

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 46 (2000)

Artikel: The first revolution : Emperor Caesar, 36-28 BC
Autor: Millar, Fergus
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660666>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 03.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

I

FERGUS MILLAR

THE FIRST REVOLUTION: IMPERATOR CAESAR, 36-28 BC

Six decades after its publication in the early days of the Second World War, Ronald Syme's *The Roman Revolution* remains unmatched as a narrative of events, as a portrayal of the rise to power of a young usurper, as an evocation of a whole class of new men who now gained a place in the Roman system, and as a representation — but above all through the medium of literature in Latin — of the real 'revolution' which took place between the 40's and the 20's BC: a revolution of consciousness, in which, on the part of Romans and non-Romans alike, an awareness arose everywhere of being part of a system where power was held by a single ruler.

This paper will look again at the crucial stage in that great transformation, from the moment when the young Emperor Caesar, just 27 years old, returned to Rome in 36 BC after the battle of Naulochus, and when Aemilius Lepidus retired from the Triumvirate, to January of 27 BC, when the unique name which he had already assumed, 'Imperator Caesar Divi filius', was further transformed into 'Imperator Caesar Divi filius Augustus'.

Only then, clearly enough, can we begin to talk of 'the Augustan regime'. But many important developments, and fundamental changes, had already occurred, and it could be argued that it was in the years before the name 'Augustus' was acquired that the true 'Roman revolution' took place. In the

same way, several of the most important 'Augustan' writers, for instance, Vergil, Livy and Horace, were already established before January of 27. It is perhaps not they but Ovid whom we should see as the prime exponent of 'Augustan' ideology¹.

There are many aspects to the significance of the years 36 to 28 BC, and I will spell out here what I see as the most important, returning later in more detail to some of them, but not all. Overall, I want to focus on the years from Actium to January 27, partly because this was perhaps one phase to which Ronald Syme did not quite do justice; and partly because there is now truly remarkable new evidence, above all in the form of a newly-published *aureus* of 28 BC.

First, therefore, a number of separate but related aspects of these years. To begin with, how should we speak of the central figure? Ronald Syme, as has been conventional in English, referred to him normally as 'Octavianus', though on occasion as 'the young Caesar'. But the name 'Octavianus' never appears in a contemporary document, and indeed it is hardly used at all except by Cicero in 44, and occasionally by later Greek narrative sources². That might not matter, but for the fact that, as Ronald Syme himself showed in what I still regard as the best of all his articles, "Imperator Caesar: a Study in Nomenclature"³, the unparalleled successive transformations of the name of the young Octavius are of great significance. Before 36 BC he had acquired a unique *praenomen*, 'Imperator'; the *cognomen* of the Iulii Caesares had come to function as his *nomen*, 'Caesar'; and the deification of Julius Caesar in 42 had given him an equally unique and unprecedented filiation, 'Divi filius'.

¹ F. MILLAR, "Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome seen from Tomoi", in *JRS* 83 (1993), 1-17.

² See *PIR*² I 215; C.J. SIMPSON, "Imperator Caesar Divi filius", in *Athenaeum* 86 (1998), 419-435. A few of the Perusine *glandes* have OCTAV or OCTAVI (*CIL* XI 6721, 9-11), but none to my knowledge has the full form 'Octavianus'.

³ R. SYME, "Imperator Caesar: a Study in Nomenclature", in *Historia* 7 (1958), 172-188 = *Roman Papers* I (Oxford 1979), 361-377.

'Imperator Caesar Divi filius' therefore was his full official name, all the more important in that after the termination of the Triumvirate, at the end of 33, as is now generally agreed⁴, the only official element which distinguished him was the successive consulates, current or prospective, of 31, 30, 29, 28 and 27. More significant, the name by which contemporary writers alluded to him was 'Caesar'. This is true, very notably, of Vergil in the *Georgics*⁵, as it is of Cornelius Nepos in the *Life of Atticus*⁶, and of Vitruvius in the preface to the *de architectura*⁷:

When your *divina mens* and *numen*, Imperator Caesar, gained the empire of the world, and by unconquered *virtus* and with all your enemies prostrate, the citizens rejoiced in your triumph and victory, and all the peoples, subdued, looked to your *nutus* ...

