

# CAESAR'S HERITAGE: HELLENISTIC KINGS AND THEIR ROMAN EQUALS

By ELIZABETH RAWSON

## I. CAESAR'S INTENTIONS

In 44 B.C. Caesar, newly declared *dictator perpetuo*, told a crowd hailing him half-heartedly as king that they were mistaken: he was 'not Rex but Caesar'; but he punished the tribunes who removed the diadems placed on his statues, and who arrested a man for putting them there. Not long after, at the Lupercalia, the consul Mark Antony thrice offered a diadem to Caesar, who was sitting, as Cicero, doubtless an eye-witness, describes him, 'amictus toga purpurea, in sella aurea, coronatus';<sup>1</sup> Caesar refused it, sending it to Jupiter on the Capitol, and had inscribed in the *Fasti* a notice that he had been offered the diadem *populi iussu* (which was certainly not true), but had not accepted it.<sup>2</sup> But would he have accepted had the people been more enthusiastic? Thus began a controversy as to Caesar's final intentions that has still not been resolved. I have no dogmatic answer to the question, and I do not wish to go through all the old arguments,<sup>3</sup> though I would like to suggest that there is good contemporary evidence for believing that Caesar was willing to be worshipped as a god, but did not wish to take the name of king; and I would also like to suggest that there might have been more logic than appears at first sight in accepting a number of honours that suggested kingship (as well as divinity, which so often in the East went with it), and yet refusing the name. For on the usual interpretations of Caesar's last actions we are in a dilemma: if he simply wanted to avoid the name of king and the hatred which, as a practical proposition at least, it still aroused in Rome, then he did, or permitted, a lot of incredibly foolish things. On the other hand, if he simply wanted to take the title, he was, as events were to show, very shortsighted—and indeed some scholars have supposed him suffering from megalomania or senility.<sup>4</sup> But it is conceivable that the dilemma is a false one; that, though our sources do not explicitly indicate it, there was a third possibility: that Caesar stressed his descent from Alban kings,<sup>5</sup> allowed his statue to be placed beside those of the kings of Rome,<sup>6</sup> made much of associations with Romulus/Quirinus,<sup>7</sup> above all dressed in the triumphal toga<sup>8</sup> and sat in an ivory or even a golden chair with a wreath of gold<sup>9</sup>—the insignia of ancient Etruscan royalty—not in order to prepare the way for taking a name still loathed both by the people and the old aristocracy, and associated with *crudelitas*, a quality he was still firmly eschewing;<sup>10</sup> but in order to claim, or because these things were not incompatible with the claim, which had deep roots in the Roman past, that he did not need the name of king, for he had the essence: he was the Roman descendant of kings, who was also consul, *imperator*,<sup>11</sup> above all *triumphator* and, reuniting the powers split and delimited in time at the beginning of the Republic, *dictator perpetuo*.

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *Phil.* ii, 85.

<sup>2</sup> M. Gelzer, *Caesar* (English trans., 1968), 321, n. 2, might imply that Antony gave the order, but Cicero, *Phil.* ii, 87 would probably have said not 'iussit' but 'iussisti' if so; Dio xlv, 11, 3 explicitly attributes it to Caesar.

<sup>3</sup> G. Dobesch, *Caesars Apotheose zu Lebzeiten und sein Ringen um den Königstitel* (1966), lists the extensive and inconclusive bibliography on both sides of the question up to that date.

<sup>4</sup> See esp. J. H. Collins, 'Caesar and the Corruption of Power', *Historia* iv (1955), 445 and the earlier writers there mentioned.

<sup>5</sup> S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971), 324 thinks Caesar had been made *dictator Albanus* (direct successor of the *rex Albanus*) by the Senate; this would make his wearing of the red boots of the Alban Kings less provocative? (Dio xliii, 43, 2).

<sup>6</sup> Cicero, *pro Deiot.* 33; Suet., *DJ* 76, 1; Dio xliii, 45, 3-4: but this was also beside the statue of L. Brutus, and possibly only involved a claim to be liberator and refounder of the city.

<sup>7</sup> Cicero, *ad A.* xii, 45, 2; xiii, 28, 3; Dio, *ib.* See

W. Burkert, 'Caesar und Romulus/Quirinus', *Historia* xi (1962), 356.

<sup>8</sup> Dio xliii, 43, 1; xlv, 4, 2; 11, 2.

<sup>9</sup> It is probable, though not absolutely certain, from the later sources, Dio xlv, 6, 1-3 and DH v, 35 (see below, p. 155), that Caesar and his contemporaries regarded the gold crown, like the rest of the triumphal dress, as part of the Etruscan royal insignia. See K. Kraft, 'Der goldene Kranz Caesars und der Kampf um die Entlarvung des "Tyrannen"', *Jahrb. f. Numism. d. Bayer. Numism. Gesellsch.* (1953), 7, with R. A. G. Carson, *Gnomon* (1956), 181. (Carson also rightly rejects Alföldi's idea that a Greek-style diadem is visible behind Caesar's head on a coin issued in his lifetime.)

<sup>10</sup> See the vote in early 44 of a temple to Caesar and his *Clementia* (or just the latter? Dio xlv, 4, 5; 6, 4; Appian, *BC* ii, 106); also what Dio says on his omitting to persecute Cassius and others who voted against these honours, xlv, 8, 1.

<sup>11</sup> For his use of this title, R. Syme, 'Imperator Caesar, a study in Nomenclature', *Historia* vii (1958), 172; R. Combès, *Imperator* (1966), 123.

These titles, as we shall see, both evoked and outdid kingship. 'I am not Rex but Caesar', indeed. Why should he have wanted to be king? What he *said* he wanted was, according to Suetonius, the *gloriam recusandi*.<sup>12</sup> It was hardly, in the circumstances, a *gran rifiuto*; but, after all, the elder Scipio Africanus, who was probably already being seen as a prototype or parallel to Caesar, had notoriously had such glory.<sup>13</sup> This then is perhaps what he hoped to gain at the Lupercalia, surely intending to tie his hands for the future (though this has been denied by some scholars) by the inscription in the *Fasti*.

If this is right, Caesar, as we shall find, was pursuing a very narrow path between two views; on the one hand, there was the Greek belief, now familiar in Rome, that a king was a supremely good ruler, the diametrical opposite of a tyrant, together with the popular Roman notion that kings were immensely wealthy, powerful and grand, and the surprisingly favourable memory of most of Rome's own kings; on the other hand, there was the idea—both Greek and Roman—that kings and liberty were irreconcilable, and kings above all associated with cruelty. He was, of course, misunderstood, or deliberately misrepresented. Even if this view of Caesar's intentions is not accepted, some demonstration of the extreme ambiguity and complexity of attitudes to kingship in Rome in the hundred and fifty years or so before Caesar's death will be relevant to the way in which he and others at the time may have understood a proposal that he should take the royal title.

The contemporary witness for Caesar's intentions is, of course, Cicero. As far as Caesar the god is concerned, *Philippics* ii, 110 is surely conclusive: 'quem is honorem maiorem consecutus erat quam ut haberet pulvinar, simulacrum, fastigium, flaminem? est ergo flamen ut Iovi, ut Marti, ut Quirino, sic divo Iulio M. Antonius?' The tenses ensure that Cicero is talking of Caesar's life-time. Even the sceptics concede that this is a difficult passage to get round; <sup>14</sup> I should have thought it impossible. It is hard to understand what Adcock (followed by too many English scholars) meant when he wrote in *CAH* IX, 718 that 'the appointment of a *flamen* in his lifetime may be in Caesar's honour, like that of the Luperco Iulii, rather than for his worship'. 'Ut Iovi'? And what of the *pulvinar*?

