

## AUGUSTUS, THE *RES GESTAE* AND HELLENISTIC THEORIES OF APOTHEOSIS\*

By BRIAN BOSWORTH

The literary genre of the *Res Gestae* has always been a source of perplexity. Over a century ago Mommsen compared efforts to categorize it with attempts to pin a literary label upon Dante's *Divina Commedia* or Goethe's *Faust*.<sup>1</sup> That did not prevent his arguing that the work was a 'Rechenschaftsbericht', a formal report of Augustus' achievements as *princeps*. Nowadays it can perhaps be accepted that the document has a multiplicity of models and many purposes, all of them propagandist in nature. However, the complexity of the work is even now insufficiently appreciated. It is, for instance, well accepted that world conquest is a primary and pervading theme, and Augustus' imperial ideology has been well documented and discussed in recent years.<sup>2</sup> But world conquest suggests another theme, that of apotheosis. The two motifs are inextricably linked in Hellenistic literature after Alexander, and the linkage was inherited by Roman authors, not least by the poets of the Augustan age. As for Augustus himself, his propaganda owes much to the Hellenistic ruler cult. His victory issues after Actium show a startling similarity to the famous tetradrachms commemorating Demetrius Poliorcetes' naval triumph at Cypriot Salamis; he adopted the same pose, and assimilated himself to Neptune, just as Demetrius had recalled Poseidon.<sup>3</sup> Augustus *may* have been directly influenced by Demetrius' issues. He was possibly aware of the divine honours which the Athenians had conferred upon Demetrius a few months before his victory, and made similar claims in his own right. But the relationship was probably more indirect — Augustus used motifs which had become familiar during the previous centuries, emphasizing simultaneously the protection of the gods and his own godlike status. Demetrius' issue helped inspire the general pattern of thought, but there was no direct imitation. The same will be true of Augustus' most careful and finished work of self-advertisement, the *Res Gestae*. It is a complex and allusive document, addressed to many audiences and with many levels of meaning. There are many undertones, possibly at times even a sub-text, and the persistent allusions to world conquest are presented in terms strongly reminiscent of Hellenistic material (in its Roman guise). There may or may not be a deliberate underlying message. What seems to me undeniable is that there are strong resonances of the Hellenistic doctrine of apotheosis through conquest and benefaction and echoes of the most celebrated text, the 'Sacred Record' of Euhemerus, which had become a Latin classic through Ennius' translation. The educated reader would grasp the allusion and make the connection between Augustus' conquests and benefactions and his divine status. The language used in the *Res Gestae* practically invited the inference.

The implicit linkage I am postulating is excellently illustrated by Vergil in a number of famous passages which must have had considerable contemporary influence. We may begin — appropriately enough — in the Underworld, where Vergil unrolls the course of Roman history, as Aeneas learns of the future through his father, Anchises

\* This paper has been delivered in various forms, at a workshop at the University of Nottingham and at a number of seminars in Australia (at the Universities of Newcastle, Sydney, and Western Australia). I am grateful to my audiences for illuminating discussion, to Miriam Griffin for her generous reading of an early draft, and to the Editorial Committee of *JRS* for constructive criticism. All have materially improved it.

<sup>1</sup> 'Der Rechenschaftsbericht des Augustus', *HZ* 57 (1887), 385–97 = *Gesammelte Schriften* iv.1 (1906), 247–58. For a useful compendium of views see E. S. Ramage, *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res Gestae"*, *Historia Einzelschr.* 54 (1987), esp. 135–43.

<sup>2</sup> See in particular the magisterial essays of P. A. Brunt, *Roman Imperial Themes* (1990), 96–109, 433–80; cf. also E. Gruen, 'The imperial policy of Augustus', in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire* (1990), 395–416.

<sup>3</sup> See, most recently, J. Pollini, 'Man or god: divine assimilation and imitation in the late Republic and early Empire', in Raaflaub and Toher, op. cit. (n. 2), 334–57, esp. 346–7 with fig. 13 (on *RIC* I<sup>2</sup> 59 no. 256). For the coins of Demetrius see C. M. Kraay, *Greek Coins* (1966), pl. 174, no. 573. The Battle of Salamis, which they commemorate, was quite literally the crowning glory of the Antigonids, and could be viewed as the Hellenistic analogue of Actium.

(Verg., *Aen.* 6.756–853). Not surprisingly, the atmosphere reeks of Latinity. The exemplars of Roman virtue from Brutus the Liberator to the Scipios and the Elder Cato are duly paraded, and, as Vergil moves through the mists of prehistory, he lays emphasis upon the age-old towns of Latium, naming no less than eight of them in a few lines of solemn dignity (6.773–6). After the Latin communities comes the foundation of Rome, and the poet looks ahead to its world domination,<sup>4</sup> and it is natural that he introduces his great patron, Augustus Caesar, as the principal architect of empire. That Augustus' career should be viewed as the culmination of Roman history is only to be expected, and it is entirely appropriate that his example should be acclaimed as inspirational, something to shame away Aeneas' doubts and galvanize him to begin the work of empire-building in Latium.<sup>5</sup> What, however, is incongruous (and slightly shocking) is the language of the encomium; we have moved away from the Latin milieu into the world of Hellenistic monarchy, and the mode of thought is unmistakably that of the ruler cult.

Nearly a century ago Norden argued that the encomium of Augustus followed standard rhetorical models, particularly the school exercises in praise of Alexander the Great.<sup>6</sup> In general he was certainly correct, but he failed to bring out one crucially important theme, the anticipation of apotheosis. What we have in Vergil is an extraordinarily powerful case for deification, based on world conquest and euergetism. The conquests prove the superhuman prowess of the future Augustus, and those conquests are used for the benefit of mankind, in a new golden age which recalls the old realm of Saturnus in Latium. The parallels which Vergil alleges Augustus was to surpass are the traditional figures used to justify the cult of Alexander, namely Heracles and Dionysus. Now, Heracles was the traditional benefactor of humanity, who traversed the world and purged it of criminals and monsters. For his services he was elevated to Olympus, and enjoyed the favours of Hebe (Pind., *Nem.* 1.61 ff.). To find Augustus outstripping his travels is high praise indeed.<sup>7</sup>

More significant still is the comparison with Dionysus. For Vergil Augustus was to cover more ground than the triumphant Father Liber, who returned in state from Indian Nysa in a car drawn by tigers.<sup>8</sup> The eastern triumphs of Dionysus, to which Vergil patently refers, were one of the most impressive mythological creations of the Hellenistic period. Alexander purported to have found traces of the god's passage in the remote north of Sogdiana,<sup>9</sup> and, more sensationally, in the borderlands of Nuristan, he encountered a city named Nysa, near a mountain which his Indian hosts identified with Mt Meru, the mythical centre of the Sanskrit universe, the Indian counterpart of Olympus.<sup>10</sup> For Alexander the mountain became Meros, and he understood the Indian name as the origin and inspiration of the Greek legend that the infant Dionysus was

<sup>4</sup> *Aen.* 6.782: 'imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo' ('Rome shall make its empire equal to the world, its spirit to Olympus').

<sup>5</sup> *Aen.* 6.806–7: 'et dubitamus adhuc virtutem extendere factis | aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?' ('and do we still hesitate to extend the scope of our excellence by action, or does fear forbid our settling on Ausonian land?').

<sup>6</sup> E. Norden, 'Ein Panegyrikus auf Augustus in Vergils Aeneis', *RhM* 54 (1899), 466–82 = *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (1966), 422–36, esp. 424–5. Norden aptly adduced texts such as Men. Rhet. 388.6–10 (pp. 112–14 Russell and Wilson) and Luc., *Dial. Mort.* 14.6, which show that the comparison between Alexander and Heracles/Dionysus was a rhetorical *topos*. He was not concerned to demonstrate that the *topos* was based on historical fact.

<sup>7</sup> For Alexander's emulation of Heracles see Arr. 4.8.1–2; 4.30.4; 5.3.2–4 with A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* (hereafter *HCA*) ii (1995), 180–1, 213–19; idem, *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (1996), 118–19. Eratosthenes was to express

extreme scepticism, and denounced the Macedonians for manufacturing evidence; but even he accepted it as axiomatic that Alexander used Heracles as a role model.

<sup>8</sup> *Aen.* 6.804–5: 'nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis | Liber, agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris' ('nor he who directs his chariot in triumph, Liber, driving his tigers down from the lofty peak of Nysa').

<sup>9</sup> Curt. 7.9.15; *Metz Epit.* 12. On this tradition see now A. B. Bosworth, 'Alexander, Euripides and Dionysos: the motivation for apotheosis', in R. W. Wallace and E. Harris (eds), *Transitions to World Power 360–146: Studies in Honor of E. Badian* (1997), 140–66, esp. 146–8.

<sup>10</sup> On Mt Meru see, for example, M. and J. Stutley, *A Dictionary of Hinduism* (1977), 190–1, and for the possible survival of the toponym in the NW of the Indian sub-continent see the literature cited in O. von Hinüber's Artemis edition of Arrian's *Indike* (Arrian, *Der Alexanderzug: Indische Geschichte* (1985), p. 1083).

concealed in the thigh of Zeus.<sup>11</sup> Alexander, then, created a legend, a mythical conquest of India by Dionysus, which he duly surpassed, following in the footsteps of the god and overshadowing the god's achievement. The mortal Alexander demonstrably emulated the god, and the parallel was explicitly adduced as early as 327, during the debate over the introduction of ceremonial prostration (*proskynesis*), when Alexander was hailed as more successful than either Heracles or Dionysus, and as such more worthy of immediate recognition as divine.<sup>12</sup> The myth he created was promptly developed by Megasthenes, who represented Dionysus as the *fons et origo* of Indian civilization and Indian kingship,<sup>13</sup> and at roughly the same time in Egypt Hecataeus of Abdera elevated Osiris (the Egyptian counterpart of Dionysus) into a world conqueror, who overran Arabia, India, and Greece itself.<sup>14</sup> Far more than any literary account the extravagant pageant of Ptolemy Philadelphus bears testimony to the attraction the newly created legend held for rulers and subjects alike. Even in the dull prose of Callixeinus the visual reconstruction of Dionysus' return, complete with elephant, 18 foot statue of the god, and an infinitely varied triumphal train, has enormous evocative power.<sup>15</sup> For spectators at the time it was surely overwhelming.

Vergil's Dionysus was the victor from India, returning in triumph from Indian Nysa (he has conflated city and mountain, faithful to the original Homeric inspiration of the myth),<sup>16</sup> and the tigers which draw his triumphal car are the beasts of India, whose size and ferocity were commemorated by Alexander's historians.<sup>17</sup> Like Alexander, Augustus would surpass Dionysus and take his triumph *beyond* the Indians. But there is more. In Vergil the Indians are listed alongside the Garamantes,<sup>18</sup> a people much closer to home, domiciled on the fringes of the Sahara immediately south of the cities of Lepcis and Oea. Unlike the Indians the Garamantes came under the sway of Augustus, and did so in the late twenties B.C., when Vergil was in the throes of composition. L. Cornelius Balbus, the magnate from Gades, fought a campaign against them which entitled him to the last triumph achieved outside the imperial dynasty.<sup>19</sup> In his triumphal procession the *tituli* of the floats proclaimed a host of outlandish names, beginning with the capital, Garama, and descending deep into the Sahara.<sup>20</sup> Now it was advertised openly that the fringe of the world had come within the *imperium Romanum*; the *extremi Garamantes* of the Eighth Eclogue had become subjects of Rome.

