligarchies[64]. For Polybius, as apparently also for the Stoics, the ideal constitution was not the monarchical rule of the wisest man, but an admixture of kingship, aristocracy and democracy; the mixed constitution provided the opportunity for all to participate and thus ensured that, instead of the state dividing on class grounds into ruler-masters and subject-slaves, freedom ("***eleutheria***") was preserved for all citizens[65]. A common interest in the state was also thought to ensure that all the classes worked together in national emergencies because everyone considered themselves to be under a common threat; equally, in times of peace there were sufficient checks and balances to ensure that no social group was able to abuse its powers, and in consequence the state remained at equilibrium ("***isorropos***")[66].

ii) Splendour and the Royal Image

In contrast to these egalitarian ideas, one branch of Hellenistic thought about rulership was interested in marking and accentuating the elevated status of kings. Whilst Diotogenes advised kings to differentiate themselves from their subjects by their superiority in virtue he clearly imagined them to be superior also in wealth, power and military strength; indeed he argues that avarice was a vital characteristic of the good king, whose duties of reward and punishment demanded vast resources[67]. Although luxury had earlier been regarded with the suspicion appropriate to a supposedly Asian vice (see above), there was now a realisation that the display of wealth could enhance the ruler's appearance of superiority; whilst Aristotelian ethics had rejected ostentation for its own sake, the magnificent furnishing of a king's house would have been considered worthy of much expenditure because, just as the houses of earlier civic leaders had been public ornaments that stood as a statement of a city's wealth and power, so the Hellenistic royal palace too might impress and intimidate foreign visitors[68]. Nevertheless Aristotle had clearly distinguished between the scale of expenditure that was appropriate to the temples and festivals of the gods, and that befitting secular structures and events; Pseudo-Aristeas' representation of the famously wealthy Ptolemy II, stressing the cost and the artistry of the royal gifts he commissioned for the Jerusalem temple suggest his capacity for magnificence, but one cannot help but feel that the temporary feasting pavilion, associated with the 'Pompe' for the Ptolemaeia of 275-274 B.C., and described by Callixeinos (in his Peri Alexandreias) was disproportionately elaborate and, in consequence, merely vulgar[69]. It is not impossible that those who counted kings as gods amongst men would also have considered them worthy of correspondingly magnificent accommodation, dress and so forth; Demetrius Poliorcetes after all, acclaimed as a god more real and powerful than the Olympians, had not only been able to take up residence in the Parthenon, but had been represented in gilded bronze[70].

The Diotogenes fragment urges the ruler to equip himself with an appearance of majesty ('***semnotes***') so as to arouse in his subjects the awe and honour that was normally reserved for gods; whilst physical appearance, posture, carriage and speech manner could contribute to an impression that a ruler was worthy of the power that had been vested in him, Diotogenes appears to suggest that for an impression of majesty the ruler had also to imitate divinity by combining beneficence and grace, with a fearsome and unwavering hostility to foreign enemies[71]. This final element was doubly important to the ruler as, according to Diotogenes, the quality of '***deinotes***' which terrified his enemies, helped to render him invincible, and also made him an inspiration to his friends; the truth of this analysis with respect to the Hellenistic kings is suggested by the fact that both the world-conquering Dionysos and Alexander the Great were considered to be '***deinos***', and served as models for Successors like Demetrius Poliorcetes[72]. Polybius remarked, however, in relation to Philip V, that it was not sufficient for a ruler to inspire fear by his military might (the part of a tyrant), as true kings were not hated by their subjects, but rather loved by them, and by their former enemies (whom mercy had spared from destruction and brought to voluntary repentance); this conception clearly underlies Diotogenes' advice that the king's majesty should not rely on '***deinotes***' alone[73].

Whilst Diotogenes' beneficent ruler was primarily understood to be emulating Zeus' fatherly concern for humanity, active '***philanthropia***' was also considered an attribute of demigods like Heracles, and saviour gods like Dionysos, whose interventions in human affairs could seem more tangible. In the Ithyphallic hymn to Demetrius, peace for the Athenians is the first blessing that is asked from their new ruler, but royal euergetism was also thought to include provision for the construction and ornamentation of civic and religious buildings, supplies of timber, grain or oil, remission of taxes, etc[74]. When Diotogenes suggests that the king must not vie with his equals or inferiors but rather with the gods (themselves sometimes considered to be dead kings, immortalised for their benefactions), he was no doubt well aware that in the sphere of euergetism, contemporary

rulers were competing throughout the Greek world, not only with rival monarchs but also with members of urban élites[75]. The extent to which a dynasty's majesty could be enhanced by philanthropic liberality is indicated by the use of titles such as saviour and benefactor ('***soter***' and '***euergetes***'), the decreeing of divine honours, the assimilation of the ruler with a particular deity or deities, and even direct deification (usually after death); claims of divine parentage or divine election, and the borrowing of divine attributes (such as the horns of Dionysos) further elevated the ruler above his subjects[76].

Turning to the contribution of a ruler's physical appearance to his majesty, it is probable that superior height was as important to those Hellenistic audiences interested in maintaining royal majesty as it had been in the kingdoms of the East before Alexander's conquest; there, artistic convention had illustrated distinctions of rank by differences in height and, at least according to Greek authors, rulers had been known to wear shoes with platform soles[77]. Certainly Plutarch's account of Demetrius mentions that he was tall, a description that appears to originate with Hieronymus of Cardia, but unsurprisingly height was not all-important as Alexander himself had not been particularly tall, whilst even the majestic Demetrius was shorter than his distinctly uncharismatic father (the 'Cyclops'); interestingly a pseudo-Aristotelian treatise suggests that the moderately sized man was more likely to achieve success than those tall or short to excess[78]. Hieronymus of Cardia may have been the originator of Plutarch's suggestion that Demetrius drew much of his "***basilike semnotes***" from his heroic youthful appearance; whilst beauty and grace were conventional characteristics of youth in the Greek world, the majesty appropriate to Zeus (ruler and father of gods and men) had conventionally been expressed through a more mature (bearded) image, with youthful beardlessness a common (but by no means universal) trait of more minor deities such as Apollo, Dionysos and Hermes, and active heroes like Achilles, Perseus and Heracles[79].

In Diodorus' accounts of Demetrius' physical appearance it is suggested that before the battle of Gaza his youth inspired anxiety for his safety, rather than confidence; although the awestruck desire of strangers to gaze on him, is later said to have stemmed from his bodily form and panoply, this desire is textually associated with the military experience and success of Demetrius down to 304 B.C., which had been engineered by his youthful energy and enthusiasm for perfecting the art of siegecraft, and was the inspiration for the epithet Poliorcetes[80]. Whilst certain physical characteristics associated with youthful beauty were culturally approved for young men, others were culturally linked to sexual passivity, effeminacy and cowardice (see above), 'weaknesses' incompatible with the majesty of a ruler; the famously leonine attributes of Alexander portraits appear to have redeemed a cluster of physiognomical failures (pale face, 'melting eyes', beardlessness, and drooping neck) more appropriate to the male prostitute than the ruler of empires, as Stewart notes[81].

The lion-man idea, suggesting the heroic vigour and virile courage of a Greek soldier from Homer onwards, may well have been further elaborated in the late fourth century B.C. by the development of the pseudo-science of physiognomics which read the physical attributes of a human subject with reference to corresponding attributes in animals whose behaviour patterns were felt to correspond to human virtues or vices. In the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise on the subject, the lion is characterised not only by courage (deep roar, stiff tawny hair, bright eyes) but by liberal generosity (hair curls away from the face and down the nape), and by due pride (flat but circular nose tip, slightly hollow eyes, square and symmetrical face)[82]. Read in conjunction with the Nicomachean Ethics it becomes apparent that this last quality was understood to interrelate with the lion's supposed love of victory; since gentleness, justice and affection for companions are also noted as characteristic of the lion without direct cross-reference to physical characteristics, one suspects that ideals of human rulership are being transposed to the king of the beasts[83]. Whether the striving ambition of Alexander to outdo his ancestor Achilles and to rival the

very gods (his "***pothos***") was already understood as confirming his leonine character, or whether the lion of this treatise drew his "***megalopsychos***" and "***philonikos***" characteristics from the example of Alexander, may therefore be a matter for debate; either way, Diotogenes would have approved Alexander's determination to compete with his superiors[84].

Whilst the leonine physical form associated with royal majesty was subject to variation over time, and from kingdom to kingdom (see below), the inspiration of the beardless youthful Alexander continued to provide an important model for most of the kings from Macedonian dynasties down to the late first century B.C.; ironically, the seated format of statuary traditionally used to demonstrate the majesty of Zeus, appears most often to have been appropriated for thinkers, orators and writers, whose posture and conventionally bearded maturity distanced them not only from divine grandeur but from the forms used for royal portrait statues (a genre of sculpture that continued to be dominated by the standing nude with spear and the armoured equestrian statue)[85]. When the flabbiness evident in some of these 'philosopher' portraits was noted in the bodily form of Ptolemaic kings it is doubtful if anyone took it as evidence of royal ascetism; whilst corpulence could suggest sturdiness and prosperity, obesity not only betokened immoderate eating habits, but effeminate inactivity (see above), particularly, one may imagine, when the man chose not to dress in the simple and manly ***himation***, but in a long-sleeved floor length tunic[86]

iii) kingship literature and the dutiful king

In Aristotle's Politics the hereditary constitutional monarchs of the Heroic past are said to have performed three functions for their contemporaries (legal judgement, religious service and military leadership) and the continuing importance of this triad of kingly functions in the Hellenistic period is strongly suggested by its recurrence in one of the passages

ascribed to Diotogenes in Stobaeus' Florilegium; what makes the 'best man' king is the knowledge (of justice and law, of the gods and human virtue, and of war) that enables him to perform all three functions, and it is the king's grasp of this knowledge that causes him to imitate the gods in creating and ordering his kingdom[87]. One vital source of such knowledge was literature, and in the so-called 'Letter of Aristeas' it is recommended that the king spend most of his time reading, not for recreation but for the sake of his subjects; with the exception of travel-writings (military anabases, anthropological surveys or utopian romances?), the works involved are not specified except inasmuch as they bore dedications to rulers[88]. When, according to the story, Demetrius of Phalerum advised Ptolemy (I) to read treatises on rulership and leadership ("***peri basileias kai hegemonias***") it was intended that he give serious consideration to their content, which could be more directly critical than the spoken counsels of the king's friends; it is not impossible that Demetrius' advice drew on his own failure to rule Athens, and constituted part of his campaign to reinstate Ptolemy Keraunos as Ptolemy Soter's appointed successor, but the idea that kings ought to perfect their conduct in line with the unsolicited advice of subjects and foreigners had a broader significance[89].

The Hellenistic king was not supposed to rule as he pleased, but in accordance with ideas about rulership already in the public domain; the quip of Antigonus II Gonatas that his reign was '***eudoxos douleia***' fits well into a school of thought which argued that rulership was an almost unbearable burden, with which no sane man would wish to saddle himself, even as a means of achieving the fame and fortune that accompanied the royal office[90]. The notion of the god-like monarch wholly and selflessly devoted to the business of ruling is an integral part of Diotogenes' vision (since the pursuit of mere pleasure was simply unworthy of the 'best man') and it should be noted that Hellenistic kings really could seem the servants of their subjects and answerable to them for their conduct; whether the story applied to Philip II, Antipater or Demetrius Poliorcetes, it is possible that the anecdote of

the ruler instructed to stop ruling, when he failed to meet the expectations of an old woman (by refusing to hear her petition), was already current by Antigonus' reign[91].

Philip of Macedon is supposed to have remarked that everyone is responsible for their own reputation (good or bad) and several stories exist reporting the interest of rulers in discerning for themselves their public reputation without the filter of the dissimulating and periphrastic language used in official reports; in Plutarch's story about Antiochus VII the king pronounces that he has heard the truth for the first time in his reign, after peasants have related the reports they have heard which criticised him for being insufficiently interested in matters of import because of his excessive passion for hunting, and for entrusting affairs of state to the worthless men he called his friends[92]. This story capitalises on the fact that peasants were ill-equipped to recognise their king without the purple and diadem, but rulers interested in their own reputations were prepared to go out in disguise amongst urban populations; it should be noted that the practice appears to remain in contemporary monarchies partly as a means of confirming the effectiveness of subordinates, whose manner of administration reflects on the sovereign[93].

A monarch who did not seem to be meeting his obligations by showing sufficient interest in affairs of state, and foreign affairs in particular, could prove the object of contempt and find himself exposed not only to a court conspiracy, but mass insurrection; according to Polybius' conceptions, for a ruler to devote all his attentions to '***pragmata***' was kingly, whereas leaving such matters to others was conduct worthy of a woman[94]. It should be admitted that when the refugee king Cleomenes, a man whom Polybius characterises as being particularly gifted in state business, urged the Alexandrians to claim their freedom, there was no uprising (despite their contempt for Ptolemy IV and their admiration for Cleomenes) and that, as Fraser points out, the first known mob intervention was in support of the accession of the boy-king Ptolemy V [95]. However, the reign of Ptolemy IV saw the growth of a nationalist Egyptian movement (despite the Egyptian contribution to the

Ptolemaic victory at Raphia) not quashed until the campaigns of Polycrates in the 180s B.C.[96]. Moreover the Alexandrian citizens had learnt that they could play a part in the installation and and dethronement of their kings, elevating Ptolemy Euergetes in 169 B.C. (when his brother Ptolemy VI had fallen captive to Antiochus), and much later driving him out of the palace into effective exile in Cyprus for several years; a role for the citizens of a royal capital was not restricted to the Alexandrians since (around 146 B.C.), dissatisfied with both Seleucid claimants to the throne, the citizens of Antioch had offered the kingship to Ptolemy VI and violently opposed the reigns of Demetrius II and Antiochus XIII[97].

c) Military leadership and the practice of Hellenistic kingship

Of the three Aristotelian functions of heroic kingship, it is military leadership which dominates our perception of Alexander's reign; even with regard to his religious leadership, illustrated by the numerous public sacrifices and other offerings, it is clear that these were made primarily to harmonise his military campaign with the will of the gods[98]. Apart from instances of summary justice and injustice, however, Alexander's juridical authority appears to have held little interest for our sources, although it should be remembered that the near continuous campaigning gave Alexander few opportunities for undertaking civil duties[99]. The artworks used for representing Hellenistic kingship (discussed in more detail below), emphasise the ruler's military power and achievements, and his relationships with the gods (reverential, filial, fraternal, etc), but distance him from previous figures of civil authority, suggesting that Alexander's apparent order of rulership priorities also stood in the Hellenistic kingdoms[100].

Certainly, in the half-century after Alexander's death the priority he had given to military leadership appears considerably to have influenced the behaviour of contemporary monarchs and the expectations of those subject to them. The eventual assumptions of the royal title by the Successors to Alexander's empire seem invariably to have followed a

successful military engagement; although the evidence suggests that those who did claim kingly authority for themselves were interested in establishing real or fictional family relationships between themselves and the defunct ruling dynasty of Macedonia (see above), it seems that such claims did not depend on these relationships, but on the proven leadership qualities of the individual Successors[101]. Indeed, the Suidas entry on monarchy suggests, with explicit reference to the failures of Philip III and Alexander IV to command the respect of the empire despite their royal ancestry (see above), that kingship stemmed neither from nature nor justice but from military and administrative competence[102]; the case of Lycurgus, appointed (despite his lack of royal ancestors) to one of the Spartan kingships after the death of Cleomenes, may present a further example, since the one talent bribes which shocked Polybius, at least imply good '***oikonomia***', whilst his '***strategia***' as king was not without success[103].

The importance given to legitimate dynastic descent in the first of the kingship treatise fragments attributed to Ecphantus in the Florilegium, thus seems alien to the Successor period; in this passage the kingly office is supposed to dazzle those who are not born to it, since only the true king, manufactured out of the common flesh of all humanity by the 'supreme Artificer', is made in the divine image[104]. In the Letter to Philocrates the king is made to ask which the public think to be finer, kingly rule by a prince of the blood or kingly rule by a man who was born a commoner; the approved reply is in one way close to Ecphantus, since it is argued that good rulership is dependent on the nature of the individual ruler, but for this Jewish sage it was clearly conceivable that a bastard usurper could have a royal nature[105]. The king's penultimate interlocutor goes on to suggest that it was the nobility of his character that made a ruler king; true kingship is here judged, neither on the basis of the ruler's military and administrative capabilities as such (in contrast to the Suidas entry), nor from the wealth and glory that such rulership skills could generate, but from the moderate and humane manner in which they were exercised[106]. Polybius, whilst respecting the notion that royal descent could qualify men for rulership,

recognised that a prince naturally gifted for kingship might nevertheless turn out to be the stereotypical '***tyrannos agrios***'; his representation of Philip V presents a case study since the young king's intelligence, majesty and generalship capabilities ("***praxis kai tolma polemike***") are said to have been coupled neither with the '***epieikeia***' and '***philanthropia***' of a Philip II, nor even the '***eusebeia***' of Alexander the Great, destroyer of Thebes[107]. It was Attalus, whose only title to rulership is said to have been his wealth, who had possessed the intelligence and courage to establish a kingdom on the basis of '***euergesia***' and '***charis***' as well as achievements in war; moreover, his early wars were conducted against the barbarians, rather than fellow-Greeks, and his campaigns in mainland Greece far from being designed to subjugate the inhabitants, assisted them in their recovery of freedom[108].

Polybius ascribes the destructiveness associated with the Macedonian victory over the Aetolians to Philip V's immoderate rage; naturally plunder was countenanced as a legitimate means of strengthening one's own resources at the expense of the enemy (during the course of a campaign) but ideally one ought, once victor, to restore liberty and become the benefactor and saviour of those who had fallen under one's authority[109]. Polybius' rendering of Chlaeneas the Aetolian's speech against Macedon suggests that such apparent generosity was calculated to perpetuate the victor's superiority, but in any case such 'ideals' were no doubt frequently disregarded; given the location of their homeland within the disputed territories of Coele-Syria, it is not surprising that Pseudo-Aristeas appears to want the reader to understand that all seventy-two Jews wished to focus the Ptolemaic king's attention away from his military capabilities towards the administrative capabilities which ensured continual peace at home, and swift justice for petitioners[110]. Whereas Diotogenes, elaborating on the idea that rulership is a parallel skill to medicine (see above), suggests that each is essentially a matter of saving life, the ruler being empowered to save those endangered in war, Pseudo-Aristeas has one of the sages assert that it is legislators who are divinely entrusted with saving lives; another counsels that the self-mastery of the

true king extends beyond mere moderation in eating and drinking to moderation in conquest, whilst another asserts that the true patriot would wish to live and die in his own country, and yet another urges him to choose generals who prefer to preserve the lives of their own troops than win victory at all costs[111].

For Diotogenes, however, military success was a form of euergetism towards the ruler's existing subjects, which served to restore the cosmic harmony of the world by eliminating opposition; the Ionian League decreed Eumenes II a gold portrait statue, following his many campaigns against the barbarians (waged to keep the Greek cities at peace), in recognition that he was their common benefactor[112]. In Ptolemaic Egypt the king as Hermes-Horus could be represented (see below) as a wrestler struggling with Seth, the embodiment of chaos and thus the representation of all enemies of Egyptian civil order, but the concept of ordering chaos by military force was already familiar to Greeks, whose representations of the Gigantomachy had served as allegories for contemporary Greek conflicts with barbarians for over two hundred years before the erection (see below) of the Great Altar of Zeus at Pergamon[113]. The cosmic dimension of human conflict was further underscored by the association of certain deities with earthly campaigns and victories; to give two examples, an inscription recording Koan thanksgiving for the preservation of Delphi, notes that Apollo punished the Celtic invaders (with human assistance) whilst, in the Mesopotamian tradition, Antiochus I when proposing conquest from sunrise to sunset, called upon the god Nabû to ensure the overthrow of his enemies and permanent victories[114].

A royal victory was only possible because of the favour of the gods, and the figure of Nike was therefore frequently associated in Hellenistic artworks with the king and his military successes (see below); as military leadership had become a stronger title to kingship than legitimate descent, it was important for young kings to embark on successful military campaigns, not only to prove their capability, but to confirm divine approval for their

accession[115]. Diodorus records a rebellion by the citizens of Antioch when Antiochus XIII had been defeated in battle and also notes that, in the wake of Antiochus IV's invasion of Egypt, a conspiracy had arisen in Alexandria because the young and inexperienced kings were held in contempt by a courtier who was pre-eminent in battle; whilst the Alexandrians did not in the end proceed with the assassination of the elder Ptolemy (apparently the first stage of the coup attempt) Dionysius Petosarapis did win the support of disaffected soldiers and 'native Egyptians'[116]. Diodorus' account well illustrates Polybius' remark that the Ptolemies only needed to fear for Egypt's security when they paid no attention to '*pragmata*' in Coele-Syria, Cyprus, Asia Minor, the islands, Macedonia and Thrace; having made this suggestion in relation to the accession of Ptolemy IV, Polybius failed to commend that king for the successful defence of his realm (perhaps because Ptolemy's predecessors had been accustomed to threatening Syrian kings by land and sea, whereas the aggressor in this case was Antiochus III), but proceeded instead to blame him for not following up the unexpected victory at Raphia[117].

The quiet for which, according to Polybius, Ptolemy IV settled all too eagerly proved to be far from the kind of peace that provided domestic security since even those who had fought at Raphia contributed to the secessionist movement a decade or so later; Polybius had earlier voiced his opinion that, whilst a just and honourable peace was a desirable and advantageous possession, the pursuit of peace solely to avoid the terrors of war was cowardly and dishonourable, and it should be noted that he used the same word ('*hesukhia*') to refer to the Theban inactivity at the time of the Persian invasion of Greece as he uses to describe the peace sought by Ptolemy IV[118]. The ideal of perpetual domestic peace depended, not on indolence, but rather on military victory over foreign enemies and so even Polybius found words to commend Philip V because Macedonia, Thessaly and the other territories under his direct control never revolted from his rule, despite his comparative youth; the key to their loyalty appears to have been the unifying effect of his campaigns against the Aetolians and Lacedaemonians[119]. The unity of purpose of the Macedonians

and Thessalians was also argued to act as a deterrent to the Northern barbarians who, during the reign of Philip V, never attempted to repeat the incursions into Greece that had followed the defeat of Ptolemy Ceraunos[120].

Polybius' Lyciscus, who explicitly casts the Romans as the new barbarian threat to Greek unity, praises Alexander the Great for plundering the Persian empire because its resources had previously been used to pit one city-state against another[121]. The economic motive for imperialist expansion could also be acquisitive, the benefits of successful wars outweighing the considerable costs and enabling the ruler to shower his subjects with goods more tangible than peace; not only might an extension of the area subject to the king's military authority equate to an enlargement of tribute-bearing territory but the defeated party might be compelled to pay war reparations and, in wartime, booty won on campaign was a useful supplement to the existing tribute and taxes[122]. Alexander the Great's right to rule and exploit the territories East of the Hellespont was his conquest of them, and this concept was also important to the Successors whose disputed claims to the resources of (and authority in) different parts of Alexander's empire were settled only by warfare; the idea that a Hellenistic kingdom consisted of the 'spear-won land' of its founding dynast was so fundamental to royal ideology that lands which had been won by the Successors were claimed by their descendants long after the territories in question had gained their independence, or fallen (as 'spear-won' land) to a rival dynasty[123]. Even the idea of recovering the universal empire of Alexander (*'ta hola'*) was never completely lost but little in the way of royal conquest, or reconquest, could occur in the later Hellenistic period without Roman objections (see below); the decreasing generosity of benefactions noted by Polybius may reflect a corresponding decrease in the profitability of royal wars[124]. After the battle of Magnesia, Antiochus III alone was instructed to pay 15,000 talents to the Romans as a war indemnity and the contrast between this sum and the mere 1000 talent indemnity levied on Philip V is particularly stark since the latter could only afford to pay over ten years the amount demanded from Antiochus each year; when it is

remembered that the tyrant of Cibyra could collect 100 talents in six days for a one-off payment to Rome's envoys, it is clear that the finances of the Macedonian kings were at a pretty low ebb, and it is no surprise that the Antigonid dynasty was the first to fall[125].

Rome's interventions in the Eastern Mediterranean effectively circumscribed the strategic options of the later Hellenistic kings, and the literary source material for their reigns suggests a widespread reversion to the practices of stereotype tyrants; inevitably praise, for the manly boldness and soldierly hardihood which became ambitious conquerors in the Alexander mould, became less common when kings lost their wars[126], and rulers who made little or no attempt to emulate the ideal of the military leader got represented as avaricious effeminates in the Sardanapalus mould[127]. The Parthian king Arsaces VI, outside of Rome's sphere of influence, wins praise from Diodorus for the '***andreia***' which permitted him to enlarge his kingdom[128]. Without such military success, however, the '***epieikeia***' and '***philanthropia***' which, according to Diodorus, characterised the reign of Arsaces were virtues difficult to afford, and other rulers had resort to somewhat unscrupulous revenue raising measures, befitting the cruelty and impiety of tyrants (see above), notably property confiscation from proscribed persons[129] and the stripping of temples and tombs[130].

For audiences familiar with the stereotypes of oriental monarchy and the ideals of Greek rulership the palace-bound lifestyle represented in accounts of the later, and less militaristic, Hellenistic kings most strongly resembled the former, characterised as it was by indolent luxury and indulgence of sensual pleasures (see above). As has already been noted Greek notions of male respectability demanded an active life (rather than a sedentary one), characterised by soldierly hardiness and self-discipline, and if the reigns of Alexander and the Successors were to approach the ideal of government by the 'best man', then active campaigning was not only a practical, but also a symbolic necessity. The athletic and muscular physiques of ruler portraits (see below) betokened the self-control of

the '***kalos kagathos***'[131]. The 'tomb-sculpture' reported by Aristobulus, and interpreted by Clearchus as Sardanapalus dancing (no doubt in an ankle-length dress), was the very antithesis of Hellenistic royal portraits, as the supposéd inscriptional invitation to indulgence confirms; Assyrian stelae showing kings supplicating the gods have a 'finger-clicking stance' that was perhaps misinterpreted to fit Sardanapalus' existing reputation as a fabulously wealthy hedonist[132].

The king's fitness to rule could be further emphasised in royal portraits by the use of military attributes (see below), which, by alluding to military victory and the conquest of spear-won land (see above), pointed to the ruler's practical wisdom ('***phronesis***') as a successful strategist and tactician[133]. Alexander's conquest-centred reign had been characterised by personal leadership in battle and many Hellenistic kings had continued to put their own lives at risk in this way, thus proving their manly courage ('***andreia***')[134]. Such personal involvement could be important to a campaign's success because, as Austin notes, troops could be inspired to victory by the mere presence of the ruler amongst them; the apparently increasing use of subordinates as battlefield commanders is thus difficult to explain, particularly when the success of such commanders could threaten the king's own security (see above)[135]. Polybius notes that Hermeias advised Antiochus III that kings ought to lead campaigns against other kings, whilst subordinate generals should be sent to deal with rebels, a thesis which has much in common with the advice of Diotogenes, that kings should not compete with their inferiors[136].

Hermeias may have been voicing a common idea since Polybius also notes that Polycrates had not allowed Ptolemy V to take any active part in the campaign against the Egyptian rebels even though he was twenty-five years old; given the marriage bond with the Seleucid royal house, the chances of external conflict had diminished considerably, and it is notable that Ptolemy V's envoy to the Achaean League a couple of years earlier was at pains to stress that his employer was, nevertheless, a vigorous and courageous youth[137].

The fact that on one hunting expedition Ptolemy was supposed to have speared a bull may have had symbolic significance since the bull was associated with the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, whilst the antique motif of a lion subduing a bull was beginning to be used again in Greece and Asia Minor, perhaps with astrological reference to Macedonian victories over Easterners (see Figure 15)[138]. Despite Ptolemy's diplomatic marriage to Cleopatra I, tension had remained between the two kingdoms, perhaps because the dowry of Coele-Syria (promised by Antiochus III to secure Egyptian quiescence before his European campaign) had never been forthcoming, and although Ptolemy never fulfilled his potential as a second Cyrus or Alexander, it appears that the prospect of war with Syria grew more and more likely in the years between the deaths of Antiochus III and Ptolemy V[139].

Whilst some no doubt considered there to be a cosmic dimension to the hunting of wild animals (the original foes of humanity), once the practical link between hunting and external wars was actually severed, then the former became a mere royal pastime; Plutarch's account of Demetrius Poliorcetes demonstrates that hunting expeditions could lose their appeal altogether once they were devoid of educational and symbolic value, and Diodorus is particularly critical of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus whose unbounded enthusiasm for the chase, which frequently led him to endanger his life in close combat with wild beasts, was at the expense of '***pragmata***'[140]. Aristotle suggests that exposing oneself to unnecessary risk could not be termed '***andreia***', a virtue exclusively connected with the mortal dangers of the battlefield, but only heedlessness and recklessness[141]. The Macedonians appear to have taken the same view when forbidding Alexander from hunting alone or on foot, after he had risked his life in single combat with a lion; although such a feat was worthy of a heroic king, as Lysimachus and Krateros were keen to show, it could also be read as selfishly irresponsible and this perhaps explains why the image of the king as hunter appears to have been rarely used in Hellenistic times[142].

It has been suggested that the centrality of war to Hellenistic rulership, and the notion that monarchy should be in the hands of active men were not unrelated; Greek women, whose traditional domestic activities had required organisational and leadership skills, were not suited to rulership over Greek men, because the former possessed neither generalship skills, nor the masculine virtues of the gentleman soldier (e.g., self-discipline and courage)[143]. Barbarian queens such as Tomyris and Artemisia had been known to command in battle, but the military success of these masculine women was proportional to the effeminacy of their foes; combats with Greek men, as at Salamis (see above) restored the conventional gender distinctions by provoking womanish flight[144]. It has already been noted that the institution of monarchy was associated with the empowerment of women in the king's household (queens, queen mothers, princesses and mistresses), a process which both contributed towards, and depended on, the effeminisation of the king himself; whilst this may appear to be a kind of literary topos it should be noted that when, within a decade of Alexander's death, Adeia-Eurydike briefly had an army at her command, this was partly to be explained by the ineffectual rulership of her husband, whose mental impairment prevented him from acting in person to defend his kingdom from Polyperchon and Olympias[145].

Whilst the status of royal women in the Hellenistic period continued to depend to a large extent on their familial relationships to men (as mothers, wives and daughters) it had become possible, by the 140s B.C., for Cleopatra II, to rule as regent for her son, a role previously taken by male ministers such as Agathocles; the apparent masculinisation of Egyptian queenly portraits in the second century B.C. is clearly not unrelated to this kind of change[146]. The step from regency to sole rulership was not a great one, but even in the 50s B.C. when Berenice IV supplanted her father, it was felt necessary to secure her a royal husband[147]; when her niece Arsinoe gained a brief ascendancy the Alexandrians, appealing to Julius Caesar for the release of her brother, complained of their subjection to a 'girl who ruled by proxy'[148]. The resultant establishment of Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy

XIV in a nominally joint reign ultimately led to the completion of the process of female empowerment, as the queen dominated her young co-ruler and appears to have ruled alone without apparent objection in the seven or so years between his death and the Donations of Alexandria; Cleopatra was present at the Battle of Actium in ostensible command of sixty warships but, like a second Artemisia determined to preserve her own safety at all costs, took to flight[149]. The slow evolution of female royal authority in Ptolemaic Egypt is irrefutable, and the representations of male rulers in our sources do indeed suggest a general decline into indolent despotism; Antony as a Heracles unmanned by Cleopatra's Omphale is largely a product of victor's history but, as such, it demonstrates Roman familiarity with long-established Greek notions concerning the conflict between the effeminised barbarian monarchies of the East and the masculine civilisation of the West.

d) Representing Hellenistic Kingship

i) Introduction

The aim of the final section of this chapter is to provide a summary typology of the artworks used to represent the Hellenistic kings, their ambitions, their achievements and their ancestors. Whilst the primary vehicle for communicating ideas of rulership in the visual arts may well have been royal portraits, it is the author's intention to set these in the context of other artworks, from coin reverses to the reliefs of the Pergamon 'Great Altar'. Far from undermining the important works of Smith and Stewart, the aim is to build on their detailed surveys by considering other iconography associated with Hellenistic rulership[150]. One important reason for taking this broader view, is that the non-portrait artworks were also available as models when Roman patrons demanded visual representations of Roman rulers and rulership (see below). Given the centrality of military leadership and success to Hellenistic rulership, it is hoped that the discussion of art in this and later chapters will go some way towards meeting Rice's demand for a study of the relationship between Roman and Hellenistic victory monuments[151].

Dealing with art from a distant historical period presents the historian with considerable problems particularly when, as with the artworks of the Classical world, so small a proportion of the original corpus has survived and so little is known of the contexts of commissioning and use; the following remarks, prefacing the typological survey, should be read in the context of the sections in the introduction discussing (respectively) modern methods for describing and interpreting visual communications, some Hellenistic and Roman experiences of viewing and using artworks, and reviewing recent literature about art and rulership in several periods of history.

It is vital to remember that determining the meanings of the range of artworks discussed below is only one part of the art historian's task; it is also necessary to establish i) who, if anyone, was commissioning artists to represent rulers and rulership, ii) who was the intended audience, and iii) how successfully the ideas of patrons and artists were communicated to the intended audience. It would be wrong to suggest that rulers were the sole patrons of those artists representing rulers and rulership in the Hellenistic world but it is clear that rulers at risk of dethronement, perhaps because of youth or military failure, had a vested interest in advertising their legitimacy and fitness to govern; given Polybius' account of the speeches before the battle of Raphia such circumstances may lie behind some commemorations in art of ancestral achievements[152]. Other artistic projects may have been commissioned with more confidence as celebrations of the patron's military success, anniversaries of his accession, and so on. It would not be impossible for such commissioned artworks to have existed for the sole pleasure of the king, but the ornamentation of the temple complex of Athena Nikephoros, and the 'Great Altar', at Pergamon for example (see below) suggest a wider civic audience; comparative evidence from better documented periods of history suggests that the population of the capital (or at least some elements thereof), foreign envoys and future generations may have been addressed (see introduction).

Whilst some of the representations considered below were paid for by kings themselves, and may be considered to be 'official communications', others were clearly commissioned by private individuals[153], religious bodies[154] or civic communities[156]. Such artworks may have had a variety of messages to convey about, for example, their commissioning patrons' willing or unwilling dependence on, expectations of, and gratitude towards the kings; as one aspect of contemporary discourse about who merited honour and dishonour, these visual communications could be recalled when loyalties were changed, hopes were dashed, or thankfulness had run its course[157]. The messages of these non-centrally commissioned artworks were intended to be read by a variety of audiences, sometimes including the king himself; unfortunately it is not always possible to determine the archaeological context of an artwork, even in the broadest terms (was it displayed in public or private space?), and with later copies it is usually impossible to determine whether the original was commissioned for a royal capital, an allied city or a panhellenic sanctuary[158]. A commonality of visual language, between these artworks and those commissioned by monarchs, is to be expected and some dependence on what appear to be 'official models' has been detected in second century B.C. ruler portraits from Ptolemaic Egypt[159]. This need not suggest a centrally organised prescription of form and consequently it should not be expected that all ruler portraits originated from such models; comparative evidence suggests that even those rulers who did wish to control the manner of their representation in portraits could not meet public demand with 'officially approved' works[160]. In any case, for some commissioning patrons a generalised 'role portrait', bearing no relation to the ruler's actual appearance, or 'official' representations thereof, could suffice; this phenomenon need not be restricted to posthumous representations[161]. The apparent use of ruler portraits among the ornamentations of furniture items seems to suggest that they could be devoid of almost all programmatic content[162].

The place of coinage in communications about rulers and rulership needs to be debated. Despite some historical evidence in its favour, the notion that rulers personally selected

coin types has been questioned of late with regard to the Roman empire, although the idea that Hellenistic kings approved the types on their, more erratic, issues appears to have remained unchallenged[163]. The Wallace-Hadrill model, of Roman artists commissioned to design coin types to further contemporary discourse on ideal leadership, as it was imagined by the urban aristocracy, with the probable aim of persuading the ruler to live up to their ideal, is not far removed from the Levick model of moneyers issuing types that were calculated to please the ruler; both are plausible because some types seem to reflect elite interests, and although this evidence might also be taken to suggest that emperors wished to communicate to the urban aristocracy of the capital, it has usually been argued that they showed little interest in coin-types, and could get their 'news' elsewhere[164].

Smith argued that the main use for the coins issued in the Hellenistic period was the payment of the 'Greco-Macedonian soldiery', particularly the bounties which accompanied the accessions of new monarchs, ensuring loyalty to the new regime; this audience, bearing its own interests in mind, was doubtless keen for each new ruler to be as successful and as bountiful as his predecessors, and it may have been reassured by representations of victory, divine favour and legitimate descent[165]. A military audience for Roman imperial coins was considered possible by Jones, who suggested that the basic literacy of the troops would have enabled them to read the legends, and thus helped to make the coin types intelligible; the Thorngrafton hoard, found at the site of one of the quarries for Hadrian's Wall, and comprising sixty-three coins all with different reverse types, suggests that some second century A.D. soldiers were interested in the 'flip side' to a certain extent[166]. It might be anticipated that different images of rulers and rulership would be chosen for the communication of elite and non-elite audiences but, if soldiers were the intended audience for Hellenistic coins, there is little evidence for such differentiation; this must suggest either that the coin-types were incomprehensible to the soldiers after all, or that many of the urban representations really were accessible to a non-elite audience.

The use of images of rulers and rulership in association with ruler cult deserves a brief discussion here. To the author of Wisdom, it appeared that portraiture had begun in association with the worship of the dead, but that more recently kings had commanded representations of themselves to be reverenced in their absence; once artists had idealised their royal subjects beyond recognition, viewers could not help equating the beautiful with the divine, and worship replaced mere respect[167]. This Jewish perspective suggests that the artist's messages about the ruler's superiority were understood and internalised by viewers, but leaves the reader confused as to whether the main impetus for ruler cult lay with the ruler or the ruled. As with ruler portraits which were commissioned by kings, subjects and allies alike there is clear evidence that whilst some aspects of ruler cult, particularly reverence for deceased royal ancestors, could be centrally orchestrated, others were acts of reverence, sometimes spontaneous and sometimes calculated, for those who seemed to be gods among men[168]. It has already been noted that it is difficult to distinguish between artworks commissioned at the centre and at the periphery if their archaeological context is unknown, but artworks used in private/domestic acts of worship, have often been identified on the basis of their modest scale and comparatively poor workmanship[169]. In Thompson's discussion of ***Oinochoai***, she interpreted the evidence as suggesting that the more accomplished faience portraits of Ptolemaic queens and kings may have been centrally commissioned for distribution as gifts, with 'degenerate' versions perhaps representing the aspirational purchases of those who wished to involve themselves in the rituals of ruler cult in the manner approved by their 'superiors'[170].

The reception of Hellenistic visual communications about rulers and rulership is now easiest to gauge when the audience rejected them with such violence that representations were defaced or destroyed; whilst the overturning of ruler portraits was probably orchestrated by a new source of authority on several of the known occasions, it is likely that on other occasions the image of the ruler as a beneficent force was understood, and felt to be too far removed from the perceived reality to be allowed to stand[171]. Apathy and

acquiescence were less 'newsworthy' and our sources are much less likely to note such responses. Incomprehension of artworks is occasionally suggested, as when Polybius appears to have interpreted the apparently ubiquitous Ptolemaic images of a standing royal woman with cornucopia (see below) as portraits of Ptolemy Philadelphus' cup-bearer Kleino, holding a rhyton to demonstrate her calling[172]. Athenaeus, our source for this seeming error, appears to have been quoting a chapter of Polybius dealing with instances of Ptolemies elevating disreputable women to positions of status at court, and a deliberate misidentification of the portraits, for the sake of his argument, is not unlikely; such a misreading, however, cannot but undermine confidence in the effectiveness of artworks for communicating ideas about rulers and rulership since it illustrates the failure of familiar symbols and clear inscriptions to control the perception of a viewer[173]. One is reminded of the oral captions, circulated amongst British expatriates, for the portraits of Saddam Hussein ('Keith gets his new teeth', 'Keith wins the Derby', 'Keith goes to Buckingham Palace for his K')[174].

ii) Typology of artworks

Ruler portraits

Whilst, as Smith pointed out, it is too simplistic to distinguish between the terms '***agalma***' (cult-statue) and '***eikon***' (portrait likeness) on material grounds alone, one may yet discern a difference between chryselephantine and marble statues on the one hand, and the conventional bronzes of honorific dedications on the other, even if the distinctions between representations of the ruler as a human and as a kind of god were blurred by the use of gold and silver on some bronzes[175]. Role portraits (see above) do not conform to any ideal of verisimilitude and ought not perhaps to be termed '***eikones***' but rather '***andriantes***' (figures)[176]. The extent to which portrait genres (nude, armoured, standing, equestrian, etc) could be used for both cult and non-cult representations is unclear, but it is not unlikely that the locational and epigraphic contexts of sculptured ruler portraits, and in

many cases also material differences, were sufficient to demark them[177]. Thus Stewart accepts the evidence of Nikolaos of Myra that the (apparently cult) statue of Alexander Founder of Alexandria was equestrian, and argues that the standing Alexander Aigiochos was the cult statue of the Ptolemaic dynastic cult centred on Alexander's tomb[178].

It should be remembered that the term '***eikon***' might describe a painted or even a textile portrait, although comparatively little physical evidence of their existence has survived[179]; in addition, of course, there were likenesses on coins, gems, cameos and seals[180]. The following discussion of royal portraiture is subdivided by artistic medium (sculpture, painting, etc) because a theoretically identical portrait type would have to be handled so differently across the different media that the resultant images would be far from identical; indeed some media seem to have been deemed particularly suitable for certain portrait genres (equestrian representations in sculpture, bust representations on coins, etc). Even different materials used within one medium could have altered the viewer's perception of otherwise 'identical' portrait types (whether a bronze sculpture was gilded or not, for example). Similarly, whilst the exercise of modern aesthetic judgements could be misleading, it should be remembered that the quality of representation would probably alter the viewer's perception of the artwork, and potentially also the viewer's perception of the ruler.

large scale sculpture

Before turning to the representational aspects of the different genres of portrait sculpture it is worth noting the importance of 'modal' elements, designed to engage the interest and attention of the viewer; examples such as scale (life size or over), or the gaze of the represented person (directed at the viewer or elsewhere, expressive or impassive) carry their own messages about the represented ruler (e.g. his superiority to, and difference from, the viewer)[181]. The relation of a sculptural portrait to its architectural context (in the

agora or gymnasium, in a temple or its precincts, in a royal palace or other residence) is also likely to have influenced the viewer's perception of it; one ought therefore to remember the lost monumental bases which literally elevated portraits above the viewer, and sometimes also above the gods and heroes commemorated in their vicinity (see below, and Figures 8 and 9)[182]. The separation of surviving sculpture from its archaeological context in so many cases is a hindrance to uncovering other devices used to direct the viewer's attention on sculptured portraits, although locating portraits in focal positions is not unlikely. Certainly when portrait statues formed part of sculptural groups, the postures and actions of other figures could make the ruler the focus of attention (by flanking and thus framing him, by crowning him, etc)[183]; similarly, if the defeated barbarians of some Pergamene groups (see below) originally had victorious kings to trample them underfoot then their gestures of subjection would have been directed at the conquerors rather than the viewers[184].

At the level of the 'work' the representational function of portrait statues appears most frequently to have dealt only with the portrayal of the ruler, rather than presenting a narrative or scene. Devoid of such a context it was not really possible for portrait statues to offer the viewer direct representations of the ruler's actions, or important events like the celebrations of births or marriages. In other words the 'figure' usually constituted the entire 'work' and the viewer's attention was thus fixed on the ruler as an individual. At the level of the 'figure' the viewer notices the stance and gesture of the represented ruler, his dress (or nudity), and his character (heroic, dynamic). These aspects of the statue contribute to the artist's representation of the socio-political ideas about the ruler and rulership that constitute the theme of the 'work'. The process of communicating these ideas is furthered if the viewer understands the significance of the 'members' from which the figure is constituted (e.g. physiognomical characteristics, accoutrements such as the diadem, or divine attributes such as the aegis), as these elements may refer not only to the ruler's

virtues, legitimacy, and divine favour, but also to such past and future actions as the 'work' as a whole cannot represent.

The standard types of Hellenistic ruler portrait either present him as a standing or a riding figure. With the exception of the representations of Antiochus I of Commagene at Nemrud Dagh (see below), the sitting figure, indicative of contemplation or rest, appears not to have been considered suitable for earthly rulers despite the fact that Zeus enthroned was an established artistic convention for majestic sovereign authority[185]. As has been noted above an active lifestyle was important to Greek ideas of rulership, very much in contrast to the pampered and palace-bound oriental despot of contemporary stereotypes. The equestrian stance appears to have been less commonly used than the standing pose and no doubt this was partly attributable to the expense of rendering the horse[186]. The elevation of the rider placed the viewer in an inferior position but this benefit was achieved at the cost of making it more difficult for the viewer to see the 'members' comprising the 'figure' of the ruler himself. In group sculptures where the rider was an agent of victory over his cowering foes it was clear that the ruler was represented as a military figure; when the rider statue alone constituted the composition similar ideas of battle-readiness, individual prowess and victory could be expressed through the rider's weapons and armour.

The nude equestrian statue is more puzzling although the image of the unclothed rider had been in currency within the Greek world since the archaic period (e.g. the 'Rampin' rider). It should be noted that nude riders with victory palms were used on some coins of Philip II, perhaps inspiring the later production of numismatic rider images (clad and apparently palm-less in most cases) which may represent the ruler himself, a portrait statue, or one of the Dioskuri (see below); uncertainty over the interpretation of this numismatic iconography illustrates the weakness of artworks which can only be read at the level of the 'figure'[187]. Recovering the gestures of Hellenistic equestrian ruler portraits is a challenge, but the evidence of Nikolaos of Myra suggests that, instead of grasping a weapon with

which to smite his enemy, the ruler's right hand might merely be raised; although Nikolaos states that this gesture on the Alexandrian statue of Alexander Ktistes suggested to him that ruler's readiness to grasp distant territories, it may have been intended to have 'modal' significance, subjecting the viewer to the ruler's perpetual greeting and benediction[188].

This gesture of the hand does not appear to have been used in those portrait sculptures using a standing pose, where it appears that outstretched hands usually grasped spears; the resulting composition thus depended (directly or indirectly) on the Alexander '***Doryphoros***' of Lysippos, an apparent celebration of his annexation of territory by right of the spear[189]. Smith suggests that the sceptre may sometimes have been substituted for the spear, but as a symbol of civic authority (see above) its usage would have been most appropriate in a portrait of the ruler in civilian dress, a genre of portraiture which does not seem to have been used for representing Hellenistic kings[190]. At the level of the 'figure', standing portraits (whether nude or armoured) tend to represent the rulers as active soldierly men, prepared for conflict, and confident in victories past and future; the impression of movement conveyed by the apparently conventional ***contrapposto*** arrangements of limbs, lends the rulers a dynamism that sets them apart from the contemplative standing portraits of Aeschines and Demosthenes[191].

In addition to the afore-mentioned spears, swords may have been common 'members', sheathed to indicate peace, or watchfully brandished[192]. The apparent absence of defensive weapons (shields, and helmets) even in cuirassed portraits is perhaps surprising although such equipment may have suggested a vulnerability inappropriate to divinely favoured rulers; in reality not every king followed the example of the younger Cyrus by fighting in battle without a helmet, and the bareheaded artistic convention may largely depend on the need to render the ruler's facial features as clearly as possible[193]. Certainly the presence of helmets on two of the herms from the Villa of the Papyri is in striking

contrast to the numerous bare heads now detached from full length portrait statues; in bust and herm portraits the 'figure' is comprised solely of a head and neck and the apparent social distance between the viewer and the ruler is reduced to the extent that the facial features are clearly visible, even if the portrait is helmeted[194].

The directing of the viewer's attention on the facial characteristics of the represented ruler, particularly marked in busts and herms, was common to many ruler portraits as the concept of 'likeness' depended principally on the accurate reproduction of facial physiognomy; because of the third dimension and the scale of composition, the apparent recreation of the presence of the ruler was particularly powerful in portrait statues and this was what frightened Kassander at Delphi[195]. Family traits have been traced in dynastic portrait series suggesting an interest in representing the ruler's legitimate succession, over and above his physical appearance[196]. Whilst the dependence on Alexander's visage for the representation of his Hellenistic successors can be exaggerated, the principle of a beardless appearance was usually maintained, affording the ruler the benefit of apparent youth and energy; although the leonine mane of Alexander portraits was not usually copied when representing early Hellenistic rulers, the late second century B.C. saw a revival of this physiognomical component in the portraits of Western Asian kingdoms[197]. A thoughtful expression with distant or upturned gaze can suggest Alexander and his ambition, but masks of blank serenity were, posthumously, considered fit for representing him (see below) and this unworried look can also be found on the portrait heads of Hellenistic rulers[198]. Whilst the presence of the diadem virtually guarantees that the portrait represents a king, it is by no means clear that the absence of this regal symbol precludes a portrait from representing a reigning monarch; portraits of the king's non-royal ancestors and princes of the blood may certainly have been shown without the diadem, but particularly in the case of standing nudes with spears, the formulaic composition may have been sufficient to identify its subject. It certainly seems to have been possible for Hellenistic representations of Alexander to be displayed without diadems[199].

One final set of 'members' to consider are the divine attributes with which rulers were equipped in portrait statues. The admirable summary in Smith's Hellenistic Royal Portraits does not need to be repeated here, but it is worth pointing out that sculptural evidence for the use of such attributes is currently restricted to six sets of horns (Papyri Demetrius, Lateran Diadoch, Busti Diadoch, Naples horned ruler, Delos horned Ruler, Antakya Seleukos), three animal skin helmets (Louvre Mithridates, British Museum statuette of Ptolemy II, New York 'Demetrios' statuette), one winged diadem (Bonn Ptolemy statuette), one aegis (Cairo late Ptolemy - 'Antony'), and one club of Hercules (British Museum statuette of Ptolemy II)[200]. In no case can we be certain that the portrait (or its original) dates from the lifetime of the represented ruler, and in at least one case it is clear that it did not (see below)[201]. Given that in ten of these twelve instances the attributes were displayed on the head of the portrait, and since portrait heads comprise the vast majority of Smith's catalogue, one may only suppose that the use of divine attributes in large scale sculpture was comparatively uncommon; supposed instances of assimilation are considered below. Despite the paucity of evidence it is possible to suggest two regional variations in the use of attributes; horns were clearly associated primarily with Antigonids (both bull and goat horns) and Seleucids (bull horns)[202] whilst the aegis may have had the greatest significance in Ptolemaic Egypt given its connection with Alexander [203].

Textual evidence exists for the grouping of a portrait statue with statues of gods (including personifications)[204], the ruler's ancestors (see below)[205], or his foes[206]. Unfortunately with respect to the last two categories, no such groups have survived for consideration; the surviving physical evidence for Pergamene battle scenes consists almost entirely of defeated persons, and as such is discussed further below. Two monumental sculptural groups of Antiochus I of Commagene and four deities have survived at Nemrud Dagh; their exceptional seated posture has already been noted. Scenes of greeting between rulers/ancestors and deities were represented in large relief panels from the same kingdom but these appear to constitute a very localised artistic tradition; it is noteworthy that in

more than one instance the rulers appear taller than the gods represented with them, a visual effect enhanced by their tall tiaras[207]. Similar scenes occur in the relief representations of Egypt, but the traditional Egyptian forms, even as adapted under the Ptolemies, gained no real currency elsewhere. Consequently, Egyptian elements in those visual arts used to represent Hellenistic rulers and rulership are not discussed here[208], except for the Ptolemaic wrestler groups discussed below, where the ruler re-enacts the struggle between Horus and Seth in familiarly Greek visual language[209].

painting

No painted originals of royal portraits have survived for consideration. However, textual evidence confirms the existence of several formats for painted portrait (representations of the ruler in 'narrative' scenes, and full length figures, busts and profiles of the monarch alone)[210]. The better documented evidence for Alexander's lifetime suggests that painted portraits may most often have been centrally commissioned for public display in temples and public buildings; the expense of manufacturing a painting was usually so much less than that of fabricating a sculpture, that the former medium appears seldom to have been used honorifically[211]. Herakleitos of Athmonon's dedication of paintings showing the battles of Antigonos Gonatas expressed his loyalty to his king in the same way as the near contemporary pillar monument to Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II at Olympia dedicated by Kallikrates of Samos (see Figure 8). Despite this element of self-advertisement the paintings enhanced the king's reputation by associating him with the expulsion of the Gauls and the salvation of the Greeks in the Athenian imagination, at the expense of Athenian figures like Kallippos[212]. Although it should be remembered that the sculptural representation of a battle scene was prohibitively expensive, Herakleitos' choice of medium may have been made because it rendered Antigonus the successor to the defenders of Athens represented in the Stoa Poikile (Theseus, Kallimachos and Miltiades amongst them)[213].