As for Caesar the King, Cicero is less conclusive, but very suggestive. He gives no sign at all that Caesar was really thinking of taking the title *rex*; and he had no motive whatsoever to whitewash the tyrant, indeed very much the reverse. The most impressive of many passages seems to me to be *de off.* iii, 83: 'qui rex populi Romani dominusque omnium gentium esse concupiverit, idque perfecerat'. 'Idque perfecerat': the wording would be extraordinarily clumsy if what Cicero believed, or for that matter expected his readers to believe, was that of course Caesar, though at the time of his death *rex* in the broad sense familiar from political invective, had not yet achieved literal kingship, but was anxiously working for it. The use of *rex* and *dominus* would be even odder if Cicero took seriously the rumour that Caesar was to be called king in the provinces alone. In fact he considered quite untrue—'falsa quadam hominum fama'—the story that on the Ides L. Cotta was to propose on the basis of a Sibylline Oracle that 'quem re vera regem habebamus, appellandum quoque esse regem, si salvi esse vellemus'.<sup>15</sup> Cicero knew Cotta

<sup>12</sup> Suetonius, *Dŷ* 79, 1.

<sup>13</sup> Caesar's close friend and agent, Oppius, wrote (perhaps after Caesar's death) *de vita prioris Africani* (Peter, *HRR* II, 46). His other biographies, on Caesar himself, and Cassius, were clearly propagandistic. The life of Africanus was certainly eulogistic, stressing the sign portending his birth (or indeed his divine parentage?) and his close connection with Jupiter. Comparison with Caesar has often been thought likely.

Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.* 2, 502 argued that Livy xxxviii, 56 is based on a bogus speech of the elder T. Gracchus in which Scipio was tacitly contrasted with Caesar—he is said to have reproached the people for wishing to make him consul or dictator in perpetuity, and to have refused statues in the Forum, Curia and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and the right that 'imago sua triumphali ornata e templo Iovis optimi maximi exiret'. Various dates for the forgery have been suggested (one view prefers Sulla

to Caesar), but Mommsen's theory still seems likely, and would imply that Caesar and Scipio were easily thought of together.

<sup>14</sup> R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939), 54; numerous continental and American scholars stress that the Cicero passage is final, e.g. J. Carcopino, *Les Étapes de l'Impérialisme romain* (1961), 148; L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (1931), 239; V. Ehrenberg, 'Caesar's Final Aims', *HSCP* lxxviii (1964), 149.

H. Gesche, *Die Vergottung Caesars* (1968) does not persuade me that the cult was only to come into operation posthumously. This is hardly the natural way to take Cicero or Dio, and it would be odd to go so far as to select a priest who after all might (however young and strong) die before his proposed object of worship became available. It is true that Antony had not been inaugurated *flamen* by the Ides.

<sup>15</sup> *De div.* ii, 110.

well, and knew also that on the one hand, as a relation of Caesar's he would not be trying to raise odium against him, but that on the other, as a moderate optimate who had disapproved strongly of Cicero's own exile, he was unlikely to become an extreme Caesarian in old age. (Those who put the rumour about were presumably thinking of Caesar, on his way to Parthia, as another Alexander, who had been βασιλεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας,<sup>16</sup> less probably of the Roman and Parthian Empires as in some way equal and parallel, for this was surely not a conception that was yet widely or seriously held.<sup>17</sup> In fact for many years yet the Romans were to suppose that they could eliminate the Parthian like other Eastern kings, and it was not to be till Augustus' time that the equality of the two powers was accepted and began to be enshrined in elaborate protocol.) What Cicero perhaps does show, here and in the passage of the *Philippics* where he says that Antony's offer of the diadem made him the true murderer of Caesar, is that the rumours that kingship was in the offing may really have spurred on the conspirators.<sup>18</sup>

Elsewhere Cicero uses the word *rex* of Caesar a number of times, always definitely in the general sense of a despotic ruler (*tyrannus* or *dominus*, as he also calls him) without any suggestion that this might be ambiguous. More precisely he says that Caesar held 'dictaturam, quae iam vim regiae potestatis obsederat'; he had said as much of Sulla.<sup>19</sup> All these passages would be odd if he or his readers believed Caesar to have been intending to become a real *rex*. What Cicero thought is not necessarily so; but he knew what other people at this time thought—he was in close touch with many Caesarians, notably Hirtius and Pansa, and in even closer touch with the Liberators. And he understood the Roman political tradition, as some in his own day, and certainly later writers, did not. It looks as if responsible opinion in the Senate, at least after the murder, discounted entirely the rumours that had been flying about before the Ides.

Other evidence does not help; Matius' words 'si ille tali ingenio exitum non reperiebat'<sup>20</sup> ought not to be pressed—obviously Caesar had not found a way out. If Brutus put a Victory breaking a sceptre, with torn diadem, on one of his coins,<sup>21</sup> that might only show that a diadem could symbolise *regnum* in the vague sense, as it seems to have done in 53 B.C. to the moneyer Messala, who, in showing a curule chair above a sceptre and (probably) a diadem, with the inscription PATRE COS, is perhaps referring to the defeat of Pompey's plans for a dictatorship by the election of his father and a colleague to the consulship.<sup>22</sup> No one supposes that Pompey or his friends were suggesting that a real king should take power.

## 2. THE HELLENISTIC KINGS AND ROME

We must now go back nearly two hundred years. When republican Rome first came into contact with the Hellenistic monarchies, she had, as is generally realized, a reputation for hostility to kings. Her insistence on freeing Greece from Philip of Macedon made a vast impression, and the Scipiones had to write to Prusias of Bithynia to counteract the propaganda of Antiochus by explaining that the Romans had in fact on several occasions supported monarchies—in Illyria, Spain and Africa—and had indeed been lenient to Philip as well.<sup>23</sup> Senatorial policy did later, for various reasons, become more conciliatory; but Perseus, if we may trust a probably Polybian notice in Livy, tried to get support from Eumenes of Pergamum and Antiochus of Syria on the grounds that kings and free states

<sup>16</sup> See now O. Weippert, *Alexander-imitatio u. römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit*, Diss. Augsburg (1972), 171.

<sup>17</sup> K.-H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich* (1964), 37 f.

<sup>18</sup> *Phil.* ii, 85 (pace J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'The Ides of March', *Historia* vii (1958), 80).

<sup>19</sup> *Phil.* i, 3; see below, p. 157.

<sup>20</sup> Cicero, *ad A.* xiv, 1. 1. But note Cicero to Matius, *ad f.* xi, 27, 8: 'si Caesar rex fuerit, quod mihi quidem videtur.'

<sup>21</sup> Crawford, *Coinage of the Roman Republic* (1974), 507/2. If L. R. Taylor, 'Varro's *de Gente Populi Romani*', *C. Phil.* xxix (1934), 221 is right, this work

was written in 43 or 42 and in its stress on ancient kings worshipped for their benefactions was supporting Octavian's insistence on Caesar's divinity—but not, n.b., on his kingship.

<sup>22</sup> Crawford, *CRR*, 435/1; J. W. Salomonsen, 'De Afspiegeling van een politiek conflict op Romeinse denarien uit het jaar 53 voor Chr.', *Jaarboek voor Munt- en Penningkunde* xli (1954), 1.