Vergil's intimations of conquest go still further, to Mt Atlas, the *axis mundi*, and even further, beyond the stars and the sun. We have transferred to the world of the school declamations, in particular the topic of Alexander's purported Ocean voyage.

<sup>11</sup> Arr. 5.1.6; *Ind.* 1.5; Strab. 15.1.8 (687); Curt. 8.10.7, 12; *Metz Epit.* 36; Pliny, *NH* 6.79. On the Greek tradition and Alexander's adaptation of it to the Indian data see my article, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 149–54.

<sup>12</sup> Arr. 4.10.6–7 (cf. 11.7); Curt. 8.5.8, 11, 17. On the basic credibility of this tradition, embellished though it may be by imperial rhetoric, see now Bosworth, *HCA*, *op. cit.* (n. 7), ii, 77–80. Uncompromising scepticism, however, persists; see G. L. Cawkwell, 'The deification of Alexander', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (1994), 293–306, esp. 296–7.

<sup>13</sup> Arr., *Ind.* 7.2–8.3 = *FGrH* 715 F 12; Diod. 2.38.3, 7 = *FGrH* 715 F 4.

<sup>14</sup> See below, pp. 9–10.

<sup>15</sup> Athen. 5.200D–201C = *FGrH* 627 F 2. On the details see E. E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (1983), 82–99. Callixeinus may have exaggerated the dimension and numbers involved, but I see no reason to assume that he has invented the entire scene, as seems implied in a recent article (P. McKechnie, 'Diodorus Siculus and Hephaestion's pyre', *CQ* 45 (1995), 418–32, esp. 428–9). But, even if it is fiction, the description is prime evidence for the popularity of the newly created legend of Dionysus in India.

<sup>16</sup> For Homer, Nysa was a mountain (*Il.* 6.133; *HHym.* 26.3–5), but the Alexander historians applied

the name to the city (*HCA*, *op. cit.* (n. 7), ii, 205). Vergil has conflated the two traditions. He accepts Dionysus' triumphal return from Indian Nysa, but considers Nysa to have been a mountain (the same confusion exists in Philostr., *VA* 2.7–8, who describes Nysa as a mountain, but even so locates Mt Meros in close proximity (*VA* 2.9)).

<sup>17</sup> Arr., *Ind.* 15.1–3 = Nearchus, *FGrH* 133 F 7; Strab. 15.1.37 (703) = Megasthenes, *FGrH* 715 F 21(a). This passage of Vergil is the first demonstrable reference to *Indian* tigers in Latin literature. He may well have been inspired by the recent Indian embassy with its gift of tigers, then seen for the first time in the West (Dio 54.9.8).

<sup>18</sup> *Aen.* 6.794–5: 'super et Garamantas et Indos | proferet imperium' ('he will extend the empire beyond the Garamantes and Indians').

<sup>19</sup> He triumphed on 27 March 19 B.C. (Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* xiii.1.21, 571; EJ<sup>3</sup>, p. 36). The literary references to the campaign are Pliny, *NH* 5.36–7; Strab. 3.5.3 (169); cf. Dio 54.12.1.

<sup>20</sup> Pliny, *NH* 5.36: 'ipsum in triumpho praeter Cidanum et Garamam omnium aliarum gentium urbiumque nomina ac simulacra duxisse...' ('(Balbus) exhibited in his triumph alongside Cidanum and Garama the names and images of all the other peoples and cities...').

The display pieces lovingly retailed by the Elder Seneca depict the conqueror at the rim of the known world, about to enter a world of darkness beyond the limits of the sun. The message is clear enough in the very first extract: 'satis sit hactenus Alexandro vicisse qua mundo lucere satis est. intra has terras caelum Hercules meruit' ('let it content Alexander to have conquered as far as the moon is content to shine; it was within this earth that Hercules earned his admission to heaven').<sup>21</sup> Alexander has conquered the known world and equalled the merits of Heracles within them; he has no need to go further. That is Vergil's theme. Under Augustus the Empire will reach the natural limits of the world — and transcend them. The reference to India immediately evokes the analogy of Alexander, and the implicit comparison is developed in the context of world empire. The boundaries of the world, we may note, are defined by their western extension: Augustus probes beyond Mt Atlas, into the Sahara and possibly the Atlantic Ocean itself. This obviously evokes the western exploits of Heracles, but there is also, I think, a concealed reference to Alexander's last plans, which envisaged the conquest of Northern Africa as far as the Straits of Gibraltar.<sup>22</sup> Those plans were, of course, embryonic, but they were well publicized, and inspired Hellenistic mythographers like Megasthenes to concoct bogus campaigns of conquest for the great figures of the past, including Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>23</sup> Such conquests in Vergil's view were to be emulated and surpassed by Augustus, whose generals took Rome's African possessions to the limits of the world and who studded the Atlantic coast west of the Atlas with *coloniae*: Zulil, Babba, and Banasa might well have been considered the western frontier of the world of light.<sup>24</sup> As early as 19 B.C. the western achievement of Augustus could be set against the eastern conquests of Alexander, and the poet looks ahead to comparable success in the East.

Anchises mentions in passing that prophecies of Augustus' coming are already causing panic, over a millennium before his actual birth. Appropriately enough, the seven mouths of the Nile are in turmoil. However, the Nile is associated with the realms of the Caspian, and, still more obscure, Lake Maeotis (the Sea of Azov).<sup>25</sup> This is the counterpart to the coupling of the defeated Garamantes and the unconquered Indians. By 19 B.C. Augustus had not made any military foray against the Caspian kingdoms (the Albani, Cadusii, or even the Medes), nor was he to do so. Tiberius may have entered the Armenian capital in 20 B.C.,<sup>26</sup> but that was some way from the Caspian, let alone the Sea of Azov. The prophesied conquests were still in the future when Vergil wrote, and the recipients of the prophecies are chosen for their remoteness. Once again they are at the proverbial limits of the world. Since the voyage of Patrocles in the third century B.C. the Caspian had been confidently identified as one of the gulfs of Ocean. It was allegedly recognized as such by Pompey, who is said to have taken his victories to the circumambient Ocean in every direction.<sup>27</sup> As for the Maeotis, it could also be

<sup>21</sup> Sen., *Suas.* 1.1; cf. 1.2: 'vicimus qua lucet. . . tempus est Alexandrum cum orbe et cum sole desinere' ('we have conquered as far as there is light. . . it is time for Alexander to turn aside along with the earth and the sun'). The rhetoric can be paralleled in the Alexander historians proper; cf. Curt. 9.3.8 (Coenus at the Hyphasis); 9.4.18 (before the Malli campaign); cf. L. Braccisi, *Alessandro e la Germania* (1991), 28–35.

<sup>22</sup> Diod. 18.4.4; cf. Arr. 7.1.1–3; Curt. 10.1.17; Plut., *Al.* 68.1. For a recent discussion see A. B. Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* (1988), 190–202.

<sup>23</sup> Megasthenes, *FGrH* 715 F 1 (Nebuchadnezzar conquers Africa and Spain, and transplants Iberian peoples to the Caucasus — a project which Diod. 18.4.4 ascribes to Alexander); Strab. 15.1.6 = *FGrH* 715 F 11(a). On this see further, A. B. Bosworth, 'The historical setting of Megasthenes' *Indica*', *CP* 91 (1996), 113–27, esp. 121–3.

<sup>24</sup> For the temporary annexation of Mauretania see Dio 49.43.7; 53.26.2, and on the colonial foundations Pliny, *NH* 5.2 ('in ora Oceani colonia Zulil'), 5 with P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower* (1971), 591, 595–7.

<sup>25</sup> *Aen.* 6.798–9: 'huius in adventum iam nunc et Caspia regna | responsis horrent divum et Maeotia tellus' ('even now, in anticipation of his coming, the realms of the Caspian and the land of Maeotis shudder at the oracular responses of the gods').

<sup>26</sup> Dio 54.9.4–5; Vell. 2.94.4; Suet., *Tib.* 9.1; Tac., *Ann.* 2.3.2. *Res Gestae* 27.2 celebrates this as a renunciation of imperial expansion: Augustus *might* have made Armenia a province, but followed tradition in entrusting it to a native king. The Albanian and Iberian kings are recorded as sending embassies (*RG* 31.2; see below), and they presumably submitted to Roman suzerainty (cf. Strab. 6.4.2 (288), with significant qualifications: 'they are properly subjugated, but are rebellious because of the Romans' preoccupations elsewhere'). The last recorded campaign against them was that of P. Canidius Crassus, in 36 B.C. (Broughton, *MRR* ii, 401).

<sup>27</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 38.2–3; *Mor.* 324A. On the rhetorical background see Bosworth, *op. cit.* (n. 22), 129–33.

considered to have a geographical link with the outer Ocean (a common misconception in early imperial literature),<sup>28</sup> and was traditionally held to be the boundary between Europe and Asia. In representing it as the limit of the known world Vergil had the precedent of Cn. Pompeius Magnus. When he was in Asia, perhaps on the eve of his return to Rome in 62 B.C., Pompey had dedicated a singularly grandiloquent inscription which (as Diodorus quotes it) boasted of the subjugation of the Pontic kings between Pontus and the Maeotis, and claimed 'to have extended the frontiers of Empire to the frontiers of the earth'.<sup>29</sup> His subsequent triumph displayed a representation of the inhabited world, symbolizing his territorially unlimited conquests, and to cap it all, the cloak which he wore was said to have been owned by Alexander.<sup>30</sup>

Vergil's prophecy echoed and outstripped the historical Pompey. There was another, more evocative model in the commemorative epigram compiled for Scipio Africanus by the father of Roman poetry, Q. Ennius. The extant verses are probably incomplete, and represent only a portion of the actual poem; but they are frequently quoted, over a span of time from Cicero to Mamertinus, and were obviously popular reading.<sup>31</sup> Scipio is personified boasting of the uniqueness of his achievement:

A sole exoriente supra Maeotis paludes  
nemo est qui factis aequiperare queat.

from the rising of the sun and beyond the swamps of  
Maeotis there is nobody who would match my deeds.

Once more the limits of the world are drawn, and the Maeotis is defined as its northern extremity. Within those limits Africanus is unrivalled, and the consequence is spelled out:

Si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est,  
mi soli caeli maxima porta patet.

if it is proper for anyone to rise to the regions of the  
gods, the supreme gate of heaven is open for me alone.