It has been suggested that the two-dimensionality of a painted ruler portrait, distanced the viewer from the ruler, giving artists the freedom to move beyond the representation of the actual, blurring distinctions between human and divine figures to a greater extent than was customary in large scale sculpture. Without more evidence it is difficult to assess this hypothesis, but it is notable that of the seven painted portraits of Alexander listed by Pliny, four showed him in the presence of gods (including personifications) and a fifth was the celebrated Alexander Keraunophoros; in the uncommissioned painting of Alexander's wedding to Roxane imaginatively described by Lucian this interest in the supernatural is subverted since the playful activities of the 'erotes' drew the viewer's eye away from Alexander and Roxane[214].

At Boscoreale the Roman copy of an early Hellenistic royal wedding painting set 'portraits' amongst generic characters (philosopher, and prognosticating priestess), and personifications (Macedonia, Asia); although apparent architectural features separate the figures according to the fashion of the 'Second Pompeian Style', unity of composition appears certain[215]. Contrary to the conventions of sculpture the ruler was not only represented as an enthroned 'figure' but with his hands resting on a sceptre. Although the panel has suffered considerable damage it is clear that the ruler was represented as a heroic beardless nude; in contrast to the Alexander and Roxane painting from the 'Insula Occidentalis' at Pompeii, and despite the disadvantage of his seated and weaponless pose, this ruler is very far from being unmanned by his respectable matronly wife whose pregnancy is 'announced' in the adjacent panel[216]. The predicted male heir of this '***katoptromaneia***' scene is represented as a standing nude with the royal fillet; a future in which this Macedonian prince ought to be master of Asia may be suggested by the allegory of spear-won land[217].

coin obverses

In an obverse composition perhaps inspired by the Ephesus portrait of Alexander '***Keraunophoros*** ' one issue of coins from Babylonia showed Nike flying in to crown a cuirassed, helmeted man, his sword sheathed at his side, his left arm grasping a spear and his right arm holding out a thunderbolt. The reverse composition abbreviated Alexander's battle with the Indian king Poros to show three mounted figures, two atop an elephant and the third in apparent pursuit on a rearing horse[218]. Despite the limits of the medium this Babylonian issue thus demonstrated that an 'episode' could be portrayed with reasonable clarity; although these ruler portraits may not have been well known elsewhere, they do not appear to have been considered a useful model for numismatic royal portraits in the Hellenistic period.

The next known portraits of a living ruler, those of Ptolemy I Soter, refer to the apparent portraits of Alexander that in Egypt had been substituted for the Heracles obverses of Alexander's own coinage in the years after his death; these posthumous portraits accord Alexander a variety of divine attributes. Ptolemy's Alexanders from before the deposition of the Demanhur hoard showed him wearing an elephant scalp and the ram's horns associated with Zeus-Ammon whilst later issues additionally showed the '***mitra***' of Dionysos and the aegis of Zeus (or Athena?)[219]. In the portraits of Ptolemy, only this last element was retained, suggesting that the other attributes referred only to Alexander; a distinction was thus created between the divinised Alexander and his successor. Perhaps a supposed inter-relationship was being illustrated between Athena, Ptolemy and the founder of Alexandria, just at the time when Seleucid coins appear to have appropriated Athena as patroness of the victory at Ipsus; Athena's vengeance for the Persian sack of her sanctuary had been executed by her protégé Alexander, but now Athena was joining with him in the patronage of Alexandria and the Ptolemaic possessions[220]. Seleukos may not have issued his Alexander coinage by the time Ptolemy's portrait appeared on the coinage and

Lysimachus definitely had not issued his; their contributions to the posthumous portraiture of Alexander introduced a bull horn helmet and panther skin, and more prominent ram's horns respectively, but again these elements were particular to Alexander[221].

After Ptolemy I, coin portraits of rulers other than Alexander frequently avoid divine attributes altogether. The most common Seleucid exception is the use of rays on the coin portraits of Antiochus IV, VI, VIII, XI and XII, Seleucus VI and Philip, a representational 'member' associated with some Hellenistic sculptures of Alexander (see below)[222]. Its first appearance in a numismatic representation, however, appears to have been around 220 B.C. in a posthumous portrait of Ptolemy III; here the rays emanate from the fillet and should be read in the context both of two other attributes (the aegis and Poseidon's trident) and of the obverse depiction of a cornucopia surmounted by rays[223]. When Ptolemy V was depicted with a radiate crown in his lifetime, the other divinising elements were replaced by an ordinary chlamys and spear; the attribute thus appears to have become as acceptable in representations of a living ruler as the aegis, which this king wears on the Berry tetradrachm[224]. Ptolemy VIII was rendered with both rays and an aegis on an Alexandrian didrachm of 138/137 B.C.[225].

The horned helmet of the Alexander portrait issued under Seleucus I appears to have been an influence on whoever designed coin-types for Eucratides I of Bactria; these coins may in turn have inspired the obverses of Amyntas, although the reverse's proclamation of his epithet (Nikator) may suggest familiarity with the originals[226]. In the intervening years between these Eastern issues Heliocles of Bactria was depicted with the aegis; in this extraordinary design not only does the ruler face left (in contrast to the overwhelming majority of numismatic portraits), but his back is turned towards the viewer (his right hand can be glimpsed behind his neck, thrusting a spear)[227]. One other Eastern issue deserves a mention; Demetrius I of Bactria appears to have been represented wearing the elephant

scalp, an attribute otherwise only associated with Alexander on coin reverses[228]. The British Museum statuette of Ptolemy II and the New York 'Demetrios' probably predate the coins but the appropriation of the attribute in this case was probably independent of Ptolemaic sculpture[229].

other media

Of the male portrait heads in faience recognised by Thompson none show evidence of divine attributes; by contrast, one of the plaster portraits from the Benaki Collection has holes in the hair and diadem for the attachment of rays, whilst two plaster heads from the Memphis hoard show the diadem in the position of the '*mitra*' worn by Alexander on Ptolemy I Soter's coins[230]. The Dionysian element in the Memphis portraits is unsurprising, and the subtlety of the attribute is matched in the Amsterdam terracotta apparently showing Ptolemy I with shoulder-length hair, worthy of a Dionysos, an Apollo or an Alexander[231]. These far from ostentatious deviations from the conventions of portraiture in the media already discussed may suggest that their metal originals were commissioned for a more sophisticated audience than the average viewers of public sculptures or coin obverses; the appliqué fulcrum bust in the Walters Art Gallery, which accords a Ptolemy the ivy wreath appropriate to a devotee or avatar of Dionysos, perhaps reflects this élite taste[232].

A garnet ring in the same gallery represents an ivy-wreathed Dionysos with apparent portrait features; the material used suggests a high status object intended to be viewed by an audience similar to that postulated for the subtly divinising representations discussed above[233]. Gem and cameo representations are comparatively rare and the textual evidence suggests that one reason for this was their limited circulation as tokens of friendship and loyalty; Smith suggests that more idealised, divinising representations could be used in court circles than in more publicly circulated media[234].

Smith argued that seal portraits were closely related to coin-types and indeed Thompson illustrates a seal closely resembling the coin portrait of Ptolemy VIII with rays and aegis[235]. Another seal from the same museum, however, has been argued to represent him in the elephant scalp, an image that does not appear to have been used for coins[236]. A remarkable seal representing one of the later Ptolemies accords him a unique attribute in the eagle scalp, an individualising symbol of uncertain significance[237].

With regard to the representational elements of the fabric portraits mentioned by Kallixeinos, Diodorus and Plutarch nothing can be said[238].

Alexander the Great and other heroic ancestors

Stewart accords a late third century date and Pergamene provenance to the original of the Tivoli Alexander (see Figure 3); even assuming that the original was drilled to receive a crown of rays it is difficult to imagine this hypothesised original influencing the Ptolemaic artists who first equipped one of their rulers with the attribute (see above), or vice versa, and the similarity in date may suggest the existence of earlier rayed portraits of Alexander, conqueror of the lands of the sunrise[239]. Probably the most famous rayed statue of the third century, however, was the Colossus of Rhodes, erected in commemoration of the failed siege undertaken by Demetrius Poliorketes[240]. This was toppled in the devastating earthquake of c.228 B.C. and, since unfavourable oracles prevented its restoration, one might speculate that foreigners viewed the event as signalling the end of Helios' patronage of the island[241]; at such a time the Attalids and Ptolemies may each have wished to claim that such patronage had been transferred to them through an Alexander-Helios, or Ptolemy-Helios respectively, defenders and benefactors of far flung lands and seas.

The use of almost certainly posthumous royal portraits in the representations of the gods has recently been postulated for two nude sculptures of Heracles in Italy and a third of

Hermes in Vienna; even if the faces are accepted as portraits of a Ptolemy the seated postures of all three, at variance with the conventions of ruler portrait sculpture, suggest that the viewer was primarily intended to understand the male 'figure' to be a god rather than a ruler[242]. To the Italian audience of the Heracles statues any portrait aspect to the facial 'member' was probably so secondary that the apparent assimilation went unnoticed. If there was a logic beyond mere self-aggrandisement or flattery in such sculptures, it may have been that Heracles or Hermes-Horus ought to have resembled the rulers who matched their achievements, because character was thought to be reflected in facial physiognomy and similar character traits generated similar achievements. An apparent case of blending also occurs in some of the posthumous Alexander coinages where the conventional heads of Heracles on the obverses sometimes seem to have become heads of Alexander in the guise of Heracles[243]. Here, as with the Ptolemaic Heracles, a family relationship may be being illustrated[244].

Outside Bactria and India, Heracles and his club emblem appear almost never to have been used for royal coin reverses which is perhaps surprising given the hero's martial character and his status as a supposed ancestor of the Antigonid and Ptolemaic dynasties[245]. On the coins of Euthydemus I, however, the seated hero has inverted his club to indicate peace, whilst the standing Heracles used on the reverse of Demetrius I crowns himself with a wreath held in his right hand; on a reverse from just a few years later the name of Euthydemus II is interrupted by the crown proferred in Heracles' right hand, perhaps suggesting that Heracles yielded precedence to the king[246]. Whilst the reverse type of Demetrius coincides with Bactrian ambitions of Alexandrine conquest, as the obverse portrait's elephant scalp appears to confirm, the earlier seated types are nearly identical to the reverses of the Spartan tyrant Nabis and one may suspect that these contemporary revivals of interest in Heracles (c.200 B.C.), in minor kingdoms almost at opposite ends of the Greek world, indicate a desire for legitimation[247].

The upstart kingdom of Pergamum presents a similar case, with the city's legendary connection with Telephus (supposedly the founder of the city), offering its rulers the chance to match the established dynasties' claims to descent from Heracles, Perseus or Apollo. Whilst this local hero was not chosen for representation on Attalid coins a sculptural narrative of his life was eventually represented in the Telephus frieze on the courtyard walls of the Great Altar; although Heracles appears twice (as the guest of Aleos, and the rescuer of his own infant son Telephus) it is the youthful adventures of Telephus in the Trojan War and its aftermath which comprise the bulk of the frieze, offering the viewer a model of active kingship[248]. However, just as the fall of the Macedonian monarchy could not be prevented by the supposed Antigonid descent from Heracles and Perseus (which had been numismatically emphasised during the wars with Rome), so descent from Telephus and Heracles failed to save the Attalid dynasty, which ended even before the Telephus frieze could be completed[249]. The stands of Seleucid and Achaemenid ancestors at Nemrud Dag represent a later attempt to legitimise a new dynasty, dependent on figures from the historical rather than the heroic past; the Esen Tepe Seleukos I and the Alexander-inspired portraits of Mithridates VI appear to reflect a similar belief that the dead could validate the authority of the living[250].

Gods around the king

The evidence for group sculptures depicting rulers in association with deities (including personifications) was outlined above, but no attention was paid at that point to the range of gods seen in association with the ruler. The early sculptural examples noted by Stewart appear to illustrate a new interest in representing territory; thus, Elis crowned Ptolemy I Soter and Demetrius Poliorcetes, Hellas crowned Antigonus Doson and Philip V, and Ge crowned Alexander[251]. Little sculptural evidence for such compositions exists beyond the third century, although the arrangement of the Nemrud Dag colossi seats Commagene between Zeus-Oromasdes and the king[252]. Whilst Ge and Tyche appeared separately in

the Alexandrian Tychaion some visual correspondence appears to have occurred between such personifications of territory, Hellenistic queens, Tyche and Eirene; thus, on the Archelaos Relief representing the apotheosis of Homer, Arsinoe III can be Oikoumene, and more generally attributes of fertility and prosperity might be held by all four figure types[253]. Although the queens appear normally to have stood, and the aforementioned figures of Elis, Hellas and Ge were probably also shown in a standing pose, other geographical personifications (Macedonia and Asia, Arcadia, Aetolia, Antioch on the Orontes) were seated; the painted Macedonia and Asia from Boscoreale are the only known examples of such personifications to wear a clearly differentiated 'national' costume, in the manner more familiar from the personified provinces of Roman art (see chapters 3 and 4 below)[254].

The figure of Nike continued to be used in contexts other than the representation of rulers and rulership, and indeed the most famous example of a Hellenistic victory figure (the Nike from Samothrace) has now been identified as a Rhodian commission of the early second century B.C., commemorating Rhodian naval victories and thus, potentially, royal defeats. Here the winged figure stood on the prow of a stone ship which appeared, from her billowing drapery, to be in perpetual forward movement; at an international sanctuary site ornamented by monuments erected at the expense of various royal houses, this would have been a bold gesture of confidence in Rhodian naval power, particularly as a similar 'episode' had been portrayed on the coins of Demetrius Poliorcetes (besieger of Rhodes, and thus her hated enemy) a century or so previously[255].

Whilst Apelles had painted Alexander in a chariot with Nike and the Dioscuri (see below), four trophy-bearing Nikai had surmounted his funeral carriage, and two Nikai had flanked Tyche in the group sculpture from the Alexandrian Tychaion, the most lasting royal images of winged victory figures have proved to be numismatic[256]. The 'episode' of Nike crowning an armed Alexander on a Babylonian issue was noted above, and her earliest

reappearance with a portrait was as reverse devices to Seleukos' obverse portraits of Alexander wearing the elephant scalp or panther-skin helmet. The latter type, resembling a reverse type of Agathocles of Syracuse, shows Nike crowning a trophy (see below) between legends proclaiming the coin, and perhaps also the victory, to be 'of King Seleukos'. The former type show a Nike closely related to those introduced on the coins of Alexander's lifetime with the head of Athena as the obverse device; here, however, Nike stretches out her hand over the Seleucid emblem of a horned horse's head[257].

Stewart relates the Athena/Nike coins of Alexander's lifetime to the Macedonian's role as head of the Corinthian League's campaign of vengeance against the Persians, and suggests that the ship's mast held by Nike refers to the Persian defeat at Salamis; although this coin type was issued under Philip III it was not much used under the Successors[258]. In Cyrenaica one early issue appears to have replaced the head of Athena on the obverse with that of Ptolemy, but the experiment of matching the obverse portrait of a living ruler with the reverse figure of Alexander's Nike of Salamis was not repeated; a new device appears to have been required to illustrate the relationship between Nike, the living king and the continuation of Alexander's mission[259]. Ptolemaic coins eschewed the representation of Nike altogether, and replaced the device of Athena Promachos used in the early portrait coins of Alexander with the dynastic emblem of Zeus' eagle and thunderbolt which had been shown at her feet[260]. One Seleucid solution appears to have been to represent Nike alighting on the hand of Zeus enthroned, in place of the eagle used on the Heracles issues of Alexander, Philip III and the earlier issues of Seleukos; after the death of Seleukos this reverse type was revived only in the second century B.C. for portrait coins of Antiochus IV, after which it appears quite regularly (Antiochus V, Alexander I, Demetrius II, Alexander II, Antiochus VIII, Antiochus IX, Seleukos VI, Antiochus X, Antochus XI, Philip, and Demetrius III)[261].

Other representations of Nike had appeared on Seleucid coins in association with usurpers. She crowns the name of Molon in the manner now most familiar from the Flamininus ***stater***, whilst on the coins of Timarchus she was shown in a quadriga (as on the coins of Syracuse from the 280s B.C. onwards), and standing with wreath and palm, a composition later borrowed for the coins of legitimate Seleucid rulers[262]. Elsewhere, under Lysimachus, the Heracles/Zeus coins of Alexander had been adapted to show Alexander on the obverse (see above) and a seated Athena Nikephoros on the reverse; the Nike on Athena's hand appears to have been the first to crown a king's name[263]. Coins issued for Antiochus I under Philetairos of Pergamon show the seated Athena without Nike, and under Attalus I this seated Athena raises her right hand to crown the name Philetairos[264]. The obverse composition of a Nike and a ship's prow on some coins of Demetrius Poliorcetes has already been noted, but the type was never directly revived even for his Antigonid descendants; one reverse type links the design to an Athena Promachos but Poseidon appears to have been more common[265]. An adaptation of Alexander's Athena/Nike coins was issued under Mithridates II of Pontus with Nike crowning the name of the king, a job done by Zeus himself on portrait tetradrachms of Bithynian kings from Prusias I onwards[266].

Outside Greek India, Athena Promachos appears to have seen few outings as a numismatic device of royal coins after the above noted example issued under Demetrius Poliorcetes, although she may have stood atop the naval monument from Cyrene; it should also be remembered that the Pergamon acropolis was dominated by the temple precincts of Athena which were ornamented with representations of abandoned weaponry and the location for the sculptural groups representing royal victories (see below). Athena's appearance on an issue of the Seleucid usurper Achaeus from the Sardis mint, however, resembles that on near contemporary issues of Antigonus Gonatas and Philip V[267]. Zeus hurling the thunderbolt appears to have been used only on the coins of the Bactrian Diodotus during the reign of Antiochus II[268]. The Dioscuri who, as noted above, accompanied Alexander

and Nike in Apelles' painting, were represented on the reverse of Antiochus VI's radiate portrait coins[269].

The deity most commonly represented on early Seleucid coins was Apollo, the supposed father of the dynasty's founder Seleukos I Nikator. Usually the god sits on the Omphalos holding an arrow in one hand and touching the top of a bow with the other; despite the figure's apparent repose this device may suggest Apollo's preparation for conflict[270].

Representations of conflict

Although royal battle paintings and battle reliefs are known to have existed, no direct representations of contemporary conflict appear to have survived apart from the fragmentary Gallic battle frieze from Ephesus, and the reliefs on the monument of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi; in the former case so little is known of the frieze's context that a royal connection can only be regarded as probable, whilst in the latter it is not clear to what extent the represented combat reflects the monument's appropriation by the Roman general[271]. A number of sculptures of defeated and dying Gauls have been associated with the group sculptures representing the battles of Attalus I and Eumenes II noted above. Here, as Pollitt observed, conflict is not treated as a past phenomenon already resolved in the king's favour, but as an ongoing struggle; whilst, given the number of enemy dead and the desperation of the living, a royal victory probably seemed inevitable to the viewers of these groups, the opposition has to seem formidable in order to glorify the rulers who defeat them[272].

Ridgway is probably right in suggesting that many of the surviving Roman 'copies' may not in fact be particularly faithful renderings, but it seems clear that the Gauls at least were clearly represented as a barbarian 'other', in dress, adornment and behaviour; this differentiation elevated the struggle against them to the epic level of Greek civilisation

facing down barbarism[273]. Inscriptional evidence from the Pergamene acropolis suggests that at least one sculptural group there represented the conflict with a Seleucid ruler (Antiochus Hierax, and perhaps also Seleucus III) but it is not clear whether the enemies were so differentiated in this case; if the Terme Persian reflects the appearance of the Seleucid soldiers represented in these groups then that dynasty may have been represented as 'philopersian'[274].

Indirect, allusive representations of such conflict continued to be produced based on the great combats of myth (e.g. Greeks/Amazons, gods/giants, see below) but, as has already been noted, a novel sculptural allegory was created in Ptolemaic Egypt; in a wrestling bout Hermes-Horus (the living king) was pitted against Seth and the forces of chaos[275]. Whilst the Gigantomachy metopes of the temple of Athena at Ilion may be associated with Lysimachus, and his claims to the patronage of Athena, the best known treatments of this mythical conflict, however, are all associated with the Attalid regime. The rendering of Attalid campaigns as fights for Greek civilisation, equivalent to the battles of the heroic and mythical past has already been noted, and was most apparent in the dedications on the Athenian acropolis which represented the contemporary struggle alongside the combats of the gods against the giants, the Athenians against the Amazons, and the Athenians against the Persians (at Marathon)[276]. At Pergamon itself, in the reign of Eumenes II a vast Gigantomachy frieze was used as the exterior ornamentation of the Great Altar; in the representation the bestial adversaries of divine order have not yet been subdued just as the king's foes continued to struggle against him in the afore-mentioned group sculptures. The composition is too large to be seen in one glance, and the 'figures' appear to have been arranged in themed groups (Leto between her children Artemis and Apollo for example)[277].

The most striking group, however, is depicted on the Northern half of the Eastern side, facing the entrance to the Altar terrace; framed by the on-rush of two chariots (that to the

North bearing Ares himself, and that to the South bearing Hera), Heracles once fought alongside his father Zeus, whose thunderbolt-throwing posture can still be seen to mirror that of Athena (the city's patron goddess, shown further to the North)[278]. Her apparently effortless subjugation of a giant presages the universal victory of the gods over the sons of earth, as shown by a Nike who hovers to crown her. The ancient viewer could not help but associate this grouping with the topography of the city, as the temple precincts of Athena Polias Nikephoros were visible on the acropolis, to the North of the Altar terrace.

An earlier response to Attalid victories had been the ornamentation of these very precincts with a monumental entrance and stoas ornamented with panels representing the spoils of battle (see Figures 10 and 11); as Callaghan notes this amounted to the conversion of the temple into a giant trophy. Traditionally such monuments had consisted of actual weapons gathered from the battlefield, but stone versions, such as are more familiar from Roman art, appear to have been used in the Hellenistic period (see Figure 15)[279]. In a non-royal context the white marble trophy of Miltiades at Marathon, and the trophies included with the Persian prisoners and victorious Athenian generals in the monument to Miltiades and Themistocles identified by Richter, may be among the earliest durable trophies if these memorials really are to be considered part of the citizens' response to the Eastern successes of the Macedonian Ares[280]. The Pergamene '***congeries armorum***' reliefs merely represent a further stage of abstraction, but provide an important link with the triumphal monuments of imperial Rome (arch of Tiberius at Orange, base of Trajan's column, etc).

<u>Other architectural monuments</u>

The sculptures associated with the Attalid monument complex at Delphi cannot be identified but remains have been excavated of a large statue base and a sizeable Stoa designed for the display of paintings (also lost) and probably also the viewing of the sculptures[281]. Smith notes that, once the Gauls of Asia had ceased to be a problem, there

was no interest in representing struggle, and suggests that in consequence Attalid self-commemoration abroad was conducted through stoas; since these buildings appear to have been increasingly conceived as civic facilities rather than dedications to the gods, it may be that the dedicators came to be viewed as civilian figures rather than military leaders offering thanks for their victories[282].

The idea of elevating the ruler portrait above the viewer and other statues has already been noted; at Delphi within a few metres of each other stood two pillar monuments of Eumenes II, one each of Attalus I and Prusias II (see Figure 9), and that designed for Perseus but actually used to commemorate the Roman conqueror Aemilius Paullus[283]. These pillar monuments can all be dated to the first half of the second century B.C., but at least one monument of the Roman Republican period appears to have been inspired by them (see below chapter 3, section **c** ii).

e) Summary

The ultimate division of Alexander's "spear-won" land into the Hellenistic kingdoms was by no means a foregone conclusion in 323 B.C.

Whilst family ties with the Argead dynasty were sought by some of the Successors, the primary claim to kingship was conquest.

Kings could be thought to be subject to the laws, lawgivers, even-handed and merciful judges, or even animate law.

Ideals of equality were difficult to reconcile with a king's superior wealth, but city-state dynasts could consider the redistribution of their own property, and the abandonment of the trappings of rank.

The mixed constitution became a philosophical ideal, in preference to the monarchical rule of the wise man.

Some thinkers, far from endorsing egalitarian ideals, urged kings to adopt a majestic, divinely awesome, appearance.

The Hellenistic king was not supposed to rule as he pleased, but in accordance with ideas about rulership already in the public domain.

Kings who did not apply themselves to the duties of public service risked conspiracies and insurrections.

The inhabitants of royal capitals could have an active role in the elevation and deposition of kings.

Whilst royal descent might qualify men for rulership, experience showed that an 'upstart' like Attalus could seem more of a 'true king' than the 'pedigree' Antigonid, Philip V.

A king's military success could seem a form of euergetism towards the ruler's existing subjects, which served to restore the cosmic harmony of the world by eliminating opposition.

A royal victory could confirm that the gods had approved the ruler's succession. Defeat in battle could prompt insurrections. A young, militarily inexperienced, king could be held in contempt by his subjects, and successful subordinate generals could represent a threat to his reign.

The economic benefits of successful warfare could fund royal euergetism. Roman objections to royal conquests decreased the profitability of royal wars, and Later Hellenistic kings are often characterised as avaricious (confiscators of property, and plunderers of temples and tombs).

Given the threats of Roman interference, the Alexandrine model of kingship became less practical, and Later Hellenistic kings are often characterised as effeminate and indolent, even if there was a revival of interest in Alexander as a royal name, and leonine hairstyles.

Hellenistic royal portrait sculptures appear mostly to have dealt only with the portrayal of the ruler, rather than representing a narrative or scene.

Standing and equestrian portraits appear to have represented rulers as active, soldierly men, prepared for conflict, and confident in victories past and future. Defensive weapons (shields and helmets) are normally absent although, in reality, some rulers used them in battle.

Only a small minority of portrait sculptures appear to have accorded rulers divine attributes, and many of these could have been commissioned after the deaths of the represented kings.

Painted portraits could portray the ruler as part of a narrative or scene (e.g. a battle).

At Boscoreale, the Roman copy of the 'royal wedding' room-painting, presents the apparent portraits amongst generic characters and personifications. Contrary to the apparent conventions of sculpture, the ruler was represented with a sceptre, and seated.

Whilst it was possible to render an 'episode' on coins with reasonable clarity, most representations of kings appear to have been mere portrayals (often busts).

The first coin portraits to have included representations of rays appear to have been posthumous, but by 138/137 B.C. it had become acceptable for a living ruler to be shown with both rays and an aegis.

Male royal portraits in faience appear to have had no divine attributes. The metal originals of some plaster and terracotta portraits may have been commissioned for a more sophisticated audience than the average viewers of public sculptures or coin obverses.

Ptolemaic coins eschewed the representation of Nike, and replaced the device of Athena Promachos with the dynastic emblem of Zeus' eagle and thunderbolt. Some Seleucid coins showed Nike alighting on the hand of Zeus enthroned. Coins of Lysimachus showed an enthroned Athena, and the Nike in her hand appears to have been the first to crown the name of the king. Athena and Zeus could also perform this function.

The struggle of (royal Greek) civilisation against barbarians (principally the Gauls) was represented both directly, and indirectly (e.g. Gigantomachies).

Durable trophies, and weapons reliefs had begun to be used to represent royal victories.

3) Greek images of monarchy and the Roman Republic

a) 'Imperialism' and 'Hellenism' in the mid and late Republic

i) initial points of contact; warfare and diplomacy in the third century B.C.

There is some doubt as to the date of Rome's first contact with a Greek king. Although some of Arrian's sources associated Alexander's supposed plans for Western conquest with a desire to check Rome's growing influence in Italy and Sicily, and others recorded an embassy to Alexander from Rome, Arrian chose to distance himself from both these stories[1]. Bosworth sees the origin of the first story as late, but describes the embassy as "certain" despite Livy's assertion that Rome had never heard of Alexander at that time[2]. The sources for the embassy story were Aristus and Asclepiades, but dating their writings is not easy, particularly as Arrian's appears to have been the only mention of this Asclepiades; Strabo mentions Aristus of Cypriot Salamis in connection with the tomb of Cyrus, noting that he was writing much later than Aristobulus and Onesicritus[3]. This statement led Pearson to propose a date after 150 B.C., whilst Tarn had earlier suggested "the age of Pompey and Caesar"; this divergence appears to reflect their different estimates of the earliest dates for Cypriot fears of Roman military success[4].

Although Rome had numerous wars and victories of their own to commemorate around 300 B.C., Weinstock suggested that the construction at Rome of temples associated with war and victory at this date was dependent on an awareness of Alexander and his achievements. Quoting Ennius' rendering of Pyrrhus' epigram at Tarentum, which falsely asserted that the Romans had previously been undefeated, he suggests that the Latin term '***invictus***' had already emerged as a riposte to claims that Alexander was '***aniketos***'; Plutarch, however, explicitly states that Rome's invincible reputation stemmed from her success in opposing Pyrrhus[5]. If the achievements of Alexander were already known, the arrival of Pyrrhus can only have served to heighten Roman fears about the military power

of Greek kings. If not, Rome's acquaintance with Pyrrhus was likely to have shaped perceptions of Alexander; Pyrrhus, after all, had chosen the name for one of his children and was himself regarded as a second Alexander in appearance and invincible military leadership, and perhaps also from his ambition to liberate Greek cities from barbarians (Roman or Carthaginian)[6].

Plutarch's Pyrrhus wished to establish a Western empire in Italy, Sicily and North Africa, as a springboard to the recovery of Macedonia, and it is suggested that the biggest threat to the fulfilment of this ambition was the military power of Rome; if this one city-state could be beaten, then no other city, Greek or barbarian, could halt his progress[7]. If the Pyrrhic victories of his Italian campaigns suggest anything about Pyrrhus' knowledge of Rome, however, it is that he had under-estimated the city's military power. Greek interest in the origins of Rome (Hieronymus of Cardia and Timaeus of Tauromenium) appears to postdate the Pyrrhic wars, suggesting that the failure of Pyrrhus' enterprise was a surprise demanding historical explanation[8]. Ptolemy II probably sent an embassy to, and more certainly received an embassy from, Rome within a year of the expulsion of Pyrrhus from the Greek West, perhaps explaining the mention of a Roman embassy to Alexander in Cleitarchus' account. The potential threat of the renewed alliance between an invincible Rome and Carthage, which may have prompted this diplomacy, was to dematerialise with the onset of the first Punic War, during the course of which (according to Appian) Ptolemy offered to arbitrate between the two Western powers[9].

The tyrant-kings of Sicily may seem minor when compared to the Macedonian dynasts but the behaviour of the latter probably inspired Hiero (II) to accept the acclamations of kingship that followed his victory over the Mamertines, just as Agathocles had earlier adopted the title king in response to the acclamations of the Successors; Alexander himself provided a model for Agathocles' North African campaign, as Stewart has shown[10]. Both Pyrrhus and Demetrius Poliorcetes had been married to Agathocles' daughter Lanassa at

different times, and a marriage between Pyrrhus' daughter Nereis and a son of Hiero had probably been contracted during the Epirot king's campaigns in Sicily. Diodorus also records an earlier treaty of friendship between Agathocles and Demetrius, negotiated by the former's proposed heir[11]. Hiero II, who probably visited the city of Rome in 237 B.C. was doubtless the Greek king best known to the Romans in the period between the expulsion of Pyrrhus and the 'First Macedonian War'; the probable impression he made on the citizens is discussed below (in section **II** e). An opportunistic alliance between Hiero and Rome in 263 B.C. had secured his kingdom and rendered him '***epiphanestatos***' in Polybius' eyes; fifteen years later the friendship was declared permanent, and indeed good relations between king and city appear to have been maintained down to his death in 215 B.C.[12]. It is possible that Seleucus II was offered "***amicitia***" and "***societas***" with Rome in the 230s B.C.; Eutropius' mention of envoys being sent to Ptolemy III at around this time has not generally been believed, because of its alleged offer of military assistance against Antiochus, but the despatch of an embassy at this point would not be surprising given Rome's previous diplomacy with Ptolemy II in the wake of Pyrrhus' defeat[13].

The Romans are said to have feared that the succession at Syracuse of a youthful king might cause other changes and indeed, when Hiero died, his teenaged grandson Hieronymus immediately abandoned the longstanding alliance with Rome in favour of a treaty with Carthage; within months, however, a conspiracy brought the new king to his death and prompted the Syracusans to end dynastic rule, their last monarch's entire family suffering execution to mark the downfall of a tyrant[14]. The purge did nothing to alter the new Syracusan hostility towards Rome, until the generosity of Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who had captured the city in 212 B.C., won over the populace[15]. By this time Rome had sent her first generals across the Adriatic, intervening twice in Illyria before the defeat at Lake Trasimene in the Second Punic War. Demetrius of Pharos, who had been driven from Illyria in the second of these interventions, is said to have advised Philip V of Macedon that he should seize the opportunity presented by Rome's losses to launch an

invasion of Italy as the first step to world conquest; ambition for empire and the recognition of Rome as a king's chief adversary are familiar from our sources' treatment of Alexander and Pyrrhus, but now, for the first time, and despite the Carthaginian victories, the king had reason to hold the Romans' military capabilities in high regard[16].

Livy notes that Philip's ambassadors in Italy proposed friendship with both Rome and Carthage in 215 B.C., but his account suggests that this was not a genuine attempt at neutrality[17]. The following year a Roman expeditionary force liberated the Illyrian city of Apollonia from Philip's forces, which were attempting to establish in the region a bridgehead for the king's invasion of Italy (agreed with Hannibal the previous year); Livy suggests that the king himself fled, half-naked, from the Roman assault on his camp[18]. Still fearful of an invasion of Italy, the Romans contracted a treaty with the Aetolians in 210 B.C., who thereafter kept Philip occupied in mainland Greece; in the context of a corn shortage at Rome diplomatic contact was now resumed with Alexandria, and at around the same time friendships were established between Rome and Attalus I, and formalised between Rome and Syphax of the Maesulii[19]. Around 208 B.C. Ptolemy (IV) sent envoys to urge Philip to end his hostility towards the Aetolians. Philip's Bithynian ally, Prusias I, forced Attalus to withdraw from active participation in the conflict the following year, but in the meantime the Pergamene king had campaigned jointly with the Roman fleet of Publius Sulpicius Galba[20]. Despite the fact that the Carthaginians again attempted to persuade Philip to invade Italy or Sicily in 205 B.C. (following the capitulation of the Aetolians?), he did not even choose to blockade Apollonia, but preferred to retire to Macedonia; in due course a common peace was negotiated at Phoenice[21].

At the end of the Second Punic War the citizens of Rome were perhaps exposed to the sight of the traitorous king Syphax, paraded in the triumph of Scipio Africanus; Rome's true ally Masinissa had been restored to his ancestral throne in 203 B.C. on the authority of the senate, and his territories were now increased[22]. According to Livy, envoys were now

sent to Alexandria to announce the end of the war with Carthage, and to urge the boy-king and his ministers to maintain the policy of neutrality with regard to Rome's wars; there is a possibility that Ptolemy IV had placed his son under the guardianship of Rome but although, according to Livy, the prospect of war with Philip was made explicit in their negotiations, there appears to have been no offer to defend the boy king from the ambition of Antiochus III. On the accession of Ptolemy V, his ministers had sought a marriage alliance with Macedon and thought to delay the transmission of the news to Rome; since then, however, the Antigonid and Seleucid kings were rumoured to have come to an agreement to divide between them the Eastern Mediterranean, with Egypt and Cyprus intended for inclusion in Antiochus' empire, and Cyrene, the Cyclades and Ionia ceded to Philip[23].

In spite of Philip's current preoccupation with affairs East of the Adriatic, and although he had shown no great inclination or capacity for such a campaign during the recent war with Carthage, Livy asserts that the Roman senate feared that this second and more powerful 'Pyrrhus' would launch an invasion of Italy, and on that basis persuaded the people to sanction the resumption of hostilities[24]. It was certainly true that the king had, since the peace of Phoenice, enjoyed greater military success than any other non-allied king the Romans had yet encountered; there may even be some truth in Florus' remark that the Romans now felt themselves to be faced with Alexander himself, even if in 214 B.C. Philip may have seemed more like a Darius[25]. The prospect of wars against Macedonian kings would now offer young consuls like Publius Sulpicius Galba, Titus Quinctius Flamininus and Marcus Acilius Glabrio the chance of eclipsing even Scipio Africanus by becoming an "***occisor regum***" (slayer of kings); never able to prove their worth against the long departed Alexander, they would be disappointed by Philip and Antiochus (see below section **b** v)[26].

Around fifty years after the event he described, the Greek-writing Roman historian Gaius Acilius narrated a conversation, supposed to have been held at Ephesus in 192 B.C., between Hannibal and Scipio Africanus; Hannibal initially ranked Alexander as the greatest general, Pyrrhus as the next greatest, and himself as the third, but when challenged about Scipio's successes against him he confessed that, but for them, he would have classed himself as the greatest. Although Hannibal had not named Scipio as the greatest general in so many words this remark was interpreted as suggesting that the Roman could have defeated Alexander[27]. Whilst it is possible to consider the whole account a product of Acilius' mid-century imagination this would still be more than a century earlier than Livy's famous repudiation of the suggestion that Rome would have succumbed to the all-conquering Alexander[28]. It should be noted that Acilius' contemporary Polybius, acknowledging the unprecedented scale of Alexander's empire, claims that it excluded the majority of the "***oikoumene***", but asserts that Rome had, unprecedentedly, brought almost the entire "***oikoumene***" under her sway in just fifty-three years; his failure to note that Alexander's vast empire had been established in a mere thirteen-year reign appears deliberate[29].

Should Acilius' account be truth, rather than an entertaining fiction, Scipio's interest in Alexander could be dated to within a decade of his African triumph. We may doubt both the authenticity of Scipio's speech before the battle of Zama predicting Rome's Alexandrine leadership of, and sovereignty over, the "***oikoumene***", and Livy's ascription to Scipio's lifetime of the Alexandrine legend that his father was Capitoline Jupiter in the form of a snake, but someone may have noticed that the "***invictus***" victor of Zama, "***qui apud gentes solus praestat***", was the same age as the "***aniketos***" king had been when he died; certainly Livy points out that Titus Quinctius Flamininus was around thirty-three years of age at the Isthmian Games of 196 B.C., when he declared that Rome's peace with Philip meant freedom for the Greeks[30]. At the conclusion of the Second Punic War therefore, it is not impossible to imagine Greek comparisons of the invincible city and her

generals with Alexander. Criticism of Rome's slowness to overcome her adversary, particularly given Rome's pride in her "***Cunctator***", would fit with the defensive language of Polybius and Livy, and Plautus' representation of Therapontigonus Platagidorus as conquering a different nation every other day; the recent campaigns of Antiochus III in the far East of Alexander's empire were a timely reminder that Alexander had established an empire in the East to the ends of the earth in less time than it had taken Rome to subdue Carthage, and some had already suggested that death alone had prevented him from adding not only Carthage and Spain to this empire, but Italy and Rome[31].

ii) access to Greek art; gifts and honours, plunder and purchase

Following the Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene Hiero II sent to Rome as a gift a large gold statue of Nike; this was taken as an omen of Rome's eventual success and dedicated on the Capitol in the Temple of Jupiter[32]. As the Roman Victoria this goddess is first attested at Rome in the first decade of the third century; her appearance on Romano-Campanian coins in the 260s B.C. (RRC 22/1), which can be connected with the onset of the First Punic War, appears to reflect Sicilian practice, and her representation (in the act of crowning a trophy) on the Victoriati issued from 211 onwards (RRC 44/1, 53/1. 57/1 and 58/1) seems to be modelled on a reverse device of Agathocles probably to be connected with his African campaign[33]. Around the time that these Victoriati were issued Livy records a lightning strike on the Victory acroterium of the temple of Concord, perhaps confirming Roman fears of a Macedonian invasion in the period before Laevinus' negotiation of friendship with the Aetolians; coins showing the goddess crowning a ship's prow (RRC 61/4) may, ironically, have been inspired by issues of Demetrius Poliorcetes and are perhaps to be linked to Florus' claim that Laevinus' ships were adorned with spoils and laurel trees, each symbol asserting that Rome and not the Antigonids now had naval superiority[34]. As has already been noted coins appear to have been issued somewhere in Greece after the defeat of Philip, with reverses representing Nike crowning the name

T(itus) Quinctius (Flamininus) as if he were a Hellenistic king; Smith distinguishes the obverse portrait heads from royal portraits, suggesting that an attempt was made to represent Flamininus' foreignness (see below section **c** ii)[35]. Over fifty years later Diodotus Tryphon attempted to gain Roman recognition of his claim to the Seleucid throne by sending to Rome for dedication the gift of a statue of Nike/Victoria; the Romans accepted the gift but altered the inscription in memory of his murdered ward Antiochus VI[36].

Greek dedications at Rome of monuments honouring Roman benefactors are first attested in the 280s B.C., when Thurii commemorated Gaius Aelius and Gaius Fabricius Luscinus[37]. Greek honorific practice is again apparent in the case of the almost certainly posthumous portrait of Marcus Claudius Marcellus at the temple of Athena in Lindos, where he had dedicated some of the plundered artworks from his Sicilian campaigns (see below); the portrait of Marcellus from Tyndaris, mentioned by Cicero, may be much later[38]. As Wallace-Hadrill has clearly set out, the Greek honorific system was balanced by a system of dishonour that could include the destruction of images and, in 200 B.C., there were almost certainly Roman witnesses to the Athenian destruction of Antigonid portraits, on the brink of war with Philip V; since Antigonus Monophthalmos and Demetrius Poliorcetes had probably remained eponymous heroes down to this date, a need to replace them arose with the Athenian decree revoking the honours that had been made to Philip and his ancestors, and the arrival, at this time, of Attalus I of Pergamon appears to have prompted them to rename one tribe of citizens after him[39].

Following Flamininus' announcement of Greek freedom at the Isthmian games of 196 B.C. many communities vowed statues in his honour (see Figure 2) and at least one such appears to have been erected at Rome near the Circus Flaminius; whilst the contrast of the brave, wise and just Flamininus, saviour and champion of Greece, with Greek generals who had fought for the enslavement of fellow-Greeks is probably Plutarch's own, there is

no doubt that Flamininus' Greek contemporaries, in accordance with the word's contemporary usage with regard to military benefactors, acclaimed him as "***soter***"[40]. The use of Greek forms of visual representation for honouring Romans is clearly demonstrated by the statue on the Capitoline hill representing Lucius Scipio Asiagenus in the short military cloak (***chlamys***); probably to be dated to around 189 B.C., following the victory at Magnesia, the Greek items of dress noted by Cicero were not calculated to differentiate the Roman victor from the Eastern Greek king, although the nudity and beardlessness of most royal portrait statues were probably not followed here[41].

After the fall of Aristonicus, no major Roman campaigns in the Greek East were undertaken for many years, but the continuing diplomatic and trading contacts continued to generate honorific portrayals of Roman benefactors; it was statues such as these that were toppled in cities like Ephesus when they fell under the influence of Mithridates VI[42]. By the time of Verres' trial in 70 B.C., even nude types were considered suitable for representing Romans, almost everywhere but Rome itself; it was not merely provincial governors and major political figures who were now honoured as if they were Hellenistic kings, but also men of business, like the Campanian C. Ofelius Ferus[43]. Smith partly ascribed the use of unflattering 'veristic' heads on idealised kingly-athletic-heroic bodies, to the dislike of the Greek portraitists for their barbarian patrons; as Jackson and Gruen have pointed out, however, low-status artists who chose to represent their patrons as caricatured boorish foreigners risked their livelihoods, particularly as Romans became increasingly familiar with the conventions of Greek art through plunder and purchase (see below), and indeed Smith has more recently gone on to document the adoption of 'veristic' portraits by philo-Roman Greeks[44]. The Republican Romans' representations of themselves, their ancestors and their leaders are discussed below (in section **c** ii)

Booty had always been a reward for successful warfare and, as Gruen points out, religious art had since the early fourth century constituted an acceptable, if relatively minor, part of

such booty, with cult statues from conquered towns (Veii and Praeneste in the earliest examples) rededicated at Rome to demonstrate that the gods had abandoned Rome's foes and approved Rome's conquest[45]. The claim of Metrodorus of Skepsis that Volsinii was conquered (in 264 B.C.) for the sake of 2000 statues was clearly intended to suggest that the acquisition of art objects had been an early aim of Roman conquest even before the Punic Wars, but reflects the much later depradations of the cities of the Greek East for Roman art collections[46]. The connection between Roman 'luxury' and Greek art is such an established literary topos in our sources that evidence for the emergence of Roman interest in secular art is difficult to date. Whilst Plutarch asserts that Rome was ignorant of Greek art before the fall of Syracuse, for Florus Rome's first contact with a Greek king, had meant that, for the first time, the triumphal procession was not restricted to livestock, captured weaponry and prisoners but included "***signa***" and "***tabulae***"; Florus, Livy and Pliny connect the birth of Roman 'luxury' to the period of Rome's first interventions in Asia and the influx of decorative art (furniture items, gold vessels, etc), and Marcus Fulvius Nobilior's campaign against Ambracia in 189 B.C. may have been a turning point since Livy asserts that the city was stripped only of its artworks ("***signa aenea marmoreaque et tabulae pictae***")[47].

Dionysius of Halicarnassus reports that, in the 270s B.C., Publius Cornelius Rufinus was expelled from the senate for possessing silver goblets, and ambassadors to Ptolemy were so embarrassed by the gifts that had been bestowed on them that they voluntarily surrendered them to the treasury; it is difficult to imagine the former event happening a century later and, taken together with the apparent existence at this time of a consul with the cognomen Gurges (spendthrift), both of the reported events suggest that there may have been concern about the contamination of the Roman lifestyle by the goods of a foreign and 'inferior' culture even before the fall of Tarentum[48]. It has been noted that Greek honorific dedications were already standing in the city and Roman self-commemoration with artworks, rather than displays of spoils, had already begun (see below, section **c** ii).

Although the majority of textually attested artworks from third century Rome appear to have been intended for public and/or divine audiences, with domestic consumption monitored by the censors, this evidence should be balanced by a unique archaeological item from the end of the previous century; the Ficoroni cista, a high status domestic artefact manufactured by an Italian freedman at Rome (albeit for use in Praeneste), has figurative decoration suggesting that the artisan was familiar with Greek myth and Greek representations thereof[49].

Livy notes that in addition to the embossed silver vessels displayed by Manius Acilius Glabrio in his triumph of 190 B.C. were items of silver furniture that had belonged to Antiochus, doubtless confirming the Roman belief that luxurious furnishings were "***regius***"; when Livy notes the apparently unprecedented charge of misappropriating booty, Cato is said to have testified that gold and silver vessels from the captured camp had never been displayed in Glabrio's triumph, or submitted to the treasury, and the implication was that the general himself had either kept them for his own domestic use, or sold them for his private profit[50]. The prosecutors of Lucius Scipio Asiaticus/Asiagenus, in 187 B.C., alleged that he had accepted bribes from Antiochus and searched his house in an unsuccessful attempt to recover from his home property equal to the sum of the fine that had been imposed[51]. Attaching spoils to the front of a ***triumphator***'s house appears from Livy to have been as common a practice as the triumph itself, but it cannot be certain that statues from Ambracia would have adorned the housefront of Marcus Fulvius Nobilior; even if they did, however, they would seem likely to have constituted a public memorial, rather than private property[52].

The later tradition about Cato's rigour as censor in 184 B.C. seems to be rooted in Cato's own speeches; his attempts to curb the growing extravagance and luxury of elite lifestyles, unpopular with the rich in the short term, were doomed to failure in the long term[53]. Even if Cato himself would have preferred to be represented in the changed lives of his fellow-

citizens, there is no reason to doubt that, around the time of his censorship, the Roman people honoured him with a statue in the temple of Salus (the Roman equivalent of Plutarch's Hygieia); at Rome honorific representations of living men appear, at this date, to have been unusual (see below, section **c** ii), and this statue, which apparently represented him as a civilian magistrate, rather than as a victorious general, was doubtless particularly so[54]. Livy records an influx of Greek artists to Rome in 186 (from Asia) and artists from as far away as Alexandria are known to have arrived two decades later (in the wake of Pydna); some of these artists probably fulfilled an educational as well as practical function and, as Pollitt and Gruen have pointed out, by the 160s B.C. at the latest, long-dead artists like Phidias were gaining posthumous recognition from a certain segment of the Roman population[55]. No doubt some continued to believe, like Ennius, that Romans should not seek after statues and sepulchres as if they were kings but, for others, education as a Roman gentleman already included training in the Greek arts of sculpture and drawing; it is irrelevant whether Ennius had meant that kings sought to seize art and plunder tombs, or that kings wished to commemorate themselves extravagantly (like Plautus' world-conquering hero Therapontigonus Platagidorus), or that they wanted to be honoured (like Josephus' Herod), since Romans were now doing all three[56].

An assertion of the new importance of honorific practice at Rome came in 158 B.C. when, Pliny records, the censors undertook to remove from the Forum Romanum all statues that had not been erected by "***populi aut senatus sententia***" (see below section **c** ii)[57]. Although some have speculated that a profuse clutter of statues had to be cleared away it is not known how many statues were removed, or left behind; although the senate had sometimes chosen to honour deceased individuals in the Forum, there is no evidence for it decreeing statues for the living at this date, and firm evidence for popular decrees is restricted to Cato and Scipio Africanus. The statue of the legendary fifth century benefactor of Rome L. Minucius, claimed by Pliny to have been the first such to have been decreed by the people, cannot certainly be dated before the censorship of Scipio Nasica

and Popilius Laenas, the column illustrated on the coins of his supposed descendants (RRC 242/ 1, & 243/ 1) being no proof of genuine antiquity (see below section **c** ii)[58]. Livy's surprising assertion that the senate had decreed equestrian statues for C. Maenius and L. Furius Camillus 180 years previously, appears anachronistic; Livy himself seems surprised by the unique decree, and equestrian statues, like chariot portraits, were later acknowledged by Pliny to be Greek in origin, superseding an older native tradition of column dedications such as that of this same C. Maenius (Pliny cites it specifically)[59].

That Maenius' column at the Northern end of the Forum survived the purge of 158 B.C. appears certain, but whilst Pliny asserts that the people ordered the installation of ship's prows on the front of the speaker's platform (around 338 B.C.) it cannot be said with certainty that the column was not a private/family dedication by Maenius himself or a descendant; the survival of C. Duilius' rostra column might be explained by Pliny's assertion that it had been decreed by the people, but an alternative tradition had it that this column too, and that at the entrance of the Circus Maximus, were self-commemorative ("***Duilius posuit***")[60]. If it remains possible that these columns were not honorific, the censors' actions may have been specifically targeted at more recent self-commemorations (rather than antiques), perhaps even the statues of those who had been degraded by these or previous censors; remembering that Pliny states the censors' action to have been restricted to the Forum, and following Gruen's suggestion that collective interests were being asserted, it is not unlikely that the Forum was being redefined as, from henceforth, public space without room for those who, like Spurius Cassius (see below section **b** ii), defied Roman law and custom[61]. The censors of 50 B.C. are said to have taken action against "***signa et tabulae***" but, in this case, it is not possible to state what that amounted to[62].

Whilst the developed Roman 'art market', identified by Pollitt, was probably a first century B.C. phenomenon, there is no reason to doubt that men like L. Mummius were already connoisseurs, able to discriminate between the 'best' art and the second-rate, ensuring that

the former came to Rome in vast quantities; Cicero and Pliny agree that even he did not amass a private art collection, the sale of which might otherwise have supplied his daughter's dowry[63]. Although the triumph of Lucullus in 63 B.C. is known to have included one outsize gold statue (of Mithridates), and both gold and silver vessels, this haul of artworks is smaller than one would expect from an, admittedly incomplete, Asian campaign; one may perhaps ascribe this to his desire to show kindness to Greeks (he never entered a friendly Greek city with his army) but it is not unreasonable to suppose that in addition to the private fortune he had amassed on this campaign, used over the succeeding years to satisfy his zeal for art collection, he had acquired paintings and statues that were never intended for public display[64]. Selfish appropriation of artworks for private enjoyment was not unprecedented, but contemporary critics of such behaviour set out to contrast it with both ancestral Roman and contemporary royal practice[65].