<sup>23</sup> Polybius xxi, 11; Cf. Livy (P) xxxvii, 25, 1-14; Appian, *Syr.* 23. Since Rome had insisted on freeing Cius, which Philip had taken on Prusias' behalf, no wonder he needed reassuring (Polybius xv, 22; xviii, 44).

It is unlikely that Justin xxix, 2, 1 should be

were necessarily enemies, and that the *populus Romanus* was picking off kings one by one—'et quod indignum sit, regum viribus reges oppugnant.'<sup>24</sup> Subsequently, it was true that the Senate did away, or tried to do away, with kings in a number of areas—Macedon itself, Epirus, Cappadocia and Cyrene—and seems to have thought that it was thereby doing the inhabitants a favour.<sup>25</sup>

In Rome itself, expressions of distrust for kingship are found—in some quarters and some moods. Cato notoriously declared, when King Eumenes was being fêted at Rome, that a king was by nature a ζῶον σαρκοφάγον; the worst that he could say of an atrocious deed was that it was more frightful than anything done by a king; and he praised the great figures of republican Greece, Epaminondas, Pericles and Themistocles, together with M. Curius and Hamilear Barca, above any τῶν εὐδαιμονιζομένων βασιλέων.<sup>26</sup> And at one point the Senate announced that it would receive no kings, though according to Polybius this was a mere excuse.<sup>27</sup>

And yet Rome's attitude to kings was already, not surprisingly, deeply ambiguous. Its full ambiguity has not been explored, though scholars have noted of late the numerous favourable references.<sup>28</sup> Some of these were caused by the exigencies of foreign policy; after a long period of friendly co-operation with Hiero of Syracuse, who had assumed the title of king, Rome came to find that her best ally in the East was the kingdom of Pergamum. Even Cato could speak when necessary of a 'rex optimus atque beneficissimus';<sup>29</sup> and his attacks on kingship are clearly deeply polemical, implying the existence of another attitude.

It is also relevant that at this time Hellenistic political and moral philosophy was filtering into Rome; probably by Cato's time at least the Roman constitution had been analysed as a μικτή πολιτεία, with the consuls representing kingship (the fact that Sparta had had two kings, and that the Carthaginian sufetes, two or more in number, were often called βασιλεῖς in Greek made this easy).<sup>30</sup> It must certainly have been widely realized that Greek theory tended to regard the king, as opposed to the tyrant, as a supremely wise and virtuous ruler: Polybius states it as a general belief οὔτε γὰρ πᾶσαν δῆπου μοναρχίαν εὐθέως βασιλείαν ῥητέον, ἀλλὰ μόνην τὴν ἐξ ἐκόντων συγχωρουμένην.<sup>31</sup> The Romans had perhaps never regarded *all* their own kings as bad; but especially when they took over the term *tyrannus*, which is attested from Ennius onwards,<sup>32</sup> it was possible to use *rex* in a neutral, even a favourable sense. To judge by Plautus, what the ordinary man thought of when the word was mentioned was fabulous wealth and fortune, rather than pride and cruelty (or else the *rex* of the parasites, a more or less benevolent patron).<sup>33</sup> At the other end of the intellectual scale, the Stoics of course described the wise man as a king. And it was indeed not only the Romans who were ambivalent about the term: many Greeks were so too, of whom Polybius is an excellent example.<sup>34</sup>

He did not love kings in practice; the Achaean League had a rule that citizens might

right in already putting into the mouth of Demetrius of Illyria (speaking to Philip) a conviction that Rome was at war with all kings, and thought it *nefas* to have one on her frontiers; for what royalties save Pyrrhus and Teuta had they recently fought? For this τόπος, H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom* (1964), 14, 46; L. Castiglione, 'Motivi antiromani nella tradizione storica antica', *Rend. R. Inst. Lomb.* lxi (1928), 623 and in *Atti del I Cong. Naz. di Studi R.* (1929) I, 240.

<sup>24</sup> Livy (P) xlv, 24, 1-6 (but not in Polybius xxix, 4). Cf. Livy xlii, 52, 16: Perseus says the Romans want no kings near them. Similar sentiments attributed to Jugurtha (Sallust, *Jug.* 81. 1) and Mithridates (Justin xxxviii, 7 and Sallust, *Hist.* iv, 69 M, 17). *Maccabees* i, 1-8 knows the Romans have defeated (and raised up) many kings, but none of them claim crown or purple; *Orac. Sib.* iii, 178—Rome puts fear into all kings.

<sup>25</sup> e.g. Macedon and Illyria, Diod. Sic. xxxi, 8; Cappadocia, Justin xxxviii, 2, 7; Strabo xii, 2, 11.

<sup>26</sup> Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 8, 8; *ORF* no. 8 fr. 58.

<sup>27</sup> Polybius xxx, 19.

<sup>28</sup> Especially M. Guia, 'La valutazione della monarchia in età romana', *Stud. Class. e Or.* xvi (1967), 308 and C. J. Classen, 'Die Königszeit im Spiegel der Literatur der römischen Republik', *Historia* xiv (1965), 385. See also L. Wickert, 'Princeps und Βασιλεύς', *Klio* xxxiv (1943), 1.

<sup>29</sup> *ORF* no. 8 fr. 180 (of Ptolemy).

<sup>30</sup> Cato knew Carthage was a mixed constitution, *HRR* Cato fr. 80.

<sup>31</sup> Polybius vi, 4, 2.

<sup>32</sup> Ennius, *Annales* 109 V: 'O Tite tute Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'. Possibly here, as in Greek tragedy, not in a wholly unfavourable sense (cf. Servius, *Aen.* iv, 320).

<sup>33</sup> A Roman usage, Ed. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (1960), 182 f.; so is the use of *rex* to denote the greatest possible might—'si rex opstabit obviam', *Stich.* 287. See Classen, o.c. (n. 28). Wealth, e.g. *Rud.* 931, *Poen.* 671. Terence, *Eum.* 397, a boast of intimacy with royalty, but this could be from the Greek original.

<sup>34</sup> For detail, K. W. Welwei, *Könige und Königtum im Urteil des Polybios*, Diss. Cologne 1963.

not receive presents from kings (τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων ἐναντίαν φύσιν ἔχόντων τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ τοῖς δημοκρατίαις as an Achaean speaker says), and it was in his time on very dubious terms with the Macedonian monarchy in particular; while Polybius himself disliked historians who flattered kings (though one ought to be fair to them) and, like the Romans, found it hard to believe that some people actually wanted to be under the irresponsible rule of princes.<sup>35</sup> These all begin by talking of freedom, but as soon as they have established their power treat those who have trusted them as servants. But he follows the normal usage of his time in regard to, in particular, the word 'kingly'; he is prone, in his rare moments of approval for Philip V or other rulers, to describe their behaviour as 'truly kingly', and he accepts that kingship is the greatest and finest thing at which a man can aim.<sup>36</sup> In Book VI, discussing the cycle of constitutions, he praises primitive kingship, which emerged when force gave way to λογισμός and virtue; such kings were elected for merit, modest and humble.<sup>37</sup>

Thus it is hardly surprising that many Romans felt towards the Eastern monarchs, grand, exotic and sophisticated creatures, rather as many Americans used to feel towards European royalty: a mixture of distaste and conscious superiority on the one hand, and attraction and a hidden inferiority complex on the other. In other words, they were snobs. This is made dramatically clear when Flamininus sends King Amyntander of Athamania to Rome in person to negotiate for a settlement, φαντασίαν δὲ ποιήσοντα καὶ προσδοκίαν διὰ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ὄνομα.<sup>38</sup> If a semi-barbarian petty kinglet could make such an impression in Rome, then Rome was pretty impressionable. Of course the city and the senators also gave a tremendous welcome to King Eumenes in 190/89, and to his royal brothers later on.<sup>39</sup> No wonder Cato grumbled.