The magnitude and uniqueness of his achievements is properly rewarded by apotheosis. It would be appropriate for Africanus to join the gods. This is a poem that Vergil (like Cicero)<sup>32</sup> would have known intimately, and indeed in the *Georgics* he borrows the metaphor of the gate of heaven (surprisingly rare in Latin literature)<sup>33</sup> in a casually

<sup>28</sup> This, Pliny (*NH* 2.168) notes, was a popular theory, and Lucan 3.277–9 explicitly couples the Maeotis with the Straits of Gibraltar: both, he claims, admit the Ocean into the Mediterranean. The theory probably goes back to the Hellenistic period (Bosworth, *HCA*, op. cit. (n. 7), ii, 240–1).

<sup>29</sup> Diod. 40.4: καὶ τὰ ὅρια τῆς ἡγεμονίας τοῖς ὄροις τῆς γῆς προβιβάζσας ('extending the boundaries of the empire to the limits of the earth'). On the historical circumstances of this dedication one may consult the views of H. Schaefer, expounded and expanded in U. Vogel-Weidemann, 'The dedicatory inscription of Pompeius Magnus in Diodorus 40.4', *Acta Classica* 28 (1985), 67–75 (I owe this reference to Jane Bellemore). Pliny cites the later dedicatory inscription which Pompey erected in the temple of Minerva after his triumph. This also stressed the conquest of the lands from the Maeotis to the Red Sea (*NH* 7.97), and stated that Pompey's achievements rivalled those of Alexander and almost those of Heracles and Dionysus (*NH* 7.95). This is now a familiar triad, linking the concepts of world conquest and apotheosis.

<sup>30</sup> Dio 37.21.3. On the cloak of Alexander see App., *Mithr.* 177.577, where healthy scepticism is displayed (εἶ τῷ πιστόν ἐστιν).

<sup>31</sup> See particularly Cic., *Tusc.* 5.49; Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 108.34; Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.18.11–12; cf. Mamertinus in *Pan. Lat.* 11.16.6, contrasting the Maeotis with the Mauretanian shore, both extremities of the known world. For the poem in general see J. Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*<sup>2</sup> (1928), 216; F. W. Walbank, 'The Scipionic legend', *PCPS* 13 (1967), 54–69, esp. 57–8, where, following a suggestion by Otto Skutsch, he argues for a lacuna in the received text; that does not affect the interpretation as a whole.

<sup>32</sup> Cicero apparently borrowed the image in his *De Republica*: Lactantius excoriates Ennius for suggesting that Africanus could climb to heaven by way of a mass of corpses, and adds that even Cicero used the conceit, reminding Africanus that the same door had opened for Heracles ('nam et Heracli eadem ista porta patuit': *Div. inst.* 1.18.13 = Cic., *De rep.* F 6 Ziegler). Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 108.34 also attests that Cicero adapted the epigram.

<sup>33</sup> Apart from Ennius and his derivatives it is found only in the Latin vulgate (*Gen.* 27.17; *Ps.* 77.23), and is consequently common currency among modern European readers.

allusive reference.<sup>34</sup> It is quite natural that Ennius comes to the fore in Anchises' speech, and he is memorably echoed, precisely in the tribute to Scipio Africanus, where Vergil paraphrases one of Ennius' most famous lines.<sup>35</sup> The reference to the Maeotis can hardly be fortuitous. It occurs in the context of the limit of the world, exactly the context of Ennius' epigram, and the implied message is the same: exceptional achievement, particularly the achievement of conquest, qualifies one for deification.

Conquest, however, was not the only criterion for apotheosis; there had to be benefactions to mankind. On this Anchises is brief but emphatic. Augustus will revive the golden age of Saturnus and bring felicity to Latium — and indeed to the human race in so far as it came under his sway. Vergil does not forecast apotheosis in so many words. That is left to Silius Italicus, who subjects Scipio Africanus to a strongly derivative dialogue between pleasure and virtue. In a context redolent of Vergil virtue personified reminds Africanus of the rewards of euergetism, and adduces a list of beneficent heroes, beginning with Heracles and Dionysus, whose conquests are recounted in language reminiscent of the encomium to Augustus.<sup>36</sup> Silius is totally explicit: for those who preserve the divine seed in its original purity (*Aen.* 6.730 f.) the gate of heaven is open ('caeli porta patet'). The inspiration here is Ennius, modified by Vergil, and the message is the pure Hellenistic doctrine that excellence on earth elevates mortals to the divine.

Vergil does not allude in so many words to Augustus' ultimate apotheosis, but the language he uses suggests parallels to his readers, parallels which make the connection between conquest and deification. In an earlier passage Vergil is quite explicit; that is in Jupiter's famous prophecy of Rome's greatness. Augustus, the ultimate descendant of Aeneas' son, Iulus, will make the Empire coterminous with the Ocean and the stars. Thanks to his achievement the civil wars will end and an era of peace and civic concord will supervene. The reward is apotheosis; Venus will welcome him into heaven, laden with the spoils of the East, and he will be invoked in solemn vows ('vocabitur hic quoque votis'). Augustus has conquered the world, achieved universal peace, and will ultimately enter heaven.<sup>37</sup> There can be no doubt that Augustus is the ostensible subject of this encomium, but there may well (as some have argued) be some deliberate ambiguity.<sup>38</sup> The emphatic Caesar, the first appearance of the name in the *Aeneid*, is taken up immediately by the gentile Iulius. That would naturally suggest Iulius the dictator, who retained the gentile in his official nomenclature down to his death, whereas his heir

<sup>34</sup> Verg., *Georg.* 3.261 (in the context of the death of Leander). Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 108.34 confirms that it was conscious imitation: Ennius took it from Homer (*Il.* 5.749; 8.393), and Vergil from Ennius.

<sup>35</sup> Verg., *Aen.* 6.846: 'unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem' (cf. Livy 30.26.10; Ovid, *Fast.* 2.242). It was a line particularly familiar to Augustus, who quoted it in a famous letter to Tiberius (Suet., *Tib.* 21.5).

<sup>36</sup> Sil., *Pun.* 15.78–82:

at, quis aetherii servatur seminis ortus,  
caeli porta patet. referam quid cuncta domantem  
Amphitryoniaden? quid, cui, post Seras et Indos  
captivo Liber cum signa referret ab Euro,  
Caucaseae currum duxere per oppida tigres?

('On the other hand the gate of heaven stands open for those who have preserved the divine element born within them. Need I speak of Amphitryon's son, who placed all things under his sway, or of Liber, whose chariot was drawn through the towns by Caucasian tigers when he came back in triumph from the conquered East, after subduing the Seres and Indians?')

Silius takes Dionysus' conquests beyond India to

China, but makes the tigers Caucasian, as required by earlier convention (cf. Varr., *LL* 5.100). If pressed, the terminology might relate to the Hindu Kush, which was regarded by many as an eastern extension of the Caucasus proper.

<sup>37</sup> Verg., *Aen.* 1.286–96.

<sup>38</sup> As suggested long ago by E. J. Kenny, *CR* 18 (1968), 106, an approach sympathetically treated in Austin's commentary ad loc. See also N. Horsfall, 'The structure and purpose of Vergil's Parade of Heroes', in *Ancient Society: Resources for Teachers* 12 (1982), 12–18, esp. 14, arguing for similar ambiguity at *Aen.* 6.789–92. The issue has recently been debated in a series of articles in *Symbolae Osloenses* by J. J. O'Hara and E. Kraggerud (*SO* 67 (1992), 103–12; 69 (1994), 72–82, 83–93). Kraggerud maintains that only Augustus can be designated by Vergil (more recently R. F. Dobbin, 'Julius Caesar in Jupiter's prophecy, *Aeneid*, Book 1', *CA* 14 (1995), 1–40, has argued that the passage refers predominantly to Caesar), whereas O'Hara argues that the focus shifts back and forth between Caesar and Augustus. (I am grateful to Terry Ryan for these references.)

discarded it soon after his adoption and termed himself simply Imp. Caesar.<sup>39</sup> However, the emphasis on the spoils of the East would immediately have evoked Augustus' recent diplomatic triumph in humbling Parthia and recovering the standards of Crassus as well as his achievement a decade previously in adding Egypt and its tribute to the *imperium* of the Roman people. Vergil's readers might well have thought back to Caesar's triumph over the wretched Pharnaces of Pontus and his Alexandrian campaign which left Cleopatra queen of Egypt. Augustus could only gain from the implicit contrast. Vergil continues with the emphasis on universal peace and a new golden age in which the personified frenzy of civil war is kept in perpetual confinement. Any reader or listener would reflect on the heritage of Caesar, whose apotheosis inaugurated a savage resurgence of civil war, and the current state of the Roman world, about to celebrate the new age through the Secular Games.<sup>40</sup> Such comparison could only enhance the glory of Augustus, who had extended the Empire to the Ocean and ushered in a new age of peace. Vergil appropriately ends the passage with an internal reference to the celebrated painting by Apelles which enjoyed pride of place in the Forum Augusti: the figure of War appeared with arms pinioned behind its back, while Alexander stood triumphant in his chariot.<sup>41</sup> For Vergil Augustus had achieved what for Alexander was merely a pious hope: he had achieved universal peace through universal conquest. His claim to apotheosis was incomparable.

In Book 8 the Hellenistic ideology becomes more central to the narrative. When Aeneas reaches the future site of Rome, he finds the lord of the area, Evander, busily supervising the annual sacrifice to Heracles. The Arcadian king explains that this is no age-old superstition, rooted in ignorance; it is the direct reward for exceptional service in the present: 'saevis, hospes Troiane, periclis | servati facimus, meritosque novamus honores' ('we have been delivered from cruel perils, Trojan guest, and so we conduct the rites and renew the honours so deserved').<sup>42</sup> Heracles had put an end to the depredations of Cacus, and brought felicity to the region — quite unexpectedly. The intervention was duly rewarded by the annual sacrifice at the Ara Maxima, and the divine honours were the recompense for exceptional and tangible service. Now, the sacrifice to Heracles was a feature of Roman liturgy in the Augustan age. The calendar of Allifanum for instance records two consecutive celebrations, one on 12 August by the

<sup>39</sup> See, for instance, the *Fasti Capitolini*, in which the dictator is invariably styled 'C. Iulius C.f. C.n. Caesar', whereas his heir emerges at his first consulate (43 B.C.) as 'C. Iulius C.f. [C.n. Caesar qui] postea Imp.[Caesar divi f. appel(latus)]'. On the nomenclature in general see R. Syme, *Roman Papers* i (1979), 365–77; and for the usage in Latin prose authors, see C. Rubincam, 'The nomenclature of Julius Caesar and the later Augustus in the Julio-Claudian period', *Historia* 41 (1992), 88–103. The scope for misunderstanding was considerable: when Drusus died in 9 B.C., he was publicly commemorated by Augustus and interred in Augustus' Mausoleum (Dio 55.2.3; *Cons. Liv.* 66–7 with Dio 53.30.5; 54.28.5), but the *Periocha* of Livy 142 has him 'buried in the tumulus of C. Iulius and extolled by his step-father, Caesar Augustus'.