In 56 B.C. Cicero mused on the utility of art for representing military and political leaders; for him at least, the visual arts had acquired a status akin to literature and, even if he admires Xenophon's Agesilaus for rejecting portraiture, and Xenophon for producing a work more popular than "***omnes imagines omnium statuasque***", it should be noted that Cicero does not want the contemporary historian Lucceius to be his Xenophon, but rather an Apelles or Lysippus[66]. In the same year he chose to use artistic terms ("***expressus***", and "***adumbratus***"), metaphorically in his speech Pro Caelio and, two years later, in a letter to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, he compared his fellow-citizens to the sculptor Apelles, who had completed only the head and shoulders of a certain statue of Venus, because they had not finished their project of restoring his "***vires et color***"[67]. It is possible that Cicero, himself an art collector (regardless of his studied ignorance of 'old masters' and their value, at the trial of Verres), was exceptional in making such passing allusions to art and art history but the forensic context of the Pro Caelio suggests that knowledge of such matters was not restricted to Cicero and his correspondents[68].

If, at the trial of Verres, Cicero's audience had needed to be convinced that mere artworks were worth consideration by Romans, this attitude may well have altered in the intervening decades; artworks had been found useful not only for illustrating the leadership skills of individuals and families, as in the previous century, but also for more general political themes (the rehabilitation of Marius, Clodius' restoration of "***libertas***", the extravagance of the idle rich, etc)[69]. The attacks on the statues of Pompey during his second consulship (55 B.C.) appear symptomatic of art's newly acquired importance in political debate, although it must be admitted that Plutarch claims the installation of Bocchus' statue group illustrating the surrender of Jugurtha to Sulla would have led to urban unrest in the late 90s B.C. had it not been for the onset of the social war; the same year, Cicero claimed that the soldiers of L. Calpurnius Piso had torn down the "***tropaea***" and "***monumenta***" which the latter had established in Macedonia, and these clearly included portraits ("***imago***" and "***simulacrum***")[70].

iii) access to Greek thought; drama, history, rhetoric and political theory

The origins of Latin literature are universally acknowledged to lie with the poet-playwrights Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius and Plautus, whose acquaintance with Greek literature prompted them to reproduce the stories of Greek tragedy, epic and comedy in the Latin language; the extent to which the stories of Greek myth were already accessible to the citizens of Rome is unclear, although again the Ficoroni ***cista*** is suggestive, but the public nature of dramatic performance doubtless offered the classic tales a wider Roman audience than ever before. Cicero's assertion that Ennius, in his tragedy Medea, set out to educate his audience about the dangers of monarchy may not authentically represent authorial intention but it does suggest that audiences could respond to such works by applying their characterisations to contemporary life[71].

Although Cicero's evidence considerably postdates the deaths of all three of these early tragedians there is no reason to doubt that contemporaries, on the lookout for topical references (to the indiscretions of Scipio Africanus in a Naevian comedy for example), were able to apply the standard dramatic stereotypes of royalty to the monarchs of their own day; it is even possible that Cato's remarks (see below section **b** v), probably dateable to around 190 B.C., that M. Minucius Thermus behaved even more outrageously than kings, and that Eumenes was "***sarcophagos***", played on such dramatic stereotypes[72]. It is possible that some Greek-speaking Romans had access to the Greek texts of plays which the Latin dramatists did not choose to translate and adapt, even if there is no evidence for their performance at Rome; the reference to Xerxes, bridger of the Hellespont, in Ennius' Annals may suggest awareness of Aeschylus' Persae since Antiochus (the new Xerxes, see below sections **b** iv & v), later laments his defeat in a manner not dissimilar to Xerxes' first lines in the play[73]. In the late Republic Pompey is said to have directly quoted Sophocles in his final moments, and Cicero and Caesar are both known to have quoted the Phoenissae, although it is possible that Accius' rendering of the tale was their immediate source rather than Euripides' play[74].

The composition, around 200 B.C., of Quintus Fabius Pictor's Greek language history of Rome suggests an acquaintanceship with the Greek art of historiography; Ogilvie distinguishes the style of the surviving fragments from that of the older historians, suggesting instead a dependence on more recent exponents of the art such as Timaeus. An interest in establishing a Roman account of the city's origins and history, to counter or confirm those already in the Greek intellectual domain, may account for the work's composition, and might suggest that late third century B.C. Roman readers of Greek histories would have been most interested in accounts of their own city and their ancestors; acquaintanceship with certain aspects of Alexander's history has, however, already been suggested as a possibility, and by 184 B.C. (the year of Plautus' death) we can be certain that some proportion of the Roman theatrical audience would have been familiar with the

names of Agathocles, Philip II and Darius[75]. Since their reigns too almost certainly predated Roman contacts with Sicily, Macedonia and Asia respectively, it is reasonable to suppose that Greek stories, if not actual histories, were responsible for such familiarity; it is therefore possible that Scipio Africanus did indeed admire Agathocles and Dionysius of Syracuse, as Polybius and Livy suggest (see below section **b** iv)[76].

It is not clear when the ideal rulers of Xenophon's Cyropaedia and Agesilaus first became known at Rome but, in the case of the former work, Cicero testifies to its hold over Scipio Aemilianus; it is not unlikely that both texts were thought useful, by Greek tutors, for educating young Romans both in the Greek language and about ruling an empire[77]. When Polybius' mentions the, to Greeks, paradigmatical effeminate despot Sardanapalus (see above) it is clear that he expects his readers to be familiar with his story, and the expectation may have extended to some Roman readers. Sardanapalus is mentioned when the author attempts to rescue Philip II from the accusations of Theopompus, whose hostile but colourful account may have shaped elite Roman perceptions of the king (see below section **b** iv); even a reader unfamiliar with the stories of Sardanapalus would be led to suppose that he was more like Theopompus' Philip of Macedon (cowardly, effeminate, and shameless) than that of Polybius (manly, active, excellent)[78].

Thucydides was mentioned, in passing, by Polybius but it is not clear that his account of the Peloponnesian wars was read at Rome in the second century B.C., although it could have been the source of Cato's information about Themistocles and Pericles; like the works of Herodotus, Theopompus, and Timaeus however, it appears to have become common reading matter for the senatorial elite in the late Republic, to the extent that Cicero could quote from it[79]. Whilst Cicero himself was sure that knowledge of the past could inform the present, ignorance of the past persisted even amongst historical biographers like Cornelius Nepos, at the close of the Republic, who presumably had the sources to hand[80]. The Roman interest in Alexander histories, suggested by the tale of

Julius Caesar weeping as he read one (considering himself to have achieved nothing in comparison), and confirmed by Cicero's evidence for the circulation at Rome of texts of Callisthenes and Cleitarchus, clearly generated a desire to read, retell and elaborate the stories in Latin; Cicero's account of Alexander's preference for representation by the artists Lysippus and Apelles is one example, and a now lost chapter of the De Viris Illustribus may have been the first complete, if concise, Latin life of Alexander[81].

The presence at Rome of Greek intellectuals from the late third century B.C. onwards opened to the elite the techniques of Greek rhetoric, and knowledge of political theory. Whilst oratory had clearly always been important to Roman magistrates and generals as a persuasive tool, over time it became so dependent on the traditions of Greek practice that, by the 90s B.C., the censors took action against teachers of Latin rhetoric[82]. Critical analysis of the constitutions of Rome, her enemies and her dependants was new, and ready-made Greek concepts such as the stereotypical tyrant, were found to be so useful that words like **"tyrannus"** entered into the Latin language; that Greek ideas of liberty, civic harmony and redistributive justice influenced Roman political debate, from at least the time of the Gracchi onwards, is unquestionable even if the exact mechanics of this are unclear[83]. Already in 158 B.C., as Wallace-Hadrill observed, when the censors took action against certain monuments in the Forum, a statue of Spurius Cassius had been melted down; apparently for the first time, someone had thought it improper for his portrait to remain on display because of his actions in life. There is no good reason to suppose that this statue dated back to the fifth century and, perhaps authentic, tales about his interest in land redistribution would have had a topicality in the mid-second century B.C. that could have led someone (a descendant?) to commemorate him; to those opposing contemporary redistributions, Hellenistic history supplied examples of 'redistributors' (Agis, Cleomenes and perhaps also Nabis, see above) whom fellow-Greeks categorised as tyrants, and thus the proposals of Spurius Cassius which had justified the statue's erection could also be argued to justify its destruction, Spurius Cassius himself

being identified as an aspirant tyrant[84]. Uncertainty about the propriety of commemorating Tarquinius Superbus (see below) may have led some to argue that the seven kings represented on the Capitol excluded him and included Titus Tatius instead; this interpretation of the group was passed down to posterity, although it did not require the addition of a Brutus figure with drawn sword, and this may suggest that there were no inscriptions identifying the figures[85].

The proclamations of Greek freedom earlier in the second century B.C., marking the liberation of the Greeks from the overlordship of monarchical rulers, may have inspired retellings of the founding myths of the Roman Republic, that placed greater emphasis on the Tarquins' Corinthian ancestry, incorporated Greek stereotypes of the tyrant, and celebrated Brutus as a tyrannicide (leading to the addition of his statue to the group of royal portraits on the Capitol?), but there is insufficient evidence to be certain[86]. Nevertheless, it is clear that the later commentators are mistaken in suggesting that an ideological objection to the return of monarchy to Rome and a more general hatred of kings had been handed down, from generation to generation, since the fall of the kings, although it is certainly true that the collective principle of Republican government was traditionally regarded as superior to the authority which any one individual could derive from his achievements (to the extent that the elder Cato refused to name "***duces***" in his Origines)[87]. Despite the fact that the majority of senators had a vested interest in maintaining the collective tradition, an increasing dependence on certain individuals (Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Antony, Octavian) for resolving the state's protracted problems can be documented in the final century of the Republic; whilst the political enemies of such "***principes***" accused them of aiming at tyranny, their supporters were able to exploit the, by then, familiar Greek notion that monarchy could be an ideal when the individual was a good citizen, a good statesman and a good general[88]. Just as Livy believed it to be reasonable to describe the senate as an assembly of kings, so L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus' pet philosopher Philodemus had felt no qualms about

dedicating to him a work On the Good King according to Homer, which dictates the appropriate conduct for a senator in the build-up to the civil wars[89]. As Rawson pointed out, Greeks had long been accustomed to calling kings those with kingly powers (eg the Carthaginian sufetes) and accordingly the Polybian analysis of Rome as a mixed constitution had explicitly named the consular office as the monarchical element in Roman society; when Hellenistic monarchs attempted to forge dynastic alliances with Caesar and Antony however, the equivalence of such individuals to kings did not depend on their holding of particular magistracies and it is no surprise that some believed such individuals to be kings[90].

b) Kings, Tyrants, and Good Citizens in Roman thought

The following five sub-sections of this chapter consider Roman attitudes to monarchs and monarchy, and to Republican leadership. It has long been assumed that the Romans had been invariably hostile to kings and kingship since the foundation of the Republic. However, the evidence presented below suggests that negative Roman appraisals of monarchy were far from universal or constant, despite the fact that the majority of kings known to Romans were foreign. Attitudes appear to have changed considerably after the first contacts with Greek political ideas and Hellenistic kings, particularly with regard to tyranny. However, Greek notions of ideal monarchical rule and generalship also appear to have affected Roman discourse and practice, and can be associated with the increasing acceptability of the idea that the government of one competent man (see section **c** i) could be a solution to the Republic's problems. It is suggested that the successful establishment of a monarchical regime after Actium was facilitated by this change. Many of those who thought that accepting repeated, and immediately consecutive, bestowals of ***imperium*** effectively made someone like Pompey or Caesar a monarch who aspired to 'full-blown' kingship (diadem and all), died in the two decades before Actium. Arguments against

monarchy continued however, and the Augustan principate appears to have taken many of them into account (see below, chapter 4) .

i) Roman attitudes to Roman kings

In the absence of complete mid-Republican accounts of the regal period, there is little evidence for the Romans' perception of their kings before the first century B.C.. By that time Greek perceptions of kingship, and the Romans' own experience of dealing with Hellenistic kings, might each have affected the stories told about the kings and their portrayal in art; that Greek notions of the tyrant radically altered Roman perceptions of Tarquinius Superbus has already been suggested (see above, section **I c**). Cherishing the memory of Romulus, founder of the city, is unsurprising and indeed textual evidence attesting to the dedication of a statue group showing Romulus, Remus and the she-wolf as early as 269 B.C. (see also RRC 20 and 39); it is not clear whether the cave and hut, associated with Romulus in later times, had already been identified on the slopes of the Palatine but Livy suggests that the identification of the Ruminal fig-tree at the Lupercal was ancient[91]. Whilst the Romulus of the annalist Piso Frugi was witty, and a moderate drinker, Ennius had even shown the inhabitants of Rome mourning Romulus as their "***pater***" and "***genitor***"; the story of the senators murdering Romulus against the people's wishes might seem to be coloured by the events surrounding the assassination of Julius Caesar, but Plutarch suggests that it was already current by 67 B.C. when a consul is said to have used it to threaten Pompey with a similar fate[92].

It is impossible to give a definite date for the statues of the seven kings on the Capitol but they were almost certainly amongst the first concrete proofs of Rome's affection for the memory of the other kings of Rome since, at this stage, even the second Tarquin could be included (see above section **a** iii)[93]. As Rawson and Erskine noted, Ennius describes the fourth king as "***bonus Ancus***", and it is no surprise that the Marcii were so proud of their

royal ancestry that they began to use "***rex***" as a cognomen in the second century B.C.; by the end of that century the Julii were probably linked to Aeneas and the kings of Alba Longa (now thought to be maternal ancestors of Romulus and Remus), whilst the Aemilii, Pomponii, Pinarii and Calpurnii had probably all staked claims on descent from Rome's second king Numa (Ancus' maternal grandfather)[94]. Numa too appears to have been regarded as a good and just man and one popular, but clearly fallacious, story had it that the king was a pupil of Pythagoras; when the king's tomb was said to have been located on the Janiculum in 181 B.C., the 'excavator' claimed also to have uncovered a chest containing Greek and Latin scrolls, the former Pythagorean in nature[95]. Gruen suggests that the discovery, and subsequent destruction, of all these documents was a pre-arranged stunt to show the credulous populace that any Hellenic elements in Numa's thinking were to Numa's detriment and Rome's; that the foreigner Tarquinius Superbus was already being surrendered to the Greeks as one of their tyrants (see below section **b** ii), perhaps represents yet another aspect of this Roman backlash to the fashionability of Greek culture[96].

When straitened fiscal circumstances, and a need to finance Sulla's war against Mithridates, forced the sale of Numa's votive treasures in 88 B.C. we probably should not consider there to have been any criticism of the king's religious thought. Indeed the fact that the sale realised so much gold was testament to the richness of the dedications associated with his name, and further proof of his piety[97]. Around this time the first numismatic 'portrait' heads of Roman kings were issued (RRC 344/1a-3, and 346/1a-i); at the close of the Social War, Titus Tatius, Numa and Ancus Marcius (all Sabines, or of recent Sabine descent) were clearly useful symbols of conciliation between the Romans and their fellow Italians. The family relationship between Numa and Ancus Marcius was suggested by the double portraits on the coins of C. Marcius Censorinus (Hellenistic double portraits on coin obverses normally represented husband and wife partnerships); like Titus Tatius on the coins of L. Titurius Sabinus, Numa was shown bearded, and the

beardlessness of Ancus Marcius may have been intended to suggest the generation gap between him and his grandfather. The anachronistic use of the fillet for the Roman kings represented on the coins of Censorinus, clearly copied from Hellenistic usage, demonstrates that the diadem had already become symbolic of kingship at Rome[98].

As dictator charged with the restoration of the Roman constitution, Sulla is said by Appian to have increased the number of his lictors to twenty-four, to match that once used for the kings; Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus agree in suggesting that Romulus had appointed only twelve lictors and there is reason to doubt that Sulla proposed this monarchical measure, particularly given the contemporary accusation that his rule was tantamount to monarchy[99]. Appian is also our source for the story that the Campus Martius had previously only been a burial site for Rome's kings (presumably only Tullus Hostilius, Ancus Marcius, and Tarquinius Priscus), when reporting that Sulla was interred there; again the 'royal' treatment might seem unlikely, given the hostility to Sulla's "***regnum***" (see below section **b** ii), particularly as Livy and Dionysius again agree in asserting the land to have belonged to the Tarquinii[100]. However, Sulla's constitutional reforms and his extension of the "***pomerium***" might have suggested parallels with Servius Tullius, particularly as one story had it that this king had failed, where Sulla succeeded, in abolishing his own reign in favour of a republican constitution; Appian suggests that even before he was dictator, Sulla had personally invoked Servius Tullius' constitution as a precedent for one of his reforms[101].

In Sallust's account of 78 B.C., the consul Marcus Aemilius Lepidus was accorded a speech which, failing to recognise Sulla's abdication, characterised Sulla as a "***scaevus Romulus***"; the qualifying adjective suggests both that Romulus was held in higher regard than Sulla, and that the latter may have characterised himself as a second Romulus (a second founder of Rome). Miles' conclusions that the concept of Rome having successive founders was later than the time of Camillus (and even Marius), and that Cicero appears to

have considered himself to be emulating Romulus in securing the state from the 'Catilinarian Conspiracy' (see below), are not incompatible with the idea that Sulla too wished his services to Rome to seem like those of her founding hero; the objection of Sallust's Lepidus was that Sulla was no Romulus, just as the Arpinate Cicero was no Roman and no hero[102]. Eleven years after Lepidus' consulship and four years before that of Cicero, as has already been noted, C. Calpurnius Piso suggested, at a public meeting, that Pompey wished to become a second Romulus; for him this was clearly an unworthy ambition deserving punishment, but the assembled populace were apparently so enraged at his threat to do away with Pompey that he only narrowly escaped being murdered himself. As will be discussed below however (section **b** iii), it was not merely the ambition of the individual to be vested with the extraordinary command against the pirates which caused alarm; a debate was raging about the role of the "***unus***" with some arguing that in a Republic everything ought never to be given over to one man since, in effect, this was monarchy, whilst others argued that current crises demanded that proven troubleshooters be empowered to act as they saw fit[103].

When Cicero, during his consulship, defended C. Rabirius, he contrasted the prosecuting tribune with both Romulus and Numa Pompilius when suggesting that he showed tyrannical cruelty (see below sections **b** ii & iv); the following year, when Cicero defended Sulla's nephew, the prosecutor appears to have referred to Cicero's consulship as a foreigner's "***regnum***", comparing him to Tarquinius Superbus, but also to the Sabine Numa, probably referring (like Catullus and Sallust) to Cicero's conception of himself as a second Romulus[104]. Cicero claimed that Romulus was regarded favourably by posterity because he had founded the city, and that those who now saved Rome deserved similar recognition for bringing her a second chance, a new birth; since Catiline was being characterised as an aspirant tyrant deserving punishment (see below section **b** ii), it is probable that Piso's conception of Romulus was not shared by Cicero or his audience (the people)[105]. When Cicero described as an "***arx regum ac nationum exterarum***" the city

he claimed to have saved, and the senate house as a "***perfugium***" he may have been reflecting the tradition that Romulus' city had been an asylum[106]. Whilst the paternal Romulus of Ennius might directly have inspired the acclamation of Cicero as "***pater patriae***", that term is first known to have been used earlier in Cicero's consulship, to refer to Marius who had saved Rome from Saturninus, and whom later writers claimed to have been thought of as Rome's third founder because of his defence of Rome from the Northern barbarians[107]. However, the language of salvation and safety ("***conservare***", "***salus***") in Cicero's speeches against Catiline, matches the later claims that his brother had been hailed as "***parens Asiae***", and that Mithridates himself had been acclaimed as both "***pater***" and "***conservator Asiae***", in suggesting that Cicero may have been drawing on Greek conceptions of the ideal ruler to define himself, Marius and Romulus; Philodemus' encouragement of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus to behave like the good (paternal) kings in Homer was probably completed in the three years after Cicero's consulship[108].

Following his return from exile, Cicero gave his enemy Clodius the ironical appellation Numa Pompilius to contrast the ignorance and impiety of Clodius with the pious wisdom of the king[109]. Three years earlier, in a letter to Atticus, Cicero accused Cato of speaking as if he lived in Plato's Republic rather than "***in Romuli faece***"; although the metaphor does not really further our understanding of Cicero's perception of the king, it may depend on the idea that the city's sewerage and drainage facilities were benefactions of the regal period[110]. Catullus' conception of Pompey as "***cinaedus Romulus***", probably in 55 B.C., matches the practice of Sallust's Lepidus in pairing the honourable title with a disreputable one, and suggests awareness of Piso's earlier accusation about Pompey; according to Cicero, Crassus and Pompey, who again had an extraordinary universal command, "***tenent omnia***" and wanted everybody to know it[111].

The idea, inherent in the historians' accounts of the senate having been established by Romulus, that Rome's kings had taken counsel from the senate, was used by Cicero against

the dedicatee of Philodemus' work on kingship in 55 B.C.; according to him, Piso had not only failed to take such counsel during his consulship but gone on to demand that one of the senate's decisions be disobeyed[112]. In Cicero's account of the aftermath of Romulus' death in the De Re Publica, the senators are said initially to have attempted to rule the state themselves, before bowing to the popular demands for a new king by appointing "***interreges***" until such time as a man of sufficient "***virtus et sapientia***" should be found to reign in his stead, be he one of their own citizens or a foreigner; according to Cicero the choice of Numa was confirmed by public votes before and after his appointment[113].

In the De Legibus it is asserted that the ancient Romans had, like other peoples, entrusted royal authority to the "***iustissimi et sapientissimi***", but were alone in avoiding resort to the hereditary principle for selecting their kings' successors; this was what had enabled wise men to desire the rulership of kings, and whilst Ancus Marcius had been Numa's grandson, it is noteworthy that both Livy and Dionysius attribute to Tarquinius Superbus the idea of primacy in a hereditary claim to the throne. Polybius had suggested that once ideas of goodness and justice had been established, true kings were appointed on the basis of the individual's supremacy in understanding and reason, rather than hereditary right; once birth was considered a title to succession, kingship deteriorated into tyranny[114]. Cicero's Numa in the De Re Publica resembles the kind of idealised king considered by Cicero's Scipio as supplying the best simple constitution, enabling the Romans to live in the peace and repose that fosters "***iustitia et fides***", turning them to "***humanitas atque mansuetudo***" and ruling "***in pace concordiaque***"[115].

ii) Roman attitudes to tyrants and the politicisation of "***libertas***"

Sallust asserts that the Romans had once given the royal title to those who would preserve "***libertas***", but that following degeneration from kingship into "***dominatio***", the founders

of the Republic had struggled to recover "***libertas***", putting an end to their master's "***superbia***". Livy's account cannot be completely squared with Sallust's summary since his Brutus, like that of the Ad Herennium, had created freedom rather than recovered it, but again Tarquinius Superbus' conduct was the turning point; Livy even suggests that Brutus would have harmed Rome by driving out any of the earlier kings, since Rome would not have been ready for the responsibility of Republican freedom[116]. In Cicero's Republic, the final king's pride seems his defining feature, and although Livy would ascribe to this vice his humiliating treatment of senators and ambassadors, and his monopolisation of 'justice', war and diplomacy, Cicero had claimed that it made him incapable both of controlling his own conduct, and of curbing the "***libidines***" of his relations; this "***insolentia***" is said to have emerged because of his victories in Latium and the wealth which he had acquired therefrom[117]. However, his reign is said to have begun with "***caedes***", and he had continued a cruel and unjust "***dominus***" whose fear of reprisals prompted him to employ a bodyguard, and to hope his subjects would fear him; this complex characterisation was clearly intended to distinguish him from earlier kings, and particularly from his "***iustissimus***" predecessor (an "***optimus rex***"), and Cicero admits it to be that of a Greek tyrant, an inhuman monster[118]. In the Philippics however, when Cicero claimed the monarchy had been ended because the last king had displayed "***superbia***", he portrayed it as a relatively insignificant vice in order to suggest that the degeneration from true kingship into tyranny had been halted before the worst excesses of the latter political form; here however, Cicero was attempting to show that Antony was, that inhuman monster, a tyrant more fully and completely than any other Roman, including Tarquinius Superbus[119]

Whilst admitting that the portrayal of Tarquinius Superbus is conventionally regarded as a literary phenomenon, Cornell has suggested that a kernel of authentic stories about the later kings of Rome underlies the later historical accounts. Arguing that sixth century Rome had sufficient trading contacts with those states of the Greek world ruled by tyrants to

permit her kings to borrow their patterns of rulership he cites, as a possible example of such borrowing, the display of a ruler's relationship to the gods through 'sacred marriage'. However, accounts of Numa and Egeria in Livy, or Servius Tullius and Fortuna in Ovid, could indeed depend on later Hellenistic precedents, such as the betrothal of Antony to Athena, since the more common (and in Cicero's case earlier) accounts suggest only divine patronage through inspiration, such as had been claimed for Greek lawgivers like Lycurgus (even by the sober Polybius)[120]. Cornell's unreferenced generalisation that "the very idea of king was viewed with an almost pathological dislike" by Republican aristocrats, presumably depends on isolated remarks from Cicero's Republic, that should be read in the context of the whole surviving text, and the other evidence for Roman attitudes to kings and tyrants summarised in this chapter; Cornell appears to suggest that an aristocratic determination to preserve the senatorial ascendancy of the Republic was a reaction to the collective memory of anti-aristocratic 'popular' tyranny[121]. The transition from royal to republican rule at Rome requires explanation, but Cornell's suggestion, that the change represented a deliberate swing away from the 'popular' tyranny of several rulers is really no more convincing than the view that the change depended on the tyrannical misrule of one man (as the Romans themselves had come to believe). One may readily imagine there to have been a desire for a greater share in power amongst the fathers, who are said to have supplied the "***interreges***", and who may already have thought themselves the equals of the kings, if not their superiors, but that is by no means the same thing[122].

Although Livy appears to suggest that the dictator L. Papirius Cursor could have referred, in 325 B.C., to L. Junius Brutus as the founder of Roman liberty there is little evidence to suggest either that freedom was a political concept at that date, or that the first consul was particularly associated with it, in the way that had become standard by the first century B.C.. Certainly the social significance of "***libertas***" in differentiating freedmen and free men from slaves appears to have been primary, even in the early second century B.C.[123]. Clearly the citizenship offered to slaves, for services rendered to their masters, could

associate this kind of liberty with becoming Roman. Similarly the liberation of 1200 Romans who had become slaves in Greece, begun when they were ransomed by the Achaeans, was only completed when Flamininus restored them to their home city[124]. Nevertheless, freedom could also mean independence from Rome, to the extent that the Campanians 'freed' by the senate in 210 B.C. were accorded neither Roman citizenship nor Latin rights; that enemy soldiers could lose their freedom is also the logic of Tyndarus in Plautus' Captivi[125].

When Appian's Appius Claudius Caecus, rejecting a peace offered by Pyrrhus, suggested that complying with its terms was "***douleia***", and his Fabricius said that he preferred "***parrhesia***" to sharing the king's possessions as his general in Epirus, the choice of language was clearly related to Pyrrhus' status as a king, an enemy of Republican freedoms. This cannot really be matched in the fragments of Ennius' Annals, the earliest surviving Latin text to deal with Pyrrhus; although the king's intention of restoring to "***libertas***" captured Roman soldiers could only come to pass on their release from his custody, their enslavement was not caused by his kingship, but by their defeat in war. In the absence of so much of Ennius' original text it would be unwise to state that the opposition of kingship and freedom was not exploited, but it is striking that in the one fragment where the term "***libertas***" occurs, it refers instead to the planned release of prisoners of war[126].

The idea that Roman freedom was established in the wake of Tarquinius Superbus' expulsion from Rome, appears dependent on that king's representation as a tyrant; as has already been suggested, the adoption of Greek political notions by Roman thinkers seems to have caused both ideas to be grafted together onto Roman traditions about the regal past and the origins of the Republic in the second century B.C.. The most obvious precedent for connecting freedom with the expulsion of kings was the Greek demand, of c. 197 B.C., that the Macedonian garrisons (the 'fetters' of Greece) be evacuated, restoring the

autonomy and freedom of all mainland Greeks; Polybius consistently represents Macedonian foreign policy as enslavement, literal in the cases of Olynthus and Thebes, but also metaphorical with the establishment of garrisons and pro-Macedonian tyrannies[127]. In 195 B.C. Romans were combatting an actual "***tyrannus***" (see below section **b** v); Livy accords him the vices of "***avaritia et crudelitas***", and claims the Greeks thought it unworthy of the liberating Romans when they attempted to establish a treaty of friendship with a tyrant "***saevissimus et violentissimus in suos***", the Aetolians even suggesting that Rome was a "***satellites Nabidis dominationis***" [128]. That this language stems from contemporary comment cannot be described as certain, but the fragments of Polybius' Histories include probable confirmation that Nabis and his wife were thought cruel, particularly in their punishments; the involvement of women in monarchies was a matter for criticism in Greek thought (see above) and it would not be surprising if Greek stories about Apia, along with queens from Greek tragedy, coloured later Roman accounts of Tanaquil[129].

As a usurper who commenced his reign with regicide, and who punished prominent citizens with exile and death, in order to confiscate their property, Nabis was not dissimilar to the Tarquinius Superbus of Cicero and Livy; according to Livy and Dionysius Rome's tyrant had even demonstrated that prominent citizens should be removed by knocking off the heads of poppies as Aristotle's Periander had done[130]. It is clear that Dionysius' accounts of Tarquinius Superbus' ban on public gatherings and his spy network, his public works programme for the subjugation of the masses, his bodyguard of foreigners, and so on, are products of a Greek historical imagination generating a picture of the last king as a prototypical tyrant; whilst these particular elements are not found in our Latin sources, the fact that a Greek felt the need to embroider his account with them, suggests that antique Roman traditions about the king failed satisfactorily to explain to Greeks, accustomed to the deterioration of states, the end of the Roman monarchy. Their puzzlement must have been even greater in the early second century B.C.[131].

In the 1920s Frank suggested that the story of the rape of Lucretia was a genuine Roman folk-tale and Cornell seems inclined to agree; in fact her central role in the tyrant's downfall may well be borrowed from the story, again in Aristotle's Politics, that Evagoras of Cyprus was killed by a man whose wife had been carried off by the king's son, and the more general Greek stereotype of monarchy as an enemy of chastity (see above). The existence of similar stories about the improbably named Verginia and the downfall of the decemvirate, and the young Gaius Publilius and the abolition of debt-bondage, probably indicates that a factor known to have prompted revolutions in the Greek world was being borrowed to explain changes in Roman government and society; Cicero's suggestion that the Vestal virgins would have been endangered by a third Cornelian "***regnum***" (that of Lentulus, Catiline's 'co-conspirator') puts into practice the advice of the Ad Herennium for conjuring the idea of a tyrant in the imagination of the audience[132]. In Livy, the representation of Brutus as a liberator and aspirant tyrannicide was consequent on his presence at Lucretia's suicide and the two ideas may have been adopted at the same time, prompting the new interpretations of the statues of the kings (suggested above), including the addition of a Brutus figure with drawn sword; this statue may even have been inspired by those of the Athenian tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton[133].

Once Tarquinius Superbus had been transformed into a hated tyrant, the election of a Tarquinius to the consulship in the first year of the Republic became problematic, particularly for those familiar with the Greek practice of punishing a tyrant's entire family; the stories of Collatinus' voluntary exile and Brutus' proposal for the banishment of the entire Tarquinian "***gens***" appear to have been the somewhat awkward solutions created for this problem. Cicero's Scipio found it difficult to reconcile the punishment of the innocent with Republican "***libertas***", and we are left to marvel at Brutus' good fortune in being a maternal, rather than a paternal, nephew of Tarquinius Superbus[134]. The poignant tale, attested by Brutus (murderer of Caesar), Livy and Dionysius, of Brutus (the first consul) ordering and witnessing the execution of his own sons for conspiring to restore their

grandfather to the throne is perhaps also a second century creation, but in this case a Greek original is to be doubted since Dionysius expects his Greek readers to be shocked by it; Cicero reports that the father of Spurius Cassius (see below) gave evidence against his son, and the rhetoric of Livy's L. Papirius Cursor suggests that both stories may have been variants on the idea of the paternal rigour of the ancient Romans[135].

The policies of Nabis for the extension of citizenship and the redistribution of land, were those of that other kind of tyrant, the demagogic social reformer (most familiar from Plato's Republic), who erodes social distinctions (between slaves and free men, citizens and foreigners, etc.), and punishes the rich (by taxes, debt cancellation, property confiscation, etc.); Polybius suggests that the similar policies of Charops of Epirus in the early 150s B.C. caused him to be shunned by the ***pontifex maximus*** and ***princeps senatus*** when he visited Rome[136]. As has already been noted, the Roman assimilation of ideas about this kind of tyrant must just predate the destruction of Spurius Cassius' statue during the senatorial purge of the Forum in 158 B.C. since it would otherwise have been destroyed already; if the posthumous punishment of the long dead advocate of Roman land redistribution was a warning to contemporary reformers, it was not always heeded in the succeeding decades down to the fall of the Republic. The tribunes of the people, defenders of the rights and freedoms of the commons (see below, section **b** iii), were easily susceptible to the charge of demagogy, and consequently to that of aiming at tyranny, but neither charge can be proved to have been levelled at a tribune earlier than 133 B.C.; it is surely no coincidence that Cicero assumed both Scipio Aemilianus (who condemned Tiberius Gracchus, from Numantia, as an Aegisthus) and Laelius (whose famed wisdom stemmed from his abandonment of agrarian legislation) to have been familiar with Plato's characterisation of demagogue-tyrants only four years later[137].

Polybius' criticism of C. Flaminius' policy of land redistribution as "***demagogia***" clearly postdates the re-evaluation of Spurius Cassius, since the evidence of Flaminius' unhindered

progression to the highest offices of state demonstrates that he was not considered a revolutionary in his lifetime; the story, in Valerius Maximus, that the tribune's father attempted to prevent the enactment of the bill depends on the idea that he too was an aspirant tyrant (see above)[138]. Polybius' apparent prediction that the populist measures of ambitious politicians would lead the city into mob rule, and towards eventual tyranny, makes no explicit mention of tribunes, but may reflect on contemporary trends at Rome, perhaps including the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus[139].

If the deposition of his fellow-tribune Octavius had given offence, Tiberius Gracchus' fatal mistakes were seeking immediate re-election, and doing so on a platform of further popular measures; having announced that he feared for his own life, the assembled populace chose to defend their leader, and Scipio Nasica Serapio appealed for the consul to defend the state by attacking the tyrant[140]. According to Plutarch, following the extra-judicial banishments and executions of the supporters of Tiberius Gracchus, the self-appointed tyrannicide Scipio Nasica was himself regarded as a tyrant, although obviously not in the sense of a populist demagogue plotting to seize the state[141]. It is unlikely that anyone seriously believed Tiberius Gracchus to be aiming at monarchy but Appian's statement that the tribune's lifeless body fell at the feet of the statues of the kings suggests that as a demagogue he was regarded, like Spurius Cassius, as a successor to Rome's only previous tyrant (Tarquinius Superbus); the puzzling story that the enemies of Tiberius Gracchus had interpreted one gesture as a request for a diadem, may relate to his reception of royal regalia from Pergamon, which Plutarch claims a neighbour had reported to the senate, saying that the envoy expected him to become king of Rome[142].

During his tribunates Gaius Gracchus proposed further land redistribution, ameliorated conditions of service for soldiers, the initiation of a fixed price corn dole, and an extension of citizenship to the Italian allies, and accusations of demagogy and tyranny were clearly levelled at him; a fragment of the speech of Gaius Fannius has been preserved in which

Gracchus' "***largitio***" is compared with the tactics of Peisistratus, Phalaris and Dionysius (see below section **b** iv). Once the senate had empowered Opimius to put down the 'tyrants', Appian claims that Gaius Gracchus and Fulvius Flaccus offered to manumit any slaves who came to their assistance[143]. The death of Quintus Antullius at the hands of the tribune's supporters, and the exile of Popilius Laenas, doubtless made it easier for Gracchus' enemies to characterise him as a tyrant, intent on eliminating his enemies[144]. The "***concordia***" of Rome was restored at some cost, with summary executions of as many as three thousand of the tribune's supporters; the punishment of Flaccus' young son, the confiscation of property, and the acquittal of Opimius on charges of punishing citizens without trial, may suggest familiarity with Greek procedures for punishing tyrants and their descendants, and protecting tyrannicides[145].

For many of Cicero's generation the Gracchi were archetypal Roman demagogue-tyrants, whose policies had only occasionally been emulated by other ambitious tribunes (Saturninus in 100 B.C., Livius Drusus in 91 B.C., Publius Sulpicius in 88 B.C.)[146]. However, popular politics also came to be advocated by consular candidates like Catiline and Caesar, as well as tribunes like Clodius, and the charge of aiming at tyranny was also levelled at them[147]. In addition however, experience of the "***dominatio***" of Cinna and the Sullan "***regnum***" appears to have helped foster an increasing use of the term tyrant in political discourse, with reference to those who exercised sole or quasi-monarchical power under the Republic, as provincial governors (e.g. Verres), generals (e.g. Pompey), and even consuls unsympathetic to popular causes (e.g. Cicero); as Erskine points out the return to dictatorship between 49 and 44 B.C. made discussion of tyranny particularly relevant as Rome again had a sole ruler[148].

As Dunkle suggested, certain vices had by this time become associated with tyrannical rule (***vis***, ***superbia***, ***libido***, and ***crudelitas/saevitia***[149]); in addition to these four characteristics one may also find "***intemperantia***"[150], "***avaritia***"[151], and more frequently

"***iracundia***"[152]. Cicero's tyrants (Verres, Catiline, Vatinius, Clodius and Antony) often appear to be modelled on Plato's men of 'tyrannical character', who had been mastered by passion and appetite, and resorted to criminal activity when their private means were exhausted by the pursuit of pleasure[153]. The tyrant of post-Sullan political invective was associated with both "***caedes***", which might afford bloodthirsty pleasure in itself and was useful as a means of eliminating opposition as the proscriptions had demonstrated[154], and with fire in the city; this second charge may relate to Blossius of Cumae's injudicious confession that he would have burnt down the Capitol if Tiberius Gracchus had commanded it to be done, although it should be noted that the Capitol really had been destroyed by fire in 83 B.C.[155].

A general inability to distinguish good monarchy from bad was confessed by Cicero in the De Re Publica; the title of king may have seemed like that of father, but Cicero's Scipio claims Romans when imagining a king thought first of an "***iniustus rex***", which is to say a "***tyrannus***", and this despite the fact that Rome could claim a "***iustissimus rex***" of her own (Servius Tullius, see above section **b** i). The apparent interchangeability of "***regnum***", "***tyrannis***" and "***dominatio***" in the rhetoric of the late Republic, is related to the usage of each term as an opposite of "***libertas***" on the ground that subjects experienced "***servitudo***" whenever they were ruled by one man; moreover, rule by the "***nutus***" of an individual was arbitrary, and as such the same ruler could be a loveable Cyrus at one time, and a most cruel Phalaris at others (see below section **b** iv)[156]. Even the reign of Romulus, for all his "***res gestae atque virtutes***", could be considered as a tyranny in the light of this new understanding; it too had begun with murder (that of Remus) and ended in circumstances so mysterious that, presumably with more recent events in mind, it could be claimed that the senators themselves had put an end to it (see above section **b i**). The fratricide came to be seen as symbolic of civil war as DeRose Evans has demonstrated, and this interpretation of the crime is surely implicit in the augury of eighteen vultures that Dio claims marked the day of Octavian's first election to the consulship, since Romulus and

Remus were supposed to have seen this number of birds between them[157]. The senatorial debate on the appropriate courtesy title for Octavian in 27 B.C. considered Romulus but settled on the "***sanctius et reverentius***" name Augustus, said by Suetonius to relate to the augury of Rome's founder, and thus probably also to that of Octavian; the ***princeps*** of a restored Republic ought neither to be a ***rex***, nor have the name of one[158].

iii) Roman attitudes to Republican magistrates and generals

Powell has suggested that the Ciceronian phrase "***rector rei publicae***" was created to meet a demand for an equivalent to the Greek term "***politikos***" (statesman) which Cicero found in the texts of Plato and Aristotle used when composing the De Re Publica[159]. The absence of such a Latin equivalent before the 50s B.C. is indicative of the amateur ideals of Republican rule which had permitted incompetent men to become consuls and generals. Such positions were not, usually, awarded according to the skills and experience of the candidates, except inasmuch as these factors affected their relative popularity with the voting body (see below); as has already been noted the popular votes to invest Pompey with extraordinary military commands, which went against this tradition, were vigorously opposed as tending towards monarchy. Cicero did not propose, as an ideal, a meritocratic Republic in which magistracies always fell to the same few "***rectores***" since taking turns at ruling and being ruled was essential to a Republic; rather, such men could direct the state by the counsels of their experience from the 'back-benches' of the senate house so long as the magistrates chose to ask the opinion of their fellow-senators[160].

The Ciceronian distinction between "***rectores***" and other citizens, focussed attention on the individual's capabilities and the virtues that characterised his conduct (particularly "***prudentia***"), rather than on his military or civilian achievements. The latter were more or less restricted to the years in which senators had "***imperium***" (as magistrates, generals and provincial governors), whereas the "***rector rei publicae***" manifested the former at all times,

just as Pericles, Epaminondas and Timoleon had done, in and out of public office, at Athens, Thebes and Syracuse respectively; like Nepos' Athenians however, and despite the example of Sulla, some late Republican Romans feared that repeated bestowals of "***imperium***" made it difficult for a man to return to the status of a "***privatus***"[161]. Civilian achievements including legislation and building projects were conventionally associated with an individual's name just as military achievements were celebrated by the commander's ovation or triumph, and titles such as Africanus, Asiaticus, Macedonicus, etc; alongside this glorification of the individual however, the Republic had a collectivist tradition, best exemplified by Cato's Origines, in which the censor and historian had deliberately avoided naming "***duces***" to prevent Rome's achievements being identified with particular individuals[162]. Panaetius' assertion that military victory is a collective achievement, taps into the line of Greek thought that had condemned Pausanias for dedicating a self-commemorating war memorial after Plataea; when Cicero cited Panaetius' view, he asserted that it even applied to kings like Cyrus and Alexander (see below, section **b** iv), as well as to civic leaders like Themistocles and Pericles[163].

For Cornelius Nepos, Pausanias' behaviour was symptomatic of a man who did not know how to handle his military success, and who would end his life an enemy of his homeland (a Caesar or an Antony?); by contrast, Nepos' Agesilaus who had none of the "***insolentia***" expected in a victorious general, obeyed the orders of his homeland's magistrates, and regretted the deaths of his fellow-Greeks, whilst Epaminondas refused to have any part in civil conflict. Similarly Timotheus was shown to have placed the best interest of his fellow citizens above personal gain, and to have deserved the statue erected in his honour for intimidating the Spartans into negotiating a peace, just as his father had deserved his (see above, chapter 1)[164]. Nepos criticised the many and elaborate honours bestowed on contemporary Roman generals, contrasting them with Miltiades' reward after Marathon, and also the ancient Roman practice of awarding honours only rarely; the inclusion of Miltiades' portrait with those of nine other generals in the representation of the battle

displayed in the ***Stoa Poikile*** was also contrasted with the three hundred statues voted to Demetrius of Phalerum. Collective celebration of the individual was a growing trend in the Republic, particularly apparent from the dictatorship of Caesar onwards (see below section **c** ii), but the more ancient Roman tradition of self-commemoration outlived the Republic (see chapter 4)[165].

The importance accorded to the senate in Cicero's De Re Publica doubtless reflects its recent neglect by magistrates like Julius Caesar[166] and, against the advice of Philodemos, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus[167]; whilst the latter returned to the status of a "***privatus***" and became liable to prosecution within four years, the ***imperium*** of the former was to continue unbroken from his consulship in 59 B.C. down to his death in 44 B.C.. Previous generations had managed to re-integrate their generals into the senate as "***rectores***"; Cicero's Antonius appears to cite as examples Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (cos 177 B.C.), Quintus Caecilus Metellus Macedonicus (cos 143 B.C.), and Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Numantinus (cos 147 B.C.)[168]. In Cicero's De Senectute, Cato asserts that Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, who died in his early fifties, would have known how to behave as an old man; the physical training expected of a man fit for military service would have been abandoned, but the training of his mind would have come into its own when he exercised his "***consilium***", "***ratio***" and "***sententia***" in the senate, for the benefit of the state. Two of these three words had been used just previously to describe the "***gubernator***" of a ship, when it was claimed that the sedentary holder of the tiller does a more important job with his "***consilium***", "***auctoritas***" and "***sententia***" than more active and junior men can do by strength, speed and agility; this was surely what Cicero had in mind when claiming that, at the time of writing the De Re Publica, he had held the "***gubernacula rei publicae***", although at other times Cicero felt able to accord "***gubernatio***" to younger men than himself[169].

Pompey, Cicero's exact age contemporary, who had held his first consulship some time before 'his year' on account of his military record, had been consistently seeking "***imperium***" through the 50s B.C., as the superintendent of grain supplies (from 57 B.C.), the restorer of Ptolemy (in 56 B.C., see below section **II** e), consul (in 55 B.C.), the nominal governor of Spain and Libya (from 54 B.C., renewed in 52 B.C.), sole consul (in 52 B.C.), and defender of Italy (in 50 B.C.)[170]. Similarly Crassus, several years older than Cicero, had sought to become the restorer of Ptolemy (in 56 B.C.) and succeeded in securing the lot for the ***provincia*** of Syria and Egypt (in 55 B.C.); our sources agree in suggesting that, by this time, Crassus had the ambition of outshining the achievements of Pompey and Caesar by conducting a Parthian campaign, Plutarch even suggesting that it was planned to end at the boundary of Ocean in the East (just as Caesar reached it in the North-West, see below section **b** iv)[171]. Cicero noted the similarity of age between Crassus and L. Aemilius Paullus (victor at Pydna), but contrasted their departures; Livy records that the populace had escorted the general from the city in unprecedented numbers in 168 B.C. prophesying his imminent return in triumph, whereas Crassus evidently encountered unfavourable omens and public curses. Cicero doubtless saw Aemilius Paullus as having acted for the public benefit in prosecuting a legitimate war against Perseus, and Crassus as an irresponsible general, determined to achieve personal renown and further private wealth by defeating the Parthians, regardless of existing treaties and at whatever cost to the lives of Roman citizens[172]. Interestingly Livy's rendering of Aemilius Paullus' address to the populace before his departure, which emphasises his willingness to heed the counsels of others, requests that would-be advisers join his staff, rather than attempt to "***gubernare***" the campaign from Rome; Plutarch's Crassus tended to ignore the advice of his junior officers, and of friendly kings, just as he disregarded omens and portents[173].

Rome had seen older commanders than Crassus and Aemilius Paullus but probably only under the extraordinary circumstances of the Second Punic War, when so many younger

senators had perished. However Livy suggests that, even before Cannae, experienced men were being appointed to magistracies, over the heads of younger men, and this may also have been the case in the emergency of 168 B.C.; even if the civil wars of the 80s B.C. had similarly diminished Rome's supply of potential generals, as Cicero had once suggested, the Parthian campaign was, far from being an emergency, completely unnecessary. By contrast, the brief sole consulship of Varro, and his claim that the war against Hannibal was being prolonged to enhance the status of Fabius Maximus do not seem far removed from the 50s B.C.[174]. Ironically Cicero's only experience of military leadership came in 51 B.C. when, very much against his will, he served as governor of Cilicia; the legislation that prevented magistrates from taking up immediate service in the provinces, may have exempted from current service those who had already served abroad as governors[175].

For his victory over the hill-tribes of Mount Amanus, Cicero appears to have requested Cato to raise in the senate the question of a public thanksgiving and in due course even the prospect of a triumph was temptingly dangled before him; Cicero, whose Scipio had suggested that the wise man sought after longer lasting honours than triumphs, was embarrassed about his eagerness to be granted this distinction once it had been offered[176]. When prosecuting L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in 55 B.C. he had mocked the claim that Piso's philosophy prevented him from desiring a triumph, suggesting that it was natural for Roman generals to desire the "***gloria***" that it bestowed. Piso's 'wisdom' in denying himself this 'meaningless' honour was first to be contrasted with the 'folly' of every consular commander who had previously been sent to Macedonia, as each had returned in triumph, and secondly with the self-commemorative programme (trophies and statues) Piso himself had undertaken in Macedonia; in reality, Cicero suggests, there was no justification for a triumph, just as Piso had been far from deserving the monuments that his own soldiers had determined to destroy[177]. Cicero's own reversal of policy with regard to the triumph was said to have been motivated by his desire to live down the reputation of an exile, but

irritation at Bibulus' undeserved "***supplicatio***" may also have played a part; nevertheless, when Cicero wrote to commiserate the previous governor of Cilicia who had been refused a triumph, he maintained that indifference towards such honours befitted the wise man[178].

Following his 'deliverance' of Rome from Catiline, Cicero had refused to accept any of the honours that would have been bestowed on a general, preferring his 'triumph' to be the grateful memory of his fellow-citizens; it must be doubted that any such honours would have been proposed in any case, but the passage demonstrates Cicero's determination to equate his own achievements with those of Pompey (shortly to celebrate a third triumph) and Lucullus (who had celebrated his triumph that year)[179]. In the De Officiis almost twenty years later, Cicero defied convention by asserting the superiority of civil over military achievement, partly with respect to his own consulship; in addition however, he claimed to prefer the law-givers Solon and Lycurgus to the generals Themistocles, Pausanias and Lysander, and the censors Marcus Aemilius Scaurus (cos 115 B.C.) and Quintus Lutatius Catulus (cos 78 B.C.) to Marius (cos 107, 104, 103, 102, 101, 100 and 86 B.C.) and Pompey (cos 70, 55, and 52 B.C.) respectively, who had five triumphs between them[180]. The triumph was normally awarded only to those who had been praetors or consuls since they could conduct wars under their own auspices, and it was unusual for an individual to merit more than one[181]; the Republican triumph was clearly an opportunity for ostentatious display and lavish 'euergetism' in its broadest sense (donatives, feasts, games, etc), that ought not to be passed up merely because the senate refused to grant permission, hence the 'private' triumphs which were occasionally celebrated on the Alban Mount[182], and the evident surprise at Caesar's willingness to forgo his triumph in 60 B.C.[183].

Whilst a praetor's triumph might improve the electoral chances of a consular candidate it was not merely the opportunity for display and generosity that swayed the public; there

appears to have been a genuine enthusiasm for successful military leaders. Thus L. Licinius Murena, who had served under Lucullus (rather than under his own auspices), was said to have had a particular advantage at the consular elections for 63 B.C. because the very soldiers who had served with him had been in town for the election and had made known his exploits; similarly Gnaeus Plancius fell under suspicion of buying votes in 54 B.C. because his less than illustrious military record had not prevented him from securing election as aedile. In fact, as Rosenstein has pointed out, whilst military success could help a candidate there is very little evidence that even military failure harmed his electoral chances and Plancius was probably no less distinguished than many other candidates for the aedileship; Cicero may just be concealing that the prosecutor had a better war record than the accused, a factor which might have been expected to turn the election in the prosecutor's favour[184].

Further evidence for the popularity of a military figure is supplied by Plutarch's description of Pompey's reception by the crowds on the day he appeared before the censors to declare that he had completed his military service; his election to the consulship of 70 B.C. had clearly been dependent on his military record in the emergencies of the previous fifteen years, just as that of Marius in 100 B.C. was a reward for his recent services to the state[185]. Enthusiasm for the military leader tended to wane in times of peace just as, according to Ennius, enthusiasm for the orator diminished in time of war. Marius realising this is said to have attempted to provoke war with Mithridates in the 90s B.C. in order to secure himself a further command and a third triumph (see below section **b** v); when the war eventually came Marius famously failed to secure the command despite his recent service in the Social War[186]. Similarly Scipio Africanus had won a second consulship in 194 B.C., but although he advised his brother in Asia during the war against Antiochus, there was clearly no plan to award him the command, despite his proven ability; indeed Livy, apparently following Valerius Antias, reported that Scipio was accused of dictating policy to his brother. Far from conforming to Cicero's ideal of an elder statesman in the

De Senectute (moulding public policy in the senate house and at public meetings, see above), Scipio Africanus had retired from public life to the seclusion of his estates, as Lucullus would choose to do following his triumph (see below, section **b** iv)[187].