But Rome was, increasingly, more powerful than the kings with whom she came into contact. The Senate's envoys are soon to be found ordering them about; Popillius' treatment of Antiochus is only the most striking example.<sup>40</sup> Generals and governors not only administer areas the size of kingdoms, but insist on precedence over the grandest monarchs; Perseus has to cross the river to meet Marcius Philippus, not vice versa.<sup>41</sup> How did the so impressionable Roman nobles acquire the confidence to behave like this? Not only, it seems, through believing like Rousseau in superior republican liberty and virtue; not only by stressing the power and majesty of the Roman state which had given them their commission; but, in addition, by developing ideas that suggested that they were themselves equal to kings, or even, in a sense, *were* kings.

### 3. EQUIVALENTS TO KINGSHIP

Some selected families could actually claim royal descent—Roman of course, unless the Julii were already claiming that their ancestor Ascanius was king of the Latins.<sup>42</sup> The Roman Kings, with the exception of Tarquin the Proud, were as far as we can see all treated favourably by the second-century poets and historians.<sup>43</sup> Most of them were thought of as the εὔρεταί of valued institutions. Ennius describes the lamentations at the death of Romulus (though Cicero notes that he is praised rather as founder than as king);<sup>44</sup> Piso

<sup>35</sup> Polybius xxii, 8; viii, 8; at Carthage the Romans behaved more like a monarch (he does not say king) than πολιτικῆς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς αἰρέσεως, xxxvi, 9, 11.

<sup>36</sup> Philip, xvi, 28, cf. xviii, 33; Perseus, xxv, 3; Attalus, xviii, 41; Antiochus, xxviii, 18; Eumenes, xxxii, 8; Cleomenes, v, 39, 6; Demetrius of Bactria, xi, 39, 9; the friends of Philip and Alexander, viii, 10; it is βασιλικόν to investigate charges carefully, iv, 85, 5; it is a king's part to do good and rule willing subjects, v, 11, 6. But extraordinary that Hiero made himself king without wronging anyone, vii, 8.

<sup>37</sup> vi, 6-7.

<sup>38</sup> id. xviii, 10, 7.

<sup>39</sup> id. xxi, 18; xxiv, 5. Antiochus Epiphanes was treated with great honour by the Senate and *iuventus* when in Rome; all regarded him *pro rege* rather than *pro obside*, Livy xlii, 6, 9.

<sup>40</sup> Justin xxxiv, 3, 2, Popillius refuses Antiochus' kiss (Polybius xxix, 27, his hand) till he has drawn his circle round the king and the latter has given in to Rome's demands.

<sup>41</sup> Livy xlii, 39, 1-6. One may note that kings, Perseus and Genthius, began to be led in triumphs.

<sup>42</sup> *Origo Gentis Romanae* xiv, 5, from L. Julius Caesar, who probably wrote in the 1st century B.C.; but Sex. Caesar put Venus on his coins from c. 130-25, Crawford *CRR* 258/1.

<sup>43</sup> Evidence collected by Classen, o.c. (n. 28): I only refer to some striking examples.

<sup>44</sup> Cicero, *de rep.* i. 64. C. J. Classen, 'Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus', *Historia* xii (1963), 447 discusses the murder of Remus as a motif possibly developed as a political criticism of Romulus and of monarchy as opposed to collegiate rule.

even made him an exemplar of antique sobriety.<sup>45</sup> Numa was to every one the embodiment of peace and piety: nothing σαρκοφάγον about him. Ennius writes of 'bonus Ancus';<sup>46</sup> Servius Tullius was a democratic monarch like Theseus—Accius' *Brutus* itself spoke of 'Tullius qui libertatem populo stabiliverat'.<sup>47</sup> (It is worth noticing in parenthesis that not all Rome's kingly enemies were treated with hostility either; the tradition on King Porsenna seems to have been favourable,<sup>48</sup> while that on King Pyrrhus certainly was.<sup>49</sup>)

It is in the mid-second century that the Marcii Reges first appear, their *cognomen* perhaps proudly declaring, as ancient sources imply, that descent from Ancus Marcius which they were certainly to claim later (and thus also from Numa, as Ancus was supposed to be his daughter's son).<sup>50</sup> It was probably at the time of their greatest prominence, in the early second century, that the Aemilii claimed, or had claimed for them, descent from Numa's son Mamercus Aemylos (said to be named after Pythagoras' son, so the story is probably earlier than the first century B.C., which had sorted out the chronological confusion here).<sup>51</sup> The historian Cn. Gellius, towards the end of the century, denied that Numa had any sons, thus probably attempting to refute the claims of the Pomponii, Pinarii and Calpurnii to descend from the King.<sup>52</sup> From the early first century, most of these genealogies are reflected in the coinage.<sup>53</sup> Other families could not actually manage descent from a king;<sup>54</sup> the best they could do was descent from a close assistant. Thus the Hostilii linked themselves to Romulus' right-hand man Hostius.<sup>55</sup> It is also worth noting that, though it is unlikely that they claimed any blood-relationship with the royal house of Macedon, the Marcii Philippi seem to have used their *cognomen* to establish a well-attested *amicitia hospitiumque* with Philip V (Livy xlii, 38, 8-9 and 39, 2—where Philippus seems to think a Roman Philip quite as good as a Greek one).<sup>56</sup>

But it was not necessary to be descended from one of these families to feel that one was the peer of a king. We have seen how the consuls had been assimilated in Greek theory to kings; and it was of course in all probability the case that they had inherited certain powers, and certain insignia, directly from the Roman kings, though when the idea of their *potestas regia* became conscious and regular among historians and antiquarians we cannot, alas, tell.<sup>57</sup> However, the belief that the death of a Roman king had been followed by an *interregnum* (with the implication that the next king had to be in some way chosen, and that there is some connection with the consuls, since if both die an *interregnum* supervenes here too) is there in fr. 1 of the *Annales Maximi*, though this is not necessarily earlier than the late

<sup>45</sup> HRR Piso fr. 8.

<sup>46</sup> Ennius, *Annales* 149 V.

<sup>47</sup> All the kings save Superbus had statues on the Capitol, carefully restored under the Republic: Pliny, *NH* xxxiv, 22. There was also one of Porsenna. O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* (1941), 83 f.

<sup>48</sup> e.g. Piso fr. 20.

<sup>49</sup> Ennius *Annales* 177 and 194 V (the latter the noble speech about the return of the captives—*nec cauponantes bellum* . . .). Ennius is often thought to have influenced the tradition on Pyrrhus.

<sup>50</sup> De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* i<sup>2</sup> (1956), 350, *pace* Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.* 104, n. 73 and Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien* (1922), 80-1. Claim first explicit in Caesar *ap. Suet. DJ* 6, 1: 'nam ab Anco Marcio sunt Marcii Reges.'

<sup>51</sup> Plutarch, *Numa* 21 (his Mamercii Reges perhaps a confusion with Marcii Reges). Perhaps we should note *Romulus* 2, 3, Aemilia the daughter of Aeneas mother of Romulus, probably from an early Greek source as the confused chronology shows; whether the Aemilii took the story up is unclear.