By failing to use the name 'Caesar', we both miss the essential connection to Julius Caesar, to whom Vitruvius alludes a moment later, and also do not express the continuity in the public image and perception of the new ruler, who when he acquired the *cognomen* 'Augustus' was still only 36. In the poems which he published after this, Horace would normally still call him 'Caesar', but sometimes 'Augustus', and occasionally 'Augustus Caesar'⁸.

A revolution in the nature of political power had indeed taken place. But it needs to be stressed that it was a revolution whose public and explicit ideology was, from beginning to end,

⁴ See recently K.M. GIRARDET, "Per continuos annos decem (res gestae divi Augusti 7, 1). Zur Frage nach dem Endtermin des Triumvirats", in *Chiron* 25 (1995), 147-161; D. WARDLE, "ILS 77: Nothing to Do with the End of the Second Triumvirate", in *Historia* 44 (1995), 496-497.

⁵ Verg. *G.* 1,25; 503; 2,170; 3,16; 47-8; 4,560.

⁶ Nep. *Att.* 12,1; 19,3-4; 20,3-5.

⁷ Vitr. *De arch.* 1,1,1.

⁸ 'Caesar': e.g. *Carm.* 1,6,1; 1,12,51-2; 1,21,14; 2,12,10; 3,14,16; 3,25,4; 4,2,34; *Epist.* 1,12,28. 'Augustus': e.g. *Carm.* 3,3,11; 3,5,3; 4,14,3. 'Augustus Caesar': e.g. *Carm.* 2,9,19-20 (*Augusti tropaea Caesaris*). I follow the general view that *Carmina* 1-3 were published together, even if, as is clear, some of the individual poems were written before 27 BC.

entirely conservative. The Triumvirs themselves had been appointed *rei publicae constituendae*; immediately after Naulochus, Appian indicates that the intention to give up power was publicly asserted⁹; and similar plans were put about, by Antonius at least, in the period leading up to Actium¹⁰. An observer such as Cornelius Nepos, and no doubt many others, might express the view that what both Caesar and Antonius sought was to be *princeps* not only of the *urbs Roma* but of the *orbis terrarum*¹¹. But at no stage can we find any evidence that public propaganda or persuasion was current, to the effect that it was desirable, for Rome, for the *cives Romani*, or for all the inhabitants of the empire, that the political system should be transformed in the future so as to give supreme power to a single individual. What we have instead, at least from the moment of Actium onwards, is a perfectly unambiguous recognition, on the part of all our sources, literary and documentary, that such a transformation had already taken place. Suetonius of course reports that there had been two moments when Augustus had given serious thought to the possibility that he might 'give back' the *res publica* (*de reddenda re publica bis cogitavit*): once immediately after the defeat of Antonius and once later when ill¹². But he did not do so.

The first moment will belong to the period after Actium, and that was how Cassius Dio, who certainly used Suetonius, understood it, in placing the fictional debate of Agrippa and Maecenas in 29 BC¹³. That is the paradox of the Roman revolution: no public argument or propaganda had called for monarchic power; but it had arrived all the same. If there ever had been propaganda to the opposite effect, that monarchic power, having arrived, had again been given up, I suggest that

⁹ App. *B Civ.* 5, 132/548.

¹⁰ Dio Cass. 49,41,6; 50,7,1.

¹¹ Nep. *Att.* 20,5.

¹² Suet. *Aug.* 28,1.

¹³ For the debate, Dio Cass. 52,2,1-20,2. For Dio's use of Suetonius, see F. MILLAR, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964; repr. 2000), 85-7.

it would have used Suetonius' expression: *reddere rem publicam*. But there never was. Instead, it has been known for centuries what the official version was in 29 BC, from the inscription seen by Ligorius in the Forum¹⁴. The *res publica* had been *conservata*:

Senatus Populusque Romanus Imp. Caesari Divi Iuli f(ilio), consuli quinct(o), co(n)s(uli) des(ignato) sext(o), imp(eratori) sept(imo), re publica conservata.