Although Pompey ought to have been fated to repeat Scipio's example, because of the envy of his fellow-senators, further military commands were bestowed on him in the two decades after his first consulship, despite his age[188]. In his speech to the people in favour of the Manilian law (see below section **c** i) Cicero had been quite explicit in suggesting that Rome needed to call upon Pompey's unparalleled expertise to meet the current emergency. It has already been noted that such reliance on one man could be regarded as monarchy, and our sources suggest a close link between Caesar's proposed Parthian war, which ought to have led to a sixth triumph (perhaps in his sixtieth year), and the fatal suspicion that he was about to become a "***rex***"[189]. An apparent desire to curb the opportunities for other men to earn and celebrate triumphs, detectable under Caesar, was eventually realised under Augustus (see below, chapter 4)[190].

iv) References to historical foreign kings and their significance

It has already been suggested (see above section **a** i) that something of the history of Alexander was understood by some Romans as early as the late third century B.C.; Quintus Fabius Maximus may have been one of those to whom Alexander was familiar since Cicero's Cato describes him as, for a Roman of his day, an extraordinary reader who had acquainted himself with all wars, whether they had involved Rome or not. The idea that the famed opponent of Scipio's policy for the conclusion of the Second Punic War, knew of Alexander's decision to transfer to the heart of their empire the long-standing Greek conflict with Persia, is appealing but unverifiable[191]. Livy suggests that, in 205 B.C., Scipio referred favourably to the record of Agathocles in combatting the Carthaginians earlier in the century, and Polybius claimed that Scipio admired both

Agathocles and Dionysius of Syracuse; given the above noted Roman ideal of kings appointed on merit, rather than by hereditary right it is perhaps worth noting that Polybius claims both men to have had humble origins[192]. If Appian is to be believed, Philip V of Macedon was contrasted with Philip II in a late third century Sibylline oracle[193]. By 184 B.C. (the year of Plautus' death) a sizeable proportion of the theatre-going public can be expected to have been familiar with Agathocles and Philip II, as their names occur in his plays; apart from contemporary references to Philip V, Attalus and Antiochus (see below section **b** v) there are also references to Hiero and Darius[194]. Within another decade or so, as has already been suggested (see above section **a** iii), Ennius appears to have been drawing parallels between Xerxes and Antiochus The reference to the bridging of the Hellespont clearly refers to the invasion of Europe and not improbably Greek criticisms of the king's hubristic pretensions to god-like power in transforming sea into land, and ***vice versa*** (the Athos canal), were already understood at Rome; L. Aemilius Regillus' inscription recording his victory over Antiochus' fleet, which notes that the king was watching, may recall Salamis[195].

Cicero's Cato in the De Senectute, a dialogue apparently set in the mid second century B.C., refers both to Xenophon's Cyropaedia and the Oeconomicus; the accessibility of these texts at this date is perhaps supported by Cicero's earlier claim that Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, Cato's interlocutor in this dialogue, was almost never without his copy of the former work[196]. Polybius' apparent references to Xenophon's Anabasis and his pamphlet on Spartan society are also suggestive[197]. The Roman victories, in 146 B.C., over Macedonian pretenders calling themselves Philip and Alexander were followed at Rome by the construction of the Porticus Metelli (see below section **b** v) which accommodated the statue group of Alexander and his companions at the battle of the Granikos, seized as booty from Dium in Macedonia; whilst Alexander portraits may already have been known at Rome, this major monument is the first to be securely attested, and its appropriation demonstrated Roman mastery over Macedonia[198]. Stewart has

suggested that the model for the Alexander Mosaic (laid at the turn of the century in the House of the Faun at Pompeii) may also have been brought to Rome at this time[199].

Whilst the above noted kings had military careers to recommend them[200], Roman readers and viewers were also becoming familiar with Greek tyrants and oriental despots. One of the objects returned to Sicily, following Scipio Aemilianus Africanus' destruction of Carthage, was the metal bull constructed for the punishment of prisoners under Phalaris (tyrant of Agrigentum in the 6th century B.C.); whilst the bull's very existence had been questioned by Timaeus, its recovery was regarded as certain by Polybius (who may have seen it), who treats Phalaris as an archetypal tyrant[201]. When Polybius attempts to distance Hieronymus of Syracuse from Phalaris he appears to concede that the young man's character was suited to tyranny, merely denying that the reign was long enough to have encompassed all the outrageous excesses attributed to it by some historians; the attacks on women and redistributions of property mentioned by Diodorus may have been reported in such histories and read at Rome in the generation that fashioned Roman attitudes towards tyrants (see above section **b** ii)[202]. Polybius also mentioned Sardanapalus, with reference to both Philip II and Prusias II of Bithynia; in the case of the former, the military activity of the king and his court is said to disprove the accusations of softness, unmanliness and shamelessness levelled by Theopompus (see above, chapter 1), but the latter's 'barbarian' and 'womanish' conduct was said to match that of the effeminate Assyrian king[203]. Two generations later when the young Pompey was gaining a reputation as a second Alexander from his physical appearance and youthful military prowess, a certain L. Marcius Philippus (cos 91 B.C.) is said to have remarked that there was "nothing strange in the fact that he, being Philip, loved Alexander"; this may suggest that whatever the origins of this alternative Marcian cognomen, it was now being associated with Philip II. Within a few years Pompey had acquired the name "***Magnus***", although Plutarch notes that he did not personally consent to use the ***cognomen*** until 77 B.C.; in his third triumph, which is said to have included a vast trophy commemorating

his victories throughout the "***oikoumene***", Pompey was rumoured to have worn a cloak of Alexander's[204].

Whilst the comparison between Pompey and Alexander was particularly close, he was probably not the only Roman to be so compared in the period of the Mithridatic Wars; Suetonius relates how Julius Caesar, already over thirty years of age, sighed with disappointment at his own career, on seeing a statue of Alexander who had achieved so much in so short a time, whilst Plutarch represents him as weeping when reading part of a history of Alexander[205]. The group of equestrian statues at Lanuvium, probably erected in the early 60s B.C. (see below section **c** ii, and Figure 13), in apparent emulation of the Granikos Monument in the Porticus Metelli has been linked to the recent clash of empires in the vicinity of Alexander's battlefield, when Roman troops had engaged with those of Mithridates; the dedicator of the Lanuvium monument probably took the role of Alexander himself[206]. If Roman defenders of the Greek communities of Asia (from the barbarian threat of Mithridates), could think of themselves as Alexanders, then the jibe that he was a "***Xerxes Togatus***" instead, must have disappointed Lucullus; as has been noted Xerxes was known for hubristic projects to convert land into sea (and ***vice versa***) and Plutarch records the landscape gardening projects that occupied Lucullus' retirement, in association with this title. Lucullus' reclusive but luxurious retirement from public life, and the fact that he had accommodation for different seasons also fitted this characterisation as a Persian king[207].

Cicero may have referred to Xerxes at Salamis when he described Verres as reclining in his litter on the beaches of Sicily, watching his agents pillage the province[208]. Verres is also said to have considered himself a "***Rex Siculorum***" and to have behaved like the barbarian kings of the Persians and Syrians in commanding cities to contribute to the upkeep of his mistresses; the malign influence of his 'harem', particularly remarked upon during Cicero's account of the pirate raids, encouraged the effeminate idleness of a

Sardanapalus[209]. Elsewhere, Cicero notes the Greeks' affection for the memory of Hiero, whose palace constituted Verres' official residence, and suggested that Verres was closer to Phalaris in using a statue to torture Sopater of Tyndaris; Verres was also alleged to have filled the infamous quarry prisons of Syracuse with innocent Roman citizens[210]. Verres' impiety in plundering the artworks from temples was contrasted both with the behaviour of the kings and tyrants who had dedicated them, and the scrupulousness of Masinissa who, having acquired property, plundered by others from the goddess Juno, ensured its rededication to her[211]. Even the behaviour of Verres' agent is said to have been "***regius***" and "***tyrannicus***"; Cicero's suggestion that Apronius demanded a banquet upon entering a town to undertake its tax assessment may suggest awareness of Persian royal practice (as recorded by Herodotus)[212].

It is not clear whether Cicero's inclusion of the Ephesian Alexander portrait among the art treasures of the Greek world listed in the Verrines represents 'specialist' or 'common' knowledge but it does confirm that ruler portraits could be valued for their artistic merit like other paintings and sculptures, and it may have been this (rather than the subject matter) that determined Verres' decision to appropriate for himself the paintings of Agathocles at war; Cicero numbered portraits of other kings and tyrants of Sicily amongst the twenty-seven other very beautiful paintings plundered from the same temple[213]. In contrast to these ruler portraits revered as monuments over generations, Cicero is at pains to show that many of the portraits of Verres, which he claims had been extorted from the Sicilians (see below section **c** ii), had already been destroyed because he had not deserved them[214].

The first surviving Ciceronian reference to Xenophon's Agesilaus comes in a letter from 59 B.C., the year after the first references to the Cyropaedia; Cicero clearly considered both works instructive for those interested in rulership although in 46 B.C. Cicero would complain that, whilst everyone now read the "***Cyri vita et disciplina***", nobody bothered to

read the memoirs of Scaurus, suggesting that he then considered the Roman work to be more useful to Roman senators. Since provincial governors, as has already been noted, exercised quasi-monarchical power treatises on ideal kingship were particularly appropriate to them[215]. When Cicero appears to hope for the monarchical rule of one wise man at Rome, he may merely be expressing the hope that Quintus would attain the consulship; the monarchical nature of this office may have been the immediate inspiration for Philodemos' treatise on Homeric kings since its dedicatee was consul designate at the time of its completion, despite the work's apparent assumption that Rome had many kings (see above section **a** iii)[216]. In the context of the apparently contemporary jokes about Caesar (cos 59 B.C.) being a queen who aspired to kingship (see below section **b** v) he is said to have likened himself to Semiramis; three years later Cicero referred to this Assyrian queen when condemning the conduct of Gabinius' Syrian governorship[217].

In Cicero's famous letter to Lucceius, asking for the suppression of the 'Catilinarian conspiracy' to be recorded in a pamphlet, he again referred to Xenophon's Agesilaus; the perceived equivalence between his own achievements at Rome and those of Pompey in the East, may underline his contrast of Alexander and Agesilaus, the former "***clarus vir***" having been keen to have his physical appearance reproduced by Apelles and Lysippus, the latter having repudiated such representations and, so he claims, won greater fame through Xenophon's text than all other kings put together, regardless of their portraits[218]. Cicero's contemporaries however, appear to have found little inspiration in Xenophon's moral hero; even Cicero's brother, an apparent reader of the work, had failed to adopt an "***artificium benevolentiae***" during his governorship[219]. However, the greater military achievements of Alexander continued to inspire generals to push their campaigns towards the boundary of Ocean (and beyond). Crassus crossed the Euphrates at Zeugma (Alexander's crossing point), and similarly even Cicero could not resist publicising the fact that he had camped on the site of Alexander's camp at Issus and been declared "***imperator***" at the site of one of Alexander's most famous battles; Cicero claims that M. Caelius Rufus had often referred

to Cleitarchus' account of the battle (perhaps preferred to that of Callisthenes following Polybius' criticism)[220].

If Cyrus, Agesilaus and Alexander could be considered model rulers in the 50s B.C., the ghost of Phalaris continued to haunt Ciceronian thought. The In Pisonem underlines the connection between merciless cruelty and tyrannical rule (see above section **b** ii) with reference to Phalaris, whilst the De Re Publica asserted that an "***amabilis***" Cyrus could degenerate into a "***crudelissimus***" Phalaris[221]. By 49 B.C., when it was apparent to Cicero (amongst others) that the dispute between Pompey and Caesar would most likely end in tyranny, Cicero and Atticus could debate whether the victor would turn out to be a Phalaris or a Pisistratus, the latter having less of a reputation for cruelty than the former; Caesar's "***insidiosa clementia***" appears to have been a response to such fears, although many doubtless thought of Cinna or Sulla rather than Phalaris or Pisistratus (see above section **b** ii)[222].

As early as 54 B.C. Cicero had questioned the safety of wise men in kingdoms or tyrannies; Plato had been put in mortal danger by Dionysius (II), Callisthenes had been slain by Alexander, and Demetrius of Phalerum died in mysterious circumstances in the Egypt of Ptolemy II[223]. Cicero's argument that Rabirius had no choice but to obey Ptolemy (see below section **b** v), may depend on Plato's judgement, following his involvement with Dionysius, that even the requests of a tyrant contain an element of compulsion; this passage, quoted in a letter to Atticus dateable to 49 B.C., certainly seems to underlie his assertion that Caesar's "***condiciones***" amounted to "***leges***"[224]. Cicero claimed in March 49 B.C. that uncertainty about what his own conduct should be in the current crisis had prompted him to read Greek works about escaping and opposing tyrants; the previous month he admired Socrates' policy of never leaving home during the reign of the Thirty, but after risking Caesar's displeasure by failing to attend the senate he was debating in May whether it was better to die at home (on one's own terms) or as an exile

abroad[225]. Cicero's choice of Sardanapalus as a possible model for himself seems surprising given the extraordinary circumstances of his death as recorded by Ctesias, far removed from the native Roman tradition of honourable suicide, but Cicero clearly indicates that Atticus is to advise flight and exile instead; the pseudonymous author of the African War would allege that in 47 B.C. Juba threatened to immolate himself, his treasure, his children and his subjects in one pyre if he was defeated, suggesting familiarity with the Sardanapalus story[226].

The implied criticism of Alexander in the Pro Rabirio Postumo is new to surviving Latin literature, but was soon matched in Cicero's De Re Publica by the story of Alexander's encounter with a pirate chief who asserted that the king's universal conquests stemmed from the same "***scelus***" as his own piracy[227]. The change in attitude towards Alexander was far from universal, as Caesar demonstrated by, for example, visiting his tomb in 47 B.C., fighting without a helmet at Munda, and allowing a statue of himself as the 'unconquered god' to be dedicated in the temple of Quirinus[228]. In a public speech, delivered in Caesar's presence in 46 B.C., Cicero could suggest that Caesar's "***res gestae***" had outstripped all the achievements of Roman generals, foreign nations, powerful peoples and famous kings (an implied reference to Alexander)[229]. The following year, in private correspondence, he doubted whether he could imitate Theopompus or Aristotle by penning advice to the new Alexander without either compromising his own integrity, or annoying his addressee. Nevertheless, against a background of the Sibylline oracle suggesting that the commander of the Parthian campaign be named as king before embarkation, Cicero produced a treatise on "***decus***" and submitted it to Caesar's friends for their comments; they demanded so many alterations that he abandoned the project, claiming that the work had always been "***kolakeia***". This is the context in which Cicero described Alexander's change of character after he had been named king, when despite the tuition of Aristotle, and his own character and restraint he became "***superbus***", "***crudelis***" and "***immoderatus***"[230]. After Caesar's death Cicero claimed that, despite the superior "***res***

gestae et gloria" of Alexander the Great, it was Philip II who was "***semper magnus***" since the behaviour of the son was "***saepe turpissimus***"; the father, here accorded the virtues of "***facilitas***" and "***humanitas***", was among those kings listed by Cicero as having urged their sons to win goodwill by "***oratio benigna***", and he was later said to have criticised his son's lavish benefactions. This apparent idealisation of Philip II is at odds with Cicero's decision to term his speeches against Antony 'Philippics', after those of Demosthenes warning about the king's threat to Greek liberty; it is ironic that Cicero's last favourable reference to Alexander is in the fifth Philippic justifying the promotion of Octavian, where the king's "***virtus***" is said to have won him great achievements, and his death is said to have come ten years before he would have been eligible for a Roman consulship[231].

Since both sides at the battle of Pharsalus had leaders who liked to think of themselves as Roman Alexanders, it is no surprise that victor's history represented the loser as a Darius; Caesar himself records that Pompey's camp was luxuriously decked in anticipation of victory, perhaps reflecting the state of the camp of the "***rex magnus Persarum***" after Issus, which had prompted Alexander to remark "so this is what it means to be a king". Plutarch and Appian however, suggest that Pompey was already being termed 'King of Kings' by his own side, probably on account of his recruitment of barbarian troops; the fact that Pompey spent the battle moping about his own tent rather than fighting in the midst of his troops, and then fled, did nothing to undermine his characterisation as an Eastern potentate[232].

In 46 B.C. Cicero claimed that having lost his forensic "***regnum***" he was following the example of Dionysius II who, having been expelled from Sicily, set up a school; the tyrant was far from being considered a wise man, despite his association with Plato, and emulation of Demetrius of Phalerum, another man who devoted himself to the composition of many excellent treatises (having lost control of the tiller of state), was certainly more respectable[233]. Cicero followed Plato's Socrates in ascribing happiness to the "***boni***"

rather than the "***fortunatissimi***" arguing that whilst kings, such as Archelaus of Macedon, had sufficient power and resources to do as they pleased, only the "***sapiens***", "***fortis***" and "***moderatus***" man was happy; tyrants who sought to maintain their power by fear were considered wretched partly because they were in constant fear of assassination[234]. In this field of discussion a knowledge of Xenophon's Hiero might have been useful, but although the Oeconomicus was misquoted to indicate that the combination of Cyrus' "***virtus***" and "***fortuna***" rendered him "***beatus***", there is no sign of the former text[235].

Following the death of Cicero there is much less contemporary evidence to consider, and with reference to historical foreign kings the losses of both Varro's Imagines and the relevant chapters of Cornelius Nepos' De viris illustribus are particularly disappointing; it is hard to believe that either could have avoided Alexander, and indeed Varro is known to have referred to Alexander in his dialogue Orestes vel De Insania, citing correspondence between the king and his mother in which the former refers to himself as "***Iovis Hammonis filius***"[236]. Darius and Xerxes made an appearance in Nepos' lives of Miltiades and Themistocles respectively as enemies of European freedom; the latter is blamed for fires and massacres at Athens[237]. Artaxerxes and Philip II are represented as offering friendships to men made prominent by their "***magnitudo animi***" (Themistocles) and "***virtus***" (Eumenes of Cardia) respectively; by contrast Dionysius II, who is characterised by "***crudelitas***", ensured the exile of Dion[238]. Alexander was mentioned in the life of Eumenes, without reference to his conquests apart from the fact of his death at Babylon[239].

In the revised edition of Nepos' De viris illustribus, probably to be dated to the early twenties B.C., the life of Timoleon was followed by a "***brevis notatio***" on generals who were also kings with unfettered powers; Timoleon had laid down his "***imperium***" and returned to the status of a "***privatus***", establishing "***libertas***" in place of the "***regnum***" he

could so easily have claimed, but Nepos does not appear to have believed that Octavian had done (or would do) the same, and his morbid interest in the deaths of the kings discussed in this appendix to the chapter on foreign generals is clearly significant. The note begins unsurprisingly with Cyrus, here said to have died in battle against the Massagetae; readers familiar with Herodotus would know that this barbarian people had been ruled by a widow queen fighting for the independence of her dominions, and the parallel with Cleopatra might suggest that Octavian ought to have died at Actium. Nepos makes no mention of the great length of Cyrus' rule prior to his defeat and death although Darius I, another "***privatus***" who had gained a "***regnum***" by his "***virtus***" is said to have died of old age[240]. Xerxes and the two Artaxerxes are next on Nepos' list, the former having been murdered and the latter pair having died of disease (prematurely?); Xerxes' failure to realise his ambition of world conquest is said to have prompted his assassination, whilst the two Artaxerxes are between them accorded three of the four virtues of Augustus' ***Clupeus Virtutis*** ("***incredibilis virtus***", "***iustitia***" and "***pietas***")[241]. Of Philip II and Alexander the Great whose "***rerum gestarum gloria***" outstripped all others, Nepos notes only that the father was murdered "***iuxta theatrum***" (like Caesar) whilst the son had died of disease at Babylon; the reader probably knew that the son had died in his early thirties, and given the famously poor health of Octavian-Augustus Nepos appears to have been hoping for history to repeat itself[242]. Nepos' readers may have considered Pyrrhus' war with Rome a "***certamen de imperio***" (see above section **I** a), and his defeat was shown to have been followed by an ignominious death at the hands of a woman who hurled a roof-slate at him[243]. The other successors of Alexander are a similarly unedifying bunch who mostly died either in battle or as a result of conspiracies; the only Diadoch mentioned by Nepos as having died a natural death is said to have done so as a captive of his treacherous son-in-law[244]. Nepos' Dionysius I, who gained power on account of his "***virtus***" lacked self-mastery only with regard to "***singularis perpetuusque***" rule, and consequently endured plots against his life, to the extent that his death in old age is attributed to "***magna felicitas***"[245]. Whilst Augustus was to survive to the old age of a Darius or Dionysius, he

was not so lucky as the latter who, Nepos says, was not predeceased by any of his descendants[246].

Livy's digression on Alexander, in Book IX of his history, is the first sustained Latin critique of the king to have survived; Livy appears to share Nepos' interest in the king's death and, asserting that his achievements seem the more remarkable because of his youth, suggests that his death prevented him from suffering the reverses of fortune that befell other military men, like Cyrus and Pompey, in their later years[247]. Whereas Cicero had noted a change in Alexander's character following his accession, Livy associated the change with his military success; Livy notes not only the ("***superba***") adoption of Eastern dress, the desire for ***proskynesis***, and the claim of divine paternity, but the drunkenness and anger, and the tortures and executions which had probably inspired Cicero's choice of "***immoderatus***" and "***crudelis***" respectively[248]. Although the earliest Greek challenges to Rome's reputation may date to the late third century B.C. when defeats in battle undermined its claim to be "***invictus***" (see above section **a** i) Livy's suggestion that Alexander gained his invincible reputation from fighting effeminate Easterners is new, although that charge had been levelled at Roman generals in the Late Republic; the related claim that Rome had faced up to Antiochus, Philip V and Perseus without danger of defeat, is similarly at odds with Cicero's decision to equate Mithridates with these rulers to prove that he was a serious threat to Rome[249].

v) Roman attitudes to Hellenistic monarchs

An outline survey of contacts between Rome and third century kings has already been set out (above section **a** i), and the evidence of war and diplomacy indicates that kings could be considered formidable foes or worthy allies. The reference in the De Finibus to Rome's consuls warning the "***inimicissimus rex***" about Cineas' plan to poison him tells us more about antique Roman "***fides***" than about contemporary attitudes to Pyrrhus' kingship; in

the De Re Publica, Cicero referred to the "***largitas***" of Pyrrhus, and the offers to C. Fabricius probably were part of the earliest tellings of the story of the king's defeat[250]. As will be noted below allegations about the royal bribery of Roman generals, magistrates and senators was a recurring theme throughout the Republic; Cicero's metaphorical use of the idea, with reference to Pompey's sponsorship of Afranius' canvass for the consulship in 61 B.C., demonstrates that this was how Romans expected kings to behave[251]. The receipt of hospitality and gifts might cloud a man's judgement even if their bestowal had not been intended to corrupt, and Dionysius' account of ambassadors surrendering to the treasury the gifts they had received from Ptolemy in the 270s B.C. may suggest an early recognition that lavishness was expected of Greek kings and could be accommodated in Rome's dealings with them, so long as it was the state that benefited rather than the individual[252].

Diodorus notes the "***philanthropia***" of Hiero in 255 B.C. towards the Roman survivors of a mass shipwreck, but this is said to have amounted only to the provision of clothing, food and other essentials; later references to gifts of grain for the city of Rome and her army in the field confirm his generosity, but out of all the less practical gifts demanded back by Hieronymus, on his succession, only the statue of Nike/Victoria (see above section **a** ii) can certainly be identified[253]. Whilst Hiero might appear to have placed Rome in his debt by paying out over and above the war reparations demanded in 263 B.C., Rome, which had confiscated territory from Hiero, was understood to be the superior power, and Gelon and Hieronymus clearly thought that the recent successes of the Carthaginians in Italy offered an opportunity to restore and even enlarge their Syracusan empire at Rome's expense. In contrast to later times, when the senate waited to receive embassies requesting the renewal of existing treaties from the successor to a dead king (see below), it was the praetor at Lilybaeum who initiated contact on Hiero's death. In fact, according to Polybius, the renewal was considered so important that a false rumour of Hiero's demise prompted a mission that had to be recalled when it was discovered that he was still alive; the Roman deputation appears to have claimed that a renewal of the ancestral treaty would be

particularly advantageous to him because of his youth. The offer of effective guardianship was rejected and thirteen months later the "***pais***" was dead, having gained the reputation of a tyrant[254].

What Rome made of her Sicilian royal visitor in 237 B.C. is not clear. Whilst the diadem was used in coin portraits of Hiero and Gelon, some are 'laureate' or even bare-headed, and Livy suggests that Hiero and Gelon had abandoned the use of regalia long before their deaths; taken with the suggestion that Hiero had several times attempted to abdicate, and Polybius' claim that Gelon was not driven by a desire for "***basileia***", it should probably be concluded that something of the pomp of other dynasties was missing from their style of monarchy. Nevertheless the wealth and other resources at the disposal of one man must have seemed extraordinary[255]. The evident anxiety about Hieronymus' succession is understandable when it is remembered that a Roman boy of his age would have been many years away from holding even a junior magistracy; in addition, the evident difference in his character from that of his forefathers was proof that heredity was no guarantee of fitness to rule[256]. It is possible that Roman envoys to Ptolemy IV offered to protect and advise his son if the former were to die before the latter was of age, perhaps even reminding him of the end of the Syracusan monarchy; whilst the story of M. Aemilius Lepidus' appointment to the tutelage of Ptolemy V, on behalf of the Roman people, has been considered later invention, it should be noted that Polybius clearly states that the will of Ptolemy IV published by Sosibius and Agathocles was a forgery, and that the envoy despatched to Rome was encouraged to take his time[257].

The first concrete proof of Rome's regard for foreign kings was the presentation of Roman regalia to Syphax in 210 B.C.; his transference of allegiance to Carthage was followed by defeat and capture, and he was probably the first diademed king to be displayed in a Roman triumph. Masinissa, who had been dethroned by Syphax, was the first to have been restored to his ancestral throne by the force of Roman arms, and the authority of the

senate; he received regalia on more than one occasion. The superiority of Rome to these African kings was more clearly apparent than had been the case with the Syracusans[258]. Attalus, who had cooperated with Roman naval movements against Philip earlier in the decade just as Masinissa had supported Scipio's African campaign, is represented by Polybius as deciding to make the journey to Athens in 201 B.C. as soon as he heard that Roman envoys were going to be there, but the exact balance of his "***philia***" with Rome is unclear[259].

If Romans already felt themselves superior to kings, this is not to suggest that kings had already become objects of contempt; indeed Polybius' Scipio was very happy both to be and to be thought "***basilikos***". The idea that kingship could begin with military success is integral to Polybius' account, and he notes that the Spanish chieftains Edeco and Andobales made obeisance to Scipio as an acknowledgement of his kingly power[260]. The legend that Genucius Cippus, returning from war, sprouted horns and retreated into voluntary exile to avoid becoming king of Rome probably cannot predate the third century as the idea of the horn prodigy almost certainly depends on the early Hellenistic practice of adorning with animal horns royal helmets and portraits (see above, chapter 2); that Genucius is first known to have been written about under Augustus does not automatically disprove that the legend was genuinely antique and Scipio's disavowal of kingship, for patriotic reasons, offers a kind of parallel[261].

Without resorting to the notion that Romans had an ancestral hatred of kingship dating back to the foundation of the Republic, it is possible to suggest that Scipio believed foreign kings should model themselves on Roman magistrates and generals rather than the reverse; as Livy's Scipio noted when giving Masinissa triumphal regalia, nothing bestowed a greater distinction on a Roman than his having celebrated a triumph. By contrast, in Plautus, "***rex***" can be just a wealthy patron, and luxurious furnishings "***regius***"; more loosely kingship can be considered freedom from want, and having power to do whatever

one likes. That these associations depended on perceptions of contemporary Hellenistic kings is strongly suggested by Gripus' plans to build a pleasure-boat once he had been recognised as "***apud reges rex***" (a great merchant); the descriptions, preserved by Athenaeus, of boats built by Hiero and Ptolemy IV suggest the kind of vessel Gripus had in mind[262]. Similarly a character in the Poenulus who wishes to be pampered desires more gentle treatment than is bestowed on the eyes of Antiochus, and Gripus' plan to found a royal capital and to name it after himself, suggesting a knowledge of the Hellenistic East's Alexandrias, Antiocheias, etc, should also be noted; Livy claims that in 196 B.C. Antiochus revealed to Roman envoys that he proposed to refound Lysimacheia as a royal capital for his son[263].

Following the battle of Cynoscephalae, Philip V chose to concede to all the Roman demands and this included the surrender of his son Demetrius who was to be held in Rome with other hostages As Braund pointed out, Demetrius' term at Rome was no imprisonment despite his inclusion in Flamininus' triumph, and he probably enjoyed the hospitality of the first Marcii to gain the cognomen "***Philippus***"; that members of the Roman aristocracy should behave like foster-fathers to royal princes, thus generating an "***amor nominis Romani***", is entirely in line with the idea that M. Aemilius Lepidus was considered a guardian for Ptolemy V, and that friendly foreign kings like Masinissa were encouraged to adopt Roman dress (see above)[264]. When in 192 B.C. Eumenes sent his brother Attalus to Rome to announce that Antiochus had crossed the Hellespont, Livy notes that the senate saw to it that he did not have to pay for his accommodation, and bestowed on him gifts of horses, armour, and gold and silver vessels[265]. Early the following year envoys from Philip, Ptolemy and Masinissa offered different forms of practical assistance against Antiochus; Livy notes that Ptolemy was excused, perhaps on his wife's account, as Livy notes that a further offer of assistance, the following year, came in the joint names of Ptolemy and Cleopatra (Antiochus' daughter), and later represents Prusias as determining to abstain himself from the conflict with Perseus because the senate

would disapprove of his bearing arms against his brother-in-law[266]. Polybius says that Rome's gratitude to Philip prompted the return of Demetrius whilst Livy, noting that the king escorted the Roman expeditionary force through Macedonia and Thrace, claims that Philip's "***dexteritas et humanitas***" endeared him to Scipio Africanus[267].

In these circumstances Polybius' description of Prusias fearing that the Romans would overthrow every dynast in Asia is surprising (Livy blames the rhetoric of Antiochus); Polybius had the Scipiones respond to the charge that Rome was a threat to kings, by citing examples both of mere dynasts who had been made real kings by Roman authority, and of Roman goodwill towards even those kings who had been subdued in war[268]. Once Antiochus' defeat at Magnesia had prompted him to concede to Roman terms, Eumenes came to Rome in person and was permitted to address the senate. Plutarch probably refers to this occasion when describing how the leading men of Rome competed to be near him, and Polybius notes that his appeal to the senate was given precedence over those of the Rhodians and the envoys of Antiochus; in line with the above noted claims that Rome rewarded loyal kings he appears to have asked for an extension of his domains[269]. Two years later Eumenes was presented with his reward, including territories formerly overrun by Prusias, who seems to have gained less from Rome, by abandoning Antiochus in 190 B.C., than Ariarathes of Cappadocia who had fought on Antiochus' side; now on the point of marrying Eumenes' daughter, the latter was to be enrolled as an ally of Rome[270].

As has been noted above Plutarch's Cato described kings as "***sarcophagoi***", but even he was apparently willing to concede that Eumenes was both a good man and a friend of Rome[271]. Although Livy's Q. Fulvius Flaccus however, was prepared (in 181 B.C.) to equate both Philip and Antiochus with Hannibal, as the greatest commanders of his time, the historian had earlier suggested that Rome's fear of Antiochus ended with his first defeat, because he failed to live up to his reputation as a serious adversary, regardless of the resources and advisers at his disposal. Certainly opposition to Lucius Cornelius

Scipio's request for a triumph, and the title Asiaticus, is represented as being rooted in the belief that Glabrio's victory over the Aetolians at Thermopylae was the worthier achievement, and by 187 B.C. it had been claimed that the former had accepted payments from the king, securing him easier peace terms[272]. The same year as the conviction of Scipio Asiaticus, on this charge, Livy claims that Marcus Aemilius Lepidus described M. Fulvius Nobilior as a Philip and Cn. Manlius Volso as an Antiochus; Livy's opposition of "***privati***" to "***consules***" seems to reflect the arguments of the Late Republic, but there probably was evidence that both had made wars on their own initiative, and their description as kings of Europe and Asia may just be genuine. Livy later claims that contrary to Rome's treaty with Antiochus, Manlius had attempted to seize the king, presumably for inclusion in a triumph[273].

Livy notes that a statue of Antiochus "***in templo Minervae Itoniae***" had outraged the consul Glabrio in 191 B.C.; whilst the location of the statue may have caused offence, Livy suggests that it was the fact that it had been established by the faithless Boeotians, who had eagerly deserted the Roman cause on the approach of Antiochus, that angered him[274]. Ennius' generalisation about kings seeking statues throughout their reigns has already been noted, and, as Whitehorne pointed out, Plautus' Therapontigonus Platagidorus, an imitator of royal titulature and conquests, is represented as supervising the construction of an over life-size gold portrait of himself to commemorate his campaigns. Plautus also represented Palaestrio as claiming that mere precedence of birth had prevented his master (the swaggering soldier) from holding "***regnum in caelo***" in Jupiter's place, and it has already been suggested that Greek ideas of royal "***hubris***" may have been used at Rome in connection with the new Xerxes (see above section **b** iv)[275].

The idea that Rome might arbitrate in the disputes of foreign kings and peoples was clearly established and the precedence given to royal envoys in 190 B.C. is known to have been followed on several occasions; Polybius and Diodorus record Rome's lavish reception of

Eumenes' brothers around 180 B.C., noting that the young men of the city had met them when serving in Asia[276]. On Philip's death Perseus sued for the renewal of Rome's friendship, and for confirmation that the senate was prepared to acknowledge him as king; there is little evidence for a similar diplomatic mission having been sent to Rome on the accession of Seleucus IV in 187 B.C., but there is no evidence either for the senate having at this stage supported the succession claim of a younger son, as it was to do with Philip's son Demetrius[277]. Antiochus' younger son Antiochus had been a hostage since the peace of Apameia, and his brother's accession did nothing to alter his status; more than a decade on, an exchange was being planned with Seleucus' younger son Demetrius, when the king died, and with Eumenes' assistance Antiochus (IV) gained the Seleucid throne. Roman approval for this accession was always likely given the long Roman education which famously prompted him to borrow Roman customs, and Livy states that the envoy entrusted with seeking the renewal of Rome's friendship, was given a huge cash gift, rent-free accommodation and a maintenance allowance because he was known to be a close friend of the king; the house used on this occasion may have been that built at public expense to house Antiochus when he had been a hostage[278].

In 172 B.C. Ariarathes of Cappadocia sent his son to Rome for education in Roman customs, apparently asking for the state to act as his guardian, rather than private individuals; the praetor was assigned the task of hiring a house for the prince and his "***comites***"[279]. In direct contrast, four years later Perseus is reported to have contacted both Eumenes and Antiochus to urge them to join his war against Rome to save themselves from a similar fate to his own[280]. Once Perseus had been defeated at Pydna, the Romans refused to grant peace so long as he claimed the title of king, and no substitute was appointed; Perseus was paraded in the triumph of Aemilius Paullus, and his children kept in custody with him at Alba Fucens, to prevent them from laying claim to their ancestral kingdom[281]. In response to reports of Antiochus' invasion of Egypt, in the early 160s B.C., C. Popilius Laenas had been sent out to investigate; mindful of Perseus' defeat he

was persuaded to withdraw by Popilius' famous act of drawing a circle around the king, an action which Polybius and Diodorus describe as overbearing and insolent[282].

The Ptolemies and Antiochus now sent envoys to Rome, the former to offer thanks for their delivery, and the latter to confirm his obedience, but Prusias came in person to congratulate Rome on the victory over Perseus, hailing the senators as "***theoi soteres***"; he was permitted public funds for sacrifices on the Capitol, and at the temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, and surrendered his son Nicomedes to the safekeeping of the senate[283]. Eumenes however, also on his way to Rome, was informed that he was not even permitted to remain in Italy, suspicion of his loyalty to Rome having been roused by his contacts with Perseus during the war; his brother Attalus was still treated with respect, given gifts and even escorted from the city on his departure, but Polybius suggests that a general decree was passed to prevent all kings from visiting Rome and indeed Livy suggests that even an old ally like Masinissa was forbidden from coming to sacrifice on the Capitol as Prusias had done[284]. Whilst Livy ascribes to Masinissa the tyrannical vices of "***superbia***", "***crudelitas***", and "***avaritia***", Polybius attests to his virtuous reputation[285].

Polybius suggests that in 164 B.C. Rome feared a coalition between the Seleucid and Attalid kingdoms; Livy suggests that, even before Pydna, Eumenes had not only been suspected but hated ("***invisus***") by the Romans, whose panel of enquiry now sought to gather evidence against him during ten days of audiences at Smyrna, and Antiochus was thought likely to resent Popilius' treatment and the thwarting of his Egyptian ambitions[286]. The possibility of such an alliance was diminished by the death of Antiochus, and the subsequent accession of a boy-king; although Rome was in possession of an adult cousin of Antiochus V, long schooled in Roman ***mores***, and bound to the senators by almost familial ties, it was determined that he should remain a hostage in Rome, and according to Polybius a commission sent to oversee the administration of the kingdom had specific instructions to harm its military capability. Appian claims that the killing of elephants and

the burning of ships prompted Leptines' assassination of Cn. Octavius (Rome's chief envoy)[287]. This policy of weakening kingdoms was again followed with regard to the Ptolemaic possessions which, according to Polybius, were divided between the brothers (Ptolemys VI and VIII) to prevent future rulers from having all the kingdom's resources at their disposal, and using them to defend their kingdom's interests at the expense of Rome; when the elder brother refused to surrender Cyprus, the Romans renounced their friendship with him, and demanded that his envoys leave Italy within five days. That Demetrius should have suggested to Ptolemy VI on an earlier visit (as an exile) that he should deck himself as a king in order to make a good impression at Rome, suggests both that the earlier moratorium on royal visitors had passed into abeyance once the threat of a visit by Eumenes had passed (Ptolemy VIII too appears to have experienced no difficulty in addressing the senate), and that suspicion and hatred of Eumenes was particular, rather than a manifestation of general attitudes towards kings. Nevertheless, Cato's apparent description of Ptolemy (VIII?) as the best and most beneficent king is probably ironical[288].

Although Demetrius was again denied permission to claim the Seleucid throne, once he had escaped and established himself, Rome did grant qualified recognition. Within a year or so he had confiscated Cappadocia from Ariarathes, who had refused a marriage alliance, installing in his place a supposed brother, Orophernes, who petitioned for a renewal of Rome's friendship. Ariarathes came to Rome as a suppliant, making private representations to the consuls in their own homes, only to find that Rome recommended the division of the kingdom between them[289]. In 154 BC Rome repudiated her friendship with Prusias, who had refused to pay reparations following attacks on the Attalid kingdom[290]. Attalus sent his nephew and intended heir to Rome for a few days to establish friendly relations between him and the senators; Ariarathes' son Demetrius was also in Rome at this time along with Alexander Balas, the Seleucid pretender, who now gained Rome's approval for his ultimately successful campaign to dethrone Demetrius

(I)[291]. The latter's decision to send to Rome Andriscus, the false Philip, who had ambitions of reviving the Macedonian monarchy, was never likely to regain him Rome's backing, but it was a sign that he respected the Romans' Macedonian settlement; Diodorus represents the Macedonian pretender as having followers willing to see him as Demetrius' successor, so there may in any case have been a more immediate domestic motive for the extradition[292].

Scipio Aemilianus, grandson by adoption of the man who had established Masinissa's rule in Numidia, was invited to his deathbed in 149 BC to arrange the division of the country between the king's sons, despite the fact that he was a mere military tribune; Cicero purports to describe a previous encounter, noting that Scipio's chief desire on reaching Africa had been to meet the king who was "***amicissimus***" towards his family[293]. Scipio's dissipation of royal power was well in line with recent senatorial decisions to weaken and divide particular kingdoms whilst retaining kings as rulers. Rome's creation of a kingless Macedonia, a decade or so previously, depended on that kingdom's failure to learn submission to Rome and Ptolemy VIII's qualified promise of a bequest to Rome of all his territories, which must depend on the example of Macedonia, was unlikely to have succeeded in its object of depriving his brother's descendants of a kingdom, given Rome's willingness to support Alexander Balas and other pretenders[294]. At Rome, the Macedonian pretenders Philip Andriscus and Alexander may have been considered less worthy opponents than true kings, an under-estimation of the capabilities of the former perhaps contributing to the defeat of Iuventius Thalna in 149 B.C.; however, Metellus' appellation "***Macedonicus***" well matches the already noted acquisition of Alexander portraits (see above section **b** iv), in suggesting that he regarded his victories as at least equivalent to those over any other members of Alexander's dynasty[295].

In 145 B.C., Ptolemy VI died and Egypt and her possessions fell in their entirety to Ptolemy VIII, whose authority had long-standing Roman approval, even if Rome would

have preferred to see a joint rule between him and his nephew (Ptolemy VII), deposed the same year; Polybius was unsure how to appraise the reign of Ptolemy VI noting that his kindness and goodness were manifested in his treatment of his brother and the infrequent resort to capital punishment, but also claiming that his successes had tended to make him debauched and indolent. The latter vice hardly matches the acknowledged fact of his death from recent battle wounds, received in an albeit unsuccessful campaign to recover Ptolemaic interests in Coele-Syria and beyond[296]. Other royal character assessments have survived in the later books of Polybius and suggest, with regard to Ptolemy's virtues, that he was perceived to be exceptional, whilst his alleged vices link him to Prusias and Sardanapalus (see above section **b** iv); although Eumenes and Masinissa are credited with better family relations than Ptolemy was able to achieve, the decade had opened with Nicomedes' murder of his father, and gone on to see Ptolemy himself betray his son-in-law[297]. In 142 B.C. the accession of a Seleucid pretender, whose luxurious lifestyle was so famous that he was known as Tryphon as often as Diodotus, conforms to the Polybian representation of kings. Whether Polybius' Roman contemporaries shared these perceptions is unclear, although they did refuse to acknowledge the kingship of Tryphon, whom they clearly believed to have murdered his ward (Antiochus VI), and Rome's commissioners are said to have gained a poor impression of Ptolemy (VIII) from their lavish reception at Alexandria[298]. Whereas for more than a century Rome had had cause to fear 'Alexanders' with troops in mainland Greece, repeated victories may have been turning such fear into contempt and disdain, the remaining kingdoms, at greater distance from Rome, posing little threat; in addition, Roman readers already familiar with the concept of constitutional degeneration doubtless knew that the greatest Macedonian king had died well over 150 years previously[299].

News of the death of Attalus III and the bequest of his kingdom to the Roman people appears to have been brought by an envoy who, as has already been noted, was reported to have paid special attention to the tribune Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (see above section

b ii); a guest friendship between the Sempronii and the Attalids is not unlikely and, just as Scipio Aemilianus had been a virtual executor of Masinissa fifteen years earlier (see above), the purple and diadem may well have been surrendered to Tiberius Gracchus in his capacity as a friend who could ensure that the king's last wishes were carried out, and that Aristonicus-Eumenes did not gain Rome's favour[300]. As Gruen rightly notes, there appears to have been no rush to provincialise the former kingdom, the senate even waiting a further two years before sending out a force to end the reign of Aristonicus; some of the kings who had opposed Aristonicus were subsequently rewarded with grants of additional territory, and in the case of Mithridates V of Pontus at least, there were rumours that Rome's legate had been bribed[301]. Around 124 B.C. envoys from both Mithridates and Nicomedes III were at Rome and, according to Gaius Gracchus at least, both embassies were investing heavily in gifts for senators[302].

Gracchus' criticism appears to have been of his fellow-citizens for accepting such bribes, and his ***lex Repetundarum*** enabling victims of all forms of Roman magisterial extortion in the provinces to reclaim the sums handed over as lubricating inducements or protection money, similarly blames the recipients; Sherwin-White has pointed out that kings were specifically included as potential claimants, special provision being made for them to present their case through intermediaries rather than in person[303]. Allegations of bribery were very much associated with Rome's relations with Numidia following the death of Micipsa in 118 B.C.; Jugurtha secured the previously divided kingdom for himself by murdering Hiempsal and driving Adherbal into Roman protection, and is said to have sent gifts to his acquaintances in the city, and other important men, to dissuade them from permitting action to be taken against him on Adherbal's account. Seven years later the consul who had been allotted a command against Jugurtha reached a diplomatic solution instead, and again bribery was suspected; Jugurtha was required to give evidence in person but a tribune prevented him from testifying[304]. On the suspicion that Jugurtha had

been involved in the murder at Rome of yet another of Masinissa's descendants, he was required to leave Italy[305].

Sallust represents Jugurtha as recruiting Bocchus of Mauretania to his cause by suggesting that Rome was against "***omnia regna***" because they feared anyone who seemed to be "***opulentissimus***"; by Sallust's day this was standard rhetoric for a king on the verge of war with Rome, and indeed Rome's previous forebearance with Jugurtha hardly backs it up[306]. Once Bocchus had been persuaded that an alliance with Rome, which he had been seeking for several years, and an extension of his domains, could be the reward for betraying Jugurtha's trust, and surrendering him into Roman hands, the war was soon concluded, and the Numidian king was paraded in triumph through the city of Rome in 105 B.C.[307]. Unlike Macedonia in 168 B. C., Numidia was not punished by the ending of its monarchy and Bocchus was certainly not permitted to appropriate it all; rather a certain Hiempsal was installed, doubtless some relation of Jugurtha's who had survived his purges and the war, perhaps even a son of Gauda, to whom Marius is said cynically to have promised kingship on the eve of his first consulship, and not improbably a mere boy[308].

The victory of Marius was not as glorious as could have been desired, the king not having been taken in battle, or by voluntary surrender, but by deceit; this underlines the fact that, allegations of bribery aside, Jugurtha had not proved to be a military pushover, however minor a leader he appears in comparison to 'Macedonians' like Philip and Antiochus. This was a timely warning against complacency given the increasing influence in Asia Minor of Mithridates VI of Pontus; again however, our sources indicate that a willingness to receive a king's bribes ensured that Roman disapproval of his actions was not translated into military action, and the tribune Saturninus was prosecuted for abusing the king's envoys[309]. The previous year, Rome had been visited by the Battaces, high priest of the Magna Mater, not improbably in connection with the earlier fire at her temple on the Palatine; his gold crown and his regal cloak of purple and gold, apparently awed the

people of the city into granting him free board and lodgings, but an outraged tribune managed to forbid him from wearing the crown in the city. When Jugurtha had come to the city in 111 B.C. he had temporarily abandoned royal dress; in Sallust's account this was supposed to inspire pity, as Ptolemy VI had hoped to do in 164 B.C. heedless of Demetrius' advice (see above), but Battaces' privileges of dress appear exceptional, whatever the popular enthusiasm for them, and Jugurtha may have been constrained by law[310].

The year before Ptolemy Apion of Cyrene died, bequeathing his small kingdom to the Roman people, claims staked on Cappadocia and Paphlagonia by Nicomedes III and Mithridates had been rejected at Rome, the territories being declared free[311]. Cappadocia having used its independence to choose to be ruled by a new and truly Cappadocian king Ariobarzanes I, Tigranes of Armenia, probably acting in Mithridates' interests, managed to unseat him, driving him to seek Roman assistance in securing his restoration. Military intervention in the East was contemplated for the first time in thirty years with Sulla, the man who had persuaded Bocchus to hand over Jugurtha, empowered to restore Ariobarzanes[312]. Travelling through Cappadocia as far as the Euphrates, Sulla received an envoy seeking recognition for Parthia, and presumably its king (Mithridates II), as a friend and ally of the Roman people in 92 B.C; probably the previously great distance of Rome's troops from the borders of the kingdom had not made such recognition an issue in the earlier contacts with Parthia, hinted at by Maccabees and Lucilius but denied by Plutarch[313]. On Sulla's return he was charged with illegally extorting money from an allied kingdom, although the prosecutor failed to appear on the day of the trial; it is far from clear which kingdom was involved but neither Cappadocia nor Bithynia is unlikely[314]

The latter kingdom had witnessed the death of Nicomedes III in 94 B.C., and the expulsion of his successor by Socrates Chrestus who, having failed to win Rome's support for his

claim to the throne, was supplied by Mithridates with the necessary troops for a coup; Ariobarzanes having been driven a second time from his kingdom, Rome again intervened directly to restore both kings around 90 B.C. encouraging them to plunder Mithridates' territories in order to repay their debts. Having unsuccessfully appealed both to Rome's legates and the senate Mithridates' response was an invasion of Bithynia and Asia; Rome and her allies went down to defeat and the ex-consul Manius Aquillius was captured and executed, molten gold (symbolic of royal bribes) being poured down his throat[315]. According to Diodorus the Italian communities opposing Rome in the Social War appealed for Mithridates to invade Italy, and indeed by the time Sulla reached Attica a couple of years later, one of the king's generals had crossed into mainland Greece and a second army arrived the following year[316]. Sulla's victories at Chaeroneia and Orchomenos allowed him to dictate peace terms and at Dardanus in 85 B.C. Nicomedes, Ariobarzanes and Mithridates were reconciled as allies of Rome, Mithridates having agreed to evacuate Asia and Paphlagonia, to surrender prisoners of war, to give up a fleet of seventy warships and to pay a war indemnity[317].

Justin's Mithridates has a speech in which the Romans are said to be hostile to all modern kings because their power and majesty provoked embarassment about Rome's own kings (mere shepherds, foreigners and slaves), whilst Sallust's Mithridates claims that his wealth and independence guaranteed that there would be war with Rome[318]. Appian suggests that even ordinary soldiers recognised that an Asian war would be profitable, and claims that Marius, who had attempted to provoke royal wars in the early 90s B. C., considered that the apparent crisis could be resolved in a short campaign; an easy victory would seem at odds with Marius' desire to rebuild his reputation, even in the context of Aquillius' defeat, and the only clear evidence for contemporary attitudes to kings like Mithridates are the plain facts that the war succeeded in its aim of restoring two kings to their thrones, and ended with a declaration of friendship with Mithridates himself[319]. The erection of royal monuments at Rome in thanks for recognition and friendship, first attested in the case of

Bocchus' statue group showing his surrender of Jugurtha to Sulla, appears to have been repeated by envoys of Mithridates following Sulla's return to the city of Rome[320].

Pompey restored Hiempsal to the Numidian throne in 81 B.C., and Sulla sponsored the accession of Ptolemy XI Alexander II the following year; the rule of the latter was very short-lived but in the meantime a will had been composed leaving Egypt and Cyprus to Rome[321]. When Rome did nothing to claim its inheritance, an illegitimate son of Ptolemy IX made his way from Syria to make himself king; a further four years later Rome played host to the Seleucid sons of Cleopatra Selene, whom she was attempting to have recognised as legitimate heirs to the Ptolemaic kingdom, perhaps suggesting that there was currently no intention of acting on Ptolemy XI's will[322]. Indeed it was a further two years before Rome acted in Cyrene, twenty-two years after Apion's death, and the Roman people now also found itself the legatee of Nicomedes IV; the last Bithynian king may well have been aware of the threat to his kingdom from the alliance between Mithridates and Sertorius, the latter having recently agreed to yield both Bithynia and Cappadocia to Mithridates[323]. The attractiveness of Nicomedes' court to Roman visitors is well attested not only by Caesar's famous dalliance there but also by Cicero's representation of Verres pestering Dolabella to allow him a visit; Dolabella's relation of the same name is credited with the remark that Caesar had been "the Queen's rival and inner partner of the royal bed", perhaps made in the context of Caesar's prosecution of him ***de repetundis*** in 77 B.C.[324]. Lucullus had enjoyed Alexandrian palace hospitality back in 87 B.C. whilst attempting to assemble a fleet with which to blockade Mithridates; according to Plutarch he was granted lavish expenses, and given an emerald ring bearing the king's portrait[325].

Such contacts as these doubtless reinforced the perception that there was a connection between royalty and luxurious living, and Romans adopting a similarly opulent lifestyle for themselves appear to have been represented as kings themselves. This is particularly clear in the case of Verres (see below) who, as has already been noted, was called both king and

tyrant and compared, implicitly or explicitly, with Xerxes, Phalaris and other monarchs. In addition however, Sallust and Plutarch probably attest to two other Roman legates of the 70s B.C. who, as they dined in extravagant luxury, were crowned by mechanical Victories; the only previously attested use of such a device had been in 87 B.C. when one used by Mithridates had broken during a ceremony in Pergamum, and Sallust's mention of purple and gold robes, and the legate receiving homage more suitable for a god than a man confirm that the origins of his luxury were royal rather than merely foreign[326]. Cicero's Verres is not only guilty of "***superbia***", "***avaritia***", and "***crudelitas***", but also of "***luxuria***"[327]. In addition, Cicero insinuates that Verres' facility with the litter was learnt in Bithynia[328]. By contrast however, a Seleucid prince is shown to behave in a fashion more Roman than Verres, attempting to dedicate a beautiful artwork to Capitoline Jupiter, rather than keeping it for his own private enjoyment[328].