<sup>52</sup> Plutarch, *Numa* 21; HRR Cn. Gellius fr. 17.

<sup>53</sup> Around 93 B.C. L. Pomponius Molo put Numa, though as priest rather than king, on his coins. C. Marcius Censorinus shows heads of both Numa and Ancus, wearing diadems; later C. Marcius Philippus shows Ancus, and Cn. Calpurnius Piso shows Numa, both with the diadem (Crawford, *CRR* 334/1, 346/1 and 3, 425/1, 446/1).

<sup>54</sup> But observe the introduction to *Anth. Pal.* iii, 19, on the relief set up by Attalus and Eumenes of Pergamum to their mother Apollonis; it showed Romulus and Remus. Their mother is called Servilia. Is this a Greek confusion or did the Servilii (one of the Alban families) claim descent from Ilia and thus the Alban Kings? (Could they have thought Servilia derived from Ilia and that name recalled her Trojan origin? That might explain why the version found favour at Pergamum.)

<sup>55</sup> Münzer, *RE* viii, 2, 2502 is surely right in suggesting that this story was invented during the brief mid-second century prominence of the Hostilii. That they also connected themselves with Tullus Hostilius is made possible by the appearance in 42 B.C. of a tribune designate with the proud name Tullus Hostilius.

<sup>56</sup> Münzer, *RE* xiv, 2, 1536 holds that in origin the cognomen had nothing to do with the kings of Macedon. A. L. Marcius Philippus, moneyer, may even have put a portrait of Philip V on his coins at the end of the 2nd century, Crawford *CRR* 293/1.

<sup>57</sup> M. I. Henderson, 'Potestas Regia', *JRS* xlvii (1957), 82 would put it later than I would. U. Coli, *Regnum* (1958), argues for a gulf between kings and magistrates, but even if some of his arguments hold, what we are concerned with is not what was, but what was thought in the second century to be, the case.

second century; and it has been argued that Polybius also had *interregna* in his *archaeologia*—Walbank thinks them necessary for his chronology and Taeger for his political thought.<sup>58</sup> I would think it very hard not to make a historical connection between kings and consuls, and suspect that the Romans were always aware of it.

But above all it was conquering generals who inevitably treated on equal or superior terms with kings and felt themselves to be their peers or their betters. The best known case is of course that of Scipio Africanus the Elder. In Spain (where he held proconsular imperium, though without having been consul) he probably modelled himself on Alexander (courtesy to captive ladies, etc., unless this is directly from Xenophon's Cyrus; the legend of Africanus' birth was certainly, though perhaps later, modelled on that of Alexander). Polybius notoriously recounts, as, with slight variants, do later sources, that Scipio twice refused the title of king from the Spaniards in 210/9 B.C., saying that they might call him royal if they wished.<sup>59</sup> It has been suggested that this last detail is anachronistic, more typical of the time of Scipio Aemilianus, but it is not certain that this is so. Polybius indeed was impressed by the fact that Scipio did not create for himself a kingdom somewhere in the Mediterranean world; what we should note, however, is the way in which the title of 'king', in the Hellenistic period, not only connoted a ruler's quality rather than his descent, but was very often loosely or not at all connected with a particular people (even less, an area); one was primarily a King, not King of anyone in particular.<sup>60</sup> It was possible then for a Roman to feel that he was 'really' a king, without having a kingdom.

Scipio was certainly later on terms of equal friendship with King Philip, with whom he corresponded, as he did with other kings, such as Prusias. Other members or connections of his family plainly regarded themselves, and were regarded, as equal to royalty. Aemilius Paullus, though in other respects a conservative Roman, put his own statues on the monument prepared for Perseus, used a king's brother as his aide-de-camp on his progress round Greece, and sailed up the Tiber on the Macedonian royal galley.<sup>61</sup> Cornelia, daughter of Africanus and widow of Ti. Gracchus the elder, exchanged presents with many kings and refused the hand of Ptolemy VI;<sup>62</sup> not all Hellenistic kings regularly married royal princesses, but the later Ptolemies all did so. Scipio Aemilianus has sometimes been thought the man in whose surroundings Greek ideas of kingship united at last fully with Roman tradition; his institution of the *cohors praetoria* and the *cohors amicorum* has been seen as based on Hellenistic court precedent, and we know that he studied the *Cyropaedia* (as indeed Roman nobles at least in the first century usually did) learning the lessons of rule from the Persian King.<sup>63</sup>

It was to provincials, not fellow-citizens, that the royal virtues were to be displayed, and rewarded with honours like those heaped on kings. Sometimes, as in Syracuse, governors simply moved in to the former royal palace as their official residence, though even in Rome magistrates did business in buildings called basilicas. Thus when at the end of the second century the *praeco* Granius claimed

non contemnere se et reges odisse superbos

he or Lucilius for him was certainly applying the word to the Roman nobles in whose company he was so outspoken; real kings would hardly come his way.<sup>64</sup> One must doubt if Philodemus, writing περί τοῦ κατ' Ὀμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως for his patron Piso, was as original as Oswyn Murray supposes if he equated kings with Roman nobles.<sup>65</sup>

There were probably more formal institutions that reflected this equation. It has been argued that acclamation as an *imperator* was based on the acclamation of a king by Hellenistic

<sup>58</sup> F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I* (1957), 667.

<sup>59</sup> Polybius x, 38 and 40; see A. Aymard, 'Polybe, Scipion l'Africain et le titre de roi', *Études* (1967), 381.

<sup>60</sup> id., 'Le protocole royal grec', ib. 73.

<sup>61</sup> Polybius xxx, 10; Livy xlv, 27, 7; Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 28 and 30.

<sup>62</sup> Plutarch, *Ti. Gracchus* 1, 4; *C. Gracchus* 19, 2.

<sup>63</sup> G. de Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* IV, iii (1964), 261; K. Münscher, 'Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur', *Philologus* Suppl.-Band xiii, 2 (1920), chap. 3. They doubtless also read

Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, which the young Cicero even translated, and which like so much Greek literature calls the art of managing the household, like that of managing the city, the 'royal' art (21, 11; cf. for example Plato, *Politicus* 259a).

<sup>64</sup> Lucilius 1180 Marx.

<sup>65</sup> O. Murray, 'Philodemus on the Good King according to Homer', *JRS* lv (1965), 178. P. Grimal, 'Le "bon roi" de Philodème et le royauté de César', *REL* xlv (1966), 254 returns to the idea that Caesar is the good king aimed at. L. Wickert, o.c. (n. 28) rightly reminds us of the many differences between republican *principes* and kings.

armies.<sup>66</sup> However this may be, it seems to be the case that the title *imperator* was used at once as a proud contrast, and in a sense as an equivalent, to that of king. Witness the language of Ennius<sup>67</sup> and of Aemilius Paullus on his monument at Delphi;<sup>68</sup> while Pacuvius boldly calls Jupiter *regum imperator*.<sup>69</sup> Alas, we probably should not put much weight on a fragment of Diodorus in which he describes the acclamation of a general by his troops as ἰμπεράτορα, ὃ ἐστὶ βασιλέα: this might be a later addition.<sup>70</sup>