<sup>40</sup> Ovid at least drew the inference. At the end of the *Metamorphoses* he produces almost a pastiche of Vergil. Venus complains about the imminent death of Caesar, to be reassured by Jupiter: Caesar has completed his destiny, and will be succeeded by his heir, who will subjugate the earth and inaugurate an era of peace and legality before at length taking his place in heaven (*Met.* 15.807–39). On this see E. S. Ramage, 'Augustus' treatment of Julius Caesar', *Historia* 34 (1985), 223–45, esp. 240–1, and R. A. Smith, 'Epic

recall and the finale of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *MH* 51 (1994), 45–53, esp. 50. There is a very similar message in the *Fasti*, on which see the thorough discussion by G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study* (1994), 109–29, esp. 124–7.

<sup>41</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.27.93 ('item Belli imaginem restrictis ad terga manibus, Alexandro in curru triumphante'). The other picture exhibited by Augustus portrayed Castor and Pollux alongside Victory and Alexander; the connection between conquest and apotheosis could not be more clearly displayed.

<sup>42</sup> Verg., *Aen.* 8.185–9. Compare Livy 1.7.10–13, where Evander establishes the altar in response to a prophecy, and Cacus is a simple rustic, whose death is resented by the other local shepherds (1.7.9). In Dionysius (*AR* 1.39.2) he leads a band of brigands, and his death is welcomed by the locals (1.40.1). However, it is the prophecy which moves Evander to establish the altar, and he is eager to institute divine honours for Heracles (1.40.2). Vergil by contrast ignores the prophecy and demonizes Cacus, who becomes a sinister ogre, whose removal is an incomparable benefaction. On the evolution of Cacus from local deity to bogeyman extraordinaire see R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (1965), 55–8.

Circus Maximus and the other on 13 August by the Porta Trigemina.<sup>43</sup> These were familiar dates (13 August was the day chosen for the dedication of an altar to Heracles in remote Siscia<sup>44</sup>), and it cannot be mere chance that Augustus' triple triumph began on 13 August 29 B.C. He had ample leisure to choose the date of his celebration, and its coincidence with the sacrifice to Hercules Invictus must surely be deliberate. The triumph which marked the culmination of his public life hitherto was held under the aegis of Heracles, the traditional benefactor of mankind, who won divine status by his deeds on earth.<sup>45</sup>

This was a message that Vergil assimilated perfectly. The book of the *Aeneid* which documented Heracles' services to Evander and Rome was to end with a brief commemoration of Roman history, as displayed on the shield of Aeneas. Predictably it culminates with the campaign of Actium, in which Augustus and Agrippa, backed by the gods of the West, preserve the order of things against the Eastern counterparts of Cacus.<sup>46</sup> The scene duly closes with the triple triumph and a list of conquered peoples, including the Geloni of the Ukraine (above the Sea of Azov), the Dahae to the east of the Caspian, and the Morini by the northern Ocean.<sup>47</sup> Of these the Morini had been defeated by Carrinas, proconsul in Gaul, whose victories Augustus subsumed in the first day of his triumphal celebrations (and allowed him to triumph in his own right after the decent interval of a year).<sup>48</sup> The Morini occupied a strategically important position, the point of embarkation for Britain,<sup>49</sup> and the implications cannot have been lost on Vergil's readers. But once again fact is blended with fantasy. Neither the Dahae nor the Geloni were affected by Augustus' campaigns, or can have paraded in the actual triumph,<sup>50</sup> but their names suggest the limits of the known world<sup>51</sup> and reinforce the image of Augustus as world conqueror. So, for that matter, did the rivers, the Rhine with its two mouths discharging into the northern Ocean and the boisterous Araxes<sup>52</sup> also ending its course at the Ocean (the Caspian was regarded as one of its gulfs). Vergil had described the progress of the young conqueror in the *Georgics* (4.560–2), pressing

<sup>43</sup> For the evidence see Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* xiii.2.493–5. Evander's ceremony in the *Aeneid* is located close to the Tiber, 'in a grove before the city' (*Aen.* 8.104). Its situation outside the city is hardly consistent with the ceremony in the Forum Boarium, in the old heart of Rome immediately south of the Porta Carmentalis and Palatine where Aeneas begins his tour of Rome (*Aen.* 8.337–44). The Porta Trigemina, further to the south and closer to the Tiber (cf. S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (1929), 418) is a better site for a sacrifice outside Evander's city. However, Vergil makes it plain that the altar of the ceremony was the Ara Maxima (*Aen.* 8.271–2), which was located in the Forum Boarium. The two sites may be deliberately conflated into one. That there is an allusion to Augustus' triple triumph has long been acknowledged (cf. D. L. Drews, *The Allegory of the Aeneid* (1927), 6–22; G. Binder, *Aeneas und Augustus* (1971), 42–3; N. Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (1995), 163 — 'remarkably neat'), but discussion has been hitherto weakened by the failure to realize that 13 August, the first day of the triumph, was itself a celebration of Heracles. The coincidence is exact.

<sup>44</sup> *CIL* iii.10836. For a dedication at Rome on 13 August, near the Porta Trigemina itself, see *CIL* vi.9319 + 33803.

<sup>45</sup> So explicitly Hor., *Od.* 3.3.9–10. The next lines bring Augustus, Dionysus, and Romulus/Quirinus into the same context.

<sup>46</sup> *Aen.* 8.698–700. The shaping of l. 698 ('omnigenumque deum monstra') recalls the initial description of Cacus at l. 194 ('semihominis Caci facies').

<sup>47</sup> *Aen.* 8.725–8:

hic Lelegas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos | finxerat. . .  
extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis  
indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes

('Here (Vulcan) had portrayed the Leleges and Cari-

ans and arrow-bearing Geloni. . . the Morini were there, the most remote of mankind, and the Rhine of double horn, the unconquered Dahae and the Araxes which disdained a bridge').

<sup>48</sup> Dio 51.21.6. For the triumph of Carrinas on 14 July 28 B.C., see Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* xiii.1.345, 570; EJ<sup>2</sup>, p. 35.

<sup>49</sup> Caes., *BG* 4.21.3, 22.1, 37.1, 38.1; Strab. 4.5.2 (199).

<sup>50</sup> The inspiration for the conceit was probably Antony's grandiose parade of allies during the summer of 32 B.C. While he was at Samos, off the Carian coast, he entertained dynasts from as far afield as the Maeotis and Armenia, who had been ordered to send troops (Plut., *Ant.* 56.7). The Maeotis suggested the Geloni, and the context in Caria is reinforced by the coupling of the Leleges and Carians, who were believed to have occupied the coast between Ephesus and Halicarnassus in pre-Hellenic times (cf. Vitruv. 2.8.12; Ovid, *Met.* 9.645; Hdt. 1.171.2; cf. S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (1982), 12–14). The king of Media also sent forces (Plut., *Ant.* 61.3; cf. Dio 49.44.2); that suggested the Caspian, and perhaps led Vergil's imagination to the Dahae, in the steppes east of the Caspian (Strab. 11.8.2 (511)). The Dahae also provided an implicit linkage between Augustus' triumph and Alexander's campaigns.

<sup>51</sup> The Morini are explicitly qualified as 'extremi', as elsewhere are the Geloni (Verg., *Georg.* 2.115; Hor., *Od.* 2.20.18–19). Lucan 7.429 places the Dahae alongside the Indians as paradigms of remoteness.

<sup>52</sup> The dramatic picture of the outraged river, so admired by Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 8.6.11), may derive from Aeschylus' description of the uncrossable 'hybristic' river (*PV* 717–21), which the Scholia identify as the Araxes. For all its unruliness it was now subject to Rome.



on to the Euphrates, placing a willing humanity under his jurisdiction, and taking the road to Olympus ('viamque adfectat Olympo'). In his later work the message could be taken for granted; he had no need to spell out the fact that the criteria for godhead had been amply fulfilled.

As we have seen, Vergil's language and thought are strongly Hellenistic in flavour, with their emphasis on conquest, deliverance, and benefaction. He evokes the world of the late fourth century, when worship of living dynasts threatened to eclipse the traditional cults. The flattery which was addressed to Alexander explicitly denigrated traditional deities, whether they were the Dioscuri, Heracles, or Dionysus himself.<sup>53</sup> The denigration threw Alexander's own achievements into sharper relief and justified his present cult. The evidence here is late and perhaps owes something to rhetorical imagining. However, there is contemporary evidence of the trend in the *Epitaphios* of Hypereides, where the orator claims that the cults of living men are extruding those of the recognized gods.<sup>54</sup> For the enemy of Macedon that was impiety and sacrilege, for the courtiers of Alexander due recognition of overwhelming merit. The thought was developed in the generation after Alexander, and culminates in the religious nihilism of the celebrated Ithyphallic for Demetrius Poliorcetes, composed at Athens early in the third century B.C.: 'other gods are far away or have no ears or don't exist or are devoid of concern for us, but you we see . . . in real presence'.<sup>55</sup> Such sentiments are the product of a long line of development, from the worship of the living Lysander in the late fifth century. They emerge clearly in the time of Alexander, when the Indian tribes of Gandhara supposedly hailed the king as the third son of Zeus to visit them: his predecessors they had merely heard of by tradition, while he was present and visible in the flesh.<sup>56</sup> What the Indians actually stated is beyond conjecture, but there is no doubt what was made of it by Alexander's historians. It is an anticipation of the Athenian Ithyphallic, and, at a longer remove, the sentiments of Vergil's Evander, who contrasted the new sacrifice in honour of the present benefaction of Heracles with 'empty superstition, ignorant of the gods of old' ('vana superstitio veterumque ignara deorum'). It is a natural development for Valerius Maximus to address Tiberius as a god in living presence, on a par with Caesar and Augustus; belief in other gods is a matter of inference, but his divinity is self-evident.<sup>57</sup>

The humanizing of the gods, which had taken shape under Alexander, gathered momentum during the next generation, and there was a move to portray even the traditional Olympians as glorified mortals. The trait is clear enough in the work of Hecataeus of Abdera, who wrote shortly before 300 B.C. in the service of Ptolemy Soter.<sup>58</sup> For Hecataeus the gods of Egypt fell into two categories: either they were the projection of physical phenomena (sun, moon, fire, and earth) or they were mortal men, 'who attained immortality by reason of their sagacity and the good service (εὐεργεσία) which they rendered to all men'.<sup>59</sup> Hence Osiris was both sun god and a human king,

<sup>53</sup> Arr. 4.8.3, 10.6-7; Curt. 8.5.8, 11; cf. Bosworth, *HCA*, op. cit. (n. 7), ii, 55-6.

<sup>54</sup> Hyp., *Epit.* 21, 43. By contrast Leosthenes and his men can expect no more than paramount honour in Hades, even though their achievements eclipse those of the heroes of Troy (*Epit.* 35-40). Their only immortality is that of posthumous glory (*Epit.* 24).