There is no escaping the fact that a Roman general was the first to act contrary to the, albeit unratified, peace of Dardanus, and that although this man was recalled, he was permitted a triumph for his raids on Pontus, now Rome's ally[330]. The senate's failure to ratify Sulla's agreement with the king, doubtless encouraged the afore-mentioned diplomacy with Sertorius, which immediately preceded his invasion of Bithynia in 74 B.C.[331]. Four year later Lucullus had every reason to expect that the war was over, Mithridates having fled as a suppliant to his son-in-law Tigranes, but the threat of war with Rome proved insufficient to compel the self-styled King of Kings to hand over the refugee and Lucullus invaded Armenia in 69 B.C.; Cicero suggested that kings and their subjects were particularly prone to pity the fallen fortunes of other kings as they reverenced even the title 'king'[332]. Although both kings sought assistance from their neighbours it was Rome that gained alliance with Machares of Bosporus, Antiochus of Commagene, and Phraates of Parthia, and a Seleucid ruler was now restored to Syria which had fallen to Tigranes fourteen years earlier[333]. Lucullus ensured that Zarbienus of Gordyene and his family, whose covert relations with Rome's general had been discovered and punished by

Tigranes, received an appropriately royal funeral; Plutarch notes that Lucullus even organised the construction of a monument[334].

As has already been noted (see above section **b** iv) Cicero equated Mithridates and Tigranes with Antiochus III, Philip V and Perseus in his speech de Imperio Cn. Pompei; whilst this made them "***potentissimi reges***", a whole section of the speech is given over to the vivid evocation of Mithridates in retreat[335]. Similarly Murena's military service in Asia under Lucullus was considered by his prosecutor to have been less than glorious as it had been a fight against mere "***mulierculae***"[336]. This belief, clearly linked to the accusation that Lucullus had been deliberately prolonging the war, ought to have been reinforced by the fact that Pompey had driven Mithridates into Colchis, and received Tigranes as a prostrated suppliant within months of his appointment to the command against them. These successes enabled Cicero during his consulship to claim that Rome need no longer fear a foreign king, even before news of Mithridates' death could have reached the capital[337]. In addition however, having stripped Tigranes of all the territories he had acquired during his lifetime, Pompey went on to annexe Syria, Coele-Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine; furthermore, with the exception of Ptolemies in Egypt and Cyprus and Phraates III of Parthia, all the monarchs of the East (Aretas of Nabataea, Hyrcanus II of Judea, Sampsiceramus of Emesa, Antiochus of Commagene, Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, Deiotarus of Galatia, Tigranes of Armenia, Artoles of Iberia, Pharnaces of Bosporus) were effectively Pompey's appointees by the end of Cicero's consulship[338]. Pompey had refused to aid Ptolemy XII, and there were plans afoot at Rome for the annexation of his kingdom in line with Ptolemy Alexander's will; only in 59 B.C. was the Egyptian aspect of the bequest annulled by Rome's recognition of the "***rex Alexandrinus***" following, according to Suetonius, a considerable bribe for Caesar and his son-in-law[339]. Phraates' obedience to Rome still had to be proved and Pompey had deliberately caused him offence by addressing him as 'king' rather than 'king of kings' when he had invaded

Gordyene; however, the kingdom was not only a long way from Rome but lacked a coast in either the Mediterranean or Black Sea[340].

Cicero's rhetoric about Rome's new-found freedom from the threat of kings was closely bound up with his claims that some of his fellow-citizens were intent on making themselves kings, not only in the provinces (as Verres had done) but in the city of Rome itself. Thus Rullus is imagined as "***iudex, arbiter, dominus, rex denique opulentissimi regni***", Labienus consults the "***commentarii regum***" in search of cruel words and punishments, and Lentulus' third Cornelian "***regnum***" has Gabinius as a "***purpuratus***"[341]. It has already been noted that the virtual sole consulship of Caesar in 59 B. C. was the context of his self-comparison with Semiramis (see above section **b** iv); in addition, Caesar's relationships with the Bithynian royal family were again under scrutiny at this time, Bibulus suggesting that whereas he had once been content to take the queen's part he now wanted to be king[342]. A certain Octavius addressed Pompey as King and Caesar as Queen, and Plutarch states that Cato criticised the political marriages of Pompey (to Julia) and Caesar (to Calpurnia); the dependence of Hellenistic royal diplomacy on such marriage alliances should not be forgotten, although the practice can hardly have been new to Rome, and the suggestion, in this context, that women should have no place in politics, surely depends on the long association between monarchy and female power in political theory, drama and history[343]. Why Cicero, in several letters from this year, chose to use the name Sampsiceramus to refer to Pompey is unclear, although the name of this rather minor royal had doubtless become familiar following Pompey's return; perhaps the name, far from the Alexandrine "***Magnus***", was felt appropriate for a 'king', whose 'queen' was currently the dominant partner[344].

The year after Caesar had organised the ratification of Pompey's ***acta*** and the recognition of Ptolemy XII, the tribune Clodius proposed that Cato should undertake the annexation of Cyprus; the island's king committed suicide in advance of his arrival, and when Cato

finally returned to Rome late in 56 B.C. he boasted that the sum of money he was adding to Rome's treasury exceeded that from Pompey's campaigns throughout the East[345]. Clodius also arranged for the release of Tigranes, son of the Armenian king, who had been held a chained captive at Rome following Pompey's triumph; Braund observed that the prince's imprisonment at Rome has no known precedent and it must be asked why capital punishment had been withheld after the triumph, if his stay at Rome was not to constitute education in Roman ***mores*** and socialisation with Roman senators and their families[346]. Aristoboulos of Judaea and his family had been removed to Rome to prevent him from threatening Pompey's appointee, but Tigranes' case was rather different[347]. Ill-content with Pompey's allocation to him of Sophene and Gordyene (Lesser Armenia), particularly as Pompey was intending to empty their treasuries, he had displayed Mithridatic ambition by attempting to murder his father, so as to reunite under his own rule the kingdom which Pompey had prudently divided; this faithless monarch, whose continuing but humiliating existence served as a warning to Pompey's other appointees, could not be granted release, honoured and returned to Armenia (as Clodius appears to have intended) without undermining the permanence of Pompey's entire Eastern settlement[348].

The following year Ptolemy XII arrived in Italy, apparently seeking Pompey's protection, having ignored the advice of Cato to return home rather than waste his money winning over corrupt men at Rome[349]. Pompey having been entrusted with the corn commission, Publius Lentulus Spinther in his capacity as governor of Cilicia and Cyprus, was accorded the task of restoring the king to his kingdom, a task necessitated by the fact that the inhabitants of Alexandria had capitalised on Ptolemy's absence to elevate his daughter Berenice to the throne; the Alexandrians sent envoys to Rome to protest against Ptolemy's restoration, but he managed to secure their assassination[350]. Pompey, who had extended hospitality to the king, is said by Dio to have saved his guest from prosecution and Ptolemy was thought to want Pompey, rather than the Cilician governor, to effect his

restoration; once the Sibylline oracle had been published (declaring that Rome ought not to offer the king practical assistance in recovering his throne), the king appears to have decided to offer bribes to many people so as to retain support for his cause[351]. Despite the oracle it looked for some time as if Pompey would be appointed after all, but in February Clodius used his "***operae***" to attack him, alleging that in his eagerness to go to Alexandria he was starving the people, and suggesting instead the appointment of Crassus[352]. Although in the summer of that year Lentulus had plans to secure Egypt with force, in order afterwards to restore Ptolemy to a pacified populace (complying with the letter but not the spirit of the oracle), the king rightly gave up hopes of an early restoration, taking refuge at Ephesus in the temple of Artemis Ephesia[353].

Clodius' treatment of kings was scrutinised by Cicero in two speeches from 56 B.C. but this evidence must be read carefully because of the animosity between the author and the man who had secured his exile. It is not impossible that others viewed Clodius' actions as benefiting the state by demonstrating that Rome's ultimate arbiter was not the 'royal couple' (Pompey and Caesar) but the Roman people represented by a tribune. In the first of the two speeches, Cicero claims that Deiotarus had proved himself to be particularly loyal to Rome, his services freely attested to by "***clarissimi imperatores***" (in other words not just Pompey) and his royal title confirmed by the senate. In addition, he objects to the fact that Clodius (alone) had elevated Brogitarus to the same title and station as Deiotarus, particularly as the man now given supervision of the sanctuary at Pessinus is characterised as both "***impurus***" and "***nefarius***", and Clodius' decision to promote him depended on a cash bribe and the promise of further payments; only in the Pro Sestio does Cicero admit that the promotion had been sanctioned by popular vote[354].

In this second speech he complains of Clodius' popular vote to annexe Cyprus; even if the senate had not declared this "***Rex Ptolomaeus***" an ally, Rome had as long-standing a "***societas***" with his ancestors as with his brother's, and in his case this had aided his claim

for recognition. It should not only be noted that when Rome seemed likely to annexe Egypt, Cicero had not thought much of Ptolemy XII's ancestry, but also that in the context of that king's expulsion and his ongoing attempts to secure his restoration, Cicero failed to create the contrast between Brogitarus and Ptolemy of Cyprus that he had made with Deiotarus in the earlier speech. There, Deiotarus' decision to pay Clodius nothing is represented as a proof of his kingly character, and the absence of the contrast in the Pro Sestio is the more remarkable because later in the speech Cicero asks whether there had been a single king who had not realised that it was necessary to purchase from Clodius what he did not have, and to commence payment for what he already possessed[355].

Cicero represents the Cypriot king as having been confident that his quiet royal lifestyle would remain undisturbed, vividly picturing him "***sedens cum purpura et sceptro et illis insignibus regiis***" unaware that all he owned was being confiscated by the Roman People; this was certainly not what a "***rex amicus***" would expect, particularly as that same body had been used to restoring to their kingdoms even those kings who had been defeated by them in war, and he by contrast had never harmed Rome's interests. In this last point Cicero found a similarity between the Roman People's treatment of himself and of Ptolemy of Cyprus; it is later claimed both that the exile and the annexation were not authorised by the Roman people at all, but merely by Clodius' "***operae***", and also that consuls who had acquiesced to Cicero's exile could not be expected to defend a foreigner, even if he was a king[356].

Cicero sets Pompey's recent treatment of the older Tigranes in the context of Rome's treatment of Antiochus and Attalus more than a century previously; the appellation "***Magnus***" is accorded to Antiochus (to distinguish him from other rulers of the same name), and the "***maiores***", who had proved themselves to be greater than him by overcoming him in a great struggle on land and sea, are represented as allowing him to continue to reign beyond the Taurus, whilst Attalus was awarded the parts of Asia that had

been confiscated from Antiochus. Pompey's war against Tigranes is justified by the fact that the "***vehemens***" king had harmed Rome's allies and given refuge to Rome's fiercest foe Mithridates[357]. Cicero cannot hide the fact that in contrast to the case of Antiochus (where the ancestors "***regnare iusserunt***") the decision to recognise Tigranes' kingship, once he had demonstrated submission to Roman authority by prostrating himself and laying aside the "***insigne regium***", was an individual one ("***regnare iussit***")[358]. Moreover, Pompey's decision is not represented as altruistic, his own reputation (as well as that of Rome) being at stake; when Cicero claims that it was no less "***gloriosus***" for Tigranes to be re-established, than it was for Tigranes to be fettered, he is surely suggesting that until the escape of the younger Tigranes, Pompey had been able to have his cake and eat it too, and it is worth noting Dio's claim that prince Tigranes had been entitled 'king of kings' in Pompey's triumph[359]. Finally, the annexation of Cyprus is said to be an "***in re publica macula***", and the consuls who had failed to prevent his own exile are said by Cicero to have failed in their duty of "***tutela***" over kings and foreign peoples, which had always been integral to the office[360].

The language of purchase, familiar from Cicero's rendering of the relationship between Clodius and Brogitarus, was used against both Gabinius and Piso in the following months. It has already been noted that Gabinius is represented by Cicero as a Semiramis (see above section **b** iv), and Cicero goes on to suggest that the usual general's gesture of an outstretched right arm symbolised "***avaritia***" in Gabinius' case, his Syrian governorship being characterised as having achieved only "***pactiones pecuniarum cum tyrannis***"; the suggestion that Ariobarzanes had rented him for "***caedes***", like a Thracian assassin, should also be noted[361]. By the time of Cicero's speech In Pisonem, where the accused is said to have sold his authority to Cotys of Thrace, Gabinius had invaded Egypt on a consul's authority (Pompey's) and restored Ptolemy XII, but again his services are said to have been bought or rented by a king; his eagerness to become a "***mercenarius comes***" to the Alexandrine king was, Cicero suggests, due to the expense of the landscape gardening on

Gabinius' Tusculum estate[362]. Archelaus, who had become king by marrying Berenice, had been killed in battle and Marcus Antonius, who appears previously to have enjoyed a guest-friendship with him, searched out the corpse to ensure it received a royal burial[363]. Gabinius' absence from Syria is said to have prompted a further attempt to depose Hyrcanus; it was noted above that Aristoboulos and his family had been held at Rome but, in unknown circumstances, they too had escaped, the father and one son being caught by Gabinius on his march into Egypt[364]. Dio also suggests that Gabinius had been planning to intervene in Parthia where Phraates had recently been murdered by his sons; one of the brothers, securing the kingdom for himself, had expelled the other but although the exile had sought Gabinius' assistance in recovering the kingdom, doubtless pledging allegiance to Rome, the senate (and evidently also the consuls) ordered him not to become involved[365].

On Gabinius' return to Rome he was held to account for his Egyptian intervention and eventually convicted and exiled. A certain C. Rabirius Postumus was then prosecuted in relation to the recovery of money lent to Ptolemy to secure his restoration, and Cicero's defence of this man demanded that the king's conduct be scrutinised. Cicero claims that a "***blandus***" appearance masked "***libido***" and that, far from showing "***fides***" the king had cheated his client[366]. In response to the prosecution claim that Rabirius agreed to abandon Roman dress and become the king's revenue collector ("***dioecetes***"), Cicero asserts that he was in the king's power and had to comply with his wishes; having suggested that Ptolemy's Egypt was a place where one would be likely to lose one's "***libertas***", Cicero describes the king's sovereignty as "***superbissimus***", noting that his client had endured imprisonment, and the sight both of his friends in chains, and of frequent executions, before his escape[367]. Earlier the same year Cicero had described Antiochus of Commagene, who may even have come to Rome in person, as an "***ignobilis rex***"[368].

Crassus reached Asia Minor in 54 B.C., coming into contact with Deiotarus and Artavasdes (of Armenia) but relations were far from intimate; the former was mocked because of his aged ambition to found a city, whilst the latter's offer of troops for his Parthian campaign met no grateful response, and his advice about invading from Armenia was ignored. Artavasdes eventually switched allegiance, marrying a daughter to the son of the Parthian king[369]. By contrast Cicero's governorship of Cilicia three years later saw Tarcondimotus, Iamblichus and even Antiochus of Commagene supplying him with information on Parthian troop movements, and the son of Deiotarus (a "***fidelissimus rex***") was temporarily entrusted with the guardianship of Cicero's son and nephew; even Cicero however was unable to win back Artavasdes' friendship with Rome[370]. The senate had demanded that the newly installed Ariobarzanes III of Cappadocia ("***Eusebes***" and "***Philorhomaeus***") should be protected and defended, and Cicero had felt compelled to inform him in person of this apparently unprecedented decree; reporting back to the senate he claims that he had put himself at the king's disposal and, once an assassination plot against the king had been revealed, Cicero also claims to have advised him about how to deal with the situation[371]. Ariobarzanes' thoroughly Roman virtues are listed as "***virtus***", "***ingenium***", and "***fides***", and he is also said to possess "***benevolentia***" towards the senate and people of Rome; in a later letter to Atticus Cicero's pride in his preservation of this king almost seems greater than over his victories at Mount Amanus[372]. Whilst Cicero remarked upon his own scrupulosity, the fact that he was happy for his young relations to live in the company of Deiotarus' son contrasts markedly with Cato's avoidance of too much contact with the father a decade or so previously; Cato had refused all gifts but was only prepared to stay one night with a man who was his father's guest-friend so as to avoid temptation[373].

In February 50 B.C. Parthian troops were still in Syria, following the previous year's invasion, and Cicero speaks as if Pompey would certainly arrive later in the year to drive them back. By the time that Cicero relinquished his province the Parthians had withdrawn,

but although there appear to have been no immediate plans to punish them with a Roman invasion, Caelius wrote to Cicero that not even an assault on Parthian Seleuceia, or the capture of the king himself, would compensate Cicero for missing L. Domitius Ahenobarbus' failure to secure an augurship[374]. Cicero had been compelled by ties of friendship to remind Ariobarzanes of the outstanding debts contracted by his father (and grandfather?); the king is represented as being in no financial position to pay even the interest, Cicero claiming never to have encountered a kingdom so plundered of its resources or a king reduced to such poverty[375].

As early as 53 B.C. there had been talk at Rome that a period of monarchy was again required at Rome, and it has already been noted that Cicero seems to have believed that this would be the result of the civil war, whether the victor was Pompey or Caesar[376]. The mocking titles 'Agamemnon' and 'King of kings' partly depend on this idea, but Pompey had received practical support from Deiotarus, Ariobarzanes and Tarcondimotus (all actually present with him in Greece), and probably offered recognition to Juba of Numidia in return for opposing Caesar's forces in Africa; by contrast, according to Plutarch, Caesar seemed a mere Tigranes, or even a king of the Nabataeans[377].

Pompey shared a boat with Deiotarus for part of the journey to Cilicia where, having considered seeking assistance from both the Parthian king and Juba of Numidia, he took the fateful decision to seek refuge with Ptolemy XIII in Alexandria, whose recognition remained unconfirmed[378]. When Caesar himself arrived at Alexandria within days of Pompey's assassination he was lodged at the palace and took advantage of this position to interfere in the family dispute between the king and his sister, and provoked a war that ended with the death of Ptolemy XIII, the banishment of Arsinoe, the restoration of Cleopatra (VII) and the elevation to the kingship of the latter's infant brother (Ptolemy XIV)[379]. It was not until the middle of 47 B.C. that Caesar left Egypt for Syria and Asia Minor, where Pharnaces of Bosporus had staked ancestral claims on Pontus, Bithynia,

Galatia, Cappadocia and Lesser Armenia; Cleopatra, who had taken Caesar on a Nile cruise to display herself and her protector to the populace, gave birth to a son, rumoured to have been fathered by Caesar, and named Caesarion[380].

According to Appian, when Pharnaces heard of Caesar's arrival in the region he sent envoys proposing peace and a marriage alliance involving his daughter (a grandchild of Mithridates); whether or not news of Caesar's close links to Cleopatra had reached him, this unprecedented proposal suggests that Caesar's current status was recognisably different from that of earlier commanders with whom he had contact. Pharnaces was defeated in battle and in due course replaced as king of Bosporus by Mithridates of Pergamon on Caesar's instructions; just as Galatia freed from Pharnaces was restored to Deiotarus, Ariobarzanes appears to have been confirmed as king of ancient Cappadocia, his brother Ariarathes raised to the kingship of Lesser Armenia[381].

Later the same year, Caesar embarked for Africa where those who continued to oppose him had joined forces with Juba. Given the fact that Caesar went on to celebrate a triumph over him, the rather negative portrayal of him in our sources is unsurprising; from pseudo-Caesar onwards he is represented as a barbarian so arrogant that he believes himself the superior of Roman generals (reducing Varus and Scipio to virtual satraps) and, as has already been mentioned, vowing to follow Sardanapalus' example in suicide (see above section **b** iv). When Bocchus of Mauretania had invaded Numidia, Juba (a "***rex potentissimus***" even to Cicero) had immediately withdrawn to defend his own kingdom, in direct contrast to Deiotarus' conduct when Pharnaces had invaded; similarly, whereas Deiotarus had arranged for the training of his own troops along Roman lines, Juba had gone so far as to educate Scipio in battle-training elephants[382]. The dynasty of Masinissa in Numidia was ended by Caesar's victory and Juba' death, his infant son transported to Rome as a prisoner, and the territory annexed as a province; the Mauretanian king, and apparently also his wife, were rewarded for services rendered[383].

All of Caesar's triumphs were dignified by the fact that he had defeated foreign kings, and Vercingetorix, Arsinoe and prince Juba were duly paraded through the streets of Rome; Dio claims that the spectators were upset by the unprecedented spectacle of a queen in chains. Only the Pontic campaign lacked a royal captive, but here there was a representation of Pharnaces' flight, and the boast "***veni, vidi, vici***" to show Caesar's superiority to Pompey (the son of Mithridates having been utterly defeated at the first encounter). The soldiery sang of their commander's liaisons with Nicomedes of Bithynia and Cleopatra of Egypt and, according to Dio, predicted that Caesar would end up a king himself[384]. In association with the dedication of his forum and its temple of Venus Genetrix, Appian notes that a statue of Cleopatra was installed there in 46 B.C.; at some point that year the queen and her young consort arrived at Rome ostensibly to be enrolled as friends and allies of the Roman people. Instead of returning home afterwards however, they settled in property belonging to Caesar until after his assassination, and Dio claims that Caesar was criticised for renewing his relationship with Cleopatra[385]. Other kings had their status formally acknowledged this year, ostensibly by senatorial decree but in fact on Caesar's command, to judge from Cicero's story of receiving letters of thanks for his support from "***ultimi reges***" of whom he had never heard; the following year, noting that he had offered to lodge the prince himself, Cicero states that Ariobarzanes' son had come to Rome to buy a "***regnum***" from Caesar[386]

As has been noted the Parthian campaign that was being planned in 45 B.C. has some connection with the notion that Caesar was about to be elevated to kingship in accordance with a Sibylline oracle (see above section **b** iv); perhaps even before the end of the year the question of the diadem, raised so publicly at the Lupercalia the following February, was already being debated[387]. In December Cicero found himself defending Deiotarus on a charge of attempted murder relating to Caesar's visit to Galatia after Pharnaces' defeat at Zela. The surviving speech provides crucial evidence about attitudes to kingship, and Caesar's own rule, in his final months. The very location of the trial (in Caesar's house)

and the apparent absence of a jury was contrary to Republican precedent[388]. Cicero refers to rumours that Caesar was regarded as a "***tyrannus***" because of the "***statua inter reges posita***"; the statue was, according to Dio, beside that of Brutus and its installation probably relates to the senate's decree naming Caesar "***Liberator***" and proposing a temple to Libertas. Cicero claims that it would be surprising if a man who actually lived in Deiotarus' "***regnum***" had found Caesar to be a "***tyrannus***", when free men, born "***in summa libertate***", had not, because his victory in civil war had not been marked by proscriptions. However, far from going on to repeat the Caesarian rhetoric that the "***clementissimus dux***" had liberated the city from the tyranny of the Pompeians and deserved this honour, Cicero suggests that the location of the statue may indeed have caused offence[389]. Cicero's remark, that one statue could not have upset anyone when there were so many, appears double-edged since other statues are known to have given offence; by claiming that there was nowhere more distinguished than the rostra for an honorific statue, Cicero may have referred to its recent demolition (Dio suggests the new rostra was dedicated early in 44 B.C., complete with the equestrian portraits of Sulla and Pompey, and at least two statues of Caesar himself: see below section **c** ii)[390].

Like Deiotarus, Caesar had been repeatedly honoured by Cicero and the senate for his unceasing services to the state, but unlike the foreign king Caesar had not acquired a reputation for deeming the senate "***gravissimus sanctissimusque***". Indeed, quite apart from his conduct as consul in 59 B.C., and despite the fact that Caesar had just enlarged the body to nine hundred members (even if many of them were regarded as foreigners), Cicero claims elsewhere that Caesar consults the "***consilium***" of no other man; earlier in the year Cicero had said both that he could not bear to see the senate-house and that Rome was without a senate-house, comments made because in Cicero's eyes public affairs were in Caesar's hands, wherever he was (including Spain)[391]. In a public trial, Cicero suggests, no citizen could have failed to support a king whose whole life had been spent fighting

wars for the Roman people, a generalisation that tacitly includes the recent civil war when Deiotarus had fought on Pompey's side at the senate's command[392].

Cicero attempts to show that Deiotarus did not behave as if he was that type of foreign king for whom assassination (particularly by poison) was second nature, and in whose conduct neither "***modestia***" nor "***temperantia***" was likely to be found; far from being likely to have danced naked at a banquet as the prosecution claimed he had done, Cicero claims that the king's "***frugalitas***" was so well attested at Rome, from his business and social contacts, that he was generally considered an embodiment of antique Roman virtue ("***optimus pater familias et diligentissimus agricola et pecuarius***")[393]. The king's conduct was said to have been "***severissimus***" and "***gravissimus***" even in his youth, and his accustomed training in manly pursuits was represented as preparing him for riding to Rome's wars even in his old age. The quality of "***gravitas***" is later listed as one of four virtues that accorded the king not only a good but a happy life (the others being "***virtus***", "***magnitudo animi***" and "***constantia***"), and it is no surprise that Cicero had already claimed the king to be possessed of surpassing "***prudentia***"; in this earlier passage of the speech "***gravitas***" had been linked with "***integritas***", "***virtus***" and "***fides***"[394]. Deiotarus' treatment of his important guest is said to be "***regius***", and Cicero later refers to the fact that "***magnanimus***", "***largus***", "***beneficus***" and "***liberalis***" were conventional terms of praise for a king[395].

As Cicero was pronouncing that for Deiotarus to have murdered his guest would have been a great crime that would have raised against him the hostility of the rest of the world, other "***aristoi***" may already have been invoking in graffiti the spirit of Brutus, and plotting tyrannicide[396]. Only just over a month after Caesar's assassination Antony, supposedly administrating Caesar's last wishes, is said by Cicero to have granted Deiotarus his kingdom on Fulvia's account; in the second Philippic Deiotarus is said to have seized the opportunity presented by Caesar's murder to reclaim the territories which had been

confiscated from him, and then offered a large bribe to Antony in his "***Gynaecium***", to secure authorisation for these actions[397]. The coins of 44 B.C., designed in conjunction with a senatorial decree granting Caesar this privilege, represented the portrait features of a living individual for the first time; a Hellenistic inspiration for such portrait coins is beyond doubt, but whereas earlier types representing Roman kings had accorded them the diadem (see above section **b i**), in Caesar's case wreaths were substituted for this much debated attribute (RRC 480/2a-18)[398]. The decision, later in the year, to represent Antony in Caesar's place (RRC 480/22) illustrates Cicero's recognition that Caesar's "***regnum***" had an heir, and that a mere "***mutatio domini***" had taken place[399].

Between April and June 44 B.C., Cicero made several references to an un-named "***regina***" who had recently left Rome (presumably Cleopatra), and it may be that she too had secured something from Antony in the wake of Caesar's murder in ostensible accordance with the intentions of the deceased; according to Cicero she had exhibited "***superbia***" during her residence in the city[400]. The following year four legions were withdrawn from Egypt where they had doubtless played some role in ordering the people during the prolonged absence of the monarchs, but although these fell into Cassius' hands Cleopatra refused to help him further, clearly aware that he had been one of the conspirators against Caesar[401]. The Parthians, by contrast, sent troops to aid Cassius even though he had participated in Crassus' campaign against them, and Dio claims that Brutus and Cassius feared that the kingdoms and peoples who had been well treated by Caesar would refuse to aid his murderers; in consequence, as well as planning an invasion of Egypt, Cassius captured and executed Ariobarzanes[402].

After Philippi Antony went out East collecting funds for the payment of troops and settling local disputes. In choosing a replacement king for Cappadocia Antony is said to have selected the contender with the most attractive mother, and around this time too Antony is said to have become infatuated with Cleopatra (who travelled to Cilicia to meet him);

certainly he followed her to Egypt despite the threat of a Parthian invasion of Syria. One should also note Josephus' claim that Q. Dellius advised Alexandra to send painted portraits of her children to Antony, to secure his favour with their beauty[403]. The Roman general Labienus ("***Parthicus***") who led this invasion secured mastery of Asia as far West as Ionia, and replaced Hyrcanus of Judaea with Antigonus[404]. In association with Ventidius' campaign against Labienus and the Parthians in 39 B.C., Appian records Antony's installation or confirmation of kings in Pontus, Pisidia, Cilicia and Judaea. According to Josephus, Herod had appealed to the senate in person the previous year, winning their unanimous support for his claim to Judaea, but the exchange of Herod for the popular Antigonus was only made irreversible by the latter's execution at Antioch in 37 B.C. By then, the son of the Parthian king had been killed at the battle of Cyrrhestica, and Labienus' Parthian forces withdrawn from Asia and Syria; Ventidius was sent to Rome to celebrate a triumph[405].

Antony, acknowledging the paternity of twin children born to Cleopatra in 40 B.C. and renaming them Alexander Helios and Cleopatra Selene, added to Cleopatra's realm a large swathe of territory from Phoenicia to Cilicia probably in 36 B.C; soon afterwards Antony betrothed the boy to the daughter of Artavasdes II of Armenia[406]. Once her father had been captured in Antony's campaign against that kingdom in 34 B.C., then Alexander's engagement was transferred to the daughter of Artavasdes I of Atropatenian Media. At the 'Donations of Alexandria' which followed the Armenian campaign, Alexander Helios (in Persian dress and tiara) was accorded overlordship of all territories East of the Euphrates as far as India (including the as yet unconquered Parthia), whilst his younger brother Ptolemy Philadelphus (in Macedonian dress) was allotted Syria and Asia Minor. Their mother Cleopatra was probably named Queen of Kings (RRC 543/1), with the suppositious Caesarion as her consort, and confirmed as Queen of Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, and Coele-Syria[407].

It seems unlikely that Antony would have expected these extraordinary depositions to be ratified at Rome and indeed, according to Dio, his friends attempted to keep them from the people. However, Octavian who wished to discredit Antony by publishing the details, reported them to the senate, even going so far as to read Antony's will which confirmed these arrangements and asked for a funeral at Rome, but burial in Alexandria; this, again according to Dio, prompted rumours that Antony hoped to add Italy and the West to Cleopatra's dominions, and to transfer to Alexandria the capital of a new universal empire[408]. Capitalising on these fears Octavian declared war on Cleopatra (rather than Antony), and his eventual victory and her suicide not only ended the Ptolemaic rule of Egypt and the imperial dreams of the 'Donations', but, in Dio's eyes, commenced Octavian's "***monarchia***"; Ptolemy XV (Caesarion) was captured and executed, but Antony's children by Cleopatra were sent to Rome to be brought up by Antony's former wife Octavia[409]. Octavian refused to see the tombs of the Ptolemies, emphasising his disinterest in them by visiting instead the tomb of the city's founder; the preserved body of Alexander the Great, a great conqueror, a true king, and a general worthy of Roman respect, was honoured with flowers and a golden diadem[410].

c) Roman leadership ideals - ***Imperatores*** and the rise of the '***unus***'

i) Positive representations of Republican leaders in rhetoric

The Ciceronian corpus was an important source of evidence for the contacts between Rome and the Greek world, and the influence of this interaction on attitudes to kings, tyrants and Republican leaders (see above sections **a** and **b**). However, in these earlier sections it was also possible to recover information from ancient historical sources (despite the fact that they were often written much later than the events they describe, and frequently from a Greek perspective), in a way that is rarely possible when considering rhetoric. Since Cicero's output of speeches, treatises and letters cannot be compared with

those of his contemporaries (Hortensius, Caesar, Brutus, etc), or of earlier generations of orators dating back to Appius Claudius Caecus and beyond, it is important to bear in mind the possibility that Ciceronian representations of Republican leaders may be products of an extraordinary individual living through extraordinary times. Cicero, after all, was that rare being a ***novus homo*** who reached the consulship in 'his year' ahead of all other candidates, and a man born just before Marius' run of five successive consulships, who witnessed the four successive consulships of Cinna, the Sullan "***regnum***", the dictatorship of Caesar, and the opening gambits of the struggle for succession (between Caesar's executor and his heir) which ended in the Augustan principate.

An apparently increasing resort, in political invective, to the characterisation of one's opponents as kings/tyrants/masters has already been noted, and a connection hypothesised between these negative representations and the trend towards offering certain individuals of proven ability repeated, and even immediately consecutive, grants of ***imperium*** (see above section **b** ii). Other changes in rhetorical representation over the last two hundred and fifty years of the Republic are highly probable, and it is likely that the lists of those 'moral' qualities (e.g. "***virtus***", "***clementia***", "***iustitia***", "***pietas***", etc) and leadership abilities (e.g. "***labor***", "***industria***", "***facilitas***", "***ingenium***" etc) considered indispensable for a Republican leader, were subject to change during this period. Livy's perplexity over the exact virtues of Scipio Africanus' cousin, attested by the senate in 204 B.C. in association with the reception of the Magna Mater, is suggestive of such change, but whilst a fragment of a third century B.C. funeral oration, a handful of early funerary inscriptions, and the contemporary evidence of Polybius about Scipio Aemilianus help to supply a background against which Cicero's own, far from consistent, lists of these virtues and skills can be considered, they do not really permit us to reconstruct a chronology of changing usage.

The fragment of Quintus Metellus' funeral oration for his father, quoted by Pliny, states that the deceased had succeeded in his wish to be a "***primarius bellator***", a "***fortissimus***

imperator", and that these were reckoned to be two of the ten greatest and best goals for wise men to seek after. In addition to these military aspirations, L. Metellus is said to have aimed at being an "***optimus orator***", being considered "***clarissimus***" in the city and a "***summus senator***", being held in the highest honour and entrusted with weighty matters, possessing "***summa sapientia***", gaining wealth honourably, and leaving many children to posterity. The son's boast was that his father had been the first Roman to achieve all ten of these worthy ambitions, and Pliny also notes that the subject of this filial panegyric had been the first to lead elephants in a Roman triumph and the only man ever to have been allowed to travel to senate meetings by chariot[411]. Wiseman has rightly noted the recurring importance of primacy in Roman inscriptions, including the Augustan "Res Gestae", as a means of distinguishing an individual not only from his contemporaries but from the ***maiores***[412].

The Saturnian elogium for Scipio Barbatus describes him as a "***fortis vir sapiensque***" whose "***virtus***" was matched by his appearance; that for his son, claims general agreement at Rome that he was "***optimus***"[413]. Members of the family who died too young for the public offices, conquests and benefactions listed on the tombs of their relations, sometimes appear to have been accorded the qualities of their forefathers; a twenty year old is praised for "***magna sapientia, multasque virtutes***" whilst Publius Cornelius Scipio is suggested to have had not only "***honos, fama virtusque***", but "***gloria atque ingenium***", just before a death which prevented him outstripping the "***gloria maiorum***". Perhaps the most striking inscription is that of the thirty-three year old L. Cornelius Scipio (Figure 17), which boasts only that his "***pater regem Antioco subegit***"; the deceased was a nephew of Scipio Africanus who, at the same age, had commanded at Zama and concluded the Hannibalic War (see above section **a i**)[414]. The epitaph for the praetor Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus not only claims that he had fathered descendants, lived up to the "***laus***" of his forefathers, and added to the "***virtutes***" of his family through his "***mores***" but that "***honor***" ennobled his line[415].

When Scipio Aemilianus was still eighteen, Polybius notes that he believed public opinion to have already characterised him as too quiet and slow to become the "***prostates***" of his family, and that this consensus had caused him to doubt whether he was worthy of his descent; Polybius' Scipio had gained a reputation for "***kalokagathia***" and "***sophrosyne***" by his mid-thirties but he had still to gain a similar public reputation for "***andreia***" and clearly surprised the senate by offering to go to Spain as a tribune or legate[416]. The virtue of "***andreia***", which clearly corresponds to the "***virtus***" repeatedly listed in the Scipionic ***elogia***, is said by Polybius to have been particularly important at Rome; Scipio's avoidance of the law-courts suggests that he did not share Metellus' desire of achieving supremacy in public speaking, and the extraordinary substitution of hunting for the conventional occupation of Roman youths cannot have given him as great a reputation for "***andreia***" as Polybius attempts to suggest[417]. Whilst the Greeks were blamed for tempting Scipio's contemporaries into debaucheries and extravagances foreign to Rome, the virtue of moderation exhibited by Polybius' friend and hero, rooted in a determination to conquer his appetites, appears to have been similarly new[418]. Polybius comments that the Romans of Scipio's day saw virtue in accumulating money honourably but only gave it away if they had no choice and at the last possible moment; this certainly squares with Pliny's citation of the Metellan funeral oration, and it should be noted that Scipio's "***megalopsychia***" with regard to money was represented as surprising even his adoptive uncles Tiberius Gracchus and Scipio Nasica (censors in 169 B.C. and 159 B.C. respectively)[419].

Livy, in describing Aemilius Paullus' presidency of a festival at Amphipolis, and probably quoting Polybius, claims that there was a common saying to the effect that a man "***qui vincere bello sciret***" was capable of laying on banquets and shows; the probable implication is that the ***scientia*** appertaining to generalship was organisational and applicable to other projects[420]. Cato's composition of a work De Re Militari, doubtless drawing on his own experience in Spain, suggests that there was more to it than that, but it

is down to Sallust to suggest a probable readership; Sallust's Marius boasts that, unlike many other candidates for the consulship, his knowledge of warfare comes not from reading "***acta maiorum***" or "***Graecorum militaria praecepta***", but practical experience, and Cicero confirms that his "***rei militaris scientia***" depended on "***res gestae ac victoriae***" rather than book-learning[421].

The "***civile imperium***" promised by Sallust's Marius, of encouragement by personal example, rather than punishment, is reported as fact by Plutarch. Whilst sharing "***inopia et labor***" with one's men, suffering the same extremes of temperature, and sleeping like them on the bare earth, seems to have been far from the universal practice of Roman generals, even after Marius, it should be noted that a general (L. Valerius Flaccus) was lynched in 86 B.C. on suspicion of living "***opulenter***" off the "***labor***" of his troops, and it is far from impossible that Fimbria, who allowed the army to plunder, had promised to lead them as an "***imperator***", rather than a "***dominus***"[422]. Plutarch's Lucullus, who did not normally permit plundering, was accused of enriching himself at his troops' expense, and became subject to mutinies[423]. Plutarch's Caesar made his soldiers believe that the wealth he was accumulating was a trust fund for the rewarding of valorous conduct and, according to Suetonius, at the outbreak of the Civil War his troops volunteered to fight without pay and rations; Sulla's troops had taxed themselves to raise money to support his return to Italy after the Mithridatic War, but according to Plutarch he would not accept their contribution[424].

Sulla's unprecedented acquisition of the epithet "***Felix***" is symptomatic of the individualisation of ***fortuna*** and ***felicitas***, noted by Rosenstein as being a comparatively late development, seemingly incompatible with the traditional belief that military failures were attributable to the gods being displeased, not with individual generals, but with the community at large[425]. Plutarch's Marius had a pair of vultures, and Plutarch's Sertorius the albino fawn, to intimate the particular favour of the gods for their generalships, and

whilst Marius also had the Syrian prophetess Martha to advise him about the timing of battles, both Sulla and Lucullus relied on divine inspiration, in the form of dreams, to guide their campaigns[426]. In 69 B.C. Cicero defended Fonteius' generalship, claiming that, unlike many of his contemporaries, he was "***felix***", possessing "***felicitas in re militari***"; in addition to this quality, Cicero referred to his client's "***virtus***" and "***industria***", claimed that he was "***honestus atque integer***", energetic in the "***labores belli***", "***fortis***" in danger, experienced both in theory and practice (of war), "***prudens***" in planning, and possessed of "***summum consilium***" and "***maximus animus***" in military affairs[427].

Three years later Cicero claimed that Pompey with his unparalleled military experience had more, and more useful, "***scientia rei militaris***" than any other man. In addition to such knowledge, Cicero claims that the ideal general would have "***virtus***", "***auctoritas***" and "***felicitas***" and Pompey is accordingly represented as possessing a "***singularis***", "***divina atque incredibilis virtus***", "***clarissima auctoritas***" and "***egregia fortuna***"[428]. Cicero is careful not to suggest that Pompey's good luck is an exclusive possession, according it to Hortensius (along with "***honos***", "***virtus***" and "***ingenium***"), and claiming that it had been an important aspect of the generalships of Fabius Maximus, Marcellus, Scipio and Marius; nevertheless the audience, reminded that even Lucullus had once had "***felicitas***" as well as "***virtus***", is encouraged to hope that it would continue[429].

As has been discussed above (see section **b** ii), some of Cicero's contemporaries believed that Rome should not always turn to the same individual to resolve a military crisis but, for Cicero, Pompey was the only man whom citizens and allies hoped would be named as general, and the only man feared by the enemy; the term "***unus***" recurs throughout the speech and in subsequent Ciceronian literature (see below)[430]. One aspect of Cicero's claim that Pompey was the only man equipped to take over the command against Mithridates, was that there were so few men who could be termed "***fortis***" and "***innocentius***"; Pompey in comparison is accorded not only "***fortitudo in periculis***" and

"***innocentia***", but "***labor in negotiis***", "***industria in agendo***", "***celeritas in conficiendo***", "***consilium in providendo***", "***temperantia***", "***fides***", "***facilitas***", "***ingenium***", "***humanitas***", "***continentia***", and "***mansuetudo***"[431]. One virtue was ascribed to Lucullus which was not also given to Pompey, but the Africanus-like "***celeritas***" of the latter probably makes up for any lack of the "***assiduitas***" accorded to the former; Catulus' "***integritas***" (again, a virtue not explicitly ascribed to Pompey) doubtless encapsulates several of the qualities accorded to Pompey, and Cicero probably intended to suggest that the people's choice of Catulus as a back-up for Pompey was very much a last resort[432].

In Cicero's consulship Lucullus, who had just been permitted to celebrate a triumph for his Asian campaigns, was termed "***fortissimus***", "***sapientissimus***" and "***summus imperator***" in Cicero's defence of his subordinate, Murena; the latter was said to have shown "***fortissimus animus***", "***summum consilium***" and "***maximus labor***", and Cicero purports to record the language of his client's troops describing him as "***fortis***" and "***felix***", and never having forced on a soldier more "***labor***" than he undertook himself. It should perhaps be noted that Murena, and not Lucullus, was the man whom these imaginary soldiers remembered as their "***dux***" in successful operations, the distributor of spoils, and the nurse of their wounds[433]. Cicero notes that his client had shown "***pietas***" in volunteering to serve under his father, and that he was no inferior to Lucullus in "***honestas***" or "***dignitas***"[434]. Servius, who had no war record to commend him to the voters is accorded "***industria***", "***continentia***", "***gravitas***", "***iustitia***", "***fides***", "***pudor***" and "***temperantia***" but Cicero suggests that a lawyer could not expect to compete with a military man's "***dignitas***" and "***utilitas***"[435]. As a "***sapiens***" praetor, Cicero implies that his client's administration of justice had won goodwill, on account of his "***lenitas***", and given no offence, because of his "***aequabilitas***"; in addition to a reputation for "***aequitas***", "***integritas***", "***facilitas***", Cicero notes that Murena's praetorship had left the populace with fond memories of his "***argentea scaena***", betokening his client's "***benignitas***" and "***liberalitas***"[436]. Cicero's positive characterisation of Cato as a man of "***honestas***",

"***gravitas***", "***temperantia***", "***magnitudo animi***" and "***iustitia***" is tempered by his criticism of his philosophy of life, which is represented as keeping him from "***lenitas***", "***humanitas***", "***comitas***" and "***facilitas***"[437]. To these positive terms, the Commentariolum Petitionis adds the adjectives "***disertus***" and "***gratiosus***" to describe Cicero himself[438].

As has already been noted the notion of the civic leader as "***pater***" can be traced no further back than Cicero's consulship, and may well depend on his knowledge of Greek political theory (see above section **b** i); in Cicero's first surviving letter of advice about governorship, addressed to his brother who had already been hailed as "***Parens Asiae***", Cicero is quite explicit in suggesting that moderation (resisting the temptations of money, pleasure and desire) is so unexpected in a Roman that his Greek subjects will believe him to have stepped out of their own history books, or to be a "***divinus homo***"[439]. The idea that Rome herself might benefit from Quintus Cicero's incarnation of a Platonic ideal ruler, educated in "***virtus***" and "***humanitas***", has already been noted (see above section **b** iv)[440]. Appian and Plutarch note that there was a more general Roman desire for a "***monarchos***" only seven years later; Appian's choices of authoritative, mild, temperate, modest and accessible to describe their ideal ruler can all be paralleled in the Ciceronian rhetoric outlined above. Both Greek commentators note that the man they had in mind was Pompey, who was offered the dictatorship in this year, but Cicero wrote to Curio saying that if one man ("***ex omnibus unus***") had to be chosen as "***dux***", "***auctor***", "***moderator***" or "***gubernator***" then he, Curio, was the obvious choice[441].

In the De Bello Gallico, Caesar ascribes to himself both "***innocentia***" and "***felicitas***"; to the latter quality, Cicero adds only "***fides***" and "***virtus***" in the speech De Provinciis Consularibus, but the near contemporary In Vatinium distances the general from his tribune Vatinius, an "***intolerandus tyrannus***" whose actions suggest "***crudelitas***", by the adjective "***clementissimus***"[442]. Although "***clementia***" was commended to Q. Cicero in 60 B.C. the word's absence from the extended catalogues of positive qualities in the De Lege

Manilia and Pro Murena (see above), makes it all the more remarkable that the superlative should be accorded to Caesar, later so famous for this virtue (rather than its near synonyms), well before the Civil Wars[443]. Whilst Cicero appears to have believed, late in 50 B.C., that Caesar would prove neither "***clementior***" than Cinna, nor "***moderatior***" than Sulla, within four months he had written to praise the "***clementia***" which Caesar had displayed at Corfinium, and which had given him the reputation of being a "***conservator inimicorum***"; even if Cicero regarded such calculated mercy as "***insidiosa***", the towns of Italy are said to have regarded Caesar as a "***deus***"[444]. As was suggested above (see section **b** iv), Caesar's appropriation of the virtue at this time seems to have been determined by his enemies' characterisation of him as an aspirant tyrant in the Sullan mould (see above section **b** ii), about to institute proscriptions and slaughter; if some on Caesar's side believed his repudiation of such behaviour to be temporary, Cicero himself admitted that Pompey had been seeking an opportunity to emulate Sulla for two years[445].

In 46 B.C., Cicero wrote to Marcus Marius that, when it had proved impossible to resist the "***unus***" (Caesar), he had wanted peace, even though he had never wanted anyone to have power greater than that of the entire "***respublica***"; three years earlier he had admitted that Caesar's opponents were themselves dependent on a "***unus***" in whom he saw no hope of "***salus***"[446]. In contrast to Atticus' recognition in 49 B.C. that Caesar was behaving "***sincere***", "***temperate***" and "***prudenter***", Cicero wrote to Varro that the Pompeians had threatened him "***crudeliter***", and imagined that victory would have made them "***intemperantes***"[447]. In the Pro Marcello, the fact that Caesar had acted "***clementer***", "***mansuete***", "***iuste***", "***moderate***" and "***sapienter***", despite the fact that he was "***in iracundia***" (the normal enemy of "***consilium***"), and "***in victoria***" (which is normally "***insolens et superba***"), is set out as an unbelievable achievement from a storybook[448]. Just as Caesar's wisdom is said to have been "***incredibilis ac paene divina***", Caesar himself is said to be "***simillimus deo***" [449]. Cicero notes the "***celeritas***"of Caesar's marches through, and victories throughout, the known world but suggests that, whilst the trophies

and monuments recording them will decay, his "***iustitia***" and "***lenitas***" will be known forever; Victoria herself, it is suggested, has been conquered by Caesar's extraordinary "***clementia***", rendering him "***unus invictus***"[450]. In the Pro Ligario, Caesar's "***clementia***" is said not only to be "***admirabilis***" but worthy of "***litterae monumentaque***"[451]. Cicero claims that some of Caesar's supporters wanted his mercy towards his enemies to be ended, and urges Caesar to continue his "***popularis bonitas***", suggesting that the granting of "***salus***" is the act in which men most closely resemble the gods[452].

A couple of months after Caesar's assassination Cicero noted that the conspirators were regarded as "***ingrati***" who had abused the "***clementia***" of a "***clarissimus vir***"; a couple of weeks later, Brutus and Cassius were already invoking the "***virtus***", "***fides et benevolentia***" of another "***unus***" (Antony)[453]. In the first Philippic, Cicero asserts that "***libertas***" and "***pax***" did not satisfy Antony, who wanted to be a "***unus***" more powerful than everyone else, and who preferred to be feared by citizens than esteemed as a citizen[454]. In the second, Pompey is praised as a "***singularis***" and "***paene divinus***" man whose "***virtus***" had inspired in foreign nations a greater fear of Rome, but whose "***iustitia***" had made Rome more loved; by contrast, the military achievements of Antony, now living in Pompey's house, are represented as being the pursuit and butchery of men whom Caesar would otherwise have spared. Caesar himself is praised, not only for his "***res gestae***", but also for his "***ingenium***", "***ratio***", "***memoria***", "***litterae***", "***cura***", "***cogitatio***" and "***diligentia***"[455]. In the near contemporary De Officiis, those who seek to make themselves not merely a "***princeps***" but the "***solus***" are characterised as abandoning "***iustitia***"; similarly their apparent "***fortitudo***" is really no more than "***audacia***"[456].

Some months earlier Cicero claimed to have detected in Octavian "***ingenium***" and "***animus***", and now that the "***divinus adulescens***" was defending Rome from Antony, Cicero added "***prudentia***"; his "***virtus***" is later said to be "***incredibilis et divina***", and Cicero claims that he has understood that the greatest "***pietas***" lies in the "***conservatio***

patriae"[457]. By June 43 B.C., Brutus had written to Atticus complaining that Cicero had so inflamed Octavian's "***cupiditas et licentia***" that he was likely to succeed Antony as "***dominus***"; whilst Cicero continued to praise Octavian's character, Brutus accused him of consenting to Octavian's monarchy, because the youth paid him compliments and called him father, and as if his objection to the rule of Antony had been not "***servitus***" itself, but the terms of that enslavement[458]. In the last of the letters preserved in the Ciceronian corpus, Plancus noted that Octavian who had once seemed "***moderatissimus atque humanissimus***" was demanding a consulship; within months the triumvirate had been formed, proscriptions instituted, and Cicero slain[459].

ii) Positive representations of Republican leaders in art

Apart from coin types, relatively few Republican artworks have survived. The publicly displayed sculptures which once represented Rome's leaders and their achievements in the city of Rome, are better known from texts than from surviving examples, and of the public paintings noted by Livy and Pliny nothing has survived (see below). The majority of surviving Republican portrait sculptures are not identifiable as known figures of importance; indeed, some clearly represent men of considerably inferior rank to the senators who supplied the city's magistrates and generals, and the relationship of these works to the lost portraiture of their 'betters' is unclear. A good proportion of these 'bourgeois' commissions were intended as memorials to the dead, the different circumstances of viewing not improbably demanding different forms and compositions from the public sculptures of the urban elite[460]. The almost complete absence of portraiture from Republican coins (in direct contrast to the practice of the Hellenistic dynasties), is counterbalanced by the well-studied attempts of moneyers from the late second century B.C. onwards, to use coin reverses to represent ancestral achievements and, eventually, current affairs[461]. Given this increasing usage of coin types to represent the achievements of Rome's past and present military and political leaders, and the growing

experience of Greek art and its functions noted above (section **a** ii), changes over time in the use of other media, would not be unexpected; it is hoped that a chronological approach to the, mainly textual, evidence will demonstrate not merely changes in the frequency of notation of usage, but actual changes in usage.

The first shield portraits are said by Pliny to have been installed in the temple of Bellona, which was constructed in the 290s B.C. by Appius Claudius Caecus; this evidence is not without its problems as Pliny appears to have had a much earlier Appius Claudius in mind, and it is far from clear to what extent the paintings constituted likenesses as they appear to have represented the dedicator's ancestors[462]. Thirty or so years later, M. Valerius Maximus Messala's campaign against Hiero was memorialised at Rome with a battle-painting on the side of the Curia Hostilia, which probably represented Valerius as one of the combatants; the immediate inspiration for this work may have been an artwork seen in Syracuse where at least one royal battle painting is later attested. Festus noted two earlier paintings in the temples of Connus and Vortumnus showing, respectively, the triumphators L. Papirius Cursor and M. Fulvius Flaccus, but it is not clear that the conflict itself was represented; the subject of Fabius Pictor's paintings in the temple of Salus is unknown[463]. In 214 B.C. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus ordered a painting for the temple to Libertas, which his father had built, representing the celebrations at Beneventum following its liberation from the Carthaginians[464].

Following the peace of Apameia Lucius Scipio Asiaticus arranged for the installation of a painting of the Asian campaign to be installed on the Capitol[465]. In 177 B.C., Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (son of the liberator of Beneventum) had a painting and inscription dedicated at the temple of Mater Matuta, the former showing the island of Sardinia and the battles fought there[466]. After the fall of Carthage, L. Hostilius Mancinus who claimed the ***Corona Muralis*** for being first to breach the walls of the city, appears to have commissioned a painting of that city and his actions there for display in the Forum;

according to Pliny he stood nearby explaining all the details to onlookers and so ingratiated himself with the citizenry that he was elected to the consulship[467]. The portrait shields installed in the Basilica Aemilia sometime before 61 B.C. (RRC 419/3a & b), the paintings displayed in triumphs down to the fall of the Republic and beyond, which may have gone on permanent display, and Pliny's reference to the domestic painting at Sulla's Tusculum retreat (representing the campaign at Nola which resulted in the bestowal on the general of the ***Corona Obsidionalis***) complete the corpus of painted works known to have represented Republican leaders[468]. However, the tradition was far from unknown in the third century A.D. when Herodian records that, the frankly unsophisticated, Maximinus Thrax ordered large pictures of his German campaign to be set up in front of the senate-house, so that the citizens could see as well as hear of his exploits[469].