Now, however, a unique *aureus* of the next year, 28 BC, acquired by the British Museum, and discussed in an excellent article by John Rich and Jonathan Williams¹⁵, reveals the official propaganda of that year, and serves to explain more fully why it was that later, in his *Res gestae* (34), Augustus was to speak of his sixth and seventh consulate. The obverse shows the laureate head of Caesar, and has the legend:

IMP(erator) C(aesar), DIVI f(ilius), CO(n)S(ul) VI

The reverse shows Caesar on a *sella curulis*, holding a scroll in his right hand, and with a *scrinium* on the ground beside him, and has the legend:

LEGES ET IURA P(opulo) R(omano) RESTITUIT

I need not repeat here the detailed discussion by Rich and Williams, which shows how Cassius Dio, seeking to produce a dramatic focus on the exchanges in the Senate, and on the measures passed, in January of 27, failed to bring out the importance of major steps taken already in 28 BC. What is important for my purpose is the particular form of the claim made in the legend on the reverse of the *aureus*, which (as Rich and Williams point out) is a precise parallel to the Latin legend on cistophoric tetradrachms of the same year: LIBERTATIS

¹⁴ *ILS* 81.

¹⁵ J. RICH and J. WILLIAMS, "LEGES ET IURA P.R. RESTITUIT: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28-27 BC", in *Num.Chron.* 159 (1999), 169-214.

P(opuli) R(omani) VINDEX¹⁶. The ideology of both coins is closely related: constitutional propriety and freedom has already been restored to the *populus Romanus*, and the agent, or 'champion', of that restoration is Imperator Caesar Divi filius.

If I may digress for a moment, the reverse legend on this coin allows me to hazard a speculation. Much attention has always been focused on the fragmentary lines of the Fasti Praenestini which refer to the events of January 13, 27 BC¹⁷. The conventional restoration has always seemed to me puzzling:

Corona querc[ea, uti super ianuam domus Imp. Caesaris]
 Augusti poner[etur, senatus decrevit, quod rem publicam]
 P.R. rest[it]u[it]

For if there had really been embodied in this text a claim that Caesar Augustus had taken a step which amounted, in modern English, to 'restoring the Republic', the inscription should have spoken, like Suetonius, of *reddere rem publicam*. But Caesar did not 'give back' the *res publica*, and the Fasti do not say that he did. But if the inscribed text referred at all to the *res publica* (which is wholly uncertain), it ought to have used (perhaps) the verb *conservare*, like the inscription of 29 BC. What we know, however, is only that it claimed that Caesar *restituit* something to the *populus Romanus*. Was that something the *res publica* itself? Surely not. Ovid's *Fasti* offer one (perhaps) possible reading: "[...quod provincias]/ p. R. rest[i]tui[t]", but Ovid speaks rather of *omnis provincia* being *reddita* (not *restituta*) to the *populus*¹⁸. The new *aureus* now offers a better restoration, which fits perfectly into what seems to be the length of the line: "[quod leges et iura]/ p. R. rest[it]u[it]". I need hardly say that I offer this as a pure speculation. But I do stress that in the only text relating to this phase

¹⁶ C.H.V. SUTHERLAND, *Roman Imperial Coinage*. I: *From 31 BC to AD 69* (London 21984), no. 476 and Pl. 8 (henceforward *RIC I*²).

¹⁷ A. DEGRASSI, *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII 2. Fasti et Elogia* (Roma 1963), 113.

¹⁸ Ov. *Fast.* 1,589-90: *redditaque est omnis populo provincia nostro, / et tuus Augusto nomine dictus avus.*

which does combine the words *restituere* and *res publica*, namely the *Laudatio Turiae*, they appear as an ablative absolute, with no indirect object: *pacato orbe terrarum, res[stitut]a re publica*; and *restituere* here clearly has the sense 'put back in order'¹⁹. I do not believe that *restituere* could have been used in the sense of 'give back', with *res publica* as the object, and with the *populus Romanus* as the indirect object, that is as the recipient of the gift.

The new *aureus* combines with other evidence, however, to emphasise how important, in the Triumviral period itself, in the 'post-Triumviral' (or 'Caesarian', we might say) period of 32-28 BC, and in the Augustan age proper, the Roman *res publica* was. At no stage was any of the traditional institutions of the *res publica* abolished, though under the Triumvirs the occupation of the annual magistracies and of provincial governorships suffered many distortions, and in the same period resources were extracted from the population in many unprecedented ways. Elections seem to have continued, and *leges* were still passed. But it remains very difficult to determine in all respects how the *res publica* actually worked in the 30's and early 20's BC, and no attempt to come back to this question in any detail will be made here²⁰. All that is clear is that, as the new *aureus* serves to emphasise, there was a specific programme of the restoration of constitutional propriety in 28 BC, symbolised from the beginning of the year by the sharing of the *fasces* between Caesar and Agrippa as consuls²¹.