Above all, however, we should notice the gift of the trappings of a *triumphator* to foreign kings. When this became regular is not easy to tell, but doubtless by an early date in the second century B.C. at latest. The first entirely certain case of such a presentation by the Senate is in 160 B.C., when it sent Ariarathes of Cappadocia τὰ μέγιστα τῶν παρ' αὐτῆ νομιζομένων δώρων . . . τὸν τε σκίπωνα καὶ τὸν ἐλεφάντινον δίφρον;<sup>71</sup> but this implies that the custom was an established one. To work backwards, Livy mentions the gift to Eumenes of Pergamum in 172 of the *sella curulis* and *eburneus scipio*, and though the source is annalistic this is probable enough.<sup>72</sup> According to Livy and Appian, Scipio Africanus in Africa had given the same gift to Masinissa; Livy seems to imply that it will be a unique honour, and this might suggest that he thought this was the first example of the practice.<sup>73</sup> It would of course be fascinating to find the equation of king and *triumphator* (if that is what it was) first recognized in Scipio's entourage; but could he have taken so much upon himself? Later, certainly, only the Senate could give these trappings: to Tacitus they are *antiqua patrum munera*.<sup>74</sup> In fact, in Livy xxx, 17 the Senate is said to confirm the gift to Masinissa, and send others, including the complete military outfit of a consul (in 200, Livy xxxi 11, the Senate dispatches triumphal wear to Masinissa again—or more probably this is an alternative version). The earliest case in Livy is almost certainly spurious: in xxvii 4 he records gifts of triumphal wear to Syphax and Ptolemy IV (also *praetextae* to *reguli* in Africa);<sup>75</sup> but Holleaux has cast doubt on this more than dubious embassy of 210 to Ptolemy and 'Cleopatra' (really Arsinoe) to renew *amicitia*:<sup>76</sup> Ptolemy's wife did not share his rule, as Livy's source seems to think, and his account of a female version of the gifts sent to her is doubtful in the extreme.<sup>77</sup>

Now Dionysius of Halicarnassus in Augustus' time certainly regarded such acts as presentation of royal insignia: iii, 61, 3, Tarquin has granted to him by the Senate and People what Romans today give as royal ornaments to kings; v, 35, the Senate gives Porsenna the ivory throne and sceptre, a gold crown (n.b.) and θριαμβικὴν ἐσθῆτα, οἷς οἱ βασιλεῖς ἔκοσμοῦντο. It is hard to believe that it was not so seen from the start (the late third century?), though the annalists speak only of 'the highest honour'. Indeed the custom is often supposed to be based on the occasional Hellenistic bestowal of a diadem and purple.<sup>78</sup> At any rate the magistrate's *sella* could certainly be treated as a royal throne;

<sup>66</sup> Combès, o.c. (n. 11) 61, doubts this; see G. de Sanctis, *Imperator*, *Studi Riccobono* II (1936), 58; D. Kienast, *Imperator*, *ZRG* lxxviii (1961), 403; Aymard, *Études* (1967), 152; E. Bikerman, 'Ἀναδείξις', *Mélanges E. Boisacq* I (1937), 117; S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971), 108.

<sup>67</sup> Ennius, *Annales* 326 Vahlen: 'insece musa manu Romanorum induperator/quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo'; cf. 83 Vahlen, of Romulus and Remus, 'omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator'.

<sup>68</sup> *ILLRP* 323.

<sup>69</sup> Pacuvius, *Periboea* xvi. For Jupiter Imperator see Combès, o.c. (n. 11), 38—the cult may be earlier, but Flamininus' dedication of a statue to him is significant. (Jupiter Rex is not a Roman cult at this time, though the poets naturally often call him thus.) Aymard, o.c. (n. 60) shows how βασιλεύς could be treated as a forename, such as *imperator* notoriously became in the end.

<sup>70</sup> Diod. Sic. xxxvi, 14 (not mentioned by Combès).

<sup>71</sup> Polybius xxxii, 1, 3.

<sup>72</sup> Livy (A) xlii, 14, 10.

<sup>73</sup> Livy xxx, 15, 11–12; Appian, *Lib.* 32, 137. E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (1958), Note M, disbelieves, stressing, surely irrelevantly, the pun with

Scipio's name. The source is Coelius, according to A. Klotz, *Livius u. seine Vorgänger* (1940), 194; G. de Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* III, 2 (1917), 651, perhaps over-optimistically thinks there is some use of Polybius in the chapter. At any rate, the existence of two versions (see below), one possibly Coelius, is some support for acceptance.

<sup>74</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* iv, 26.

<sup>75</sup> Klotz, o.c. (n. 73) 180 thinks this is from Valerius Antias; we need not worry about disbelieving him.

<sup>76</sup> M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce, et les monarchies hellénistiques* (1935), 67.

<sup>77</sup> It is true that, later, minor kings did get just the *praetexta* of the Roman magistrate (Cicero, *ad Q. fr.* ii, 11, 2) and according to Livy Gallic *reguli* only got cavalry equipment (xliii, 5, 18; xliii, 14, 2). It is often supposed that Ariovistus was given triumphal garb (Caesar, *BG* i, 43: 'munera amplissime missa'), but would he qualify? For later cases see S. Weinstock, 'The Image and Chair of Germanicus', *JRS* xlvii (1957), 148 n. 38.

<sup>78</sup> D. Kienast, 'Entstehung und Aufbau des römischen Reiches', *ZRG* lxxxv (1968), 355, accepts this origin (also Masinissa and the king-triumphator equation). See also H. Ritter, *Diadem und Königsherrschaft* (1965), 91, esp. n. 1.



according to Plutarch, Sulla, as a mere proquaestor, ordered three chairs to be set and took the central one between King Ariobarzanes and the ambassador representing the Parthian king (who was subsequently executed for permitting it); according to Valerius Maximus, Pompey called Ariobarzanes king, and made him take a diadem and sit in the general's own *sella*; according to Sallust, only those on whom Rome had bestowed the title of king might place their *sella* beside that of a governor or general.<sup>79</sup>

Non-Romans seem to have accepted the principle that Roman magistrates and kings were equal. One wonders if Antiochus Epiphanes, in adopting the dress of a Roman magistrate, and sitting in a curule chair to hear cases, was not emphasising a parallel he had learnt of while in Rome, rather than just displaying 'democracy' and accessibility run mad, as Polybius supposes.<sup>80</sup> When Roman ambassadors appeared, he gave up his palace and 'almost his diadem' to them; he had troops armed in the Roman fashion and the great procession and games that he held out of rivalry with Aemilius Paullus and his actions in Macedon were probably based, as Polybius' account may suggest, on the Roman triumph.<sup>81</sup> Equally interesting are two cases of highly unofficial assumption of a mixture of royal and magisterial insignia. At the end of the second century, the young *eques*, named either Vettius or Minucius, who raised an ill-considered slave-revolt in Campania, combined the diadem with lictors (and a purple garment and other signs of ἀρχή).<sup>82</sup> Salvius, leader of the slaves in Sicily, on taking the name King Tryphon had lictors, a striped tunic and a purple toga.<sup>83</sup> Vogt holds that this is the triumphal insignia and notes how it points forward to Caesar, but without realising the full background.<sup>84</sup>

So consuls were equal to kings; those hailed as *imperator* were more equal; most equal of all were triumphators. What of the Senate as a whole? We all know the famous tale—that Pyrrhus was told by his envoy Cineas that the Senate was a council of Kings; unfortunately the date and origin of this anecdote cannot be established.<sup>85</sup> Something similar is indirectly implied when Prusias (disgustingly) prostrates himself at the entry to the Curia and hails the senators as θεοὶ σωτῆρες, for few but kings were so addressed.<sup>86</sup> The Senate, according to Polybius, was delighted, as it was when Demetrius claimed<sup>87</sup> that the Senators were his fathers and their sons his brothers.<sup>88</sup>

#### 4. KINGS AND KINGSHIP IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

By the first century B.C. several factors had affected the Roman view of kings. With the rise of the *populares* and then of the great generals, *regnum* and a *rex*, in the common metaphorical, and even, as some asserted, in the literal sense, had become a more present

<sup>79</sup> Plutarch, *Sulla* 5, 4; Val. Max. v, 7, ext. 2; Sallust, *Jug.* 65, 2.