As has already been noted (see above section **a** ii) the evidence of Livy about equestrian statues erected by the senate in the lifetimes of C. Maenius and L. Furius Camillus appears untrustworthy, and it is not impossible that the equestrian statue of Q. Marcius Tremulus was a posthumous or ancestral portrait rather than a contemporary dedication, allowing for the contacts with Greek art which Pliny asserts inspired the adoption at Rome of an equestrian stance for portrait sculpture. The togate form of the statues of Tremulus (and Cloelia) may suggest a desire to distance Romans from Greeks, whose rider statues appear normally to have been armoured and were occasionally unclad (as noted in chapter 2), and similarly the avoidance of gilding in such works before 181 B.C. may not merely be a matter of thrift[470]. Plutarch notes that the equestrian statue of Q. Fabius Maximus on the Capitol was dedicated by the person represented, rather than as a memorial of filial piety (as with Glabrio's over twenty years later), or by the decree of either senate or people. Fabius Maximus died in 203 B.C. and it would not be unreasonable to date the so-called "Brutus" head, which has been considered a fragment of a lost equestrian statue (see Figure 1), to around that time[471]. Livy's account of Scipio Africanus' arch at the summit of the Clivus Capitolinus suggests that it was ornamented with seven bronze statues, two in the

relatively new equestrian stance; it is not clear whether the figures were family portraits and, if they were, whether the deceased or the living were accorded the horses. The slightly earlier ***fornices*** dedicated by L. Stertinius, were noted by Livy as having "***signa aurata***" and given the location of two of his three arches (at the entrance to temples), it is possible that these sculptures were not portraits at all but representations of divinities, or even Spanish booty[472].

The earliest arch certainly known to have carried ancestral portraits is the so-called ***Fornix Fabianus***, erected near the ***Regia*** around 121 B.C., which bore representations of the dedicator's paternal grandfather Aemilius Paullus and his uncle Scipio Aemilianus, as well (presumably) as the dedicator himself (Quintus Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus); this concern for setting one's own achievements off against the family record matches the rhetorical presentation of ***virtus*** as an inherited trait, noted above (section **c** i). Apart from the ***fornix*** of Calpurnius noted by Orosius in his account of the death of Tiberius Gracchus, other arches may have existed at Rome in the ninety or so years before Octavian's was erected on the Palatine at the entrance to the Apollo temple (see chapter 4, below); as Wallace-Hadrill has noted all known Republican arches appear to have been dedicated by individuals rather than by decree of the senate or people of Rome[473].

Sometime after 204 B.C. the people of Rome are said to have honoured Claudia Quinta with a statue because she had enabled the image of the goddess Cybele/Magna Mater to enter the city; it is certainly unlikely that a woman would have possessed the resources to commission the statue for herself, but its posthumous dedication by a relative is not impossible[474]. Pliny claimed that among the first statues erected by the people (rather than the senate, as Dionysius had claimed) was that representing the legendary fifth century hero L. Minucius (near the ***Porta Trigemina***). His benefaction to the city is connected, both by Pliny and Livy, with the aftermath of the death of Spurius Maelius; it has been suggested above that the monument to Spurius Cassius, removed from the Forum

by the censors of 159 B.C. (see sections **a** ii & iii), had been dedicated by a descendant shortly before its demolition, and the column of Minucius, illustrated on coins from the two years before the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus (RRC 242/1 & 243/1), may be of similar origin[475]. Dionysius claims that the populace had decreed an armoured statue to Horatius Cocles in his lifetime, as a reward for saving the city from Porsenna, and Aulus Gellius reports the tale that, having been struck by lightning, this was moved to a higher position (atop a column?); again the date of dedication seems unreasonable, and if this was not in fact an antique statue of Vulcan, it may have been an ancestor portrait, although the political achievements of the Horatii appear to have been less than illustrious[476].

It seems unlikely that the statues of Tullus Cloelius, L. Roscius and Spurius Nautius, the envoys murdered at Fidenae in 438 B.C. date to the fifth century, particularly as Cicero notes that they were displayed on the Rostra (built only in the late fourth century), but honouring with portraits on the Rostra those who had died in the service of the state does appear to have been the prerogative of the senate. Pliny notes that the, presumably third century, memorials to the envoys murdered by Teuta of Illyria were half life-size, in probable contrast to that of Octavius (erected around 160 B.C.?)[477]. The many statues to the Gracchi, erected by the people after the death of the younger brother, may have been conceived as parallels to these senatorial commissions; the commemoration of their mother Cornelia in the Porticus Metelli seems also to have been by popular decree, perhaps under Saturninus who claimed that a certain L. Equitius was her grandson[478]. Apart from the uncertain case of Claudia Quinta noted above, the Roman people appear to have commemorated in their lifetimes Scipio Africanus, Cato and Q. Marcius Rex; Scipio was said to have objected, and Cato probably did not approve[479].

It is far from clear how many of the statues and columns toppled by the storms of 182, 179 and 152 B.C. represented Republican leaders, but the soothsayers' prediction in the latter case that death would befall magistrates and priests is perhaps suggestive[480]. Livy notes

that the "***columna rostrata***" of Aemilius, erected on the Capitol in 254 B.C. was destroyed by lightning in 172 B.C; in this case, although expiatory rites were followed, it was determined that the portent was a positive one for Rome because the prows which had ornamented the column were confiscated enemy property. It should be noted that Aemilius Paullus' eventual victory over Perseus was marked by the appropriation of pillar monuments at Delphi, which had been intended to receive statues of Perseus[481]. Whilst the latter monuments were not in the city of Rome, the Roman commander's decision to use them at all suggests that, like his son, far from seeking to differentiate himself from Perseus and the other kings commemorated with similar monuments at this sanctuary, he considered himself their equal[482].

The first numismatic ancestor portraits to be less than wholly imaginary appear to be those of Sulla and Q. Pompeius Rufus which competed with the portraits of Brutus and Ahala, the ancient tyrannicides, on the coins of 54 B.C. (RRC 433/2 & 434/1); in contrast to the bearded visages of the latter, the former are shown clean-shaven, as were C. Coelius Caldus in 51 B.C. and, anachronistically, M. Claudius Marcellus in 50 B.C. (RRC 437/1a-4b, & 439/1). The features of an Aulus Postumius Albinus (RRC/3a-c), or a C. Antius Restio (RRC 455/1a & b) seem exceptionally wrinkled not only when compared with most of the coin portrait types noted immediately above, but also many of the issues representing Pompey and Caesar down to 44 B.C. and beyond[483]. The relationship between these coin-types and contemporary 'veristic' sculpture is unclear, but this numismatic diversity may suggest that different degrees of sculptural wrinkliness are attributable to something other than differences in the ages of the 'sitters'. In the absence of securely dated Roman portraiture from the second century B.C. it is possible to hypothesise a long-term, and perhaps far from universal change, from the severe maturity of 'earlier' Roman portraits (the style made essential by the onset of the fashion for beardlessness in a society that valued age and experience over juvenile vigour), to an apparently youthful and energetic maturity in the age of Pompey and Caesar (who both

fought campaigns well into their fifties, see above section **b** iii). Certainly the idealism of heroic nudity does appear to have become increasingly acceptable for portrait statues of Romans by the end of the Republic, and nods to the portraiture of Alexander in the cases of Pompey, Murena and Caesar (see below) would also fit this outline[484].

Whilst the facial 'members' of second century portraits may well be irrecoverable, something can be said about portrait sculpture in this period. The use of the equestrian stance has already been noted, and numismatic evidence suggests the currency of at least three poses for the horse; the horse carrying an Aemilius Lepidus, on coins of 114/113 B.C., appears to stand with all feet on the ground (RRC 291/1), whilst that of another relative (RRC 419/1a-e) seems to walk (see also Figure 14), and those of the Marcii rear, as if moving at speed (RRC 293/1 & 425/1). Julius Obsequens may refer to a statue of the second type in the grove of Libitina, when relating the prodigy of water dripping "***ex ore et pede***"[485]. The first numismatic representation of a human triumphator (RRC 326/1) came over a decade after the first portrayal of equestrian statues and it is far from clear that this chariot group is meant to be read as a statue; the use of the palm branch on the first of the Marcian portraits to be represented suggested to Crawford that the figure had celebrated a triumph, and it may well be that chariot groups, such as that dedicated by P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, were not yet used for portraits[486].

When equestrian stances were not adopted, it can probably assumed that full-length portraits stood, as in the case of Minucius (see above); the seated armed figure on the reverse of coins issued by Numerius Fabius Pictor (RRC 268 1a-b) seems more likely to be the god Quirinus holding the symbol of Fabius' priesthood rather than the Flamen Quirinalis himself as Crawford suggests[487]. Whilst many of the standing portraits will probably have been togate (like those of the Minucii, see above), at least one of those commissioned at Rome was not. When the senate had repudiated Mancinus' humiliating peace settlement, which had saved thousands of citizen lives, the assembly surrendered

him to the Numantines on his own advice; the enemy returned him unharmed despite Rome's resumption of hostilities and Mancinus is said to have chosen to be represented in a portrait statue, stripped of his clothing and bound, just as he had been when he was given over to the Numantines [488].

Numismatic representations of Republican leaders exist which probably do not depend on sculptural models. The charging armed horseman with streaming cloak on the coins of Q. Marcius Philippus from 129 B.C. (RRC 259/1) was considered divine by Crawford, but the additional representation of the Macedonian royal (horned) helmet may suggest a reference to the involvement of the moneyer's ancestor in the Macedonian wars; it is not impossible that the reverse of a C. Servilius Vatia (RRC 264/1), which represents a cavalry engagement, also refers to these wars, as the Macedonian shields shown on the near contemporary coins of a M. Metellus (Macedonicus) and a T. Quinctius (Flamininus) certainly do (RRC 263/1a-5b, & 267/1)[489]. Just over a decade later, the obverse of the Marcian triumphator coin noted above (RRC 293/1), shows a beardless head in a diademed horned helmet, which Crawford interprets as a fanciful portrait of Philip V[490].

The specific references to past events on three of the coin reverses from before the end of the second century seem irrecoverable (RRC 295/1, 319/1, & 327/2); the horseman of L. Manius Torquatus, and the battles on coins of Q. Marcius Thermus and M. Servilius Vatia may even be generic. Three or four years before the earliest of these three coins, a M. Sergius Silus appears to have represented the exceptional ***virtus*** of his grandfather, whose right hand had been severed in battle, but who is shown wielding a sword and holding a severed head in his left hand (RRC 286/1)[491]. In 119 B.C. the moneyer M. Furius Philus appears to have been the first to refer to immediately preceeding events, with a reverse design representing Roma Victrix crowning Gallic trophies (RRC 281/1); the Quinarius issue of C. Fundanius which shows a Victory, crowning a Gallic trophy that is completed by a kneeling captive (RRC 326/2), was similarly topical, following Marius' victories over

the Cimbri and Teutones, and its companion triumphator Denarius (noted above) probably represents Marius and his son as Crawford suggested. In this context Crawford's interpretation of the seated civilians on the reverse of the coin issued by the quaestors Caepio and Piso in 100 B.C. (RRC 330/1a-b), as the moneyers themselves is not impossible; Torelli's dating of the so-called Domitius Ahenobarbus reliefs to the late second century may supply a further parallel as two censors were represented, one performing the ***census***, and the other the ***lustrum***[492].

The dedication in the late 90s B.C. of a monument celebrating the confirmation of Bocchus' kingship and the surrender to Sulla of Jugurtha has already been noted (see above sections **a** ii & **b** v); its apparent illustration on one of the Denarii of Faustus Cornelius Sulla (RRC 426/1) has long been noted and the possible significance of these coins will be discussed further below. There is no evidence of such a statue group, with real persons represented as interacting with each other (rather than merely being displayed together), having previously been erected at Rome, but such interactions would have been familiar to viewers of coins (e.g. RRC 292/1, & 301/1), and the Domitius Ahenobarbus reliefs (if indeed they are late second century in date, as Torelli suggests). Sulla's seated posture, which may have made some standing viewers feel uncomfortable, cannot be paralleled; the apparently contemporary arguments about the monument, noted by Plutarch, centred on the fact that Sulla's role in ending the war with Jugurtha was emphasised at the expense of his commanding officer Marius, who appears not to have been represented at all[493]. The heroic warrior nude, not distant in appearance from the 'Alexander Rondanini', and associated with a trophy and a ship's prow on coins of C. Publicius Malleolus from the mid-90s B.C. is of uncertain significance (RRC 335/3a-g). However, the association of the moneyer's name with a reverse depicting a Victory crowning a seated Roma, and the continuing references to the defeat of the Cimbri and Teutones in other coins of this decade (RRC 332/1a-c, 333/1, 335/1a-c, 335/9, 337/1a, 342/1, & 342/2) are clearly suggestive[494].

In the 80s B.C. the first apparently anticipatory coin reverses seem to have been issued; if the victory column associated with ship's prows on the As coinage of the 'Marian' C. Marcius Censorinus seem unlikely to have looked forward to Sulla's victory in the war with Mithridates (RRC 346/3 & 4a-b), this victory does seem to have been predicted in the empty triumphal quadriga reverses of L. Rubrius Dossenus which, ***pace*** Crawford, were hardly suitable for the civil war of 87 B.C. (RRC 348/1-3), just as news of the peace of Dardanus appears to have prompted the triumphator issue of Laterensis (RRC 358/1)[495]. The Alexandrine rider of P. Crepusius' Denarii (RRC 361/1a-c) may be a product of the same pleasure at the king's defeat, in the period before the massacres of the younger Marius. Sulla's own coins, as Ramage has correctly noted, emphasise the legitimacy of his command, and his individual relationship with the gods who had fostered his victory (see above section **c** i), culminating in the first representation of a new portrait statue, complete with references to his ***felicitas*** (RRC 359/1-2, 367/1-5, & 381/1a-b); not only did Sulla's coins from 82 B.C. portray him driving the triumphal chariot a year in advance of the actual event, but unprecedentedly a Victory is shown flying in to crown him (only deities and trophies had been shown receiving crowns before)[496].

The statue of Sulla represented on the coins appears to have been the gilded equestrian statue erected on the Rostra, perhaps following a senatorial decree that unprecedentedly honoured a living man rather than a civic 'martyr'; inscriptional evidence attests to dedications of further statues by his freedmen, and by the Vicus of the Lacus Fundanus. The right hand of the rider is shown, to have been raised in the gesture of address[497]. The enigmatic, but probably Sullan, relief fragments from the Via della Consolazione at Rome, depicting victories, trophies and displays of weaponry have been suggested to derive from a pillar monument, not unlike that of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi and its Hellenistic royal antecedents; presumably this too would have been surmounted by statuary[498]. The debt-campaigning praetor Marius Gratidianus appears to have received a statue in each district of the city, and these honours almost certainly came before his death in the Sullan

proscriptions (in contrast to the Gracchi, see above); it is doubtful that so many representations of the same individual had been seen before at Rome, and unlikely that there were, now unknown, precedents for honorific statues in such numbers. Cicero's assertion that the statues were reverenced with incense need not suggest that they managed to survive the Sullan ***regnum***, in a way that the monuments of C. Marius did not, because he seems to date this treatment before Gratidianus' death; by contrast, the reverencing of the statues of the Gracchi was as posthumous as the statues themselves[499].

In the Verrines, Cicero admits that honorific statues give the honorand pleasure, because they increase his "***honor et gloria***", and claims that it was normal practice for such honours to be bestowed by whole communities, or by interest groups like farmers, merchants and ship-owners; it is not clear that he is specifically and exclusively describing the Sicilian tradition. A large number of statues is considered ridiculous as there are only a few worthy locations for monuments ("***in foro***", "***in curia***", "***propter aedem***","***in primo aditu vestibuloque templi***", and perhaps even "***in gymnasio***"); appropriately enough for Cicero's characterisation of Verres as a bandit-king, this means that he can suggest that statues were to be put where it was not safe to walk ("***in omnibus angiportis***"), whilst claiming that the collection of contributions by Verres' agents amounted to extortion. Two cities that did manage to get portraits erected are said to have represented Verres with his son, and his father; the representation of the latter at Syracuse is said to indicate the governor's "***pietas***", whilst the nudity of the former, on what was probably the same monument, was cause for remark[500].

In the Verrines, Cicero assumes that those defending Verres would draw attention to the fact that, against a background of the Spartacan slave revolt in Italy, there had been no such trouble in Sicily under Verres' rule, and Cicero explicitly refers to the suppression of the Sicilian slave revolt by Manius Aquilius, thirty years previously; the apparently 'anniversary' coin-issue of that governor's grandson (RRC 401/1) appears to show a soldier

restoring a fallen Sicilia to her feet, and may have contemporary resonance given the inscriptional acclamation of Verres as "*soter*"[501]. Pompey's near contemporary issue of coins (RRC 402/1a-b), probably minted for distribution in triumphal donatives, appears to show Pompey himself as a triumphator on the reverse; a head in an elephant-skin on the obverse, almost certainly to be identified as Africa, is set within a laurel wreath border that refers to his previous triumph. In Pompey's subsequent consulship, the relationship between Rome and Italy was similarly illustrated by the grasped hands of their personifications (RRC 403/1); the relationship between Rome and the rest of the world, however, was indicated by the positioning of a globe (see also RRC 393/1a-b, and 397/1) under Roma's right foot. The use of ethnic personifications, other than Roma, appears a late development (Hispania was represented in 81 B.C., RRC 372/2), although according to Appian, towers had been used to represent cities in the triumph of Scipio Africanus. The statues of fourteen nations, presumably those encountered and conquered by Pompey, which were displayed in his theatre would probably not have been seen by the public until late in 55 B.C[502].

The Lanuvium monument (see Figure 13), and its probable dependence on the Granikos monument of the Porticus Metelli, has already been noted in association with the idea that Roman liberators of Asia from the domination of Mithridates saw themselves as successors to Alexander (see above section **b** iv); the Ciceronian account of Murena caring for his troops (see above section **c** i) matches Arrian's account of Alexander's own conduct after this very battle, and it is possible that the Lanuvium monument also served as a memorial to the fallen[503]. The possibility of direct inspiration is much reduced in the case of the so-called 'Tivoli General' (see Figures 4 and 7), which has also been associated with the Asian campaigns of the late 70s and early 60s B.C., although in its draped nudity it resembles Hellenistic Alexanders, such as that from Magnesia-by-Sipylos. The statue of a Mithridatic general from the Helianax monument on Delos (see Figure 6), which may itself

have been inspired by such Alexander-portraits, should also be compared with the 'Tivoli General'[504].

Rome's past and present relationships with kings were represented on five coins issued between 62 and 55 B.C. and, given that this is the very period of Pompey's settlement of the East, its ratification at Rome, and the apparently unprecedented treatment of the younger Tigranes (see above section **b** iv), it seems likely that something more than family pride was at stake. In the first (RRC 415/1), L. Aemilius Paullus, conqueror of Macedonia, stands to the right of a trophy, the apparent focus of attention of three figures to the left of it; these are to be interpreted as his royal Macedonian prisoners since the adult (Perseus) appears to have his arms bound behind his back. In the second (RRC 419/2), M. Aemilius Lepidus' Ptolemaic tutelage appears to be illustrated (see above section **II** d); the togate Roman, again on the right of the composition, bestows a diadem on a foreign adolescent and the obverse personification of Alexandria (with Cybele-like mural crown) confirms the location. The obverse of the middle issue (RRC 422/1a-b) shows a kneeling Eastern king, sometimes identified by the legend "***Rex Aretas***" (of Nabataea), apparently dismounted from a camel, and holding out an olive branch to the unseen Roman conquerors who granted him Rome's recognition only a few years before the coin was minted; the reverse of the final type in this 'set' (RRC 431/1) repeats this image with the legend "***Bacchius Iudaeus***". The penultimate reverse type has already been noted for its apparent depiction of Bocchus' monument to Sulla (RRC 426/1); like Aretas, Bocchus was depicted extending an olive branch (prior to receiving Roman recognition) and like the faithless Perseus in the first type, Jugurtha has his arms bound behind him.

Until the 'Pompeian' types of Faustus Sulla (RRC 426/3-4b) were issued in 56 B.C., numismatic reference to Pompey's settlement of the East had been limited to the Aretas coin noted above, which gave more credit to Scaurus (one of the moneyers) than his commander; the symbolism of world conquest, noted by Plutarch, Appian and Dio in

association with Pompey's third triumph was now realised in reverses showing three trophies (one for each continent from which he had won a triumph), and a set of crowns centred on the globe[505]. Messalla's coin from 53 B.C. (RRC 435/1), representing the subjection of the filleted sceptre of kingly power to the curule seat of Roman magistracy has been interpreted as sharing, with the Brutus coins of the previous year (RRC 433/1-2), in criticism of the contemporary enthusiasm for monarchy noted above (section **c** i)[506]. The personification of ***Libertas***, utilised on coin types for more than half a century, does not appear to have been linked to the foundation of Republican rule and the expulsion of the Tarquins, until the Brutus issue (RRC 433/1). However, the characterisation of political opponents as being tyrants already, or aspiring to tyranny, had received concrete treatment during Cicero's exile when Clodius established a temple and portico to ***Libertas*** on the site of the 'tyrant' Cicero's house, installing a statue of ***Libertas*****;** once Cicero had returned from exile, he alleged that Clodius had threatened to establish a second such complex on the site of Pompey's house. Apart from suggesting that Clodius' ***Libertas*** was freedom from proper constraints and that the cult statue was, accordingly, stolen from the grave of a Tanagran prostitute, Cicero notes that a certain Menulla of Anagnia had set up a statue of Clodius in return for services rendered to his community (far from the normal, corporate, practice set out in the Verrines, see above)[507].

After the battle of Pharsalus, Caesar is said to have erected a separate memorial to one of the fallen veteran soldiers (Crastinus), who had earlier asserted that the cause of ***Libertas*** would be victorious, and shown particular courage in the battle; Caesar himself noted that the man expected to be rewarded in death as well as in life (see above section **c** i)[508]. At Rome, news of the battle prompted the removal of the equestrian statues of Pompey and Sulla from the Rostra in anticipation of Caesar's return; as early as Caesar's aedileship he had secured the restoration of the monuments of Marius, commissioning new portraits and trophy-bearing Victories at his own expense, and in due course even the statues of Pompey and Sulla were restored by him (see below). Dio goes on to state that the news of

Pompey's death caused the citizens of Rome to propose the bestowal of honours such as portraits and crowns[509]. The following year Cicero noted with some horror that his son-in-law Dolabella, as tribune, had been involved with the erection of a "***statua Clodi***", perhaps not unlike those of the Gracchi and Marius Gratidianus noted above[510].

Following decrees issued in anticipation of Caesar's triumphs, Dio notes that a chariot was dedicated on the Capitol in his honour, as well as a bronze statue composition representing the relationship between Caesar and the rest of the world. It is far from clear that the chariot carried a portrait of Caesar, and its combination with this statue group seems unlikely; it may even have been a war-chariot captured from the land beyond Ocean (Britain), although in that case one would have expected the dedicator to have been Caesar himself. As for the statues, Caesar may have been represented with his foot on the globe, a position previously adopted by personifications (see above), or perhaps raising to her feet a personification such as Roma who had possession of the globe and thus seemed, to Dio, to represent ***Oikoumene***; the Via Cassia relief which appears to show a victorious general raising Roma to her feet, could be considered to have represented Caesar as "***hemitheos***" since his ***clementia*** had rendered him a "***deus***" to the Italians long before Pharsalus (see above section **c** i)[511].

The following year's dedication of a portrait of Cicero's "***unus invictus***" in the temple of Quirinus with the apparent inscription "***Deo Invicto***", and the equestrian statue dedicated by Caesar himself in his Forum, using a supposedly Lysippan Bucephalus for the mount, further negotiated ideas of Alexandrine rule[512]. Owing to Caesar's ***clementia***, this rule was not tyrannical, even if it was monarchical, and indeed it seems clear that the statue erected beside the kings was intended to represent him as liberator of the city from a Pompeian revival of Sullan tyranny (see above, sections **b** ii & v, and **c** i)[513]. The re-sited Rostra had restored to it statues of Pompey and Sulla, replacing those removed several years earlier (see above), and the two statues were also erected there which represented

Caesar in the ***Corona Civica*** and ***Corona Obsidionalis***, indicating that he had been the salvation of Rome (see above section **b** v)[514]. The sculptural interchange between the human and 'divine' figures on the Via Cassia relief (and perhaps also the Capitol statue discussed above) was also replicated in the statue of ***Clementia Caesaris***, where Appian noted that the goddess and Caesar clasped hands; the universal nature of this virtue is indicated by the globe in the pediment of the shrine illustrated on one of Sepullius Macer's Denarii from 44 B.C. (RRC 480/21). Appian further claims that by Caesar's death, statues had been erected in all temples and public places, the various honours decreed not only by citizens (each tribe), but the provinces and foreign kings; to this Rome-focused account, Dio adds that a statue of him was to be erected in every(?) city[515].

On the coins issued between the battle of Pharsalus and the decree permitting the minting of Caesar's own visage on the coinage, his victories in the Gallic wars, continued to feature prominently (RRC 448/2-3, 450/1, 452/1-5, 454/1-2, 468/1-2)[516]. The shift in 44 B.C., from using ancestral portraits on coins, to representing a living person was not a great one, particularly as Pompey's sons were already representing their father's features on the coins they were minting in Spain (e.g. RRC 470/1a-d), and it is no surprise that, as early as the following year, Brutus the self-styled 'tyrannicide' was minting his own portrait on coins (RRC 506/1, 507/1, & 508/3). However, the difference between Caesar's portrait coins and the ancestral portraits noted above (including those showing Pompey) is quite striking; in most types Caesar is shown in a wreath, identified by Crawford as the ***Corona Aurea*** he wore at the Lupercalia, and in some he is veiled, presumably for the performance of a sacrifice. It is unclear whether veiled male portraits, which appear to have been common under Augustus, were already known in other media; certainly Numa's augury, on the Pomponian Denarius from the early 90s B.C. (RRC 334/1), appears to have been performed bareheaded and, numismatically, the veil was particularly associated with Vesta (RRC 406/1, 413/1 428/1) and Concordia (415/1, 417/1a-b, 429/2a-b)[517]. The significance of the Pompeian As coinage, apparently showing Janiform portraits of

Pompey is unclear (RRC 479/1). The only previous occasion on which Janus himself had been supplanted from the obverse of these coins the features of Hercules and Mercury had been placed back to back (RRC 348/6), but this was hardly a precedent. Some relation to the Pompeian Denarii (RRC 477/1a-3b), interpreted by Crawford as showing, alternately, the head of Pompey himself and Cn. Pompeius junior, is not unlikely and, given the death of the latter in 45 B.C., the double portrait on the As may in fact represent father and son; the identical reverses of the two Denarius types, showing a standing figure of Pietas support the hypothesis that both men represented on the obverses were already dead[518].

Caesar's portraits had been at the centre of the diadem debate, and others had given offence to some viewers (see above, section **b** v). Following the assassination, some of his statues were taken down; the extent of this action, and the identity of those responsible for it are unknown, and if it was not for Appian's account of a 'mob' burning down the workshop in which the statues were being rendered down, no record of it would survive[519]. Whilst Appian suggests that this apparent proof of popular enthusiasm for Caesar was punished by Antony, its close association with the demise of the pseudo-Marius Amatius who had erected an altar on the site of Caesar's funeral pyre, suggests that Antony, who had probably been responsible for commissioning the revolving wax model of Caesar displayed at the funeral, was determined both to exploit that enthusiasm for himself, and to restrict the opportunities for others to do so[520]. In July, the appearance of a comet prompted Octavian to commission for the temple of Venus Genetrix a statue of Caesar surmounted by a star, thereby acknowledging this heavenly symbol of his adoptive father's apotheosis; the Caesarian starburst was clearly distinguished from the crown accorded to Sol on Roman coins (e.g. RRC 303/1), perhaps suggesting an attempt to distinguish Caesar from representations of Alexander-Helios, and epiphanous Ptolemies and Seleucids (see above, chapter 2), but a star in this position appears to have been used on Apollo obverses only the previous year (RRC 474/1a-3b) so something of the solar imagery of world

conquest may still have been intended, as Weinstock suggests (see also RRC 494 20-21, & 43a, and 496/1-3)[521]. Octavian's probable restoration of the altar on the site of the funeral pyre in the summer of 44 B.C., and the inscribed "***parens patriae***" column, was followed by Antony's amendment of the inscription below the Rostra portraits to include the title "***parens***"[522].

In the sixth Philippic, Cicero criticised the establishment in the forum of an "***equestris statua inaurata***" dedicated to Lucius Antonius as "***patronus***" of all the tribes; this appellation is claimed as unprecedented, and Cicero notes three other statues which hailed Lucius Antonius as patron (of the equites, of the military tribunes who had served twice under Caesar, and of the banking district around the Ianus Medius)[523]. Dio records that a statue was voted to Octavian in early January 43 B.C.; it is possible that this statue was the one shown on some of the reverses of Octavian's coins from this year (RRC 490/1 & 3)[524]. The following month the senate was urged to adapt the ancestral principle of rewarding civic 'martyrs' (see above) to contemporary circumstances by honouring their late envoy to Antony with a statue on the Rostra and a public tomb on the Campus Esquilinus; Cicero proposed that the consuls should see to it that the quaestors contract for the manufacture and installation of the statue which, he suggests, ought to be both 'pedestrian' and free from gilding in accordance with the "***maiorum continentia***" admired by the deceased[525]. Before the end of March the senate had decreed Lepidus a statue on the Rostra because he had concluded a peace with Sextus Pompeius; by July it had been erected and then thrown down when Lepidus sided with Antony, and the statue voted to M. Iuventius Laterensis may have taken its place[526].

Both Octavian and Antony minted coins showing themselves on the obverse and Caesar on the reverse (RRC 488/1-2, and 490/2 & 4); whilst Sextus Pompeius was now unprecedentedly portraying his father with Neptunian symbols, it is not clear that Sextus was already claiming divine parentage[527]. Following the establishment of the

Triumvirate, Antony and Octavian issued coins with the other's head on the reverse, in place of Caesar, and Antony also issued Aureii with a Lepidus portrait reverse (RRC 492/1-2, & 493/1a-c). The following year Lepidus paired himself with Octavian (RRC 495/1-2d). In addition, Octavian was shown paired with an image of ***Pietas*** (Aeneas carrying Anchises, RRC 494/3a-b) which was perhaps designed to reclaim the virtue appropriated by the Pompeians (see above, and RRC 511/3a-c). Dio notes that early in 42 B.C., Caesar's transition to godhead as Divus Julius was confirmed by the laying out of a sanctuary, on the site of the pyre, that would eventually house his temple, and a decree forbidding the use of Caesar's portrait in funeral processions; there is little indication of these developments in the Roman coinage until as late as 40 B.C. (RRC 525/1-2, and 526/1-3), but the increasing identification between Pompey and Neptune may have been Sextus Pompeius' response (RRC 511/2-4). Unusually, Dio goes on to refer to Brutus' coins showing the cap of liberty set between two daggers over an inscription giving the date of the tyrannicide (RRC 508/3)[528].

Dio notes that during the food shortage of 40 B.C., the rioting populace pulled down statues of Octavian and Antony in an apparent attempt to persuade them to make peace with Sextus Pompeius, whose blockade had starved the city[529]. Four years later however, with Lepidus reduced to the status of a ***privatus***, and Sextus Pompeius a defeated fugitive, the citizens of Rome voted Octavian statues, including a gilt portrait atop a ***columna rostrata*** and, unprecedentedly, an arch surmounted by trophies[530]. The capture and execution of Sextus Pompeius, on Antony's orders, was marked at Rome by Octavian's dedications of a chariot near the Rostra and statues (of himself, Livia, Antony and Octavia?) in the temple of Concordia; Livia and Octavia were certainly accorded portraits this year. On one of Antony's reverses three years previously Octavia had the honour of being the first living woman to be depicted on a Roman coin (RRC 533/3a-b), and her replacement by the diademed Queen Cleopatra was clearly marked in 32 B.C. (RRC 543/1)[531].

Dio suggests that knowledge of the portraits of Antony with Cleopatra, dressed up with the divinising attributes of Osiris/Dionysos and Isis/Selene, may have done further harm to his reputation at Rome around the time that his will was published, and M. Valerius Messala Corvinus' pamphlet De Antonii Statuis may have been partly responsible; after Antony's defeat Plutarch and Dio report the desecration of all his monuments[532]. Suetonius quotes a verse written below a statue of Octavian at the time of the proscriptions which suggested that those who possessed Corinthian vases were likely to be added to the lists on account of Octavian's passion for them; Plutarch suggests that the defacing of monuments with political graffiti dated back to at least the time of Tiberius Gracchus, but this is the first recorded instance of a written response to a representation of a living ruler at Rome[533].

d) Summary

Rome's role in foiling Pyrrhus' ambition for a Western empire appears to have been a surprise to Greeks, arousing Greek interest in Rome's origins, and prompting diplomatic contacts from as far away as Alexandria.

Comparisons between the invincible Alexander, and young Roman generals like Scipio Africanus may indeed have been made as early as the 190s B.C. (the date of the supposed conversation at Ephesus between Scipio and Hannibal).

Hiero II, the Greek king best known to Rome between the wars with Pyrrhus and Philip V, is the first king known to have given the Romans a Greek artwork. Sicilian models for Romano-Campanian coins appear to have been used as early as the 260s.

The effect of the censors' purge of non-honorific statues from the Forum Romanum (in 158 B.C.) is unclear. The targets for demolition may only have been the portraits of those who

had defied Roman law and custom, as the Duilius column (which one tradition held to have been self-commemorative) appears to have survived.

Poet-playwrights like Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius and Plautus offered a wide Roman audience access to the stories of Greek tragedy, epic and comedy, and their audiences appear to have been capable of applying their characterisations of monarchy to contemporary life.

Something beyond the mere names of Agathocles, Philip II and Darius may have been accessible to a certain proportion of the Roman theatrical audience before 184 B.C., and Scipio Africanus may indeed have admired Syracusan monarchs.

Greek ideas of tyranny, liberty, civic harmony and redistributive justice influenced Roman political debate from at least the time of the Gracchi onwards.

The founding myths of the Republic may have been retold, after the liberation of the Greeks from the overlordship of monarchical rulers, with Tarquinius Superbus recast as a stereotypical (Greek) tyrant and Brutus as a tyrannicide. The favourable traditions about the other kings show little evidence of the hostility to monarchy assumed by many modern historians.

Cicero assumed that Scipio Aemilianus and Laelius were familiar with Plato's characterisations of demagogue-tyrants at around the same time as Roman tribunes were first accused of aspiring to tyranny.

Cicero's prudent ***rectores*** were not envisaged as holding perpetual magistracies, but would have taken turns at being ruled, directing the state from the 'back-benches' of the senate house so long as the magistrates chose to ask the opinion of fellow-senators. In reality,

however, a few individuals were being accorded repeated and continuous ***imperium*** (even into their fifties) and ignored the opinions of their fellow-senators.

Although comparisons between Alexander and Roman senators may have been made since the early second century B.C., the latter appear to have found it acceptable to take the Macedonian king as a model only in the first century B.C. By then, political rivals and opponents could, instead, think of such a man as a Xerxes, or a Sardanapalus. Some pointed out Alexander's vices, but even Cicero cited Alexander as a precedent for the youthful "***virtus***" of Octavian.

Contemporary Roman attitudes to third century (B.C.) monarchs are difficult to recover. Although offers of effective guardianship, for the immature rulers that a hereditary succession generates, and presentations of Roman regalia, suggest an idea of Roman superiority, this does not amount to a deep-seated hatred of monarchy.

Royal guests and envoys were well-treated at Rome, and friendships existed between senators and kings in the first half of the second century B.C. However, negative Greek stereotypes of monarchs were being voiced at Rome, and successive kings were being defeated by Roman armies. Romans now terminated the Antigonid rule of Macedonia without installing another monarch, treated Antiochus (IV) in a manner regarded by Greeks as overbearing and insolent, and proposed divisions of both the Ptolemaic possessions and Cappadocia in order to weaken them. Nevertheless, any general decree prohibiting kingly visits to Rome appears to have been shortlived, and designed principally to affect Eumenes.

Allegations that Roman senators had accepted bribes from kings become common in the period after the death of Attalus III. The idea that Roman defeats stemmed from the

enemy's bribery of Roman commanders caused some to under-estimate the generalship of kings like Jugurtha and Mithridates.

The opulent lifestyle of royal courts was enjoyed and emulated by some Late Republican visitors.

In Cicero's rhetoric the idea that powerful kings (like Mithridates) were no longer a threat to Rome was associated with attempts at Rome to install a monarchical regime.

Pompey and Caesar were termed 'king' and 'queen' at just the time when the latter was securing the recognition of Ptolemy XII, and ensuring the ratification of the former's Eastern settlements (which had included the effective appointment of all other Eastern monarchs outside Parthia).

The effective monarchy of Caesar after the death of Pompey appears to have prompted Pharnaces to offer him a marriage alliance. Antony's paternity of some of Cleopatra's children, and the announcement of the boys' kingship, helped confirm suspicions that he aimed at extending the Queen's authority to the Roman West.

The range of virtues and leadership qualities ascribed to Republican leaders appears to have increased over time. Over the same period, the public use of a proven individual to solve problems appears to have become more common. Specialist knowledge and unique skills now set such a "***unus***" apart from other potential candidates.

The senate appears normally to have honoured with statues only those who had already died in the service of the state. Popular decrees honouring living benefactors are not commonly attested before the Late Republic. Many statues, argued by later commentators

to have been honorific, should be reclassified, either as ancestor portraits or self-commemorations.

By the late second century B.C. it appears to have become acceptable for coins to refer to immediately preceding events. From this point on, coins can show living individuals, although the numismatic portrait bust was used only for the dead until Caesar's dictatorship.

Coins showing foreign monarchs to be inferior to Roman magistrates were issued over a period when Roman magistrates were thought to be acting like kings, and some commentators were recommending monarchy as a solution to Rome's problems. Visual evidence that Roman ***Libertas*** depended on the expulsion of tyrants (whether Tarquinius Superbus or Cicero) is also attested in these years.

Caesar's portraits were at the centre of the diadem debate, but the failure of the populace to endorse the characterisation of Caesar's assassination as tyrannicide was marked by the attempted defence of his statues.

4) Monarchical aspects of the Augustan Principate

Although an English reviewer of Volume V of Mommsen's Römische Geschichte (in 1886) felt that the concept of 'dyarchy' was "taken for granted", the Berlin Academy fragment of the proposed Volume IV which pre-date the fire of 1880, and the recently published Hensel lecture notes of 1883, demonstrate that Mommsen could also talk about Julius Caesar's replacement of the Republican constitution by a Roman monarchy, and the Principate as "a Republic with a monarch at its head". A further century of scholarship has not satisfactorily resolved these inconsistencies and paradoxes. This chapter amounts to a re-evaluation of Syme's suggestion that "the Principate provided a middle way" between the impracticable ideal of "complete freedom" and the "intolerable" despotism of the Hellenistic kingdoms, in the light of the previous chapter's assessment of the diverse and evolving Roman attitudes to monarchs and monarchy in the Republican era[1].

The acknowledgement that Republican problems could legitimately be resolved with monarchical leadership was clearly important to the Augustan 'solution', and the first section of this chapter analyses the Augustan attempts at ensuring that the death of the ***Princeps*** did not end the stability which his leadership had brought to the state. The use of the term 'dynasty' reflects the elevation in status of the whole extended family of Augustus, but should not be understood to suggest that a straightforwardly hereditary succession from father to son would have been envisaged, even if Augustus had had one. The second section of this chapter, which closely relates to section **c i** of the previous chapter, looks at rhetorical representations of Augustus, and other male Caesares in his household, which attest their possession of virtues, and other qualities, that fitted them for leadership. The final section of the chapter considers the relationship of Augustan Rome, and its ruling family, to foreign kings and peoples, and contemporary perceptions of Rome's empire as Alexandrine.

a) The creation of a dynasty

It is unclear that Caesar's nomination of his great nephew as his heir had the constitutional implication that Octavius was to succeed as monarch, even if the self-proclaimed tyrannicides considered their campaigns down to the battle of Philippi as a continuation of their opposition to diademed monarchy (RRC 505/3 and 507/2). Nevertheless, according to Nicolaus of Damascus and Suetonius the 'boy' had been marked out for honours by Caesar since coming of age, and given experience not only in warfare, but in hosting *ludi*. As Tarn noted, some, including Vergil, appear to have considered that a child born to Antony's wife (Octavian's sister) in 40 B.C. would grow up to rule the world, but even once Lepidus had been reduced to the status of a ***privatus***, the prospect of a war between the effective monarchs of East and West, to determine whether Antony or Octavian would succeed to mastery of the whole empire, was probably not considered inevitable[2]. The divorce of Octavia in 32 B.C., three years after the probable dedication of statues in the Temple of Concordia illustrating a united family (see above chapter 3, section **c** ii), roughly coincided with the emergence at Rome of the belief that Antony, whose sons by Cleopatra had already been allotted kingdoms in the East, would extend Cleopatra's empire to the Western Mediterranean, and even Rome itself (see above chapter 3, section **b** v). Octavian's successful defence of Rome from the last of the Macedonian rulers, confirmed his own position in the West, and extended his authority to the East. However, owing to Antony's abolition of the dictatorship, Octavian's primacy could, at first, only be marked by a run of successive consulships that stretched beyond the 'constitutional settlement' of 27 B.C. (which granted the newly entitled 'Augustus' ***imperium*** for ten years)[3].

Given Octavian-Augustus' famously bad health, even the anticipation of his 'reign' continuing for a further decade may have seemed unrealistic, and if the city was to be spared the chaos of renewed civil war on his death, a system of succession acceptable to the citizens had to be formulated even if, as Dio suggests, no actual nomination was made

in the will he intended to publish following his recovery from illness. As has been noted above (Chapter 3, section **b i**), succession amongst the ancient kings of Rome was supposed to have depended on the virtues of the individuals themselves rather than hereditary right, and the successor was, in some sense, elected during an interregnum; Dio's suggestion that the 'new Romulus' wished the populace to choose Agrippa for itself would conform to this pattern. Since Augustus had no male children, their accession was not an issue, but he did have other male relatives. His nephew and son-in-law, Marcellus, who died in 23 B.C., whilst probably groomed for eventual succession, seems too young and inexperienced to have been able to take Augustus' place, if the latter had died before the expiration of his ***imperium***, and Velleius' account of a predicted struggle for power between the youth and his brother-in-law Agrippa seems most unlikely. It was to Agrippa, an approximate contemporary in age, that Augustus handed his signet ring during the near fatal illness of 23 B.C., and Tiberius (Marcellus' age contemporary) received no such powers as were accorded to Agrippa in the 'second constitutional settlement' despite his military achievements in the East (see below), and the fact that he was Augustus' step-son; it should perhaps also be noted that it was not Marcellus' statue but his own that had been placed in the ante-room of his Pantheon along with that of Augustus, each referring to the statue of the deified Caesar within (see below)[4].

The history of the Hellenistic kingdoms had clearly demonstrated the dangers of monarchs dying before their nominated successors were of age and the irrelevance of Antony's boy-kings, Alexander Helios and Ptolemy, underlined the point. The minimum age limits for high public office had only occasionally been over-ridden in Rome's history, and there was clearly no thought of electing a Marcellus or a Tiberius to the consulship this early in their careers; whereas non-consulars could hardly hope to retain precedence over senators whose experience of affairs was so much greater than their own, Agrippa had not only been consul three times, but effectively also a Censor. The posthumous ascriptions to Marcellus of Augustan-Caesarian virtues like "***pietas***" and "***virtus***" (see below, section **b**),

resemble the inscriptions from the tomb of the Scipiones (see above chapter 3, section **c** i) in suggesting that these inherited qualities would have become obvious if he had lived long enough. Relationship to the emperor himself was not stressed by Vergil, who chose a respectably antique ancestor for Marcellus to have emulated in dedicating the ***spolia opima***; Propertius however, whilst mentioning the "***Siculae victor***", refers also to his "***optima mater***" and his subsequent closeness, in life and in death, to the Caesars[5].

The reshuffle of family arrangements after the death of Marcellus confirms that a dynasty was being established. The divorces of Octavian and Livia (from Scribonia and Tiberius Claudius Nero in 38 B.C.), and of Agrippa (from Caecilia Attica a decade later) supply the only precedents for the divorce from Marcella Maior which enabled Agrippa to marry Julia (Marcellus' widow), and thus become the son-in-law of Augustus; in 20 B.C. this union was blessed with the birth of a son Gaius, who was adopted by Augustus himself three years later, probably at around the time that Tiberius was finally married to Vipsania, a daughter of Agrippa's from his first marriage. Tiberius' younger brother Drusus may also have been married to Antonia Minor (half-sister to Iullus Antonius) in 17 B.C., the propitious year of the Secular Games[6]. By the time that Agrippa died in 12 B.C., Tiberius had served one term as consul and gained much military experience, so he was at last in a position to succeed his step-father, if he should now have passed away. The next generation of Julii Caesares (the children of Julia and Agrippa adopted by Augustus) already had a public profile, and had even been shown with their mother on coins of 13 B.C., in association with the Corona Civica of Augustus (RIC *Augustus*166 &166a); even discounting the fact that Tiberius and Vipsania appear to have had no children by then, it appears that C. Caesar was being groomed for eventual succession to Tiberius[7].

On Livia's birthday in 9 B.C., the Ara Pacis, vowed on Augustus' return to the city four years earlier, was finally consecrated; as a public monument this paid unprecedented attention to the ***Domus Augusta***, whose internal ***Concordia*** would guarantee the ***Pax***

Augusta long into the future[8]. The death of Agrippa and the subsequent marriage of his widow to Tiberius would have presented problems to artists interested in portraying family relationships since the young Julian 'princes' not only had a birth father (deceased), and an adopted father (Augustus) but also a step-father; Rose is surely right to suggest that the obvious artistic solution was to separate the children from all three fathers by representing the two generations on separate reliefs[9]. The positioning of Julia (daughter to Augustus, widow of Agrippa, and, by 9 B.C., husband to Tiberius) was similarly problematic; although various women on the Southern frieze have been identified with her, the removal of her children to the Northern frieze probably demanded her presence with them, and indeed some scholars have suggested that the veiled figure leading the family party on the Northern frieze is Julia[10]. The often disputed identification of Livia as the next major woman behind Agrippa on the Southern frieze should, it seems to me, be rejected in favour of Vipsania (Tiberius' first wife, whom he had been compelled to divorce on the death of Agrippa); the figure in question stands in the same relationship to Tiberius (Figure 18c), as does Antonia Minor to her husband Drusus (Figure 18b), and as does Antonia Maior to her husband Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus (Figure 18a)[11]. The probable absence of Livia from the Southern frieze is a consequence of this interpretation, but if the veiled woman leading the family party on the Northern frieze is taken as Livia (see further below), there is no problem in finding a suitable figure to represent Julia; the woman insouciantly waving the laurel over the head of C. Caesar is the obvious candidate (Figure 19a), not only because of the correspondence between this visual idea and the aforementioned coins (suggesting that Julian Caesars would continue to confer safety on Roman citizens long into the future), but also because the relative positions of Augustus and Agrippa would then be reproduced by the relative positions of their wives (see Appendix 1)[12].

The veiled woman in the background between Julia and her older son is perhaps Scribonia (Julia's mother), and the young man between her and Livia (behind C. Caesar) could be a

Scipio, another grandchild of Scribonia; he would be a cousin to Julia's children and may even be the man later accused of adultery with Julia (Figure 19a)[13]. Julia's half-sister Cornelia, who had died in 16 B.C. had been married to Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (nephew of the Triumvir, and nominal restorer of the Basilica Aemilia) and their son L. Aemilius Paullus, another cousin for Julia's children, was eventually married to Julia's daughter Julia (when she came of age); the younger Julia is almost certainly the little girl immediately behind the woman now identified as her mother and, given the extreme likelihood that she was already betrothed to her cousin, the man affectionately urging on this girl may be her future husband (Figure 19b)[14]. His father, the maternal uncle of Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus has been considered to be the old man represented between Antonia Maior and her husband on the Southern frieze (Figure 18a); such a relationship between these figures may confirm that the veiled woman in the background between the younger Antonia and Drusus is none other than the emperor's beloved sister (Figure 18b), who died in the same year that Tiberius had been married to Julia (11 B.C.)[15].

Amidst the public mourning for Octavia, Drusus had delivered one of the funeral orations in the Forum; her bier was carried to the Campus Martius for cremation by her sons-in-law (presumably Drusus, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Iullus Antonius and perhaps even Paullus Aemilius Lepidus, see below)[16]. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Marcella married to Iullus Antonius following her divorce from Agrippa was also represented on the Ara Pacis; the pair may have constituted a final couple on the far right of the Southern frieze, although the space to be filled is considerably smaller than that available to the other couples and Iullus Antonius alone may have been represented so as further to distance Agrippa from his former wife. Marcella may then have appeared with her younger sister on the far left of the Northern frieze (behind L. Caesar); the younger Marcella was married to one of the consuls of 12 B.C. Marcus Valerius Messalla Appianus (actually a son of Appius Claudius Pulcher, and thus a kind of cousin to Iullus Antonius, whose mother had once been married to P. Clodius Pulcher, Appianus' great-uncle), and on

his death early that year she was remarried to the aforementioned Paullus Aemilius Lepidus[17].

One consequence of the deaths of Agrippa and Drusus (in 9 B.C.) was the rapid promotion of the young Iulii Caesares. If Augustus and Tiberius were to perish at around the same time, there was now no spare step-son to bridge the gap until their maturity could justify even a precociously early consulship; the voters' decision to elect C. Caesar (aged fourteen) to the consulship was permitted to stand, but the year of office was postponed for a further five years, until Gaius reached the same age as his adopted father Octavian had been when he held his first consulship. Tiberius and Drusus had waited a further decade or so beyond this to hold their first consulships, and further to emphasise Augustus' preferential treatment of his own Julian descendants over his wife's children, Gaius Caesar was permitted to attend meetings of the senate, and as early as 4 B.C. he joined Augustus' council of advisers, arbitrating between the rival claimants to the Judaean throne[18].

Augustus had not chosen to adopt the step-father of his adopted sons. That would have granted Tiberius the benefit of the Julian family name which, despite the recent military successes of the Claudii Nerones, was unquestionably the more popular. If Augustus could favour his blood-relations so, it appears to have been argued, might Tiberius on his accession promote his own son Drusus as his successor in place of Gaius or Lucius Caesar; Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C. ought therefore to be seen not only as the consequence of injured Claudian pride, but as the ultimate proof that he was not hindering their advancement, even if (as it appears) he violently disapproved of it[19]. Once Tiberius' departure had endangered public affairs (see below section **c**), by leaving Augustus without a deputy capable of dealing with military crises, there could be no reconciliation between Tiberius and his father-in-law and his tribunician powers were allowed to expire. Julia, who had chosen to endorse her sons' advancement, rather than her husband's interests, was banished in 2 B.C.; probably she interfered in her father's succession plans, perhaps

proposing Tiberius' replacement by Iullus Antonius, but no reconciliation with Tiberius followed[20]. In fact, Tiberius, on the verge of being a mere ***privatus*** again, was forced to divorce Julia, meaning that he was no longer step-father to her children; even once his tribunician powers had expired he was refused permission to return to Rome to see his family[21].

The marriage of C. Caesar to Livia Julia, daughter of Drusus, was intended to accord him the ***dignitas*** of a married man, in advance of his mission to Syria (see below section **c**); Pollini suggests that a new portrait type was introduced for him at about this time, expressing his military potential with reference to earlier representations of Ares/Mars and military heroes including Alexander[22]. Tiberius demonstrated his inferior status to his former step-son by travelling to Samos/Chios to visit him; further rumours, that Tiberius was trying to eliminate Gaius Caesar, compelled the former to ask for a "***custos***" to monitor his words and actions. When Tiberius found out that someone had offered to eliminate him, for Gaius' benefit, he petitioned Augustus for permission to return to Rome; as the final humiliation, Tiberius was required to obtain his former step-son's approval, and he stipulated that Tiberius was to have neither a role nor an interest in public affairs[23]. The hostility to Tiberius that accompanied enthusiasm for Gaius Caesar in this period was manifested at Nemausus by attacks on his statues[24].