At the level of political structures and political ideology, it could be suggested that the evolution towards the 'Augustan

¹⁹ D. FLACH (Hrsg.), *Die sogenannte Laudatio Turiae* (Darmstadt 1991); *Eloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine*, texte établi, traduit et commenté par M. DURRY, 2ème tirage revu et corrigé par S. LANCEL (Paris 1992), col. II, l. 25.

²⁰ See F. MILLAR, "Triumvirate and Principate", in *JRS* 63 (1973), 50-67; J. BLEICKEN, *Zwischen Republik und Prinzipat: Zum Charakter des Zweiten Triumvirats* (Göttingen 1990); A. GARA and D. FORABOSCHI (eds.), *Il triumvirato costituente alla fine della repubblica romana. Studi in onore di Mario Attilio Levi* (Como 1993).

²¹ Dio Cass. 53,1,1.

principate' took place in three stages. The first was the period from Emperor Caesar's return from Naulochus in the Autumn of 36 BC to his departure for the campaign of Actium. These years saw, in Rome, the co-existence of an individual ruler, 'Imperator Caesar Divi filius', with Senate and People. It was symbolic of that co-existence that his first step on return was to make a speech reporting on the military situation to the People meeting outside the *pomerium*²². As regards the wider context of this regime, there was, in essence, Italy and those provinces which would eventually be Latin-speaking. The 'empire' of Emperor Caesar is neatly summed up in retrospect when Augustus speaks in the *Res gestae* of the oath taken in 32 BC, when those who swore it had also 'demanded' him as *dux* for the war of Actium: it had been taken first by *tota Italia* (allegedly *sponte sua*), but also by the western provinces: Galliae, Hispaniae, Africa, Sicilia, Sardinia²³.

The second phase was from the moment of Caesar's departure for the campaign of Actium to his return to Rome before his triple triumph in 29 BC. In this period he was almost entirely in the East, returning only for a brief critical moment in the winter of 31/30, to deal with unrest among the veterans in Italy. This period has immense significance. Firstly, the 'empire' of Emperor Caesar now became a Greek-speaking empire as well. Of course there had never been a rigid division, and the well-known dossier from Aphrodisias shows how relations had earlier been maintained even with a small city in Asia Minor²⁴. But now, for the first time since the dictatorship of Julius Caesar, there was a single ruler to whom the communities and kingdoms of the Greek world looked, and whose personal decisions would decide their fate. There is a curious parallel here with the evolution of the position of Constantine, who was to bring the Greek part of the Empire under his rule

²² Dio Cass. 49,15,3.

²³ *RG* 25.

²⁴ J.M. REYNOLDS, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982), esp. nos. 10-12.

only in 324, twelve years after his entry to Rome. But the parallel is closer than that; for, firstly, in both cases, the Emperor's appearance in the Greek East brought his activities under the gaze of a significantly larger range of both contemporary and later observers; and, secondly, his travels, activities and exchanges with communities and individuals there serve to illuminate the nature of his regime in a way which is not possible in the context of the West, for which our evidence, both literary and documentary, is so much poorer. The last part of this paper will focus precisely on what we know of the travels and activities of Emperor Caesar in the East between 31 and 29 BC. Partly because there is now new evidence, this is one aspect of the march of events to which Ronald Syme's sweeping and powerful narrative may seem now not to do full justice.

Are there other aspects of the regime of Emperor Caesar which we might now want to see in somewhat different terms? If we return for the moment to Rome and Italy of the years 36 and 28, the most obvious transformation in our outlook is represented by the huge impact on Roman history of the work of Paul Zanker on the changing image of Caesar Augustus, and on the importance of the monumental development of the city in the Augustan period²⁵. The importance to our understanding of Roman history of the monumental and symbolic evolution of the city is further emphasised by the triumphant conclusion, within the last decade of the 20th century, of all five volumes of the topographical lexicon edited by Margareta Steinby²⁶. With buildings, as with literature, much of what we tend to label as 'Augustan', had in fact been completed before Emperor Caesar became 'Caesar Augustus'. The facts are familiar: the spectacular new temple of Apollo, next

²⁵ P. ZANKER, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (München 1987), translated as *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1988).