<sup>55</sup> Athen. 6.253E = Duris, *FGrH* 76 F 13; 253C = Demochares, *FGrH* 75 F 2. Cf. C. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (1979), 34-44; idem, *Athen* (1995), 98-100.

<sup>56</sup> Curt. 8.10.1: 'patrem Liberum atque Herculem fama cognitos esse; ipsum coram adesse cernique' ('Father Liber and Heracles were known to them by repute; he himself was actually present and visible'). The tradition recurs in the *Metz Epitome* (34), and was clearly part of the Vulgate. On its historicity see Bosworth, op. cit. (n. 9), 149-54.

<sup>57</sup> Val. Max. 1 praef.: 'cetera diuinitas opinione colligitur, tua praesenti fide paterno auitoque sideri par uidetur' ('others' divinity is a matter of inference;

yours is apparent to us by confidence in your presence and is the equal of your father's and grandfather's star'). See now D. P. Fowler, 'Notes on Pighius and Valerius Maximus', *CQ* 38 (1988), 262-4; D. Wardle, *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings: Book I* (1998), 71-4.

<sup>58</sup> Fragments in Jacoby, *FGrH* 264, and general discussion in E. Schwartz, *RE* v.670-2 = *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber* (1959), 46-9; Jacoby, *RE* vii.2750-69 = *Griechische Historiker* (1956), 227-37; O. Murray, 'Hecataeus of Abdera and pharaonic kingship', *JEA* 56 (1970), 141-71; W. Spoerri, 'Hekataios von Abdera', *RLAC* 14 (1988), 275-310, esp. 278-82. On the chronology see M. Stern and O. Murray, 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians', *JEA* 59 (1973), 159-68.

<sup>59</sup> Diod. 1.11.1-13.1 = *FGrH* 264 F 25. On the attribution to Hecataeus see the synopsis of views in Murray, op. cit. (n. 58), 146. The discussion by W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (1959), 201-11, is ultra-sceptical.

who conquered and civilized the world in remote antiquity. His immortality was acknowledged by all mankind, and he received honour equal to the gods of heaven (i.e. the divine hypostases of natural forces).<sup>60</sup> Hecataeus' Osiris (the Egyptian manifestation of Dionysus) was clearly cast in the image of Alexander and the myth of Dionysus which Alexander had created. He was the world conqueror, who subjugated Ethiopia, Arabia, and India,<sup>61</sup> and then returned to Europe, where he installed one of his sons, aptly named Macedon, as ruler of northern Greece.<sup>62</sup> At the same time he imparted the gifts of civilization: agriculture, viticulture, and music. And to perpetuate his achievements he left *stelae* documenting his campaigns everywhere he went.<sup>63</sup>

Much of Hecataeus' work was propaganda for the dynasty of Egypt, the land which (on his account) had provided a divine forebear for Alexander and furnished Macedonia with an eponymous hero. He also developed the concept of the mortality of the gods, which was to be taken to its extreme by his (younger) contemporary, Euhemerus of Messene. Euhemerus claimed to have been a friend and ambassador of Cassander of Macedon, and alleged that he travelled extensively in the latter's interest before his death in 297.<sup>64</sup> His travels provided the framework for his description of an apocryphal community located on a small archipelago to the south of the Persian Gulf, between southern Arabia and Gedrosia. These non-existent islands abounded in frankincense and myrrh, and were the source of supply (he alleged) for the entire civilized world. Euhemerus went on to describe the flora and fauna of the islands (particularly the largest, Panchaia) in minute detail, as well as the ideal political structure and social customs of their inhabitants. However, the main curiosity of the work was its portrayal of the gods. The deities of Panchaia had followed the example of Hecataeus' Osiris and left written records of their exploits. In particular the central sanctuary of Zeus Triphylius, established 'while he was king of the inhabited world and was still among men', contained a stele of gold with the deeds of Uranus, Cronus, and Zeus inscribed in summary (κεφαλαιωδῶς).<sup>65</sup> What followed, and gave the work its title, Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή ('Sacred Record'), was a deconstructed account of Greek mythology. In particular the career of Zeus is that of a Hellenistic monarch writ large. After defeating and expelling his father he established himself on Olympus, where he dispensed justice and encouraged invention (like Osiris and Isis in Hecataeus). He then embarked on a campaign of world conquest, traversing the globe five times and imparting the gifts of agriculture and law. Conquest and euergetism are linked yet again, and Zeus himself sets the model of deification by establishing his cult world-wide.<sup>66</sup> For Euhemerus the gods were not merely mortal but self-appointed, and it would follow that anybody who achieved at the same level would be entitled to make the same claims to divinity.

Not surprisingly Euhemerus' work was castigated in antiquity. For Callimachus he was 'the babbling dotard who fabricated Zeus Panchaios'.<sup>67</sup> The hostility is echoed in later testimonia, which dub Euhemerus an outright atheist; and his work was a boon to patristic writers like Lactantius, who were eager to subvert the whole fabric of pagan mythology. However, he clearly enjoyed a good deal of popularity, and no less a figure than Ennius took the pains to translate (or perhaps paraphrase) his work into Latin

<sup>60</sup> Diod. 1.20.5. This passage and the world conquest of Osiris, in which it is embedded, is usually denounced as an alien insertion of the later Hellenistic period, not the work of Hecataeus. However, as Schwartz long ago observed (*RhM* 40 (1885), 231 n. 1, glossed over in *RE* v.670), Plut., *Mor.* 356A-B combines Osiris' civilizing work in Egypt, as described by Hecataeus, with his traversing of the earth; civilization and conquest are combined in a unitary extract, exactly as we find (on a broader scale) in Diodorus. I discuss this problem at greater length elsewhere.

<sup>61</sup> Diod. 1.17.2-3, 6; 19.6-8.

<sup>62</sup> Diod. 1.18.1, 20.3.

<sup>63</sup> Diod. 1.20.1: καὶ στήλας πανταχοῦ καταλιπεῖν τῆς ἰδίας στρατείας.

<sup>64</sup> Diod. 6.1.4. The fragments of Euhemerus have been edited by M. Winiarczyk, *Euhemeri Messenii*

*Reliquiae* (1991), and are collected (without commentary) by Jacoby, *FGrH* 63. The best complete treatment is still that of Jacoby, *RE* vi.952-72 = *Griechische Historiker*, 175-85; see also G. Vallauri, *Euemerio di Messene* (1956). On the political aspects of the work see M. Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios: Staatstheorie und staatsutopische Motive* (1976).

<sup>65</sup> Diod. 6.1.6-7 = *FGrH* 63 F 2; Winiarczyk T 36. Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.33 = *FGrH* 63 T 3; Winiarczyk T 65.

<sup>66</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.22.22 = *FGrH* 63 F 23; Winiarczyk T 64A; Diod. 6.1.10 = *FGrH* 63 F 2; Winiarczyk T 61.

<sup>67</sup> Call., *Iamb.* F 191 (Pfeiffer), much quoted by the hostile critics of Euhemerus. An illustrative selection of critical views is provided by Jacoby, *FGrH* 63 T 4.

prose.<sup>68</sup> For our purposes that is of cardinal importance. The humanized pantheon of Euhemerus carried no offence for Ennius, and he did not consider it harmful to broadcast the message that deification was the proper reward of conquest and benefaction. That, as we have seen, was what he implied in his epigram for Africanus. The translation of Euhemerus expanded the message in an exotic and highly readable context. Whether Ennius was intending to make a case for deification of the living Africanus is naturally beyond conjecture, but the fact remains that he was willing to publicize the most extreme example of mythical deconstruction and to supply mortal origins for the greatest of the gods. He apparently hinted at the parallel when he wrote his encomiastic poem on Scipio: 'What a vast statue the Roman people will erect, what a column to speak of your achievements'.<sup>69</sup> Like Zeus in Euhemerus the Roman *triumphator* was to have his deeds perpetuated in monumental form, and once again Scipio is compared with the gods who had gained divinity by their performance as mortals. The Hellenistic message is embedded in a Roman context.

As we might have expected, Ennius' work was popular in later generations, particularly in the Augustan period. Panchaia had become almost a literary commonplace. For Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, and Tibullus it was the archetypal source of frankincense.<sup>70</sup> In later poetry it is far less familiar; there is a single reference in Valerius Flaccus and derivative echoes in Claudian.<sup>71</sup> For the poets it was the botanical data which caught the imagination, but the exploits of the humanized gods were clearly popular. Cicero adduces Euhemerus as the archetype of atheism, willing to write of the death and burial of the gods.<sup>72</sup> What he is criticizing is the humanizing of the divine, which he sees as the logical culmination of the religious rationalism of the sophistic movement. There is, however, no criticism, implicit or explicit, of the ruler cult, the notion that mortals might acquire immortality through achievement. Cicero repeats in his own right the canonical list of Heracles, Dionysus, and the Dioscuri, who served as precedents for the apotheosis of Romulus, and he embodies their worship in his ideal code of laws.<sup>73</sup> The guiding principle of Euhemerus was reaffirmed ('they were duly deemed gods, as being both supremely good and immortal'), even though its application to Zeus and the Olympians was denounced as anathema. One might accept Euhemerus' picture of Zeus as the supreme embodiment of what was achievable by a human monarch while denying that Olympian Zeus was ever mortal.

Euhemerus, at least in Ennius' translation, was popular reading in the Augustan period, and one might expect his exposition of the career of Zeus/Jupiter to have had some impact. His Zeus was the archetype of the world conqueror and the world civilizer, who institutionalized his cult by a deliberate act, and left a summary account of his exploits on a golden stele in a temple which he had established. This was the ultimate demonstration of what a king should do to become a god, and according to Euhemerus and Ennius, Zeus intended his actions to be exemplary. 'Exemplum ceteris ad imitandum dedit' ('he gave an example for others to imitate') is Ennius' wording, as transmitted by Lactantius, and it unmistakably records one of Augustus' proudest and most self-assured claims: 'I myself passed on examples in many areas for the imitation

<sup>68</sup> Cic., *De n. d.* 1.119. The extant fragments are found preponderantly in Lactantius. Varro quotes the work once for a recondite piece of vocabulary which (he claims) is unique to Ennius' translation (Varr., *RR* 1.48.2 = *FGrH* 63 F 26; Winiarczyk T 83).

<sup>69</sup> *HA Claud.* 7.7: 'dicit Ennius de Scipione: "Quantam statuum faciet populus Romanus, quantam columnam, quae res tuas gestas loquatur"' (*Scipio* II. 1, p. 212 Vahlen). Cf. also O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (1985), 130, 753, with a conjectural reconstruction of the verses. Ennius may have had in mind Roman monuments like the naval column of Duilius (*ILLRP* 319; cf. Pliny, *NH* 34.20; Quint., *Inst.* 1.7.12; Sil., *Pun.* 6.663), but it is hard to think that he was not influenced by Euhemerus' description of the golden stele of Zeus, 'in qua columna sua gesta perscripsit' (Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.33 = *FGrH* 63 T 3; Winiarczyk T 65).