When Tiberius finally returned to the city in A.D. 2, he oversaw the introduction of his son Drusus into the adult community and then retired to a house in the gardens of Maecenas. Lucius Caesar died at Massilia the same year and Velleius Paterculus suggests that Augustus approached Tiberius inviting him to be adopted in Lucius' place; the relative status of Gaius may have proved the sticking point since Tiberius refused[25]. Probably the following year C. Caesar wrote to ask Augustus for relief from his labours, and although he intended to stay in Syria, Augustus persuaded him to head for home; the disease which had prompted Gaius' request finally carried him off in A.D. 4, at Limyra in Lycia. When

the news reached Rome, Augustus was obliged to reinstate Tiberius, renewing his tribunician powers and finally adopting him 'for reasons of state'. Tiberius was obliged to adopt Germanicus (his brother's oldest son) granting him equal rights with his own son Drusus; Agrippa Postumus, the only surviving grandson of the emperor, was also adopted in A.D. 4, but it appears that he was left out of the succession plans (as was Germanicus' brother Claudius)[26]. Germanicus was now married off to the emperor's younger granddaughter Agrippina, whilst Drusus was given Livia Julia (widow of C. Caesar)[27].

Agrippa Postumus was exiled in A.D. 7, whilst his sister Julia and her husband were banished for treason the following year; these Julian members of the ***Domus Augusta*** appear to have been resentful of the Claudian ascendancy, and some connection is not unlikely between the earthquakes, mutinies, famine, fires and revolts that had followed the adoptions of A.D. 4, and support for Julian plots. Augustus certainly appears to have attempted to connect the end of the food shortage with the succession arrangements of A.D. 4, by permitting Germanicus to hold gladiatorial games in honour of Drusus; Dio similarly notes that the dedicatory inscription of the temple of Castor (and Pollux) distanced Tiberius Caesar from the Claudii. It was doubtless hoped that the successes of Tiberius and Germanicus in Illyricum would demonstrate divine favour for the Claudian successors, but the loss of Varus' legions in A.D. 9 must have seemed a clear sign of continuing disapproval[28]. During Tiberius' brief return to the city in the winter after Varus' defeat the ***Aedes Concordiae Augustae*** was finally consecrated, a monument which strongly suggested that a new period of Augustan peace and prosperity had begun in accordance with the renewed domestic harmony of the, predominantly Claudian, Caesars[29].

Before the disaster of Varus' defeat, Germanicus' proven capabilities may have encouraged Augustus to think of handing over the German command to him on completion of the war in Illyricum (see below section **c**), and a German triumph for Germanicus may have been

planned to coincide with the opening of his first consular term, already scheduled for A.D. 12. A double triumph for Tiberius (now in his fifties) planned to coincide with his return from Pannonia and Dalmatia, would have smoothed the chosen successor's transition into a civilian statesman, ready at any time to replace the elderly Augustus. Instead, for the time being, Tiberius and Germanicus went to the Northern frontier together. The former's triumphs over Illyricum were not celebrated until A.D. 12, and the long anticipated German triumph of Germanicus actually post-dated Augustus' death by three years[30]. Ovid had predicted Germany's submission long before then and claimed that this outcome would be repeated whenever and wherever the world came into conflict with "***Caesares***"; the use of the plural ought perhaps to be regarded as referring to all who bore the name since Ovid goes on to note the young men multiplying "***sub nomine Caesareo***" (i.e. Drusus Caesar I, Nero Caesar, and Drusus Caesar II), whose wives would in their turn pray (like Livia) for the safe return of their sons from active service abroad[31].

Before the death of Augustus, Ovid prayed for the eventual succession of Germanicus to the reins of empire, suggesting that the youth who now seemed a 'Lucifer', ushering in a new dawn of Augustan peace, would in due course assume control of the metaphorical solar chariot as "***moderator orbis***"; by contrast Ovid makes plain his hope that Tiberius would continue to have parents for as long as possible (thereby postponing his accession)[32]. There is good reason to suppose that Germanicus' popularity was a matter of concern to the new emperor on the death of Augustus and, despite the fact that he was not actively campaigning, Germanicus appears not to have been recalled to Rome for the funeral of Augustus in A.D. 14; he thus seems to have been prevented from participating in any of the symbolically important public occasions in which Drusus Caesar (I), the new emperor's natural son, featured so prominently[33]. Despite the altar commemorating Augustus' ***Providentia*** in adopting Tiberius as his successor, probably vowed at around the time of his accession, the conspiracy of Libo Drusus, in A.D. 16, seems to have been planned as a dynastic coup in favour of Germanicus and his descendants; the willingness

of the Italian population during that same year to believe in Clemens' claim to be Agrippa Postumus (the last surviving grandson of Augustus, and Germanicus' brother-in-law, who had in fact been executed around the time of Tiberius' accession), further suggests dissatisfaction with Tiberius.[34].

The creation of a system of succession, centred on the ruler's family (even if not on direct descent) was always likely to give public importance to the women whose familial roles, as wives and mothers, ensured the provision of successors. An increasing politicisation of women in Late Republican Rome, evident from the marriage alliances of the so-called first and second Triumvirates, and an increasing resort to the representation of contemporary women, has been noted above with reference to the Greek idea that monarchy led to female power (see chapter 2, sections **b** v, and **c** ii). Roman spectators of dynastic politics in the Greek East after Pydna, were doubtless concerned about the behaviour of queens and queen mothers even before Cleopatra's relationships with Julius Caesar and Antony, the 'Donations of Alexandria' and the alleged threat of a Ptolemaic invasion of Italy. Whilst Livia's public profile dated right back to the triumviral period, it is likely that the Consolatio ad Liviam's presentation of her as a maternal "***princeps***" and "***tutela hominum***" was a recent development; it is in the third decade after Actium and following the death of Agrippa, when her natural sons had become her husband's heirs, and her adopted sons their successors, that we first hear of monuments particularly associated with her (the Ara Pacis, and Livia's Portico established around a shrine to Concordia)[35].

On the face of it, the fact that Tiberius ruled without a wife appears to demonstrate that the matriarchal 'queenly' role played by Livia in Augustus' lifetime was not indispensable to the new dynasty; in fact however, her survival as the ***Augusta*** for most of his reign gave it instead a 'queen mother' and, within months of her death, the long-standing popularity of his one-time step-daughter Agrippina (mother of Augustus' great-grandchildren) had become sufficiently threatening, particularly given his own absence from the city, to

demand her banishment[36]. Gaius' mother Agrippina having died in exile under Tiberius, Antonia Minor (his paternal grandmother) was, briefly, able to fulfil a queen mother's role for him; on her death, a month or so after his accession, his younger sisters may have substituted to a certain extent. The failure of successive wives, and his sister Drusilla to supply Gaius with a male heir, fostered the accession of his uncle (Claudius)[37]. Claudius, who at last accorded his grandmother, the Augusta, deification, may have adopted his cousin's son, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, as Nero Claudius Caesar and married him off to his daughter Octavia, according to Augustan principles of non-hereditary succession (rather than the 'malign influence' of his new wife, the younger Agrippina). In Nero's reign Agrippina, as 'queen-mother', appears to have had little influence on him after 55 B.C.. His wives too had failed to supply him with male heirs by his death in A.D. 68, and having already eliminated male cousins like Rubellius Plautus, Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix, and the Junii Silani, the Julio-Claudian dynasty ended, almost a century after the battle of Actium[38].

As has been noted the figure on the Southern frieze formerly identified as Livia is here considered to be Vipsania, Livia leading the family party on the opposite side of the monument; the head of this figure has been considered to resemble that of the enigmatic mother figure, seemingly conflating elements of Venus and Tellus with Ceres, who sits at the Eastern end of the altar, and who seems suggestive of the future prosperity of the Roman people at home and abroad. The possibility of resemblance is far from diminished by the identification of this figure as Vipsania, particularly as the latter was, finally, pregnant in 13 B.C. but the now faceless Northern figures here interpreted as Livia and Julia (see above) may also have shared some facial features with this goddess. Just as Antonia Minor could seem a second "***femina princeps***" to her mother-in-law in the Consolatio, so, perhaps, other Julio-Claudian women could share in Livia's Venus-like fecundity[39]. The suggestion, in the Consolatio, that Drusus seemed to be a Jupiter (and Antonia a Juno?) almost certainly predates the Ovidian representations of Augustus as a

Jovian individual, but probably just post-dates the original design for the sheath plaque, representing Livia with features of Venus Genetrix, noted by Kuttner[40].

Given that the conventional Ptolemaic association of Cleopatra with Isis and Aphrodite had given offence at Rome in the triumviral period (see above chapter 3, section **c** ii), it would be surprising if the representational forms of Ptolemaic queens as prosperous and fertile Tyche figures (see above chapter 2) had been directly appropriated for representing the women of Rome's 'first family'. However, Drusus Caesar's twin boys appear to have been represented emerging from crossed cornucopiae, probably before A.D. 23 (RIC *Tiberius* 28), and over a decade later Gaius' three sisters were represented on a sestertius as Securitas (Agrippina), Concordia (Drusilla) and Fortuna (Julia Livilla), each figure bearing a cornucopia (RIC *Caligula* 26). The gem illustrated by Galinsky representing the Augusta holding a cornucopia surmounted by the globe, itself surmounted by a radiate portrait of Augustus, may well pre-date this later coin issue; certainly Divus Augustus could be radiate on Tiberian coins (RIC *Tiberius* 1-10) and, whilst the Sardonyx in Vienna representing Livia as Ceres/Cybele/Oikoumene (Genetrix Orbis?) may be Claudian in date, there appears to be no doubt that other coin issues from the early 20s A.D. (RIC *Tiberius* 22-24) represent Iustitia, Salus Augusta and Pietas with Livia's portrait. However, it is far from clear that the representation of a mortal with the cornucopia was attempted in Augustan Rome, even if Augustus could be Apollo or Jupiter, and Livia Venus, Juno or Roma; similarly, whilst the numismatic representation of the cornucopia with a capricorn (RIC *Augustus* 12, 239, & 264-267) may illustrate Augustan prosperity, born of mastery of land and sea, it is unclear that the fertility of the women of the ***Domus Augusta*** was being referred to[41]. It is not impossible that the Cleopatra of the temple of Venus Genetrix corresponded to the familiar 'Tyche' format and the Augustan indirectness in representing dynastic fruitfulness may have been designed to distance Julio-Claudian mothers from her. It should perhaps be noted that the fact that the queen had at least four children was one point in which she excelled Livia; Tiberius and Drusus were hardly Apollo and Artemis,

and Livia hardly a Leto to Scribonia's Hera, but some equation between Cleopatra and Niobe may nevertheless have fostered the inclusion of the latter's punishment in the iconography of the Palatine Apollo temple, just as Apollo's expulsion of the Gauls from Delphi could be understood as referring to Octavian's victories over Gauls, Germans, Pannonians and Dalmatians[42].

The interments of the ashes of Marcellus, Agrippa, Octavia and Drusus in the Mausoleum on the Campus Martius illustrate that this structure was itself a 'dynastic' monument, rather than just a new family tomb for the Julii Caesares, planned to show Octavian's commitment to the city of Rome, and built to outdo those of the Ptolemies in Alexandria[43]. Its relative position to the funerary monument(s) of Julia (Pompey's wife), and Julius Caesar himself, is unclear; Dio reports that Atia (Octavian's mother) had been given a public funeral in 43 B.C. and, given her designation as "***genetrix Caesaris***" in the fortieth of the Epigrammata Bobiensia, her remains may originally have been placed alongside those of her cousin and her uncle. Whilst the Forum altar was incorporated into the temple of Divus Iulius, there is no evidence that the ashes of his natural mother, and his posthumously adopted father and sister, were rehoused in the Mausoleum as a demonstration of Octavian-Augustus' ***pietas*** (see below section **b**). The relationship is also unclear between the claims that Octavian-Augustus was not only, or not in fact, son of C. Octavius and Atia, but of Apollo and Atia, and his status as ***Divi Filius*** stemming from his deification of Julius Caesar with the starburst symbol that could be used for numismatic portrayals of Apollo (see above chapter 3, section **c** ii); Kleiner suggests that the ambiguity was exploited before 28 B.C. in the Palatine arch, erected in ostensible filial piety towards C. Octavius but associated with the Temple of Apollo[44].

The early 20s B.C. saw the dedications of the Forum temple (of Divus Iulius) and the Curia Julia, and Galinsky is right to note the honour paid to Caesar by the installation of the ***Clupeus Virtutis*** in the latter (see below section **b**)[45]. The same decade saw the

installation of Caesar's statue among those of the other gods in Agrippa's Pantheon; although there appear to be no historical references to Caesar's commemoration in art in Augustan Rome after this time, it is clear from the Res Gestae that the just punishment of Caesar's murderers was a vital element in the legitimation of Octavian-Augustus' rise to power, and it is generally accepted, on the evidence of the Carthage-Algiers relief, that a statue of Divus Iulius stood beside that of Mars Ultor in the ***cella*** of the latter's temple, balanced by a representation of Venus Genetrix. Whilst the fact that the temple was finally dedicated in the fortieth year after the battle of Philippi may be significant, it should be noted that the first known expression of a connection between the god's epithet and Octavian's vengeance on his father's murderers is in Ovid's Fasti; although the completion of the temple and its surrounding Forum does seem to have been connected by Ovid with the prospect of Gaius Caesar's campaign against the Parthians (see below section **c**), there is no reason to doubt that it had originally been conceived in the knowledge of Caesar's own plans to honour Mars, and of his planned campaign against the Parthians to avenge Crassus' defeat[46].

Between the completion of the Pantheon and the Forum of Augustus, the emperor's deified father had twice been represented on the coinage of the city of Rome; first (RIC *Augustus* 141-142), on coins issued under M. Sanquinius in association with the Secular Games, Divus Iulius was shown with the comet-inspired starburst on his head, and secondly (RIC *Augustus* 173), under L. Lentulus, Augustus crowning Caesar with the starburst, an image which Fullerton has plausibly connected with Augustus' succession to the post of Pontifex Maximus. The Spanish Divus Iulius issues, from the first half of this period, representing the comet alone (RIC *Augustus* 253 & 271) should probably be viewed in the context of other coins from the same mints noting the recovery of Crassus' standards and representing Mars Ultor (see above)[47]. Galinsky has rightly noted the close relationship between the features of Augustus and the 'ageless' Caesar on the Sanquinius reverses noted above (RIC *Augustus* 142), and the father's rejuvenation is also apparent on the Carthage-Algiers relief

noted above as illustrating the relationships between the statues placed inside the temple of Mars Ultor. Similarly, Pollini has suggested that portraits of Gaius and Lucius Caesar may have looked more like portraits of Augustus than the individuals themselves, and the adoption of what might be termed family likeness for rendering some of the Julio-Claudian Caesares has made it difficult to identify which of the young men are being represented, not only in foreign public monuments such as the Aphrodisias Sebasteion, but even gemstones (like the Grand Camée de France), that were clearly commissioned by members of the elite close to the centre of power[48].

One final 'Augustan' monument, the Belvedere Altar, has usually been considered to represent Caesar's Apotheosis; on this interpretation, the short figure behind the ascending chariot is Octavian-Augustus, whilst the group under its 'flight-path' is constituted of Venus with Gaius and Lucius Caesar. It may be better to read the ascending ruler as Augustus himself, disregarding the omission of Augustus' title '***Pater Patriae***' from the ***Clupeus*** shown on the opposite face; Venus-Livia may have been shown to the same scale to illustrate her relationship to him, and her maternal superiority to Tiberius (shown behind the chariot). The two 'children' may therefore be Drusus Caesar (I), who was in his late twenties in A.D. 14 and whose height is correspondingly similar to that of his father, and Germanicus' eldest son Nero Caesar who, whilst here looking taller than his nine years of age, was a probable witness of Augustus' funeral (in his father's absence, see above). Whilst it is perhaps going too far to suggest that the 'sky-god' preparing to welcome Augustus was Divus Iulius, such a late date for the altar would allow the ***Genetrix*** to indicate the dynasty's survival for a further three generations beyond Augustus (rather than one as would be the case if the 'children' were Gaius and Lucius Caesar)[49].

b) Virtues and Qualities of a ***Princeps***

The obvious place to begin a discussion of the 'rhetorical' representation of Augustus is the ***Clupeus Virtutis***, established in the Curia Julia in either 27 or 26 B.C., which accorded him "***Virtus***", "***Clementia***", "***Iustitia***", and "***Pietas***". The first of these words is authentically 'Republican', being found in the earliest funerary texts, but the second seems to have been particularly associated with Julius Caesar as a quality which allowed a monarchical ruler to avoid the charge of tyranny (see above chapter 3, section **c** i). The second pair are those of the "***rectores et conservatores***" accorded stellar immortality in Book VI of the De Re Publica, the former virtue being particularly associated with civilian magistracies (rather than military commands), and the latter referring to respect for one's parents and one's fatherland (see above chapter 3, section **c** i). As has already been noted Cicero claimed of Octavian that he had realised that the greatest "***pietas***" lay in the "***conservatio patriae***" rather than, we may assume, in mere vengeance for his father's murder. In fact, as Powell has noted, the quality was particularly associated with Sextus Pompeius in the early triumviral period, when Octavian was gaining a reputation for cruelty and greed. As with the Sicilians honouring Verres almost half a century previously however, the possibility should be considered that the ***Clupeus*** listed hopes about the ruler's future conduct, as much as recognition of his accustomed conduct[50].

The forty or so years after the shield's dedication gave plenty of time for Augustus to live up to its challenge, and if Augustus' retirement from personal engagement in Rome's wars early in this period prevented him from repeating the proofs of his ***Virtus***, mercy could still be extended to the defeated after the wars of his subordinates. The second pair of virtues appears to have been integral to Augustus' presentation of himself as a civilian statesman (who administered justice, proposed legislation, saved his fellow-citizens and ornamented their city with urban facilities and temples)[51]. Nevertheless, as Wallace-Hadrill has pointed out, the shield's prescription neither constituted a translation of the Greek 'canon',

nor stood as a new Augustan one. In addition to his arguments, one may cite Nicolaus' biography of Octavian-Augustus; although this appears to accord the latter "***sophrosyne***" and "***phronesis***", even its Greek author actually seems more interested in the youth's "***philanthropia***" and "***euergesia***". From the context, it is apparent that these terms do not amount to ***Clementia***, but to the 'Bread and Circuses' ***liberalitas*** of a 'super-patron'; despite its importance in the De Officiis, this virtue is usually omitted from 'lists' in Ciceronian rhetoric (see above chapter 3, section **c** i), and was similarly omitted from the ***Clupeus***, although it was clearly important to Augustus[52]. If the range of virtues and other leadership qualities with which Augustus was associated in contemporary art and literature extended beyond those of the shield, then variation over time is perhaps to be expected, as the occasion of the triple triumph became a distant memory; an attempt is therefore made here, to record these changes, and secondly to note the 'Augustan' qualities accorded to the heirs who predeceased him. Finally, Velleius' assessment of his successor will also be considered.

In the 20s B.C., Horace described Octavian as a "***victor***" superior to Marius and Scipio Aemilianus, and suggested that the "***invictus***" Caesar was also "***iustus***" and "***fortis***"[53]. In the first collection of Horace's Epistles, the poet advises his friend Quinctius to remember that the flattering words used by the public, in response to his military achievements on land and sea, are in fact due to Augustus alone; by contrast, Tibullus is only interested in the campaigns of Messalla, and predicts not the future triumphs of Marcellus or Tiberius, but of Messalla's descendants. In this context the inclusion of the Panegyricus Messallae amongst the Tibullan corpus is understandable; in its very first line Messalla is accorded "***virtus***", and the unknown poet goes on to suggest, not only that no-one excels him in war or peace, but also that Messalla has a unique understanding of the "***artes belli***" (siting camps, techniques of fortification, tactics, etc). Since the context of these remarks was the external wars of the late 30s B.C. in which Octavian had played an important part, the additional suggestions that Messalla alone was responsible for the submission of the

chieftain Domator to Roman chains, and that Britain remained "***invictus***" (see below section **c**), even if true, were less than tactful; whilst Octavian-Augustus was "***Caesar magnus***" to Propertius, the Panegyricus imagines a future when the world-conqueror's title would be Messalla's[54].

The fact that Vergil and Propertius refer, respectively, to the "***pietas***" and "***virtus***" of the dead Marcellus has already been noted. Vergil also claims for him the "***fides***" that would mark Rome in the reign of the "***Troianus Caesar***" (Augustus) and, although in fact he had never seen military service, an "***invicta***" sword-arm; Propertius' references to death's elimination of king Nireus' handsome appearance ("***facies***"), of prince Achilles' strength ("***vis***"), and of king Croesus' wealth ("***opes***") offer the reader the opportunity to compare the attributes of these figures with those of Marcellus. Crinagoras imagined Marcellus bringing home spoils from a Western war on the brink of adulthood, and it is not impossible that Vergil's Marcellus, invincible in combat, was considered a likely candidate to have dedicated ***Spolia Opima***, in emulation of his ancestor[55]. It is unclear whether Seneca's choices of "***frugalitas***", "***continentia***", "***patiens labor***", and estrangement from "***voluptates***" for describing Marcellus date back to an Augustan laudation, but the former would reflect Augustus' own lifestyle as recorded by Suetonius[56].

The Carmen Saeculare, composed for the inauguration of a new age (calculated to begin in 17 B.C.), describes Augustus, recently returned from the eastern campaign that had seen the recovery of Crassus' standards, the submission of Armenia and the surrender of Parthian hostages (see below section **c**), as "***lenis in hostem***"[57]. It is claimed that ***Honor***, ***Virtus***, ***Pudor***, ***Fides***, ***Pax***, and ***Copia***, were now returning to Rome, and Zanker has plausibly linked this poetic vision of cosmic change with the iconography of the Prima Porta cuirass, where the heavens and the fruitful earth focus their attention on the surrender to Rome of the standards of Crassus and Antony; elsewhere Horace noted that, the "***virtus***" of Agrippa having subdued the Cantabrians and that of Tiberius the Armenians,

golden ***Copia*** could pour her fruits into Italy[58]. The idea of a new era was inherent in the Parthian arch of Augustus (now erected beside the temple of Divus Julius), since it was ornamented with complete lists of all those who had celebrated triumphs and ovations from the time of Romulus down to Cornelius Balbus, and no room was left for further entries. Moreover, after Balbus, only members of the emperor's family were granted the honour of celebrating triumphs; Agrippa, by this time Augustus' son-in-law, was offered the right to one in 19 B.C. but, as had doubtless been pre-arranged, he refused it and the next full triumph was that of Tiberius, at the start of his second consulship (7 B.C.)[59].

Augustus himself, having celebrated at once all the triumphs that Republican moderation would allow, may well have intended not to take the field again, and probably feared that the glory of new triumphs might eclipse his own. The triumphs and ovations celebrated by Octavian-Augustus since 40 B.C. were distinguished by the substitution of the appellation "***imperator***" for his forename, and although he had not just celebrated a triumph (having crossed the ***pomerium*** at night) the arch was probably surmounted by a statue of him in the triumphal chariot (RIC *Augustus* 149)[60]. Propertius, at around this time, had Apollo hail Octavian-Augustus as "***servator mundi***", and suggests that further wars in the East can be postponed for some time; the "***pueri***" of Augustus (presumably Gaius and Lucius Caesar, adopted in 17 B.C.) are imagined as the ones who would secure trophies from defeated Parthians, their success contrasted not with any failure on the part of their adopted father, but with the defeat of Crassus, whose tomb beyond the Euphrates was currently accessible through the agency of Augustus[61].

By contrast, Horace imagined that a fourth triumph for Augustus would soon be versified by Iullus Antonius (now married to the Marcellan niece of Augustus, divorced when Agrippa was promoted to Julia's husband). Two poems later however, the formerly conquering hordes of the Vindelici are said to have been defeated by the "***consilia***" of a youth (Drusus) who proved himself a worthy step-son of Augustus and a worthy

descendant of the Claudius Nero who had shortened the Punic Wars by defeating Hasdrubal; having already established that Drusus was like a lion or an eagle, the poet asserts that unwarlike doves would be un-natural offspring for eagles, and suggests that Drusus has added "***doctrina***" to inherited "***vis***". In the final lines of this Ode, it is claimed that nothing is beyond the capabilities of a Claudian[62]. Ten poems later, Augustus, here invoked as the greatest of "***principes***", is said to have supplied both step-sons with resources, "***consilium***", and divine favour, and they are said to have embellished his victory in Egypt by the coincidence of their victories falling on the fifteenth anniversary of Alexandria's surrender; Tiberius ("***sine clade victor***") is said to have swept over the Rhaeti like a tidal wave, whilst Drusus had cast down the Genauni and Breuni, and Alpine citadels[63]. In the fifth Ode from Book IV Augustus, whose return to Rome is anxiously anticipated, is suggested to have been responsible for the prosperity of agriculture, the safety of traders, the chastity of wives and the return of justice; Augustus is here associated with Ceres and Fides, and the personification ***Faustitas***[64].

Between the deaths of Agrippa and Drusus, Augustus appears to have accorded Tiberius greater strategic freedom, but even so neither step-son was permitted to celebrate a full triumph, or to retain the title imperator with which they had been acclaimed; despite the fact that Augustus had nominally remained in charge of Drusus' campaigns no celebrations of his achievements were held after his death, but Tiberius' campaigns in 8 B.C. were rewarded by a triumph and probably also the monument to Augustus, Tiberius and Drusus that underlies the Boscoreale cups recently analysed by Kuttner (see further below, section c)[65]. The Consolatio ad Liviam suggests that it would not have been out of place for Livia to have hoped that Drusus' return would be marked by a full triumph (with "***currus***"), and imagines the dead man celebrating his triumph among his dead ancestors[66]. Drusus is here set up as a pattern of good behaviour in war and peace, encompassing in one person a crowd of "***boni***"; Tiberius is said to have shared not only a mother with his brother, but

"***omnis virtus***", "***concors***", "***pietas***" and "***amor***", and his proposed reconstruction work on the temples of Concordia and Castor is noted[67].

In a line that links Livia to the Venus Genetrix of the Aeneid, and her dead son to "***pius Aeneas***", victim of fate, she is made to ask "***Hic pietatis honos***?"; a passer-by questions the very existence of gods whom Livia-Venus could not move[68]. Drusus' funeral pyre is said to have burnt up his handsome appearance ("***decor***"), his noble beauty ("***generosa forma***"), his kindly face ("***facilis vultus***"), his energy ("***vigor***"), his victorious hands, the eloquent mouth of a "***princeps***", and the seat of his "***ingenium***"; whilst the poet compares Drusus' pyre to that of Hercules, he had just represented Mars informing a mourning Tiber that the Fates had decreed Romulus, Caesar and Augustus to be the only three Romans who would escape death[69]. A reference to Alexander's brief career is probably intended when the poet speaks of so many great deeds having been achieved in so short a time that Drusus' ancestors would scarcely believe it possible, and when the dead Drusus asks his mother to count his achievements, rather than numbering his years[70].

Augustus' return to the city in 13 B.C. had been marked by the decreeing of the afore-mentioned ***Ara Pacis Augustae***. Half-way between this time and the inauguration of the altar, Dio notes that funds were subscribed for the erection of statues of Augustus; since he would not permit the senate and people of Rome to establish portraits, they arranged instead for the dedication of statues representing not only Pax and Concordia, but even ***Salus Publica***, who had doubtless seemed absent in the previous year, which had required three suffect consuls[71]. Horace had termed Augustus "***custos gentis Romulae***" and "***custos rerum***", and it should be noted that it was in his capacity as "***custos***", not only of Roman citizens, but of the whole world, that Augustus was remembered at Cumae on the anniversary of the ***Ara Pacis***' dedication in 9 B.C.[72]. It is possible that the shrine of Concordia, probably planned when Augustus was censor (in 11 B.C.) as an integral part of Livia's portico, was dedicated in the same year as the latter (7 B.C.), but several months

later, so as to coincide with the Matralia and the feast of Fortuna so as to indicate that it was family unity, such as that of Livia and her sons in the Consolatio, that was celebrated here, and not the harmony of the civil state[73].

As has already been noted, the inauguration of the Temple of Mars Ultor coincided in Ovid's imagination with the departure of C. Caesar for the East; in the Ars Amatoria, Ovid may refer back to Propertius' prophecy about Caesar's boys (see above), when suggesting that the "*puer*" will prove himself an "*Ultor*" in the furthest "*Oriens*". The poet's argument that age is irrelevant to "*virtus*", probably refers principally to Octavian-Augustus who, as has been noted above (section **a**), appears to have stood as his model in art and life, but Alexander, who had proved this self-same point for Cicero when commending Octavian to the senate (see above chapter 3, section **b** iv), was also a suitable model for a young man about to campaign in the East[74]. Pompey was another general who had campaigned under his own generalship from an early age, and Plutarch reports that Augustus wished C. Caesar Pompey's "*eunoia*" (probably this was the goodwill of others towards him), the bravery of an Alexander or a Scipio Africanus (presumably "*virtus*", or "*fortitudo*"), and his own good fortune (presumably "*felicitas*")[75].

Following the restoration of Tiberius to Augustus' succession plans (see above, section **a**) and his successful conduct of the Pannonian war, Suetonius notes the proposals that the former be entitled "*Pannonicus*" (to match the "*Germanicus*" posthumously bestowed on his brother, and his descendants), "*Invictus*" (an Alexandrine and Scipionic epithet, see above chapter 3), or "*Pius*" (Metellan in a late Republican context, but with Augustan connotations relating to Aeneas and the *princeps* himself)[76]. Following Varus' disastrous defeat in A.D. 9, Suetonius claims that Tiberius' conduct in the following years was designed to distance him from the "*temeritas et negligentia*" of his predecessor; Suetonius' account also suggests that Tiberius displayed himself to the troops as a fellow-soldier, in order to demonstrate that he did not regard lightly the value of their lives[77].

In Ovid's Metamorphoses (composed in the years leading up to his exile in A.D. 8), although the poet refers to the achievements of Augustus no direct reference is made to any of the wars that had occurred since the triple triumph of 29 B.C.; the transition from military to civil affairs at line 832 (of Book XV) suggests that Augustan ***pax*** had been given to the earth immediately after the fall of Alexandria well over thirty years previously[78]. This false impression of uninterrupted peace, may have been intended to suggest a return to the unwarlike conditions of the Silver Age, a more realisable ideal than the Saturnian Golden Age promised early in Augustus' reign; Ovid tactfully implies that the latter idyll could only exist in a primitive society very different from contemporary urban civilisation as it was manifested in the glittering imperial capital[79]. The Silver Age was envisaged as an agriculturally based, peace-loving time, accustomed to ***Fides***, ***Pudor***, and ***Pietas***, and unsullied by civil conflict; it was also presided over by Jupiter, who supplied laws and acted as the society's avenger ("***vindex***", see RIC *Augustus* 10). The moral rectitude of the population had required no such external justice in the Saturnian Age (***pace*** Vergil), but even the decorous Silver Age had given way to Bronze and Iron Ages characterised by the impious war of the giants and the depravity of their human successors; for Ovid, this decay had now been halted, and was being reversed by a Jovian individual who had brought about a new reverence towards the gods, and imposed new laws to restrain his people from their Iron Age vices, and to encourage them to adopt antique virtues[80]. The fragility of the "***Felicia Saecula***", and their dependence on Augustus is suggested by Ovid's prayer that the death and apotheosis of the earthly "***auctor***", "***pater***" and "***rector***" be postponed until after his own death, and those of his contemporary readers; the new "***insidiae***" against the Claudian succession (see above, section **a**) suggest that characteristics of the Bronze and Iron Ages had not in fact been eradicated, even in the emperor's own family[81].

Whenever one dates the third closure of the gates of war on the temple of Janus (see below, section **c**), it is clear that they had been open for some time before Ovid's first draft of Fasti

Book I; reference to the fact that Augustus' 'reign' had seen them closed three times would detract from the (false) impression of unbroken peace which was vital to Ovid's conception of the Augustan Age. If, as Herbert-Brown suggests, Augustus had invented this tradition, then the persistence of conflict may have persuaded him to abandon it and to use other monuments to mark the end of war (such as the ***Ara Pacis*** in 13 B.C.), and the start of war (the Forum of Augustus after 2 B.C., see further below section **c**)[82]. Whilst the imprisonment of "***bella***" and "***discordia***" was still a current way of describing the restoration of Augustan peace, as this was what Manilius prayed for in the lifetime of the "***invictus pater patriae***", in the revised version of Fasti Book I Ovid's Janus suggests that the gates of war would now be shut to prevent peace from leaving Rome; not improbably this was a clumsy allusion to the earlier claim that before the Iron Age Janus had nothing to do with war, but guarded peace (and doorposts)[83].

The anniversary of the acclamation of Augustus as "***Pater Patriae***" provided Ovid with the opportunity to contrast the ***princeps*** with the king whose name he had refused to take upon himself more than two decades previously; it is suggested that the current ruler has preferred (silver) "***leges***" to (brazen) "***vis***", removed "***nefas***" from the state, encouraged "***castitas***" and offered pardon to his enemies, whereas Romulus is shown to have been a "***dominus***" who had sponsored rape, made Rome an asylum for criminals, delighted in the use of force and even murdered his own brother[84]. Despite these faults Romulus was suggested to have won a place among the stars as Quirinus, when his father Mars saw that the city he had founded could survive his absence because of his many wars and the city's new defences; earlier Ovid had noted that these defences were easily jumped over, that Romulus' enemies had been "***parvi***", and his domain "***brevis***", and there was a clear implication that Augustus the world-conqueror was even more worthy of apotheosis[85]. In the Metamorphoses Ovid had similarly contrasted the ***divi filius*** with Julius Caesar although, as he himself noted, even Augustus had no doubts as to which of them was the superior general; even if fifty years had passed since the assassination of that "***princeps***",

some of Caesar's veterans were still alive to tell what it had been like to serve under this more charismatic "***dux***", and indeed Herbert-Brown has suggested that there may even have been a revival of interest in, and nostalgia for, the dead ruler at this time, perhaps associated with opposition to the Claudian succession. In the Fasti Caesar's assassins are represented as having defied the will of the gods, and their punishment, through the agency of Octavian's "***iusta arma***", is accounted the work of a son's "***pietas***"[86].

Augustus' Silver Age did not seem to have extended as far as the place of Ovid's exile, which is said to have endured "***iniustus ius***" and plunderous wars which prevented the practice of agriculture. Consequently, Ovid renders the still Jovian emperor with the passion-driven characteristics of the Iron Age gods (particularly anger); however, whilst Ulysses had been kept from his homeland by the opposition of individual gods, the current ***Pax Deorum*** ensured that the very gods who had ensured his survival on the journey into exile were united in opposition to his return[87]. Ovid is at pains to remind the reader of the accustomed "***moderatio***" of the "***mitissimus***" Augustus, noting that "***venia***", and even rewards, had been accorded to the military opponents of Octavian-Augustus. One of the points of comparison later drawn between Alexander and Augustus was the "***clementia***" shown towards their foes in life and death; although Ovid does not mention it explicitly, he may have wished the reader to recall the intemperate anger shown by Alexander towards friends like Cleitus[88]. Augustus' reputation as a "***servator***" of citizens, and a "***pater***" to his subjects is, understandably, invoked by the banished poet[89].

The laurels of the Palatine are linked by Ovid, not only with "***decus***", Pax and Apollo, but also with the "***perpetui triumphi***" of Augustus' household; whilst the latter association seems tactless in a poem written within around a year of Varus' defeat, the anticipated and actual triumphs of Tiberius and Germanicus are a recurring theme in Ovid's poetry of exile[90]. Augustus himself is probably termed "***magnus dux***" and "***dux invictus***", although it is just possible that Alexander's epithets were accorded to Germanicus who did

eventually celebrate a triumph over "***rebellatrix Germania***"[91]. The language of praise for Germanicus as the best of young men in war and peace is very close to that of the Consolatio's praise of his natural father Drusus, and it is probably the latter "***pater***" who took pleasure in the display of Germanicus' achievements in Tiberius' triumph, awaiting vengeance for his own death (and Varus' defeat) in his son's punishment of Germany; Ovid's references to Germanicus' oratorical skills may also recall his father's reputation[92]. The "***virtus invicta***" attributed to Livia's male descendants perhaps encompassed the dead Drusus Germanicus as well as Tiberius, Germanicus and Drusus Caesar (I); elsewhere, Germanicus' "***animus***" is said to outstrip his years, whilst Tiberius' son Drusus Caesar (I) is said to have had "***vigor***" equal to his "***nobilitas***"[93].

Celebrations of ***Iustitia Augusta*** in the final years of Augustus' life have gained lasting notice in Ovid and the Fasti Praenestini; the latter records that a statue of this personification was dedicated by Tiberius early in January A.D. 13, whilst the poet suggests that Tiberius had reverenced her during his triumph (the previous autumn) and appears to speak of a marble temple in a poem that associates Augustan justice with mercy, rather than a tyrant's cruelty. As has been noted above (section **a**), the third known virtue to have been elevated by the epithet ***Augusta*** was ***Providentia***, probably in the context of Tiberius' accession, and it should be noted that the first (Concordia) was also 'created' by Tiberius[94]. Certain of the honours that had been decreed for Augustus, Tiberius refused to accept for himself, including the name Augustus (with certain exceptions) and the substitution of ***imperator*** for his forename, the ornamentation of his residence with the ***Corona Civica*** indicative of a ***servator***, and the title ***Pater Patriae***, which the Res Gestae renders the culmination of Augustus' principate[95].

In Velleius' account of the Tiberian principate the successor's reign is credited with the restoration to Rome of "***Industria***", "***Aequitas***", "***Fides***", and even "***Iustitia***"; over the same time period, it was claimed that "***seditio***", "***ambitio***", and even "***discordia***" had been

banished from the city, each list an apparent indictment of the last two decades of Augustus' 'reign', about which Augustus himself was understandably coy in his Res Gestae (see further below). The idea of improvement may also be inherent in Velleius' suggestion that Tiberius was an "***optimus princeps***" in peace, and as great a "***dux***" in war. The campaigns of this "***victor omnium gentium locorum***" are said to have been characterised by "***prudentia***", "***temperamentum***", "***civilitas***", "***virtus***", "***utilitas***" and "***humanitas***", and Tiberius even won Velleius' praise for "***celeritas***" in the dispatch of C. Silius to deal with the Gallic revolt[96]. Whilst Velleius gave Tiberius credit for Rome's recovery, others appear to have detected a causal link between Tiberius' abandonment of Rome in 6 B.C. (and his subsequent reinstatement) and these very difficulties; following his accession such commentators may have been amongst those who remarked that the Golden Augustan Age had deteriorated once more into the Age of Iron, and who represented the ruler as an Atreus-like tyrant[97].

c) War, Peace and Empire under Augustus: International relations and civic life

By the time that Octavian returned to Rome, in the summer of 29 B.C., the senate had already decreed him the honour of separate triumphs for his victory at Actium and the subjugation of Egypt, and triumphal arches at Brundisium and in the Forum Romanum; the temple of Divus Julius was now also to be ornamented with "***rostra***". For Octavian however, the culminating honour was the closing of the doors of the temple of Janus, signalling his ending of civil and foreign conflicts, which may have occurred in early January[98]. If his celebration of three triumphs suggested that Octavian was a second Romulus, readers familiar with Varro's treatise on the Latin language or Piso's annals may have considered him a second pious, peace-loving, Numa since Rome's second king was supposed to have set the precedent for this action; however, Syme was probably right to suggest that Livy would not have bothered to mention Numa's closure had it not been for Octavian's[99]. The following year saw the dedication of the Palatine Apollo temple

complex and although Gurval has questioned the closeness of association between the god of this temple and the battle of Actium, Vergil offers a contemporary perspective in his description of the imaginary shield of Aeneas, and this effortlessly links Actium not only to the triple triumph but to the gifts of all peoples from Rome's boundless empire carried in procession for Apollo; the possible connection between the representation of Apollo's expulsion of the Gauls and punishment of Niobe, and Octavian's triumphs over Northern barbarians and Cleopatra has already been noted (see above section **a**). The precise relative chronology of the new temple's dedication and C. Sosius' restoration of the ancient one ("***in Circo***") is unclear, but there too the ornamentation has been linked to Octavian's recent campaigns against trousered barbarians and a masculinised queen[100].

It seems clear that Augustus intended that foreign kings should depend on Rome and the emperor for their legitimacy; Suetonius comments that Augustus normally chose to keep kingdoms in the hands of the existing dynasty, fostering friendly relations between the kingdoms (often by intermarriage) and bolstering the weak by appointing regents (to rule if the king was young or mentally disturbed)[101]. It is in this context that we should view the Roman interest shown in 27 and 26 B.C. (and also in the mid-thirties B.C.) in a Britain divided into kingdoms; Caesar had succeeded in intimidating the Britons during his two campaigns there, securing promises of tribute, and it is probable that Augustus hoped both to cash in those promises and to inculcate the idea of Roman overlordship. In 27 B.C. unrest in Gaul and the apparent tractability of the Britons are said to have determined Augustus' decision not to penetrate beyond the bounds of Ocean at this time, but the following year would probably have seen an invasion had it not been for the revolt of supposedly subjugated tribes in the Alps and Spain[102]. Diplomacy seems eventually to have won British compliance since there appear to have been no further plans for military expeditions until the reign of Gaius (Caligula); moreover British kings would, at a later date in Augustus 'reign', present themselves as suppliants at Rome and dedicate offerings there[103]. Augustus himself initially conducted the campaign against the Astures and

Cantabri but, having fallen ill, this campaign was entrusted to subordinates, as the Alpine campaign had been. The roughly contemporary victory of M. Vinicius against German tribes thought to have murdered Roman traders also contributed to the restoration of peace to the empire, and the gates of war were again closed; the emperor was hailed as "***imperator***" for these vicarious victories, and even voted a fourth triumph (which he refused)[104].

Following Cleopatra's suicide, the then Octavian had travelled through Syria and Asia Minor, allotting rulers to kingdoms and peoples. He granted refuge to the pro-Roman Tiridates, a defeated but still rival claimant for the Parthian throne who had ruled in Phraates' place for a couple of years and carried to Rome Phraates' son (who had been kidnapped by Tiridates). The Armenian king Artavasdes had been murdered on Cleopatra's orders and his son Artaxias was left in place (despite his Parthian sympathies). Amyntas who had eventually succeeded to the Galatian throne with Antony's assistance was confirmed in office, as were also the recently installed Cappadocian king Archelaus, and both Polemo of Pontus and Herod (who had, in the end, failed to assist Antony). The brother of Iamblichus was deprived of Emesa and taken to Rome to be paraded in one of Octavian's triumphs (see above)[105]. Negotiations with Phraates had failed to secure the standards of Crassus and Antony, even once his son had been restored to him, and Tiridates' brief recovery of Parthia around 26 B.C., may have been prompted by Augustus (coins proclaim him to be "***philoromaios***")[106]. In 23 B.C. Agrippa was sent to negotiate with Parthia over the return of the standards, and it may be that the son of Phraates, recorded in the Res Gestae as having fled to Augustus, had at this time usurped the throne[107].

In 25 B.C. the opportunity had arisen to adopt Galatia as a province, following the death of Amyntas but, far from heralding an end to all such kingdoms, the year 25 B.C. also saw the elevation to kingship of Juba (II) who had, as an infant, been paraded at Rome in Caesar's

African triumph; it is known that this new ruler for Mauretania married Antony's daughter Cleopatra Selene, and the union may have been settled this year[108]. Augustus himself set out for the East in 21 B.C., and the following year he legitimised the accessions of Iamblichus (II) of Emesa, Tarcondimotus (II) of Cilicia, and Mithridates (III) of Commagene, and extended the kingdoms of the Cappadocian Archelaus and Herod the Great. At around the same time Augustus sent his elder step-son Tiberius into Armenia, in order to bestow the diadem on Tigranes who had spent some time in Rome and was now being installed in place of Artaxias; according to Velleius Armenia was brought back under the "***potestas populi Romani***"[109]. News that there was to be a Roman expedition into a neighbouring kingdom perhaps contributed to the Parthian decision finally to return the captured standards and soldiers; petitioning for the friendship of Rome as if he had been overcome in war, Phraates now sent to Rome his children and grandchildren to serve as hostages. Herod's sons may already have been sent to the city[110].

In 24 B.C., a military expedition had been launched into Arabia Felix, an independent and apparently peaceable kingdom, to instigate a recognition there of Roman supremacy (just as had now been secured from the British kingdoms, see above); if we only had the Res Gestae for evidence we might well believe that the Aethiopian expedition of around 21 B.C. was similarly aggressive. In fact, the Aethiopians, no longer cowed by the military reputation of Aelius Gallus, had invaded the Egyptian Thebaid in 22 B.C. Strabo records that they had pulled down Caesar-statues (presumably portraits of Augustus) and carried them back to Aethiopia as booty; the plunderers appear later to have claimed that they were avenging themselves on local rulers (nomarchs), either being, or pretending to be, ignorant of the existence and authority of Augustus, to whom they were forced to send ambassadors after Petronius' retaliatory campaign[111]. L. Cornelius Balbus' campaign against the Garamantes, which secured him the final triumph to be commemorated on the Parthian arch, had probably seen him venture further South (in Africa) than any previous Roman general, and at around this time Augustus received ambassadors from Indian kings.

With the peoples of the known world now (arguably) submitting to Roman overlordship from the limits of Ocean in the West (Mauretania, and following Agrippa's most recent campaigns, the Spanish provinces) to Parthia, Arabia and India in the East, and from the Gauls and Britons in the North to the Garamantes and Aethiopians in the South, late 19 or early 18 B.C. are clearly the most likely times for a third closure of the gates of war, and it is worth noting that Horace appears to link Janus to the standards[112].

If the war with Cleopatra had been a struggle for world domination between West and East, with even the Gauls ranged against the meretricious queen, her eunuchs and her enslaved "***Romanus***", the decade since Octavian's three triumphs had seen the completion of the project. Vergil's elaborations, in the Georgics, of the idea that the most distant peoples were coming under Rome's authority, began to look like prophecies; whilst it had been an exaggeration to suggest that Octavian had been contending with Indus on the furthest borders of Asia, Augustus had been the first Roman to receive Indian embassies, and similarly the Nile, Asia, Armenia, the Parthians, and probably even the "***Britanni***", had submitted either to Roman arms, or the threat of them, whilst even Arabia and Aethiopia had found themselves within the reach of Augustus' Rome[113]. Just as Vergil had envisaged double triumphs and double trophies for Octavian's conquests in West and East, Horace opposed "***Galli***" to "***Parthi***", or "***Persi***" to "***Britanni***", whilst Propertius paired "***Parthi***" with "***Britanni***" and predicted an ***Ovatio*** for Maecenas "***utroque ab litore***"[114]. Following Tiberius' interventions in Armenia (and Germany, see further below), Crinagoras appears to have accorded Augustan Rome a universal empire stretching from the point of sunrise to that of sunset, these furthest regions being bounded, in his estimation, by the Araxes and Rhine respectively; the idea may already have inspired Vergil's pairing of the two-horned Rhine with the Araxes and Euphrates, although elsewhere he predicts that Augustus would out-distance both Hercules and Bacchus in travelling beyond the Indians into lands beyond the path of the sun[115].

Even if the idea of travelling to lands beyond the sunrise did not depend on the stories about Alexander later incorporated into the Alexander Romance it is difficult to believe that the unrealised predictions of Augustus conquering the lands of the East as far as the limits of Ocean were unrelated to the Macedonian king's campaigns; the use of Alexander's epithets "***magnus***" and "***invictus***" for Augustus has already been noted (see above section **b**). As was argued above (see chapter 3, sections **b** iv and **c** ii) Romans of the late Republic could already think of themselves as imitators of Alexander when liberating Greek cities from the barbarian yoke of Mithridates, and Alexandrine world-conquerors when extending the boundaries of empire on all three continents or to the limits of Ocean[116]. Vitruvius' De Architectura, probably to be dated to this period, uses language suggestive of Alexander when describing Augustus, referring to the latter's subjugation of "***cuncti hostes***" and "***gentes omnes***", his "***invicta virtus***" and his "***imperium orbis terrarum***"; in the context of the first surviving reference to the plans of Dinocrates/Stasicrates for the conversion of Mount Athos into a giant Alexander portrait, Vitruvius claimed that he too had ambitiously large plans and had hesitated before dedicating his treatise to Augustus[117]. Livy's critique of Alexander summarised above (see above chapter 2, section **b** iv) was probably also assembled at this time and this offered readers the opportunity to draw their own unflattering comparisons between the Macedonian and the Roman "***unus***"; each claimed to have a divine father, and to a certain extent, the military reputations of both depended on wars against 'womanish' orientals[118].

Following the activities of Augustus and Tiberius in the East, before their return in 19 B.C., coins were issued across the empire bearing reverse legends such as "***Signis Parthicis Receptis***", "***Armenia Capta***" and "***Armenia Recepta***" (e.g. RIC *Augustus* 47, 45, 41, & 42); other numismatic legends and devices refer to the ***Corona Civica*** bestowed on Augustus in 26 B.C., doubtless with topical reference to the Parthians' surrender of citizen soldiers who had been captured with the standards of Crassus and Antony (RIC *Augustus* 109, & 311)[119]. Up until this point, artistic interest in representing the military aspect of

Octavian-Augustus' rulership had, as Picard notes, focussed on the victory at Actium; even the provincial monument from St. Bertrand de Comminges representing more recent and more local victories in Gaul and Spain, was centred on a trophy alluding to the victory at Actium. No direct parallels for this monument are known from the city of Rome, although the ship's prow on which the Actium trophy was founded is one of several maritime symbols used in Augustan art that have been understood as referring to the naval battle (including RIC *Augustus* 4, 5, 33, 58); at St. Bertrand, this element was surmounted by a triton who supports a globe, a visual idea that is further elaborated in the marine triumph cameo from Vienna where each of the outer pair of tritons holds up a globe, that on the right supporting a standing victory who looks towards the triumphator, whilst that on the left sprouts two capricorns which together support a laureate ***clupeus***. The cameo's combination of a human triumphator and mythical tritons has no known precedent in art before the Augustan era, and may depend on the idea that Neptune and his minions had at last, after supporting Sextus Pompeius, ranged themselves on Octavian's side; this idea appears to underlie the early denarius reverse (RIC *Augustus* 1), representing a rather Octavian-like Neptune with one foot placed on the globe, and the Boston Sardonyx of a similar (but nude) figure riding the waves behind four hippocamps[120].

One issue of coins from an Eastern mint (RIC *Augustus* 42) dateable to around 18 B.C. bears the familiar legend "***Armenia Capta***" and shows for the first time a Victory apparently wrestling a bull into submission (see Figure 16); glyptic representations of the same visual idea may also be Augustan in date, and the bull may here stand for the East, as in the earlier Sibylline oracles which had opposed Antony's new bull to Octavian's Capricorn[121]. Other contemporary types represent kneeling Easterners, perhaps even the kings of Parthia and Armenia (RIC *Augustus* 98-103) and, following Vitruvius' suggestion that the architectural use of Atlantes and Caryatids could represent to Greek viewers the subjection of defeated foes, crouching Eastern barbarians in Pavonazzetto now seem to have begun to be used as supports for Roman tripods. The ***Porticus ad Nationes***, which

Servius suggests held "***simulacra***" of all peoples, may also date to this period; it is not clear that these ethnic representations were themselves Caryatids or Atlantes, and it should be remembered that seated personifications, not unlike the Asia from the Boscoreale wall-paintings (see above chapter 2), were used on the Prima Porta cuirass (Figures 21b and c), and at least once for a personification on the altar of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***[122]. The Spanish numismatic portrayals of the altar to Fortuna Redux (RIC *Augustus* 272-275), which had been dedicated on Augustus' return to the city in 19 B.C., are too conflicting to suggest knowledge of the appearance of the actual monument on the part of the die-cutters[123].

As early as 16 B.C. the gates of war must have been reopened. Of all the disturbances that broke out across the empire at this time, the most serious seemed to be the movement of German tribes across the Rhine, although in fact the barbarians returned to their own territory, surrendering hostages and suing for peace on the approach of the emperor and his elder stepson Tiberius[124]. The Rhaetians had launched plundering raids into Gaul and Italy and Drusus was initially deputed to deal with them, but once the Germans were in retreat his brother could be spared to assist him. Elsewhere, Publius Silius dealt with the revolt of the Camunni and Vennones and the Pannonian and Norican invasions of Istria, and Agrippa was sent to Syria, probably suggesting that in addition to further difficulties in Spain, Dalmatia, Macedonia and Thrace trouble was expected in the East. Propertius' hope, noted above (section **b**), that wars in the East could be postponed until Augustus "***pueri***" were of age for command had certainly not been realised[125]. Dio's chronology of Agrippa's activities is somewhat loose but it appears that a supposed grandson of Mithridates had seized power in Bosporus without Rome's consent, against whom Agrippa despatched Polemon of Pontus; from Josephus' account it appears that Agrippa was free to tour Judaea in 15 B.C., but the following year Herod set out to join him for the campaign against Bosporus. That campaign secured Agrippa permission for another triumph (again

rejected) and the installation of Polemon as king of Bosporus; Agrippa was probably present on the occasion of Polemon's marriage to Dynamis of Bosporus[126].