<sup>80</sup> Polybius xxxvi, 1.

<sup>81</sup> Polybius xxx, 25.

<sup>82</sup> Diod. Sic. xxxvi, 2.

<sup>83</sup> *id.* xxxvi, 7, 4, usually thought to be from Posidonius. (Florus ii, 7, 10: 'veste purpurea, argenteoque baculo et regium in morem fronte redimita' is perhaps less accurate.) Salvius is a common slave name and could surely be given to a man from the East.

<sup>84</sup> J. Vogt, *Sklaverei u. Humanität* (1965), 34: 'Tryphon hat seine Monarchie aus hellenistischen und römischen Elementen zusammengestellt, er ist der erste der als Herrscher in einer grossen Gemeinschaft die höchste Magistratur Roms zum Ausdruck des Königtums gemacht hat — eine seltsame Verbindung von Triumphalgewand und Monarchie, die weit in die Ferne auf den Diktator Caesar weisen konnte'. Salvius' model in other respects is sometimes thought to be Diodotus 'Tryphon', the Syrian usurper who rose to power c. 140; he aimed for Roman approval. Could he conceivably have been creating, in Antiochus' footsteps, a kingship with Roman features? Salvius in this case would not simply have been confused.

<sup>85</sup> Plutarch, *Pyrrhus* 19, 5, Appian, *Samm.* 10, 3 (cf. for the individual as potential king, Fabricius in 10, 4: 'I would be preferred as king were I to join you'). Justin xviii, 2, 10: 'respondit regum urbem sibi visum.'

<sup>86</sup> Polybius xxx, 18.

<sup>87</sup> *id.* xxxi, 2.

<sup>88</sup> P. Grimal, *Le Siècle des Scipions* (1953), 142 holds that 'le peuple de Rome apprenait de plus en plus à se considerer comme le "peuple-roi"'. I can find no basis for this conception outside poetry and art: Virgil's *populum late regem* is a very poetic phrase, perhaps merely equivalent to *late regentem* (*Aen.* i, 21). Roma appears with diadem on first century B.C. coins. Greek poetry from Melinno (perhaps 2nd cent. B.C., C. M. Bowra, 'Melinno's Hymn to Rome', *JRS* xlvii (1957), 21) to the Sibylline Oracles can call Rome royal; cf. Horace, *Ep.* i, 7, 44. In the imperial period the conception is much commoner, and τῆ βασιλευσύνη πόλει can even occur in an Imperial letter of the second century, see M. Wörle, 'Aegyptisches Getreide für Ephesos', *Chiron* i (1971), 325, see esp. 329 f.

threat at Rome.<sup>89</sup> Damaging in the extreme was Pompeius' denunciation of Ti. Gracchus as having actually been presented with regal insignia—purple robe and white diadem—by a Pergamene envoy who believed he was to become king in Rome; while it was said that Tiberius' murder was sparked off by a gesture of his that could be interpreted as the demand for a diadem (it is probable though not certain that this was a contemporary charge). Thirty years later, according to Diodorus, a tribune objected to the exotic garb of Battaces, high priest of Comana, when addressing the people, on the grounds that it was too kinglike: he wore a large golden wreath and a robe embroidered with gold.<sup>90</sup> Saturninus may have been represented, doubtless falsely, as welcoming, during the riot in which Memmius was killed, his followers' acclamation of him as king;<sup>91</sup> the sources are late, and may have been affected by the Caesar episode, but one notes the pre-Sullan *ad Herennium* on the possibility of twisting what is meant innocently: 'ut si quis potens ac factiosus in contione dixerit: satius est uti regibus quam uti malis legibus'.<sup>92</sup> The result can be an *atrox suspicio* ('rex' here must mean an actual king). Sulla himself, of course, though there is no real likelihood that he wanted to take the title of king, 'sine dubio habuit regalem potestatem,' as Cicero said; while Appian declared that people called his rule as dictator 'kingship denied and tyranny confessed', a *mot* that depends for its full value on the double sense of the word king—both something to be avoided with horror in Rome, and something vastly superior to tyranny.<sup>93</sup> The re-founder of Rome was thought of as another Romulus, and it may be only now that Romulus came to be regarded as having been, at least at the end of his life, a tyrant.<sup>94</sup> Cicero and Pompey were both to be attacked as the new Romulus; though no-one seriously suggested that Pompey wished to be called king, yet when he wore a bandage on his leg Cato's friend Favonius could jestingly declare that it did not matter where he wore his diadem,<sup>95</sup> and it is, as we saw, possible that a coin of 53 symbolizes his failure to obtain the dictatorship by subordinating sceptre and (perhaps) diadem to the curule chair of the consul Messala.<sup>96</sup>

It is also possible that Roman literature had by now become more interested in the figure of the evil king or tyrant. Tragic playwrights had of course always put kings on the stage, some bad no doubt and some good. If one of Ennius' characters says

nulla sancta societas nec fides regni est,

another harmlessly affirms that the great disadvantage of Kingship is that one cannot weep openly.<sup>97</sup> But though one should not go all the way with Biliński's attempt to reconstruct Accius' politics, it may be true that he was more consistent than his predecessors in stressing the horrors of tyranny: there are several relevant fragments besides his Atreus' famous 'oderint dum metuant'.<sup>98</sup>

In the first century, furthermore, few of the kingdoms of the Hellenistic East survived,

<sup>89</sup> For second-century interest in earlier aspirants to *regnum*, see the fragments of the historians, especially Cassius Hemina and Piso. The latter registers, for 158, the melting down by the censors of a statue supposedly set up to himself by Sp. Cassius, 'qui regnum adfectaverat' (fr. 37; I do not share Mommsen's scepticism, *RF* 2, 153 f.).

<sup>90</sup> Diod. Sic. xxxvi, 13. In Plutarch, *Mar.* 17, 3, the tribune simply calls Battaces ἀγροτινῶν. If Diodorus is right (and he could be influenced by the events of 44) then the gold crown, like that of the *triumphator*, was recognized as royal wear as well as the white diadem of the Greek East.

K. Ziegler, 'L. Caecilius Metellus Diadematus', *Gymnasium* lxxiii (1956), 483 argues that this man was given his nickname (the result of a bandage round his brow) by someone who remembered the story of Ti. Gracchus. But people were generally sensitive about *regnum*, surely, and the power of the Metelli was oppressive—yet glorious.

<sup>91</sup> Florus ii, 4, 4; according to Orosius v, 17, 7: 'ab aliis rex, ab aliis imperator est appellatus'; surely false, for he had no military achievements.

<sup>92</sup> *Ad Her.* ii, 26, 40.

<sup>93</sup> Cicero, *Har. Resp.* 54; Appian, *BC* i, 101.