<sup>70</sup> Lucr. 2.417; Verg., *Georg.* 2.139; 4.379; Tibull. 3.2.23; Ovid, *Met.* 10.309, 478. For Euhemerus' account of the profusion of frankincense see Diod. 5.41.4-42.1 = *FGrH* 63 F 3; Winiarczyk T 30.

<sup>71</sup> Val. Flacc. 6.119; Claud. 7.211; 10.94; 35.81. In prose there is a reference in Apul., *De mundo* 35, and passing notes in geographical authors (Mela 3.81; Pliny, *NH* 7.197; 10.5), but surprisingly little as compared with the interest shown in the Augustan age.

<sup>72</sup> Cic., *De n. d.* 1.119. Euhemerus is here explicitly categorized with Diagoras, Protagoras, and Prodicus.

<sup>73</sup> Cic., *De n. d.* 2.62; cf. *De leg.* 2.19: 'divos et eos qui caelestes semper habiti sunt colunto et ollos quos endo caelo merita locaverint, Herculem, Liberum, Aesculapium, Castorem, Pollucem, Quirinum.'

of posterity' ('et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi').<sup>74</sup> Lactantius, it has been argued, is reasonably faithful to the original text of Ennius, and he is unlikely to be echoing the terminology of Augustus' *Res Gestae* in his own right.<sup>75</sup> For all his concern for posterity the emperor's memorial was practically unknown in later antiquity. The overwhelming probability is that any similarity of expression is due to Augustus' imitation of Ennius; Lactantius is not superimposing Augustan terminology upon Ennius.

The analogy can be taken beyond mere verbal echoes. The context of publication is strikingly similar. The exploits of Euhemerus' Zeus, on their gold column 'in qua sua gesta perscripsit, ut monumentum posteris esset rerum suarum' ('on which he inscribed his achievements so that it would be a monument of his deeds for posterity'),<sup>76</sup> inevitably recall the monument erected by Jupiter's vicegerent on earth. Augustus had established his cult in the provinces as firmly as had Euhemerus' Zeus. As early as 9 B.C. the *koinon* of Asia acclaimed him as a god and justified the acclamation by a classic restatement of the Hellenistic principle of deification through euergetism: 'Since the providence that has divinely ordered our existence . . . has brought to life the most perfect good in Augustus, whom she filled with virtues for the benefit of mankind, bestowing him upon us and our descendants as a saviour — he who put an end to war and will order peace, Caesar, who by his epiphany exceeded the hopes of those who prophesied good tidings, not only outdoing benefactors of the past, but also allowing no hope of greater benefactions in the future . . .'<sup>77</sup> Against that background readers might have seen Augustus' *Res Gestae* as the Roman counterpart to Euhemerus. It contained the record of conquest and achievements which justified apotheosis, and the language in which the record was phrased suggested literary models where the connection was explicit. The connection was duly made. At the first Senate meeting after Augustus' death the document was publicly read by Tiberius' son, Drusus, along with instructions for the funeral and a formal account of the resources of Empire.<sup>78</sup> In that context it was inevitably taken as Augustus' report of his life's work, and the Senate acted appropriately at its next meeting, installing a state temple and cult for the deceased dynast (Tac., *Ann.* 1.10.8). The language of the *Res Gestae* and the political setting of its first reading left no doubt that its subject was now a god, made immortal by his achievements on earth.

In his early years the young Wilamowitz argued that the *Res Gestae* was deliberately written to support Augustus' claims to divinity, enumerating the services which he believed had earned him immortality ('Kurz und knapp, klar und wahr spricht er aus, womit er sich den Himmel verdient zu haben glaubt').<sup>79</sup> The hypothesis was contested (by rhetoric rather than serious argument) in a famous article by Mommsen, and it has

<sup>74</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.22.26 = *FGrH* 63 F 23; Winiarczyk T 64A; cf. *RG* 8. 5. The Greek translation of *RG*, to which Edwin Judge kindly drew my attention, reads: καὶ αὐτὸς πολλῶν πραγμάτων μίμημα ἑμαυτὸν τοῖς μετέπειτα παρέδωκε ('I transmitted myself to posterity as a model for imitation in many areas'). That is even closer to Ennius.

<sup>75</sup> cf. E. Laughton, 'The prose of Ennius', *Eranos* 49 (1951), 35–49, with E. Fraenkel, 'Additional notes on the prose of Ennius', *Eranos* 49 (1951), 50–6 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (1964), ii.53–8. If the linguistic analysis is correct, Lactantius gave practically verbatim quotations in most cases. The passage in question (Vahlen Fr. X, p. 227) both Laughton and Fraenkel argued was stylistically shaped by Lactantius, but the vocabulary must echo that of Ennius. Lactantius was hardly so attuned to the terminology of the *Res Gestae* (of which he displays no knowledge elsewhere) that he superimposed it upon the text of Ennius. Similarly, at the beginning of the fragment Lactantius' reference to Zeus having acquired supreme power ('rerum potius sit') is likely to be a close paraphrase of Ennius, not a subconscious grafting of the terminology of *RG* 34.1. The probability is that Lactantius reflects the wording of Ennius, and Ennius in turn influenced Augustus.

<sup>76</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.33 = *FGrH* 63 T 3; Winiarczyk T 65; cf. Diod. 6.1.7 = *FGrH* 63 F 2; Winiarczyk T 36.

<sup>77</sup> *OGIS* 458.33–40 = *EJ*<sup>3</sup> 98. Cf. U. Laffi, 'Le iscrizioni relativi all' introduzione nel 9 a.C. del nuovo calendario della provincia di Asia', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 16 (1967), 5–98.

<sup>78</sup> Dio (56.33.1) is the only source to place the reading of the document in a specific chronological framework. Suet., *Aug.* 101.4 does not give the circumstances of publication, and Tacitus omits all mention. Admittedly the context in Dio is not above suspicion. The statement of resources, which on his account was read on the same occasion, is placed by Tac., *Ann.* 1.11.4 in the later debate on the powers of Tiberius. However, there is nothing to contradict the association of the *Res Gestae* with the funeral honours, and, since the document was to be engraved outside the Mausoleum, it could be argued that the debate on the funeral was the natural place for its first reading.

<sup>79</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, 'Res Gestae Divi Augusti', *Hermes* 21 (1886), 623–7 = *Kleine Schriften* v.i (1937), 267–71. There is a passing reference to Euhemerus at p. 625; cf. also Kornemann, *RE* xvi.228.

been almost wholly ignored in recent scholarship.<sup>80</sup> Commentators have rightly insisted on the Roman context of the document. It commemorates Augustus' conquests for the *populus Romanus*, his benefactions, his building projects and shows within the capital. With the single exception of the restitution of the temple treasures of Asia (*RG* 24.1), his euergetism is directed to the Roman citizen body, and the provinces are seen as a Roman preserve, where Augustus might magnanimously offer compensation for the land he took (*RG* 16.1), but in general used their resources to serve the interests of the sovereign people. The target audience was clearly Roman, the citizen body in general, perhaps (as Yavetz has argued) with particular emphasis upon the *iuventus*, the younger members of the upper orders.<sup>81</sup>

All this may be readily conceded. Yet one cannot deny the similarities between the language of the *Res Gestae* and Ennius' translation of Euhemerus. One may accept with Mommsen, Yavetz, and others that the *Res Gestae* had a Roman audience which would appreciate the record of conquest and consolidation, and see Augustus as the ultimate propagator of empire, the paragon of traditional Roman values. But the language was ambivalent (or multivalent). It echoed the claims of immortality through achievement which were made for Alexander and Hellenistic dynasts, and insinuated without stating the case openly that the same response was appropriate for Augustus. Both Wilamowitz and Mommsen can be held to be justified. The plain statements of the text support Mommsen, the allusions contained in those statements give credence to Wilamowitz. At one level it is a record of achievement, at another a justification of divine status. There is the same ambiguity in the physical location of the monument in Ancyra, in the temple of Rome and Augustus. The governor had presumably given instructions (as was done with the *senatus consultum* condemning Cn. Piso) that the text be installed in the most prominent locations in the province, and the central state temple was a natural choice. But it was also the centre of the cult of Augustus; and there was no more appropriate home for the document which gave implicit justification for the apotheosis. One recalls Euhemerus' Zeus, who established his cult in the territories he conquered and housed the golden stele recording his achievements in his temple in Panchaia.<sup>82</sup>

We may now turn to more detailed analogies. Euhemerus' stele had a *titulus*, proclaiming that it had been erected by Zeus himself.<sup>83</sup> The extant copies of the *Res Gestae* also have a *titulus*, which must derive from the original inscription in front of the Mausoleum at Rome. It is deliberately sonorous, beginning with a complete dactylic hexameter to set the epic tone of what follows,<sup>84</sup> and defines the content of the work — world conquest and benefactions. The two qualifications for apotheosis could not have been expressed more succinctly or impressively and, as far as world conquest is concerned, the text is unequivocal: 'orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit' ('he brought the entire world under the rule of the Roman people').

From the beginning of the work the universal character of Augustus' achievement is duly stressed. The whole world is the theatre for his campaigns (*RG* 3.1), and those campaigns are marked by euergetism; he spared all citizens (who sought his pardon) and refrained from exterminating foreign peoples (who could be safely spared). The qualifications are somewhat breathtaking, and perhaps weaken the impact of the

<sup>80</sup> See above, n. 1. For recent, authoritative dismissals of Wilamowitz see, for example, A. Heuss, 'Zeitgeschichte als Ideologie', in E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Monumentum Chiloniense* (1975), 55–95, esp. 56 n. 3 and Ramage, op. cit. (n. 1), 99 ('Thus in the *RG* there is depicted a ruler who remains human, but who has taken on some of the trappings of divinity.'). 138 ('the connection with Alexander is fanciful and spurious'). Mommsen too claimed that Wilamowitz' concept was incompatible with his (Mommsen's) sober vision of Augustus: 'Mit meiner Auffassung von Augustus eigenartig temperirtem und alles Excentrische ablehnendem Naturell ist diese Anschauung unvereinbar' (p. 254). That overlooks the fact that in the Hellenistic period a claim to godhead could be the product of sober calculation.

<sup>81</sup> See particularly Z. Yavetz, 'The *Res Gestae* and Augustus' public image', in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*<sup>2</sup> (1990), 1–36, esp. 14–20 with the Editors' Note referring to the Tabula Siarensis (*AE* 1991.20; 1984.508, II col. b).

<sup>82</sup> Diod. 6.1.6–7 = *FGrH* 63 F 2; Winiarczyk T 36; Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.33 = *FGrH* 63 T 3; Winiarczyk T 65; cf. Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.22.22–3 = *FGrH* 63 F 23; Winiarczyk T 64A.

<sup>83</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.33: 'in fano Iovis Triphyliae, ubi auream columnam positam esse ab ipso Iove titulus indicabat'.