Having settled the Bosporan succession, Agrippa had been despatched to Pannonia where his mere approach was sufficient to provoke the collapse of the incipient revolt which he had been sent to quash; following Agrippa's death however, Pannonia revolted again and Tiberius, aided by the Scordisci, exacted punishment, ravaging territory, stripping inhabitants of their weapons and deporting into slavery the majority of adult males[127]. Meanwhile, Drusus had been empowered to replace M. Lollius in the command against the Germans, and he avenged his predecessor's loss of the fifth legion's standard by launching incursions beyond the Rhine, campaigning as far as Ocean in one season; in 11 B.C. Drusus again crossed the Rhine, advancing as far as the West bank of the Weser and establishing two fortifications beyond the Rhine[128]. Apparently towards the end of 11 B.C., and following the conclusion of L. Piso's Thracian campaign, it was decreed that the gates of war could be closed (for what would probably have been the fourth time under Octavian-Augustus) but news of a Dacian invasion of Pannonia and another Dalmatian revolt prevented the decree from being enacted; Tiberius was again sent out to the region, and he was allowed to celebrate an ***Ovatio*** in 9 B.C.[129]. As consul in that year, Drusus' German campaigns reached the Elbe, but no attempt was made to cross the river and trophies were established on its West bank to mark the limits of his conquests; he died from disease on his return march to the Rhine and the following year Tiberius' campaign beyond the Rhine is said by Velleius to have left the territory almost a tributary province. At Rome, in line with this expansion of Rome's dominion, Augustus extended the ***pomerium*** and, as has already been noted, Tiberius was allowed to celebrate the long anticipated triumph over the Sycambri (and other Germans) at the opening of his consulship (in 7 B.C.)[130].

In the decade or so between the renewal of Augustus' ***imperium maius*** in 18 B.C. and the second consulship of Tiberius in 7 B.C., Augustus had been absent from Rome for about half the time. After his first absence from the city the senate, following its own precedent in the case of the altar to Fortuna Redux, had decreed in commemoration of his return and his subordinate's achievements the ***Ara Pacis Augustae.*** The immediately preceding period had seen Agrippa's establishment of Augustan peace in Bosporus and the conclusion, by Tiberius and Drusus, of warfare in the West, but it is unclear whether these settlements had ended conflict sufficiently for the senate to seek a fourth closure of the gates of war, particularly as Drusus' campaigns beyond the Rhine may already have been under consideration; whilst, as has been noted, the senate appears to have decreed such a closure two years later, it may be that, following the third re-opening, Augustus had already decided to drop the recently revived Janus tradition which, for several years at a stretch, proclaimed Augustan war rather than peace[131].

Rose and Kuttner have argued that barbarian 'princelings' from East and West were depicted in the procession reliefs of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae.*** On the Southern frieze a diademed Eastern child stands behind Agrippa, grasping his garment but looking back through the family group towards the end of the frieze; on the Northern frieze the veiled leading woman of the family party, here identified as Livia, is immediately preceded by a toddling Westerner. This Western child is not in physical contact with Livia, but rather with two men whose faces have plausibly been restored as youthful; these foreground male figures and a third youth in the background who is probably to be associated with them, turn back towards the Eastern end of the Northern frieze, and may also be foreign royals receiving education at Rome in the imperial household, a possibility increased by their proximity to Livia (who had just returned from Gaul with Augustus). This trio may, in some sense, represent the three Gallic provinces and a relationship has been postulated between the ***Ara Pacis*** reliefs, and the representation of Augustus receiving children from three bearded Celtic chieftains on the Boscoreale cups; the fact that only one Western

child was shown on the Northern relief, was probably intended to balance the sole Eastern child represented on the Southern relief. The Eastern child may have been shown with his mother and a family relationship should perhaps be considered to have existed between the Western child and either of the two young men with whom he is in physical contact[132].

The worthiness of foreigners to participate in the ritual life of the city of Rome (on whatever occasion was actually represented in the Procession friezes), may have been questioned by some viewers, and on the actual altar subject provinces appear to have been grouped together separately from Romans (Figure 20); the reliefs of the West precinct wall however, showed that the city's foundation had depended on the peaceful incorporation of foreigners by referring, as Vergil had done, to the city's dual origins in Troy and Latium. Although Augustus is actually said to have criticised Alexander for being more interested in conquering his empire than ordering it, Livy's suggestion that Alexander would have invaded the West as a Darius leading Persians, may imply knowledge at Rome of the Macedonian's attempts to harmonise victor and defeated peoples. Certainly Alexander's alteration of his dress habits in the East was criticised by Livy (see above chapter 3, section **b** iv), but there was clearly no question of Augustus emulating him in this respect, given his native city's tradition of encouraging foreigners to adopt Roman dress (see above chapter 3). Also, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus noted at exactly this time, the unity of Alexander's empire did not long survive him, and this was no encouragement to repeat his experiments in intermarriage (even without the disastrous example of Antony and Cleopatra, which had set East against West as Helen's marriage to Paris had done)[133].

Kuttner has noted that, in contrast to the Armenian and Parthian submissions rendered on earlier coins, denarii from the Lyons mint (RIC Augustus 346-347, from around the year of Tiberius' second consulship) represent a Gallic chieftain standing before the emperor

(rather than a kneeling suppliant). It is certainly true that the chieftains show no sign of having just been defeated, but the significance of the non-kneeling stance is unclear given that the chieftain closest to Augustus on the Boscoreale cup has knelt down to present his child, whilst the one furthest away still stands, or more probably continues to approach the spot where he too would kneel; it should be recalled that the Parthians were similarly undefeated when Phraates had returned the lost standards and offered hostages[134].

Around the time of the altar's construction, Augustus' Horologium was laid out on the Campus Martius, confirming the submission of Egypt to Roman rule, on the twentieth anniversary of Alexandria's surrender, by its use of an antique obelisk; its dedication to the sun fitted the purpose of an instrument displaying the movement of the sun through the Zodiac from its symbolic winter rebirth in Capricorn, but some reference to the empire's reach as far as the points of sunrise and sunset may also have been intended. Whilst the use of the shadow to point at the ***Ara Pacis*** on Augustus' birthday is now in doubt, the geographical proximity of the sundial to the altar and other Augustan monuments may still be significant; both the exact location of Agrippa's portico, with its annotated maps of the known world, and the date of its completion by Augustus are unclear, but a relationship between it and the Horologium is similarly plausible. Solar imagery is missing from the surviving fragments of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***, but just as the Genetrix Orbis figure (see above section **a**) appears to be flanked by fresh and salt-water nymphs suggestive of Rome's dominion over land and sea, its much damaged pendant (showing Roma seated on captured arms) may once have borne some reference to the sun's apparent movement from East to West[135].

In Horace's fifth Ode of the fourth collection, Rome's empire is surveyed from East to West (Parthia, Scythia, Germany and Spain) and Augustus, the "***custos gentis Romulae***" (a figure worthy of comparison with Castor or globe-trotting Hercules), is presented as a second sun who has deprived Rome of his light for too long; the poem ends with the

assertion that the prayers of his people continue from early morning to the setting of the sun in Ocean. In the final Ode Horace claimed that the "***fama***" and "***maiestas***" of Rome's empire now extended as far as the points of sunrise and sunset[136]. The more than Alexandrine vastness of this empire may have prompted Horace's famous discussion of the literary and artistic judgements of Alexander in a poetic letter to Augustus; noting that the court poet Choerilus had won a great fortune for what was now judged to be appalling verse (with occasional lapses into excellence), he states that, in the visual arts, the king preferred to have his "***virtus***" represented by the now acknowledged 'old masters' Lysippus and Apelles (to the extent, Horace claims, that he forbade anyone else to represent him). The poet expresses no statement about Augustus' artistic judgement, but clearly asserts that his favourite poets (Vergil and Varius) better represented the habits and characters of men than bronze statues, perhaps reflecting Augustus' own reticence about accepting portraits; Horace appears to go on to suggest that the unsuitability of his own poetic style to the representation of Augustus' "***res gestae***" would, if he attempted it, result in poetry no better than that of Choerilus, fit only for wrapping the produce of a market seller[137].

The Consolatio ad Liviam refers to the territory beyond the Rhine as "***terrae novae***" and a triumph over Germans is said to be unknown; apparently looking forward to Tiberius' campaigns and triumph, the poet suggests that Germania ought to be punished for Drusus' death not only with the shackling of her kings, but mass executions. Germania herself is promised execution, her threatening spirit alleged to have been rendered "***superbus***" by Drusus' death. Elsewhere the poet's references to "***Dalmata supplex***" and the blood-stained river Isargus (feeding the Danube which in its turn disgorges into the Black Sea), seem far removed from the Romanisation of foreign princes and nobles discussed above. The perceived scale and significance of Drusus' conquests is suggested by the poet's reference to a "***Germanus orbis***", and it should be noted that the "***remotus orbis***" of the Dacians too, is suggested to have felt the force of a Nero (presumably Tiberius); Dionysius of Halicarnassus may have had the latter in mind when asserting in 7 B.C., that

Rome's universal empire had not only outstripped Alexander's in the West, but in the North, beyond Thrace (and the Danube)[138]. These Northern worlds may correspond to the frozen latitudes of the Panegyricus Messallae bounded to the South by the temperate zone of Mediterranean civilisation; in the poet's imagination, the latter was bounded to the South by the globe's central sunbaked stripe, beyond which lay further temperate and frozen zones, mirroring those in the Northern hemisphere. Messalla alone had been imagined winning triumphs from, and being called "***magnus***" by, both hemispheres[139].

The monument considered by Kuttner to have inspired the Boscoreale cups is dated by her to the immediate aftermath of Tiberius' triumph, and the fact that the triumph appears to have been rendered without reference to Germanicus (see further below) supports this hypothesis. Kuttner points to the inclusion of a Gaul amongst the soldiers ranged behind the chariot as evidence of cross-referencing between the cups, since the Gauls presenting their children to Augustus appear also to have been represented as allies rather than defeated foes, and the apparent presence of Drusus in this scene also suggests a date not far removed from his death[140]. It is far from clear that the 'lost monument' (or its base) comprised only those four scenes represented on the cups, and the change of medium and audience may have demanded iconographical changes; the representation of interaction between the emperor and the gods cannot be paralleled in Augustan relief sculpture and the cup's composition may actually indicate the form and location of the 'lost monument'. Kuttner herself suggested that the Forum of Caesar ("conqueror of Gaul and victor against the Germans") would have been an appropriate location for it and the representation of Augustus between Venus Genetrix and Mars does nothing to harm this hypothesis; Kuttner also notes the existence of a statue monument in the same precinct representing the emperor Tiberius seated among the cities of Asia, and it is possible that child presentation, ***nuncupatio*** and triumphal reliefs ornamented the base of a similar statue of Augustus representing him seated in civilian dress. Perhaps Augustus was shown holding the globe (as on the cup), or perhaps amongst personifications of peoples from the cardinal points of

the empire (Gaul and Spain, and unknown African and Asian peoples were the only recognisable personifications shown with Mars on the Boscoreale cup); competition with senatorial monuments such as the eight metre long dedication to an unknown Rufus which probably showed this governor of Bithynia-Pontus among the cities of his province might well have demanded the representation of peoples (rather than cities) in the case of the first emperor. If this interpretation is accepted, then it seems clear that at least one relief from the monument was not rendered on the pair of cups from Boscoreale[141].

The death, in the year after Tiberius' triumph, of Tigranes (II) of Armenia (who had been installed by Tiberius, see above) prompted Augustus to send Tiberius on an Eastern mission; although the late king's son and daughter (Tigranes III and Erato) claimed the throne, Augustus had chosen as successor (their uncle?) Artavasdes, who had almost certainly been in Rome since 19 B.C. learning the Roman customs which he proceeded to impose on his subjects[142]. As has already been noted Tiberius retired to Rhodes rather than continuing his journey to Armenia. This strike left Augustus without an assistant of sufficient ***dignitas*** to deputise for him in the provinces, and foreign ambassadors to Rome were doubtless aware of this situation. Even the pro-Tiberian Velleius claims that the Parthian invasion of Armenia and the German rebellion (see below) were the result of Tiberius' retirement; the dating of these events is problematic, although the former appears to have become embarrassingly common knowledge at Rome just at the moment when the long awaited Forum of Augustus (Figure 22) was finally inaugurated. Its temple of Mars Ultor proclaimed Parthian obedience to Rome on the basis of Phraates' surrender of standards, prisoners and hostages in 19 B.C.; now however, Phraates had been murdered by an illegitimate son (Phraataces) who had not only succeeded to the Parthian throne against Augustus' wishes, but unseated Augustus' appointee in Armenia, annexing his kingdom[143]. Tacitus and Dio noted a crossing of the Elbe under L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (husband to Augustus' elder Antonian niece); this crossing, which permitted the conduct of diplomacy, appears to have followed his settlement of migrating

Hermenduri amongst the Marcomanni (in trans-Rhine Germany) and preceded the rebellion of around A.D. 1, which prompted the "***immensum bellum***" waged by M. Vinicius[144].

After only one season's experience of military leadership, with the Danubian legions (under L. Domitius Ahenobarbus?, see below), the emperor's adopted son Gaius Caesar had been despatched to Syria to settle the Armenian crisis. It was probably intended that Artavasdes be restored, but following his death Augustus appears to have been prepared to countenance the restoration of Tigranes III. In either case Phraataces was to withdraw from Armenia. In A.D. 1 diplomacy triumphed when Phraataces, agreeing to renounce his claim to Armenia, received Augustus' recognition. Following the death of Tigranes III however, Gaius Caesar attempted to foist on the Armenians a prince from (presumably Atropatenian) Media; Armenian hostility to his succession demanded Roman military action and Gaius Caesar was hailed as ***imperator*** during the course of this campaign. He also sustained the injuries which led to his request for furlough in A.D. 3, and ultimately to his death at Limyra the following year[145]. In the meantime Phraataces himself had been deposed, the Parthian nobility seeking Augustus' permission to choose as his successor Vonones (one of the four Parthian princes resident at Rome since 19 B.C.); Suetonius notes that, once Tiberius had been reincorporated into Augustus' own succession plans, the Parthian envoys were sent on to him from Rome to secure his approval[146].

In addition to housing the Roman standards surrendered by the Parthians the temple of Mars Ultor, and its precincts, now provided a clear point of departure for commanders (of whom Gaius Caesar may have been the first) and was also supposed to be used for senatorial votes awarding triumphs; any military standards recovered from the enemy were to be dedicated at the temple along with all triumphal sceptres and wreaths, whilst portrait statues were to be erected there representing all those who were decreeed ***ornamenta triumphalia***. These portraits added to the ranks of those already arrayed there,

representing the greatest Romans of the past; Suetonius claims that Augustus called upon the citizens of Rome to ensure that he and all future "***principes***" (a reference to Gaius and Lucius Caesar?) lived up to the standards of the men portrayed there, but the statues were doubtless also intended to act, like a private household's collection of ancestor portraits, as an inspiration to future generations of citizens, and it is worth noting that teenage boys were supposed to spend time in the Forum of Augustus when they became eligible for military service[147].

The inauguration ceremonies for this complex had included a ***naumachia***, cast in the form of a re-enactment of the battle of Salamis. Some viewers may have found in this spectacle references to the battle of Actium which had arguably also been a battle waged in defence of Western civilisation's freedom and against a despotic Eastern empire; just as Livy's Alexander became a Darius, and Antiochus (III) invading Europe had seemed a second Xerxes (see above chapter 3, section **b** iv & v), so Cleopatra (another supposed descendant of Philip II of Macedon) had commanded the forces of the barbarian East like a Semiramis or Penthesilea, and escaped from the battle not unlike Artemisia at Salamis. The 'Westerners' were victorious in the mock-battle, just as in the original battle (as also at Actium) and this may have been considered a propitious omen for the anticipated Parthian campaign[148]. Ovid certainly predicted that Gaius would return victorious, leading in triumph the Tigris and Euphrates. Ecbatana, a royal capital of the Achaemenids and their Parthian successors, may have been Ovid's "***urbs in Achaemenis vallibus ista***", the ostensible vagueness of the poet's description perhaps referring to the Herodotean idea that this city had seven defensive walls of different colours; this city's submission to Roman authority might have been imagined as marking an end to the threats posed by such Eastern empires since it was said to have been founded by Deioces, ancestor of Cyrus the Great[149].

The idea that contemporary Rome was the successor to Classical Athens in opposing Eastern empires is considered to have influenced the architectonic decoration of the Forum of Augustus, particularly in the case of the ***Korai***, supporting the entablature of the porticoes, which seem to have been modelled on those from the Athenian Erechtheion, a building which is known to have housed some Persian spoils. It is unclear whether these stone women were regarded as conquered persons or peoples, but (bronze?) Caryatids or Atlantes from the tent of Alexander, which may well have been understood in this Vitruvian way (see above), are said to have been established in front of the temple of Mars Ultor, and some listing of conquered peoples does appear to have been displayed in the Forum. The ornamented shield designs between the ***Korai*** have been understood as referring to Alexander, and certainly some of these ***tondi*** do appear to have represented his divine father Zeus-Ammon; however, at least one represented a Western torc-wearing Jupiter (Figure 23a and b)[150]. Alexander himself was represented in a painting which Augustus chose to have displayed in the most frequented part of his Forum; the Macedonian king was shown in triumph over war itself, here pictured with its arms bound behind it, like Vergil's "***Furor impius***". It was probably not hard for the viewer of this painting to draw parallels between the Macedonian king and the Roman ***Pater Patriae*** now represented in the triumphal chariot at the centre of his Forum, but the emperor Claudius is said to have substituted a portrait head of Augustus for that of Alexander in the case of this very painting[151].

Following the adoptions of A.D. 4, Tiberius was sent to Germany to restore and maintain order. By the end of the following year the only German tribal leader not to have been cowed into submission by his presence was Maroboduus of the Marcomanni who, ironically, is known to have spent time in Rome as a young man gaining Augustus' favour[152]. When a rebellion broke out in Illyricum in A.D. 6, the planned campaign against Maroboduus was shelved, but in the end it was the Cherusci ("***recepti***" in A.D. 4), rather than the unconquered Marcomanni, who took advantage of Tiberius' absence (see

below). Germanicus, as one of the intended successors of Augustus, had reached an age when he was ready to gain experience of military leadership, and he was sent out (as quaestor) to his adopted father with an emergency army of veterans and freedmen. The following year Germanicus appears to have led a campaign against one of the Dalmatian tribes. The Pannonian rebellion seems to have been crushed in A.D. 8, and the final victory in Dalmatia was secured in A.D. 9; Germanicus, who was awarded ***ornamenta triumphalia*** (presumably meriting a portrait in the Forum of Augustus), appears to have been chosen to relay the news of each success to Rome. Just as the victories in the two theatres of operation had been reported separately, Dalmatia and Pannonia now became separate provinces and Tiberius looked set to celebrate two triumphs; Dio notes that two arches were commissioned, and although he suggests that both were erected in Pannonia it is not unreasonable to suspect that one was, in fact, in Dalmatia[153].

Within days of the Dalmatian capitulation Publius Quinctilius Varus, left in charge of Germany in Tiberius' absence, had been defeated by Arminius and the Cherusci with the loss of three legions and their standards. News of the ambush and its disastrous outcome may have been relayed to Rome by Tiberius who certainly rushed to the city immediately upon hearing of it. Augustus entrusted him with the recovery of Roman authority in Gemany, and the triumphs were postponed[154]. The humiliation of Varus' defeat ought to have been particularly devastating for Rome because the territory beyond the Rhine had so recently seemed to be a virtual province but Tiberius' first season of campaigning appears to have been one of reassurance to the provincials West of the Rhine, rather than of immediate vengeance on the hostile tribes beyond it. When Tiberius and Germanicus did lead a campaign beyond the Rhine in A.D. 10, they (or their troops) did not dare venture far and no enemy was engaged[155]. After a further year of campaigns, Germanicus took up his first consulship in A.D. 12 without celebrating the German triumph that had probably been planned for him before the loss of the legions. However, in the late autumn of that year affairs were sufficiently settled for Tiberius to return to Rome. Although Ovid, now

in exile, appears to have imagined that Tiberius' return would see him celebrate a second German triumph, it was the postponed Illyrian triumphs (over Pannonia and Dalmatia) that were actually held[156]. Germanicus, who appears to have had a section of the procession(s) dedicated to his exploits, was entrusted with the conclusion of the German wars, Augustus having become afraid that Tiberius might predecease him if he continued to go on campaign. Tiberius, even as emperor, was never again to go on campaign and he now began to share the burden of civilian rule with Augustus (see further below)[157].

The separation of the two barbarian groups on the lower register of the Gemma Augustea perhaps indicates the dual nature of the recent rebellion in Illyricum, the captives below the trophy representing Pannonia, and the newly suppliant barbarians on the right representing Dalmatia, although it should be noted that at least one barbarian appears to be missing from the left of the trophy raising scene; the massive scale of the male barbarians (they could not stand fully upright in the lower register, see below) may have been intended to suggest the significance of the two victories. The theme of restored Augustan peace which appears to dominate the right hand side of the upper register thus relates closely to the scenes of the lower register, by means of the imagined triumph of Tiberius shown to its left. Here the adopted son of the emperor steps down from a triumphal chariot, flanked not only by Germanicus, but probably also by Drusus Caesar (the lost togate figure to the left of the chariot). There appears to be no indication of the defeat of Varus having intervened to dissociate the victories from the triumph, and the object may well have been produced in expectation of Tiberius' imminent Dalmatian victory. The Roman forces represented in the lower register appear to be assisted by personifications of Thrace and Spain (a 'client kingdom' and a formerly recalcitrant province); it is unclear whether the figure in the Thracian hat is male or female, but such personifications were normally female[158].

When Ovid referred, in the Fasti, to the temple of Mars Ultor it was suggested that the structure was worthy to commemorate victories over Giants. The victories of Jovian Augustus were not infrequently compared to Gigantomachies in Augustan poetry, particularly in ***recusationes*** explaining how the poet's 'meagre talent' was inadequate for epic composition. Although anguipede giants were occasionally used for Republican coin reverses (e.g. RRC 474/4) it is not clear that the 'Pergamene' connection between the divine establishment of order, and the victories of human generals, was made at Rome before the Augustan era, and even then, there is little evidence for visual representations of the Gigantomachy[159]. However, the disproportionate scale of the male captives on the Gemma Augustea may depend on the Hellenistic association between Northern barbarians and giants; the later Jupiter-giant columns of Germania Superior may further pursue this association[160].

When imagining the German triumph of Germanicus, Ovid pictures a cowering Germania crouched under the foot of the "***dux invictus***" (or the "***magnus dux***") and, like the Germania of the Consolatio, about to suffer execution; later "***Illyris***" too, is pictured bending her head beneath the "***Caesareus pes***" at Tiberius' triumph[161]. The image of a conqueror treading down his foes brings to mind oriental representations of kings dating back over more than two millennia before Actium (such as the Sar-i Pul Annubanini, and the Naram-Sim stele in the Louvre, see Figure 24), portraits of later Roman emperors (such as the Hierapytna Hadrian, see Figure 25) and the Egyptian representations of Nemesis noted by Lichocka; the horses of later emperors could rear over kneeling suppliants (as in the case of the equestrian portrait of Domitian described by Statius), and the afore-mentioned Jupiter-giant columns of Germany ride down their giant foes in a manner familiar from the tombstones of auxiliaries (such as that of the Claudian cavalryman Longinus Sdapeze), but neither Augustan nor Julio-Claudian Rome has yielded up such representations of an emperor. Claudius' execution of Britannia on the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias has only these literary parallels to suggest that the representation of

punishment (rather than pardon) was known to the inhabitants of the capital[162]. Suetonius mentions a statue group visible (in Nero's day) from the road between Antium and Rome representing a mounted Roman dragging a Gaul by his hair (see RRC 454/1-2) but even supposing its former existence is genuine, its date and dedicator are unclear, although an imperial commission seems unlikely. Kuttner has noted that the Niederbieber ***signum***, apparently of Tiberian date, represents a defeated barbarian merely as part of a ***congeries armorum*** piled at the feet of a young commander. Perhaps military artists representing war, peace and empire for standards, military equipment (and tombstones) chose to do so differently from artists working on the monuments of the centre, and if such men had a role in creating the displays for a commander's triumph, this might account for the discrepancy between poetry and art noted above; Ovid certainly found it hard to believe in the ***Pax Augusta*** when exiled amongst warlike barbarians at the 'icy' fringes of empire. [163].

The attempt, in the Metamorphoses, to give a false impression of uninterrupted peace since the fall of Alexandria has already been noted. The exordium of the second book of the Fasti however, already seems overloaded with military references, a fact that is all the more striking because it once followed on from the original passage relating to the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***; Ovid notes that Augustus was currently pre-occupied with the pacification of an enemy, and claims his own versification of the calendar as military service, a remark that strongly suggests the passage's composition in the period of manpower shortage at the time of the Pannonian and Dalmatian revolts[164]. Ovid's eventual abandonment of his 'post' probably reflects the apparently increasing distance between the poetic vision of Augustan peace and the reality of rebellion, war and famine. As has already been noted it was possible to link the recent disasters that had befallen Rome, either with Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes or his subsequent reinstatement as Augustus' deputy in A.D. 4, and when claiming, in a poem written in exile, that Augustus' public duty had kept him from reading his love poetry, Ovid seems to date the

commencement of the current period of crisis to at least 1 B.C. Of the nations listed (in the same passage) as ostensible proof that Augustus' empire had no weak link, all may once have been brought to heel with Tiberius' assistance, but most are known to have required at least the threat of military intervention since his second consulship[165].

The emperor's own disinterest in discussing events since the deaths of his grandsons (Gaius and Lucius Caesar) in the Res Gestae, has been interpreted as suggesting that the main body of the text was composed at around the time he was hailed as ***Pater Patriae***; in fact, there had been little to celebrate since then, Tiberius' double triumph serving only to mark the suppression of revolts that fitted ill with the idea of stable Augustan peace. Contemporaries, aware that the gates of war had stood open for the best part of thirty years (since 16 B.C., see above), cannot have been taken in by the placement, in the Res Gestae, of the three closures of the gates of war after the dedication of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***, and it is doubtful whether many shared Ovid's optimistic expectation that Germanicus' German triumph would herald a fourth and lengthier closure[166].

d) Summary

Augustus' wish for the Roman people to choose Agrippa as his successor (without direct nomination) appears to reflect the Roman tradition that the ancient kings had been appointed for their virtues during an interregnum.

The weakness of Hellenistic boy-kings was no incentive for promoting the inexperienced Marcellus (or Tiberius) over Agrippa, and the traditional Roman respect for the minimum age limits for public office was not upset to procure precociously early consulships for Marcellus, Tiberius or Drusus.

The reshuffle of family arrangements after the death of Marcellus firmly established the dynasty. Future generations of successors were trained up to have sufficient of the virtues, leadership qualities, and experience of military and civic life to justify their future accession.

This extended family appears to have been segregated from the other figures in the procession friezes of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***, as discrete groups at the Eastern ends of the two friezes. The relative positions of Augustus and Agrippa on the Southern frieze are suggested to have been reproduced by those of Livia and Julia on the Northern frieze. Tiberius is suggested to have been paired with Vipsania. The little girl identified as the younger Julia, sister of Gaius Caesar, may be paired with her future husband, L. Aemilius Paullus. Iullus Antonius, the two Marcellae and M. Valerius Messalla Appianus were probably also represented in one or other of the family groups.

The deaths of Agrippa and Drusus precipitated the rapid promotion of the young Iulii Caesares as there was a danger that Augustus and Tiberius might both die before Gaius Caesar was of sufficient age to hold a consulship, and of sufficient experience to command respect.

Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C. proved that he was not hindering the advancement of his step-sons, but left Augustus without a deputy capable of dealing with military crises.

The deaths of Gaius and Lucius Caesar forced Augustus to reinstate Tiberius, and Germanicus appears to have been groomed as Tiberius' eventual successor. This Claudian solution does not seem to have satisfied Julian members of the ***Domus Augusta***, who seem to have noted the apparent signs of divine disfavour for the adoptions of A.D. 4. Dissatisfaction with the prospect of Tiberius' accession, and the youthful prowess of his adopted son, urged others to hope that Germanicus could be installed in his place.

Greek associations between monarchies and female power not only shaped historical accounts of the Augustan past, but appear also to have cautioned the slow evolution of Augustus' consort into a maternal "***princeps***" and the "***Genetrix orbis***". No mortal appears to have been accorded the Cornucopia in Augustan Rome, perhaps because of its association with the fecund Tyche image of Ptolemaic queens.

The relationship remains unclear between the claim that Octavian-Augustus was the son of Apollo (in addition to, or in place of, Octavius) and his status as Divi Filius (once Julius Caesar had been deified, using a starburst symbol associated with Apollo).

Whilst no historical references attest to Augustan portraits of Caesar after the completion of Agrippa's Pantheon, it is generally agreed that he was accorded a statue in the temple of Mars Ultor, and represented on some coin issues. The Augustan facial features accorded to Caesar on the Sanquinius reverses appear to suggest that family likeness was important, perhaps confirming Pollini's hypothesis that portraits of Gaius and Lucius Caesar looked more like Augustus (or his portraits) than the individuals themselves.

The virtues of the ***Clupeus Virtutis*** do not, by any means, cover the entire range of virtues ascribed to Augustus and his heirs. The dynasty's monopoly of such qualities was challenged in the Panegyricus Messallae, but other writers went on to affirm the prowess of Agrippa, Tiberius, Drusus and Germanicus. They gained the credit for success in Augustan wars partly because the ***princeps*** did not intend to celebrate further triumphs. Civilian duties do not appear to have fired poets' imaginations to the same extent.

With the peoples of the known world submitting to Roman overlordship from the limits of Ocean in the West to the lands of sunrise in the East, and from the Gauls and Britons in the North to the Garamantes and Aethiopians in the South, it appeared that a world-empire had been acquired as early as 19 B.C. It is suggested that the third Augustan closure of the

gates of war took place at around this time. Once it became clear that the seemingly incipient golden age of peace and prosperity had not dawned, other monuments began to be used to indicate the ending and commencement of wars.

The long-standing practice of educating foreign princes at Rome was continued under Augustus, and such foreign royals enjoyed close contacts with the ruler's family. In the Procession friezes of the ***Ara Pacis Augustae***, Agrippa, who had just returned from Bosporus when the altar was decreed, is associated with a diademed Eastern child. Livia, who had just returned from Gaul with Augustus, is associated with a toddling Westerner. The latter is in physical contact with two, of a group of three, male figures who turn back towards the family group at the end of the frieze. These (probable) youths may, in some sense, represent the three Gallic provinces.

Augustus is said to have criticised Alexander for being more interested in conquering his empire than ordering it. The long-standing belief that foreigners should imitate Romans (and not ***vice versa***), and the disastrous example of Antony and Cleopatra, can hardly have recommended the revival of the Alexandrine schemes of intermarriage and adopting 'Persian' dress, but Augustan art and texts representing the dual origins of Rome in Troy and Latium, did suggest that the city's foundation had depended on the peaceful incorporation of foreigners. Ovid's visions of the humiliation of enemies under the "***Caesareus pes***" are in some contrast to this ideal, but may have been shared by the legions, particularly after Varus' defeat.

The use of epithets such as "***magnus***" and "***invictus***", and suggestions of youthful "***virtus***" and achievements beyond the years of a Drusus or a Gaius Caesar, acknowledged the similarity to Alexander of Augustus and his male descendants. Vitruvius had compared himself to Dinocrates/Stasicrates and, more playfully, Horace had compared himself to Choerilus. Caryatids or Atlantes from Alexander's tent were established in front of the

temple of Mars Ultor, and elsewhere in the Forum of Augustus a painting of Alexander in a triumphal chariot could be viewed, and shields representing Jupiter-Ammon (and a corresponding Western Jupiter in a torc) were visible in the Attic storey of its colonnades.

Epilogue

Galinsky has recently suggested, with respect to Augustan poetry, that the word influence is "too passive" to describe the interaction between Greek and Roman elements. However, if Roman exposure to a contemporary (and evolving) Greek tradition prompted the (mere) evolution of Roman ideas (rather than their wholesale replacement) this ought not to preclude us from using the term influence to account for that evolution. Doubtless, changes in the way that Roman people thought about individual senators and their politics, rulership in general, and monarchy in particular would have occurred, in any case, over time. However, even accounting for the earlier (archaeologically attested) contacts between Rome and the Greek world, it is most improbable that the evolutions in Roman thought would have progressed in the same way if there had been no contact with the Hellenistic East in the three centuries prior to the death of Augustus; this dependence further justifies the use of the term influence with regard to the evidence presented in chapters three and four[1].

Whilst interesting in itself, the history of changing political thought would be of greater significance if it could be shown that the Greek influences on Roman thought changed the practice of Roman rulership. The idea that acquaintance with Greek civilisation changed the way that Romans behaved was far from unknown in antiquity; indeed, the defeated Greeks were blamed for the 'corruption' of Roman Italy that followed the introduction of the 'frivolous' arts, domestic luxury, and "***gymnasia et otia et turpes amores***". The successful rooting of these foreign practices in Roman soil depended on their increasing acceptability among certain social groups (in other words, some people had begun to think about such behaviours, differently from their forbears)[2]. The evidence presented in chapters three and four suggests that the contemporary changes in political thought (brought about by contact with Greek ideas) did also affect behaviour. For example, voters had increasingly looked to the same individuals to solve military or economic crises,

having been persuaded (by the Greek inspired rhetoric of orators like Cicero) that one man could be uniquely gifted to lead them. Similarly, Caesar was assassinated by men who believed themselves to be tyrannicides (Cicero even calls them "***tyrannoktonoi***")[3].

The causes of change in 'real life' are often most clearly observed in retrospect, hindsight giving weight to past events, apparently insignificant at the time, which now appear to point to the conclusion that a change was inevitable (if unforeseen). Gruen has rightly noted that the ancient historian's privileged knowledge of what was still an unknown future for those living through the late Republic, similarly colours his/her perception of that period. There is clearly an extent to which this thesis is interested in attempting to explain, from the presentation of evidence about the late Republic, how the monarchical regime of the Augustan principate could have come into being; indeed, since the 'Fall of the Republic' occurred when Roman political thought was evolving under Greek influence, it is tempting to attribute to that influence the 'constitutional' change[4]. However, as has already been noted in the case of Caesar's murderers, the Greek impact on Rome was as evident amongst the opponents of monarchy as amongst its proponents. Moreover, the fact that this thesis pursues the influence of Greek images of monarchy on Rome only as far as the death of Augustus was determined by the time limits imposed on its composition, rather than on the belief that the 'reign' of Augustus represented a real end-point. More will be said below about future areas of research, but it is sufficient here to note that it was originally hoped to trace the influence of Greek ideas about rulership well beyond A.D. 14, to permit treatment of Trajanic and Severan ***imitatio Alexandri*** for example[5].

The idea that Roman art was indebted to Greek models (many of which were themselves already on display in the city of Rome) was understood by Pliny, and the nature and extent of that indebtedness (e.g. Atticism vs. Asianism, the acceptability of nudity in portraiture, etc) have continued to interest those studying Roman art[6]. Similarly the evident Greek influences on Roman rhetoric (e.g. Cicero's Philippics), philosophy (from the De Rerum

Natura to the Paradoxa Stoicorum), and literature (from Plautine Comedy to Vergilian Epic) have long been accepted[7]. However the associations between these intellectual and aesthetic interactions and the 'event history' of Rome are too rarely drawn and, given the continuing compartmentalisation of ancient history (into studies of Classical Greece, the Hellenistic World, the Roman Republic, Augustan Rome, and so on) it has been difficult to trace the development, movement, acculturation and influence of Greek ideas about rulership over the 350 year period between the deaths of Philip II of Macedon and Augustus, Rome's first emperor.

Mason Hammond's article (Hellenistic influences on the structure of the Augustan Principate, published as long ago as 1940), collected several instances of similarity between the institutions of the Hellenistic kingdoms and of Augustan Rome, arguing that these instances suggested borrowing (rather than independent development) and speaking of "continuity between the civilisations of Greece and Rome". His conclusion that the postulated borrowing of institutions, increased the likelihood that Augustus acted under the influence of Hellenistic and Greek thought may be criticised on three fronts. First, it separates thought from action. Secondly it appears to ignore the influence of Hellenistic and Greek thought on Augustus' contemporaries. More fundamentally however, it also appears to ignore the centuries of Greek influence on Rome and its institutions before Augustus' lifetime. Nevertheless, the structural parallels noted by Hammond (in legislation and administration, in ruler cult, public honours, and nomenclature, and in architecture), remain stimulating. With relation to the first of the three monarchical themes pursued in the fourth chapter of this thesis (the creation of a dynasty), Hammond notes that there were Hellenistic precedents both for the renaming of months (July and August), and for the public celebration of the ruler's birthdate (and those of important family members)[8]. The second two themes from the fourth chapter (the virtues of Augustus and his heirs, and the acquisition and maintenance of an Alexandrine world-empire) are too far removed from

Hammond's pre-occupation with institutions to figure in his assessment of the Hellenistic influences on the Augustan regime.

It has already been noted that, once emperor, Tiberius began to be represented as a tyrant, an image far from undercut by his eventual withdrawal to the seclusion of Capri, following his departure from the city in 26 A.D[9]. This withdrawal was quite different from the earlier retirements (from active campaigning) of Augustus and Tiberius; the active civilian life of old age, recommended by Cicero's Cato, had been embraced by both men in their sixth decades, a fact probably to be connected with the late Republican criticism of men like Pompey and Crassus who had continued to campaign abroad well into their fifties (see above chapter three). Whilst Augustus appears to have travelled to the provinces as late as 8 B.C., it is clear that his step-sons had been the field commanders in the West since 16 B.C. and Tiberius' first triumph appears to have marked the opening of a more civilian urban life for Augustus, not far removed from the ideal of a Ciceronian ***rector*** (see above chapter three). Indeed there is no evidence that Augustus ever left Italy again, despite the onset of the wars in East and West that followed Tiberius' withdrawal to Rhodes, when Gaius Caesar was still a teenager[10].

The extraordinary recall of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus to public service in Illyricum and Germany (more than a decade after he had been consul), may have been intended to give Gaius some further military and leadership experience prior to the consulship that had been allotted to him (A.D. 1) whilst allowing Augustus to remain at Rome. Domitius' command, as has been noted, appears to have ended before the German revolt of A.D. 1, and it may be that he had subsequently been entrusted with the military training of Lucius Caesar (in the months before the latter's death); with the German revolt still raging, Spain (Lucius' destination) may have been considered a comparatively safe region for such training[11]. Following the adoptions of A.D. 4, Tiberius temporarily resumed his position as Augustus' deputy in the field. Although it was probably intended that Germanicus

would succeed him in this 'post' as early as A.D. 9 (when Tiberius was still some years off becoming a "***senex***" to Augustus' "***senior***"), the defeat of Varus entailed the postponement of the changeover for three years. After his Pannonian and Dalmatian triumphs Tiberius, as has already been noted, never undertook a further campaign[12].

Tacitus, living in an era when emperors like Trajan continued to lead armies in person well beyond this age, appears to have supposed that Tiberius was behaving oddly in sending Germanicus and Drusus to quell the mutinies which had marked his accession, rather than attending in person; Suetonius notes that Tiberius as emperor repeatedly announced his intention to tour the provinces during his reign, and Tacitus similarly claims that the dissembling Tiberius pretended for some time to be on the point of departure for either the German or Pannonian legions, whilst having no intention of leaving the city. In A.D. 88 Domitian (in his late thirties), faced with the similar choice of combatting either the nearest or the most serious threat (Saturninus' German rising or the defence of Pannonia from Iazyges, Marcomanni and Quadi) is said by the younger Pliny to have remained "***iners***" and his vacillation may have coloured Tacitus' account of Tiberius[13]. In fact, having retired from military life equipped with the ***auctoritas*** of a triple triumphator, the Augustan plan appears to have been for Tiberius to grow accustomed to civil duties in the run-up to his accession; his was to be a civilian principate, Germanicus and Drusus undertaking any wars that might occur[14].

This division of labour associated the conduct of war with Alexandrine youths, a comparison all too easily made for Germanicus following his untimely death in the East (in A.D. 19)[15]. The death of Tiberius' son Drusus four years later shattered the Augustan succession plans by eliminating the intermediate generation of successors, leaving only the still teenage Nero Caesar, his younger siblings Drusus Caesar (II) and Gaius (Caligula), and the twin sons of Drusus, still in their infancy. Germanicus' younger brother Claudius was irrelevant at this stage. Tiberius was already relying on the middle-aged Sejanus as a

"***socius laborum***" in the city of Rome, and even if Sejanus and Livilla were innocent of Drusus' murder there appears to be no doubt that there was talk of their subsequent marriage in the year before Tiberius' departure for Campania and Capri[16].

As for the sons of Germanicus, little effort appears to have been made to give them military leadership experience and Sejanus (increasingly the "***autokrator***" to Tiberius' "***nesiarch***"), himself a soldier, may have feared that they would win the loyalty of the legions, and the favour of the populace by achieving something worthy of a triumph; after all, Tiberius' reign had opened with the revolt of the legions stationed in Germany who hoped to replace Tiberius with Germanicus as the new "***dux***" for the new "***status***". The brief career of the 'false Drusus' in Greece and Asia, ended before he could reach the Syrian legions once commanded by his supposed father (Germanicus), but the fact that the legions were his destination suggests that they were likely to accept him[17]. The death of an Armenian king prompted a Parthian invasion in the mid-thirties A.D., but there appears to have been no idea of sending Germanicus' son Gaius, who had escaped the fate of his older brothers, to fulfil the role once played by his father (in A.D. 18), by his maternal uncle (Gaius Caesar) after A.D. 1, and by his adopted grandfather (Tiberius himself) two decades before that[18].

The German, and projected British, campaigns of the emperor Gaius (Caligula) seem partially to be explained by the desire to prove his capabilities, that opportunity having been denied him under Tiberius, despite the upbringing in camp which had earned him his nickname; even if untrue, the allegations that he boasted of the defeat of Gallo-Graecia having confirmed death sentences on a mixed batch of prisoners, or received the titles Britannicus and Germanicus for his sexual conquests, suggest that his lack of military conquests was significant[19]. Claudius' more successful attempt at conquest beyond the boundary of Ocean seems similarly to reflect the need for a significant military achievement as justification of his authority, although his participation in the conquest was

more symbolic than practical; the fact that Claudius was already in his fifties should be noted[20]. Nero was still only seventeen on his accession, but despite the recruitment of 'The Phalanx of Alexander the Great' in apparent preparation for a campaign of Eastern conquest, he appears to have gained no military experience; despite the submission of Tiridates at Rome in A.D. 66, the first closure of Janus' gates of war since Augustus' lifetime (RIC *Nero* 44 & 159-204), and the erection of victory monuments representing him in a triumphal quadriga, Nero would have been justified in fearing the legions' enthusiasm for commanders like Galba, Vitellius and Vespasian. It should be noted that Dio rationalised the death sentence passed on Lentulus Gaetulicus, back in A.D. 39 (by Gaius Caligula), as a punishment for his popularity with the troops[21].

One aspect of Tiberius' principate that appears to have excited the interest of Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio was the, apparently novel, imposition of controls on the manufacture and use of ruler portraits; Augustus had forbidden the multiplication of his portraits in the city of Rome and even boasted of dismantling eighty silver portraits of himself, so that he could dedicate in the names of their dedicators golden offerings for Apollo, but Dio claims that Tiberius forbade all communities and individuals the erection of "***eikones***" representing himself without his express permission[22]. Whilst Suetonius suggests that Tiberius may have had in mind only the display of his portrait amongst those of gods, Dio notes elsewhere that Tiberius even forced the Augusta to submit proposals for erecting in her own house a statue of Divus Augustus, and Tacitus similarly notes that Tiberius took offence when his mother named him as the secondary dedicator of a similar statue near the theatre of Marcellus[23]. The introduction of ***maiestas*** legislation ensuring the protection of the portraits of Divus Augustus does not seem to copy any Augustan legislation protecting Divus Julius, and was represented by the younger Pliny as a tyrant's tool for increasing the populace's fear. Tacitus appears to suggest that the appearance of cases involving alleged offences against Divus Augustus' images in the immediate aftermath of the legislation surprised Tiberius, but Dio has Tiberius claim that the tendency of his subjects to bring

such charges against their fellows was one reason for restricting the proliferation of his own portraits. A certain Falanius was charged with selling a statue of Augustus as if it was a garden ornament, and Marcellus (governor of Bithynia) was said to have removed the head of Augustus from one statue, replacing it with a head of Tiberius; these had not been the only charges against either man, but both were acquitted. No dates are given by Suetonius for the convictions of those who had beaten slaves or changed their clothes in the presence of a statue of Divus Augustus, or carried Augustus' portrait on a ring or coin into a brothel or privy. As late as A.D. 22 however, Tiberius was unprepared to sanction the prosecution of a man who had melted down for tableware a silver "***effigies principis***"[24].

The existence of almost certainly unauthorised portraits of Tiberius is further implied by Tacitus' story that persons of bad character had been abusing their 'betters' with impunity because their slanders had issued forth when they were clutching portraits of Tiberius, an apparent example of the sanctuary rights noted later with regard to a Cretan portrait of Augustus; similarly portable portraits of Agrippina and her son Nero Caesar appear to have been available to the crowds (of non-senators) protesting the pair's innocence following a letter of denunciation from Tiberius in A.D. 29. Ovid's apparent acquisition, at Tomoi, of small-scale portraits of the imperial family has already been noted; the fact that he paid (at least) lip service to the idea that the family's "***numina***" were immanently present in the representations was not[25]. It is probable that both painted board and statuette representations of the emperor and his family had been on sale in the city since at least the late Augustan period, but it is unclear whether the ubiquity of their display (as tokens of loyalty and affection), noted by Fronto, was already apparent[26].

According to Suetonius, Gaius ordered the smashing of the statues of the Republican heroes removed by Augustus from the Capitol to the Campus Martius. It is further suggested that this imperial jealousy might have led to the removal from the libraries of

busts representing Vergil and Livy, and Suetonius also claims that portraits of no living person could be established without his permission[27]. Dio adds that, having forbidden others to create portraits of him, Gaius established them himself; this is not, in itself, as inconsistent a policy with regard to ruler portraits as Dio seems to suggest, but it should be noted that the ones eventually made are termed "***agalmata***" (cult-statues). Suetonius and Dio report the importation of Greek statues of divinities to be displayed after their heads had been remodelled to represent the emperor's portrait features, and the former notes a temple to his divinity in the city of Rome[28]. Claudius' contrasting moderation in allowing to be erected only one silver "***eikon***", and two "***andriantes***" (one each in bronze and marble) interested Dio, who suggests that Claudius not only thought that the cost of more widespread manufacture was too great for the city to bear, but worried about where any more were to be located in the already overcrowded city (a problem solved by the Neronian fires, whether started deliberately or not)[29].

Certainly Nero and his subjects appear to have experienced little difficulty siting the seemingly plentiful statues of him (from the presumably solar Colossus in his enlarged palace, to the Apolline representations of the lyre-playing emperor, and the triumphator portrait on the arch of Nero), and his wives; perhaps the iconoclasm associated with the civil wars again cleared the ground as it is Domitian who is said to have earned the punning graffito "***arcei***" (enough) with respect to his numerous triumphal arches[30]. Dio's mention of a, presumably vast, embroidered portrait of Nero in the (solar?) chariot, displayed on the occasion of Tiridates' presentation in the theatre, should also be noted[31]. Tacitus' claim that Nero had been trained in painting and sculpture, as well as singing and composition, may mean nothing more than that he received the Greek education of Plutarch's Scipio Aemilianus, or of Tacitus' younger contemporary Hadrian; certainly Pliny does not seem to have thought that the training improved Nero's aesthetic sensibilities in the case of the Lysippan statue of Alexander which he "***inaurari iussit***"[32].

These summaries of our sources' evidence for Julio-Claudian developments in rulership, and its representation in art, underline the point that Greek images of monarchy continued to affect the evolution of thought and behaviour at Rome beyond A.D. 14. Inasmuch as these developments entailed departures from the thoughts and actions of the past, some knowledge of them helps define what was peculiarly 'Augustan'. Inasmuch as these developments built on those of the Augustan and Republican past, the history of interaction presented in this thesis is essential contextualisation for a yet to be written history of post-Augustan responses to Greek images of monarchy. Such a history could offer new perspectives on the stories told about an emperor like Gaius. He was supposed to have considered realising Plato's Republic by banning Homer from his city, and to have suggested (in language dependent on Plato's Politicus) that the herdsman of mankind had to be as superior to his flock as the shepherd to his sheep. Borrowing from Xerxes the idea of converting sea into land, he was said to have arranged for a bridge of boats to cross the bay at Puteoli and then, wearing Alexander's breastplate, to have made a speech mocking the Persian king's bridging of the (narrower) Hellespont. At a conference with allied kings he is thought to have considered adopting the diadem. Finally, having been represented appropriating the tyrannical language of Atreus ('let them hate me so long as they fear me'), his (inevitable) assassination was linked with that of Philip II of Macedon by the performance of the tragedy of Cinyras[33].

As has already been noted occurrences of apparent ***imitatio Alexandri*** deserve to be studied in context. In the case of Trajan (for example) this means not only the consideration of the 'event-history' of his reign, but understanding the changing relationship between emperors and the armies since Augustus, and the increasing interest of Roman artists in representing not only that relationship (from the '***Adlocutio***' coins of Gaius to Trajan's column and the Great Trajanic frieze), but the struggle of war (rather than, or in addition to, victory and triumph), and the subjection of the defeated adversary. The praises and condemnations of Alexander in Curtius, Seneca, Dio Chrysostom and

Tacitus should be noted, and attention paid to the interest of later writers in Trajan and Alexander (from Fronto and 'Lampridius', to Arrian and Julian)[34]. The existence of the miniature ivory reliefs from Ephesus, understood as representing Trajan's campaigns, should raise broader questions not only about the relationship between monumental and domestic art, but also the relationship between the art of the capital and the art of the Greek East (do 'Greek' images of Roman monarchy differ from 'Roman' images of Roman monarchy executed, often by Greek artists, for Roman clients living in a society with at least three hundred years of acquaintance with Greek images of monarchy?). As Kleiner suggests, the Athenian Philopappos monument offers the opportunity to consider the extent to which 'Greek' images of Greek kingship depend on 'Roman' images (such as representations of triumphal processions). The Adamklissi monument permits the posing of similar questions about the relationship between the art of the centre (principally Trajan's Forum) and that produced by military artists in the century after the Augustan disjunction hypothesised above[35]. Within half a century of Trajan's death we know that apparently eyewitness pictures of Lucius Verus' Eastern campaigns were sufficiently portable to be despatched to Rome (should Fronto have requested them)[36].

The interest of artists in representing the emperor's generosity towards the citizens of Rome or inhabitants of Italy (and even the empire), from Nero's ***Annona*** and ***Congiarium*** coins onwards (RRC 73-87, & 109-126), should also be studied as evidence for changing priorities of rulership[37]. The continuing production of Greek literature on the subject of ideal rulership from Philo's Moses to Synesius' address to (the Byzantine emperor) Arcadius, and the development of Roman imperial panegyric deserves further scrutiny, not only in the context of the 'event-history' of the period but the changing interests of artists in representing the ruler; what, for example, may have linked Dio Chrysostom's suggestion that the good king makes hunting his recreation and the Hadrianic interest in hunting revealed by the ***tondi*** reused on the Arch of Constantine?. One might also ask how the

Greek philosophy of Marcus Aurelius affected his rulership, and its representation in artworks such as the Column at Rome or 'crustulum moulds'[38].

It is hoped that this present study of the influence of Greek images of monarchy on Rome in the Republican and Augustan periods has shown the benefits of interdisciplinary and multi-period approaches to ancient historical research. It is not only the completion of the remaining areas of research into the influence of Greek images of monarchy on Roman rulership (outlined above) that could benefit from the application of these approaches. Here they have permitted the observation of long term change, not only in the ways the inhabitants of Rome thought about rulership, but in the ways they sought to rule and be ruled. If Augustus, the first emperor of Rome, was neither Alexander the Great, nor Darius (the Great King), nor Xenophon's Cyrus, nor Plato's philosopher-king, this study has demonstrated that he and his contemporaries were influenced, wittingly and unwittingly, by these real and imagined figures of fourth century history and art, fiction, and political philosophy.