<sup>94</sup> Note Sallust, *Hist.* i, 55M, 5, 'saevus iste Romulus'. The argument of E. Gabba, 'Studi su Dionigi di Alicarnasso. I: La costituzione di Romolo', *Athenaeum* xxxviii (1960), 175, that Dionysius' picture of Romulus reflects a pamphlet of Sullan date making this identification, is opposed by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'Dionysius on Romulus; a political pamphlet?', *JRS* lxi (1971), 18. Later figures invidiously compared with Romulus: Cicero, *Sall., Inv. in Cic.* 7: 'Romulus Arpinas'; Pompey, *Plut., Pomp.* 25, 4; Catullus 29, addressing 'cinaede Romule', is I think more probably referring to Caesar than the domesticated Pompey ('socer generique' are addressed at the end), but the commentators differ among themselves.

<sup>95</sup> Val. Max. vi, 2, 7.

<sup>96</sup> n. 22.

<sup>97</sup> Ennius, p. 141. 155 (Jocelyn). Naevius, not surprisingly, has a couple of lines in his comedies that might imply hatred of kings: ll. 69–71 Warmington. Or are these already Roman magnates?

<sup>98</sup> B. Biliński, *Accio ed i Gracchi* (1958). Note the choice of *Brutus* as a subject; Cicero, *Phil.* i, 36 for the *Tereus*; Warmington, frs. 25, 217, 269 and, from uncertain plays, 55, 67.

and those that did were not very impressive. The most famous, Syria and Egypt, were both in rapid decline and the prey of action and unrest. The notion that kings were enormously rich can hardly have held by the time that most of them were deeply in debt to Roman financiers and politicians.<sup>99</sup> (Even Polybius had complained that kings were now much meaner than they used to be.)<sup>100</sup> Indeed, after Pompey some kings at least probably paid tribute to Rome.<sup>101</sup> The Romans were more arrogant towards them than ever; we have seen what Sulla, as a mere proquaestor, was prepared to do—and we are told that some praised, though others blamed him; another mere proquaestor, Lucullus, was given a full-scale royal welcome in Egypt.<sup>102</sup>

Cicero for one was far from over-impressed by the oriental kings—or the queen, Cleopatra—with whom he came into contact. Nonetheless, he retains to some extent the ambiguous attitude to kingship that we have traced for an earlier period. He could at need praise the sacred name of king, as he did in the *pro Deiotaro*, also declaring that it was a name Rome granted to those who served her well: an honour therefore, but one befitting a vassal. In a strictly theoretical discussion he can praise kingship as the best of the simple forms of constitution, but he adds that it is the most easily corrupted, and in the same work remarks that the overtones of the word are those of injustice. In 63 he thought it worth while to try to work up the assembly against *crudelitas regia*,<sup>103</sup> and to compare the commissioners set up by the Rullan bill, with their sweeping powers, to kings; those of the plebs who were of freedman and especially oriental origin may not have seen the point, but historians of Caesar often assume more royalist sentiment in the People at large than there is any evidence for; Plutarch at least was convinced that the People hated the idea that Caesar should be king.<sup>104</sup>

As for Caesar himself, he also had shown no sign of being over-awed by foreign kings (though he had a distinct penchant for foreign queens).<sup>105</sup> Nicomedes of Bithynia was his *hospes*, but Nicomedes' descendants and subjects, after the kingdom was willed to Rome, seem to have become his clients.<sup>106</sup> He very properly regarded it as signal insolence when Ariovistus, a *rex amicus populi Romani*, refused to come at his bidding in Gaul and tried to treat on equal terms.<sup>107</sup> Cleopatra was no doubt a fascinating figure, but one doubts if Caesar was quite so overwhelmed by her position, and so anxious to emulate it, as some scholars have suggested;<sup>108</sup> he certainly dunned her wretched father and brother, successive kings of Egypt, remorselessly for huge sums of money. And in the last years of his life he bestowed the title on Rome's vassals as he willed—for example on those who wrote to thank Cicero for supporting a decree of the Senate which had never existed.<sup>109</sup>

It is in this long perspective that we must see Caesar's own advance to *regnum*. The glamour of kingship as practiced in the East had dazzled the Romans, and then declined; while to counter this glamour the idea of kingship as it had once been in Rome was in various respects subsumed into certain Republican titles and offices. Yet at the same time it was still hated, and it was inevitable that, like Ti. Gracchus and Saturninus, Caesar should be accused of wanting the title. (Why should he have done so? It would have brought him, with considerable odium, neither more absolute power nor more spectacular ceremony.

<sup>99</sup> Debt: Nicomedes of Bithynia, App. *Mithr.* 11, 36–7; Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, Cicero, *ad A.* vi, 1, 3–4; but note his *ad f.* vii, 5, 2, Caesar promises he will make a protégé of Cicero's 'vel regem Galliae'—largely a matter of money?

<sup>100</sup> Polybius v, 90, 5–6.

<sup>101</sup> E. Badian, *Roman Imperialism* (1967), 78.

<sup>102</sup> Plutarch, *Luc.* 2, 5.

<sup>103</sup> *Pro Deiot.* 26; 40; *de Rep.* i, 57; iii, 47 (i, 62; ii, 52, the name hated at Rome); *de leg. agr.* ii, 29, ii, 32 etc.; *pro Rab. perd. reo* 10; 17; *de Or.* i, 32 (i, 37 praises the Roman kings). See R. Klein, *Königtum u. Königszeit bei Cicero*, Diss. Erlangen (1962); J. Kroymann, 'Die Stellung des Königtums im I. Buch von Ciceros Staat', *HSCP* lxxiii (1958), 309 thinks *rex* was not too bad a word in the late republic. In fact accounts of first-century attitudes to kings and tyrants are commoner than those

dealing with the earlier period; but they diverge, and simplify. J. Béranger, 'Tyrannus', *REL* xiii (1935), 85 restricts the favourable view, probably too narrowly, to a few lettrés; J. Carcopino, o.c. (n. 14), 129 thinks the second century solidly hostile to monarchy, while the first century was increasingly interested in it; while Classen and Guia (see n. 6 above) think Rome was increasingly nervous about *regnum* from the Gracchi on, which is perhaps more nearly true, but not the whole story.

<sup>104</sup> Plutarch, *Caesar* 60–2.

<sup>105</sup> Suetonius, *Df* 52, 1.

<sup>106</sup> H. Dahlmann, 'Caesars Rede für die Bithynier', *Hermes* lxxiii (1938), 341.

<sup>107</sup> Caesar, *BG* i, 34–5.

<sup>108</sup> Esp. Collins, o.c. (n. 4).

<sup>109</sup> Cicero, *ad f.* ix 15, 4.

His best-informed contemporaries, it seems, did not believe that he wanted it. Yet hated as it was, there was still a splendour that played about the name, and it had been a recognized temptation to great men. It was, perhaps, in the final analysis, worth turning down.<sup>110</sup>

*New Hall, Cambridge*

<sup>110</sup> As to the only other first-century figure of whom much can be said, A. Momigliano, *JRS* xxxi (1941), 157, review and discussion of B. Farrington, *Science and Politics in the Ancient World*, argues that the Roman Lucretius, unlike the Epicureans in general, saw human progress as furthered by magistrates and laws rather than kings; but in spite of *sceptra superba* and *nimis ante metutum* there is

almost a touch of regret for the overthrow, by the rich and ambitious, of the early kings who founded cities and divided the land according to merit (Lucretius v, 1105 ff). Note also, not long after Caesar's death, Sallust, *Jug.* 113, 1: the wishes of kings are mobile and contradictory.

I am grateful to the Editor and the Editorial Committee for criticism and suggestions.