<sup>84</sup> See particularly S. Koster, 'Das "Präskript" des *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*', *Historia* 27 (1978), 241–6; Ramage, op. cit. (n. 1), 13–15.

benefactions, which were for survivors alone. However, such qualifications are wholly absent ten chapters later, when Augustus boasts of his closure of the sanctuary of Ianus Quirinus. Here conquest and *beneficia* are linked in the most telling way: peace had been achieved — by military victories — over the whole of the Roman Empire.<sup>85</sup> Augustus incidentally has us know how rare a commodity peace had been in the past. The temple had been closed only twice in Roman history before his birth, but the Senate voted its closure three times during his Principate.<sup>86</sup> As always, the language is impeccably chosen. The Senate did indeed vote three closures, but in actual fact the temple was closed only twice, thanks to the troublesome Dacians who stormed across the Danube (in 11/10 B.C.) and violated the universal peace before it could be properly commemorated.<sup>87</sup> Be that as it may, the emphasis upon peace as Augustus' primary benefaction is unmistakable, and evokes the vote of the *koinon* of Asia, and at a more distant remove the Osiris of Hecataeus and the Zeus of Euhemerus.

The claims to world empire are justified at greater length in the final portion of the *Res Gestae*. Here the *orbis terrarum* is defined by the circumambient Ocean. From the Straits of Gibraltar to the mouth of the river Elbe Augustus has conquered all the territory 'where the Ocean encloses it' ('qua includit Oceanus': *RG* 26.2). The parallels show indisputably that what is at issue is the limits of empire. The Ocean represents the *ne plus ultra* of conquest, which Augustus attained to the west and the north. Apuleius was later to echo the language when speaking of the sea: 'circling the Gallic <gulf> and the Pillars at Cadiz, the Ocean encloses the limits of our world'.<sup>88</sup> The historicity of the description in A.D. 14 is immaterial. By that time the territory beyond the Rhine might have been lost, thanks to the Varian disaster, but for nearly two decades, from the campaigns of the Elder Drusus, it made sense to speak of the annexation of the German lands as far as the Elbe and the Ocean.

After dwelling a little on his subjugation of the Cimbri, those spectres from the Roman past, Augustus deals with the extension of the Empire to the south. He chooses two expeditions fought under his auspices (the campaign against the Garamantes was conducted under Balbus' auspices as proconsul of Africa): those against the peoples of Arabia Felix and the Ethiopians (*RG* 26.5). In neither case can he claim annexation (though the unwary reader might be led to assume it), but he deliberately notes the southern point of penetration. In Ethiopia his armies came close to the capital, Meroe, which Eratosthenes had represented as the southern terminus of the inhabitable world.<sup>89</sup> As for Arabia Felix the very name suggested proximity to the Ocean (it was the point of

<sup>85</sup> *RG* 13: 'cum per totum imperium populi Romani terra marique esset parta victoriis pax'. The terminology was consciously evoked in Nero's coinage (*BMC Imp.* 1, p. 214 = Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*, no. 53; cf. M. T. Griffin, *Nero* (1985), 122). A. Momigliano, 'Terra marique', *JRS* 32 (1942), 53–64, esp. 64 = *Secundo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (1960), 444–6, argues that 'the words are repeated so solemnly that one is inclined to believe that they were already traditional'. The formula is now paralleled in a dedication to Pompey from Ilium (*AE* 1990.940: ἀποκαθεστακότα δὲ [εἰρ]ήνην καὶ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν). I am grateful to Jane Bellemore for the latter reference.

<sup>86</sup> 'ter me principe senatus claudendum esse censuit' ('the Senate voted its closure three times during my principate').

<sup>87</sup> Dio 54.36.2: ἐψηφίσθη μὲν οὖν τὸν Ἴανὸν τὸν Γέμινον ὡς καὶ πεπωμένων τῶν πολέμων (ἀνέφακτο γάρ) κλεισθῆναι, οὐ μὲντοι καὶ ἐκλεισθη ('it was decreed that the temple of Ianus Geminus (which was open) should be closed, since the wars had ceased; it was not, however, closed. . .'). On the complex question of the triple vote see R. Syme, 'Problems about Janus', *AJP* 100 (1979), 188–212 = *Roman Papers* iii (1984), 1179–97 (discussed and modified by Herbert-

Brown, op. cit. (n. 40), 185–96), where the possibilities of a third closure are exhaustively canvassed. The proposed closure of 11 B.C. is, however, glossed over (1189 fin.) with a statement that the decree was 'annulled'. Perhaps so, but the Senate *had* voted the closure, and the vote, not the closure, is what the *Res Gestae* records. If the temple had in fact been closed three times, Augustus would surely have been explicit. As it is, he records the senatorial vote, and induces his readers to believe (wrongly) that all the closures were implemented. Of other sources Suet., *Aug.* 22.1 ('ter clusit') is contracted and misleading; and the purported quotation of Tacitus in Orosius (7.3.7 = Tac., *Hist.* F 4 (OCT)) remains an enigma — and in its omission of Nero's closure demonstrably inaccurate.

<sup>88</sup> Apul., *De mundo* 6.30: 'per quod Gallicum <sinus?> atque Gaditanas Columnas circumvectus Oceanus orbis nostri metas includit'; cf. Val. Max. 3.2.23: 'C. Caesar non contentus opera sua litoribus Oceani claudere Britannicae insulae caelestis iniecit manus' ('not content to close his achievements at the shores of the Ocean, C. Caesar laid his divine hands on the island of Britain'); Sen., *Oed.* 504.

<sup>89</sup> Strab. 2.1.14 (72) 3,000 stades from the borders of the inhabited world; cf. 2.2.2 (95); 2.5.7 (114); 2.5.35 (132); 17.3.1 (825).

embarkation for Euhemerus in his apocryphal journey to Panchaia).<sup>90</sup> The exact location of Mariba, the furthest populated centre reached,<sup>91</sup> was probably unknown to Augustus' readers, but it was intended to parallel Meroe and suggest the limits of the world.

The theme re-emerges at ch. 31. Here Augustus echoes Vergil's prophecy of his eastern conquests. He cannot claim to have conquered the Far East in actual fact, but there had been diplomatic overtures, and the rulers of the lands in question could be thought to have submitted themselves to the *imperium* of the Roman people. India is prominent, and Augustus makes much of the fact that embassies had *often* reached him.<sup>92</sup> Here he includes the famous delegation of 20 B.C.,<sup>93</sup> and also the earlier embassy which he had received five years before at Tarraco. Orosius, the sole source for the latter episode, draws the explicit parallel with Alexander: the Macedonian had received embassies from Spain and Gaul while he was in Babylon, and Augustus was approached by delegations from India and the Scythian North while he was in Spain, at the furthest limit of the West.<sup>94</sup> This reflects Augustan propaganda, perhaps transmitted through Livy; Alexander had been matched and more than matched. Once again the parallel is not spelled out explicitly in the *Res Gestae*, but the reader is inevitably reminded of Augustus' great predecessor. As in Orosius, the Far East is coupled with the North. After India comes the Maeotis, or rather the great river Tanais, which had traditionally formed the boundary between Europe and Asia and which discharged into the Sea of Azov, the ancient Maeotis.<sup>95</sup> The Tanais was evocative of Alexander. He and his staff had identified it with the native Iaxartes, the present Syr-Darya, which formed the limit of his conquests in the North-East. Its termination in the Aral Sea was unknown, and for a time at least it was thought to describe a vast arc and join with the Don to discharge ultimately in the Sea of Azov.<sup>96</sup> Thanks to Alexander the very name Tanais suggested world empire, and it was a recognized continental boundary. Augustus could boast that kings to the east and west of the river, for Europe and Asia alike, had submitted themselves to him. The Tanais was practically incorporated in the Empire; it had ceased to be merely a frontier.

The Tanais and Maeotis suggested the northern Ocean, and the Ocean continues to play a role as Augustus moves to the Albanian and Median monarchs who were located to the west and south of the Caspian Sea.<sup>97</sup> Once more Augustus represents his writ running to the terminus of the civilized world, to an acknowledged gulf of Ocean. His diplomacy had extended the influence of Rome, or so he intimates, to the limits of the world, as defined in Vergil's prophecy. India, the Maeotis, and the Caspian regions

<sup>90</sup> Diod. 6.1.4 = *FGrH* 63 F 2; Winiarczyk T 3. Arabia Felix is also reminiscent of Alexander's last plans: Aristobulus' delineation of the motives for conquest and the abundance of spices (*FGrH* 139 F 55 = Arr. 7.20.2) could almost have inspired Strabo's explanation of the mission of Aelius Gallus (Strab. 16.4.22 (780); cf. C. Marek, 'Die Expedition des Aelius Gallus nach Arabien', *Chiron* 23 (1993), 121–56, esp. 125 ff.).

<sup>91</sup> *RG* 26.5: 'in fines Sabaeorum processit exercitus ad oppidum Mariba.' Cf. Pliny, *NH* 6.160; Strab. 16.4.24 (782); H. von Wissmann, 'Die Geschichte des Sabäerreiches und der Feldzug des Aelius Gallus', *ANRW* II 9.1 (1976), 308–544, esp. 313–15, 396–8; Marek, *op. cit.* (n. 90), 142–5. Educated readers of the *Res Gestae* might recall Artemidorus' description of the Sabaeian kingdom, which gave a vivid description of its capital, 'Mariaba' (Strab. 16.4.19 (778)).

<sup>92</sup> *RG* 31.1: 'ad me ex India regum legationes saepe missae sunt, non visae ante id tempus apud quemquam Romanorum ducum' ('embassies from kings in India were often sent to me; before that time they had not been seen before any Roman commander').

<sup>93</sup> Dio 54.9.8–10 (see above, n. 16); Strab. 15.1.73 (710–20), citing the eye-witness, Nicolaus of Damascus; cf. Suet., *Aug.* 21.3; Flor. 2.34; Aur. Vict., *Caes.* 1.7; *Epit. de Caes.* 1.9; Eutrop. 7.10.

<sup>94</sup> Oros. 6.21.19–20: 'Meanwhile Caesar was at

Tarraco, a city of Nearer Spain, when envoys from the Indians and Scythians, who had traversed the entire world, finally found him there, at a point beyond which they could not search; and they reflected upon Caesar the glory of Alexander the Great; for, just as an embassy of Spaniards and Gauls approached Alexander at Babylon, in the centre of the Eastern world, in search of peace, so in Spain, in the furthest extremity of the West, Caesar received the entreaties of the Indians of the East and the Scythians of the North together with the gifts proper to their nations.' On this passage see briefly Brunt, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 436. For the Western peoples who approached Alexander in 323 see Diod. 17.113.1–4; Justin 12.13.1–2; Arr. 7.15.4–6 with Bosworth, *op. cit.* (n. 22), 83–93.

<sup>95</sup> *RG* 31.2: 'Sarmatarum qui sunt citra flumen Tanaim et ultra reges.'

<sup>96</sup> For the geographical theory see Bosworth, *HCA*, *op. cit.* (n. 7), i, 377–8; ii, 15, 105–7. According to Curtius (7.6.12; 8.1.7) Alexander had commissioned an envoy to follow the Tanais and make contact with the European Scyths.

<sup>97</sup> *RG* 31.2: 'Albanorumque rex et Hiberorum et Medorum'. On the Median monarchs see *RG* 33. Here there is conscious emulation of Pompey, who boasted of his subjugation of the Iberians and Albanians (Pliny, *NH* 7.98) and explicitly names the monarchs of Iberia and Media (Diod. 40.4).

had not, to be sure, been subjugated by force of arms. It was a bloodless conquest. The rulers of the most far-flung areas of the globe had solicited his friendship and implicitly submitted themselves to him. In this there may be another echo of Ennius and Euhemerus. For them the mortal Zeus did not merely extend his sway by military force. He was welcomed by the rulers who encountered him in his triumphal progress ('he attached the kings and leading men of the peoples he encountered by ties of hospitality and friendship'), and when he moved on he had shrines erected 'so that the memory of the friendship and treaty would be preserved'.<sup>98</sup> The empire of Zeus was the product of voluntary submission, secured by friendship and treaty relations. Augustus' enlargement of the Roman domains followed the same model, except that his presence was not required for submission; his new subjects voluntarily sought him out. The message is most clearly expressed in his description of the crowning diplomatic success of his reign, the surrender of the Parthian hostages: King Phraates sent his family into Italy 'not defeated in war but soliciting our friendship by surrendering his children as pledges'.<sup>99</sup> There was no need for military victory. Roman friendship was a powerful inducement for the Parthian king to offer his children as a pledge of good faith. In the same way a whole plethora of peoples which never previously had contact with Rome now established ties of *amicitia*, and what they experienced in return was the reassuring virtue of *fides* (RG 32.3).

The extension of empire through *amicitia* might, then, recall the exploits of Euhemerus' Zeus. The same might be said of the benefactions to humanity. Like Megasthenes' Dionysus or Hecataeus' Osiris the Zeus of Euhemerus was the author of civilization; he implanted the rule of law, framed social norms, and installed the practice of agriculture ('leges mores frumentaue paravit').<sup>100</sup> Augustus could hardly represent himself as the originator of Roman society or Roman agriculture, but he did insist on the importance of his moral legislation, which restored many of the lost institutions of ancient Rome. He practically re-established the *mores maiorum* (RG 8.5). What is more, he lays quite remarkable emphasis on his subsidies to the grain supply of Rome. The text reads as though he single-handedly supplied subsistence (*frumentationes*) to the urban population (RG 15.1), and in 22 B.C. it was his assumption of the *cura annonae*, so he implies, which saved the citizen body from the privations of famine.<sup>101</sup> His protection of the livelihood of the Roman people is at least reminiscent of Zeus' provisions for humanity at large. By themselves these parallels mean little. Augustus' commemoration of his social legislation probably owes more to Horace's Roman Odes than it does to Ennius' translation of Euhemerus. But it is the cumulative weight of analogy that matters. There are two sets of *res gestae*, both inscribed on monumental stelae by mortal dynasts who achieved godhead. In both cases world empire is achieved by conquest and conciliation, and it is accompanied by unparalleled benefactions: peace, civilization and internal concord.

Euhemerus, of course, was only one of many sources which influenced the *Res Gestae*. Nobody would discount the importance of the triumphal inscriptions, not least those of C. Duilius, whose triumphal column was one of the sights of the Forum Augusti.<sup>102</sup> Other monuments may well have been influential, that for instance

<sup>98</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.22.22 = *FGrH* 63 F 23; Winiarczyk T 64A: 'reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat . . . . iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitis sui nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari.'

<sup>99</sup> RG 32. 2: 'non bello superatus sed amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens'; cf. 33: 'by means of the embassies they sent the leading men of those nations received the kings they requested' ('per legatos principes earum gentium reges petitos acceperunt'). For the historical facts see Strab. 16.1.28 (748-9); Jos., *AJ* 18.39-42; Justin 42.5.12 with Brunt, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 462-4; Syme, *Roman Papers* iii, 1097-8 (on Vell. 2.94.4).

<sup>100</sup> Lactant., *Div. inst.* 1.11.45 = *FGrH* 63 F 24; Winiarczyk T 69A.

<sup>101</sup> RG 5.2: 'quam ita administravi, ut intra dies

paucos metu et periculo praesenti civitatem universam liberarem impensa et cura mea' ('which I so administered that within a few days I freed the entire state from fear and present danger at my expense and through my diligence'). The terminology of liberation is interesting; it recurs in the *Res Gestae* only at 1.1, where Augustus commemorates his liberation of the state 'from the tyranny of a faction'. In the later passage Rome is liberated from the tyranny of famine, and the benefaction is underscored in the most telling way. See also Ramage, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 69-70.

<sup>102</sup> Degraffi, *ILLRP* 319. Cf. J. Gagé, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*<sup>2</sup> (1950), 29-30, and on the elogium in general P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (1967), 4-5; Ramage, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 135-7 with bibliographical review.



commemorating the road-building activities of P. Popilius Laenas (132 B.C.), which displays the first-person style of the *Res Gestae* and its preoccupation with precedent.<sup>103</sup> Augustus was subtle, evocative, and painstaking. There was no single model, rather a complex web of allusions, most of which are irretrievably lost to us. One such allusion may perhaps be detected in the apocryphal speech of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, which Livy suggests was read and used during the Augustan period.<sup>104</sup> At all events his own history will have publicized it. It was an attack upon the ageing Scipio Africanus, who had infringed the tribunician power in the interests of his brother, Lucius. Gracchus complained that the attack upon the tribune's authority was an attack upon the state itself,<sup>105</sup> and contrasted Africanus' current authoritarianism with the moderation of his youth, when he had reproved the people for attempting to vote him perpetual consul and dictator.<sup>106</sup> The tradition is no doubt unhistorical, but it was popular and used as an *exemplum* by Valerius Maximus, at a time almost contemporaneous with the publication of the *Res Gestae*.<sup>107</sup> Not surprisingly Augustus himself suggests a parallel with the young Africanus, much as Vergil had done with his concealed allusion to Ennius' epigram. He refers proudly to his rejection in 22 B.C. of a dictatorship and perpetual consulship, conferred, so he emphasizes, by Senate and Roman People.<sup>108</sup> That in itself evokes Gracchus' commendation of Africanus. However, the previous sentence commemorates Augustus' tenure of the *tribunicia potestas*, and a chapter later comes the passage on his moral legislation, which includes the forceful statement that he assumed no magistracy that was offered in contravention of tradition, but passed all the legislation required by the Senate through the operation of his *tribunicia potestas*.<sup>109</sup> Augustus here compares and contrasts. He claims to have emulated the young Africanus at his most *civilis* by his refusal of extraordinary office, but far from attacking the power of the tribunes he took it on himself and used it in the interest of the state, with the full approval of the Senate. The reader — at least an educated reader — would recall the parallel and note how Augustus surpassed his great exemplar.

Like all sophisticated texts the *Res Gestae* may be read at several levels. A member of the urban *plebs*, attuned to the propaganda of sound-bites (or coin-bites), might go no further than the *titulus* with its proud boast of conquest and benefaction.<sup>110</sup> If he or she did, there was a rapid, coruscating list of offices held, donations conferred, temples dedicated, shows staged, and peoples offering submission. All or part would underscore the original message. For more sophisticated readers, the educated members of the upper classes, there was a harvest of allusions, subtle and recondite, which could be absorbed with self-satisfied pleasure (or outrage). They could reflect on themes in Roman literature and history which suggested parallels with Augustus' career. One of those parallels, I have argued, was Euhemerus' Zeus, the model for world conquest, unlimited euergetism, and the lapidary commemoration of achievement. The language

<sup>103</sup> Degrassi, *ILLRP* 453-4; cf. Gag , op. cit. (n. 102), 30 n. 1.

<sup>104</sup> Livy 38.56.5-6. Livy's doubts about the speech have been generally shared by modern writers; cf. M nzer, *RE* iiA.1404; H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics 220-150 BC* (1951), 282; P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* (1956), i.325-8.

<sup>105</sup> Livy 38.56.10: 'For it is just this conduct that Tiberius Gracchus complains of, that the tribunician power has been undermined by a private citizen' ('haec enim ipsa Ti. Gracchus queritur dissolutam esse a privato tribuniciam potestatem').

<sup>106</sup> 38.56.12: 'castigatum enim quondam ab eo populum ait, quod eum perpetuum consulem et dictatorem vellet facere.'

<sup>107</sup> Val. Max. 4.1.6: 'They wished to confer on him a consulship which would continue all the years of his life and a perpetual dictatorship; but he permitted none of these offices to be given him by plebiscite or voted by decree of the Senate, and in refusing the honours he displayed excellence almost as great as that which he had shown in earning them.'

<sup>108</sup> *RG* 5.1: 'dictaturam et apsentem et praesenti mihi

delatam et a populo et a senatu. . . non recepi.' 5.3: 'consulatum quoque tum annuum et perpetuum mihi delatum non recepi.' On the actual circumstances of 22 B.C. see Dio 54.1.3-5; Suet., *Aug.* 52; Vell. 2.89.5 with Woodman's commentary ad loc.

<sup>109</sup> *RG* 4.4: 'eram septimum et tricensimum tribuniciae potestatis'. 6.1-2: 'nullum magistratum contra morem maiorum delatum recepi. quae tum per me senatus geri voluit, per tribuniciam potestatem perfeci'. On Augustus' use of the tribunician power see now M. Griffin, 'Urbs Roma, plebs and princeps', in L. Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire* (1991), 19-46, esp. 24-32. I do not deny that Augustus' use of the tribunician power was profoundly non-popular. However, that does not preclude the implicit reference to Africanus which I am proposing. Augustus was suggesting that (unlike Africanus) he did not oppose the power of the people's representatives; instead he assumed it himself and transmuted it for good.

<sup>110</sup> See Yavetz, op. cit. (n. 81), 13: 'written propaganda addressed to the masses would have to be short, like slogans on coins.'

suggested the analogy, and the analogy justified apotheosis. The first four words of the *titulus* said it all: the text contains the achievements of the deified Augustus. The preface gives us the fact (that Augustus was deified), and what follows is the record of achievement which earned immortality. Its first audience, the Senate of A.D. 14, promptly established the state cult of Augustus. After Caesar's deification that was a political inevitability. But the vote came in a context that was carefully crafted. The *Res Gestae* was so rich in allusions to conquest and benefaction, the traditional justification for admission to the pantheon, that the concept of Augustus as god would have been present in every educated mind. Divus Augustus, then, had a lineal connection with Euhemerus' Zeus; he was not merely admitted to heaven but headed the pantheon. The literary setting added depth, richness, and even perhaps some irony to the political necessity of deification.

*University of Western Australia*