²⁶ E.M. STEINBY (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* I-V (Roma 1993-9). Henceforth *LTUR*.

to Caesar's house on the Palatine, begun in 36 and dedicated in 28 BC²⁷; the restoration of the temple of Iuppiter Feretrius on the Capitol, urged on to Caesar by Atticus, before his death in 32 BC²⁸; the new Curia Julia and the temple of Divus Julius, the latter dominating and transforming the eastern end of the Forum, dedicated at the time of the triple triumph in 29 BC²⁹; and it was in 28 BC, his sixth consulate, as Augustus was later to record in his *Res Gestae* (20, 4), that by the authority of the Senate he had repaired 82 temples in the city. But surely the most significant innovation of all was the great tomb on the north end of the Campus Martius, which immediately acquired the nickname 'Mausoleum', and which, as Konrad Kraft argued, must have been started in the 30's. For Suetonius states categorically that it and the surrounding area was ready, once again, in Caesar's sixth consulate, 28 BC: "That building, lying between the via Flaminia and the bank of the Tiber, he had constructed in his sixth consulate, and already then had made public property, for the use of the *populus*, the surrounding woods and walks"³⁰. Strabo, commenting on the recent monumentalisation of Rome, particularly stresses the development of the Campus Martius, and in that context lays the most stress on the Mausoleum³¹:

The most noteworthy is what is called the Mausoleum, a great mound near the river on a lofty foundation of white marble, thickly covered with ever-green trees to the very summit. Now on top is a bronze image of Augustus Caesar; beneath the mound are the tombs of himself and his kinsmen and intimates; behind the mound is a large sacred precinct with wonderful

²⁷ Dio Cass. 49,15,5; Hor. *Carm.* 1,31; Prop. 2,31; 4,6; *LTUR* I, s.v. 'Apollo Palatinus'.

²⁸ Nep. *Att.* 20,3; see *LTUR* IV, s.v. 'Iuppiter Feretrius'.

²⁹ Dio Cass. 51,22,1-2; see *LTUR* I, s.v. 'Curia Iulia', and III, s.v. 'Iulius, Divus, Aedes'.

³⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 100,4. See K. KRAFT, "Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus", in *Historia* 16 (1967), 189-206 = *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur antiken Geschichte und Militärgeschichte* (Darmstadt 1973), 29-46.

³¹ Strab. 5,3,8, p.236, Loeb transl.; see *LTUR* III, s.v. 'Mausoleum Augusti: Das Monument'.

promenades; and in the centre of the Campus is the wall (this too of white marble) round his crematorium; the wall is surrounded by a circular iron fence and the space within the wall is planted with black poplars.

In fact, there were also other major projects on the Campus Martius which must already have been long under way when Emperor Caesar received the name 'Augustus', and which were to be completed only in 26 BC and 25 BC: the Saepta Iulia for electoral meetings of the assemblies, and the first Pantheon, both built by Agrippa³².

These major monuments, closely associated with the regime of Emperor Caesar, were not of course the only important building-projects of these years. One of the most distinctive features of the collective life and urban development of Rome in 36-28 BC was one which precisely distinguishes it from the developed 'Augustan' regime which was to follow: the fact that a whole succession of triumphs were held by *proconsules* from both halves of the empire, a significant number of whom then constructed or repaired temples or other public monuments. For example, C. Domitius Calvinus triumphed *ex Hispania* in 36 BC, just before the return of Emperor Caesar, and then rebuilt the Regia; C. Sosius triumphed *ex Iudaea* in 36, and subsequently built or rebuilt the temple near where the theatre of Marcellus would be built, sometimes referred to later as 'Apollo Sosianus'³³; L. Cornificius triumphed *ex Africa* in 33 or 32 BC, and rebuilt the ancient temple of Diana on the Aventine.

These triumphs, and others not listed here, are very important, as one of the main indications that the monopolisation of military glory which was to begin in the middle of the reign of Augustus, and be retained perpetually afterwards, had not yet

³² Dio Cass. 53,23,1-3 (the Saepta Iulia, see *LTUR* IV, *s.v.* 'Saepta Iulia'); 27,2-4 (the Pantheon, see *LTUR* IV, *s.v.* 'Pantheon').

³³ For the many problems associated with the identity and building-history of this temple see *LTUR* I, *s.v.* 'Apollo, aedes in Circo'.

occurred³⁴. But, as regards building projects, and the evolving monumentalisation of the centre of Rome and the Campus Martius, it should be stressed that if Emperor Caesar had succumbed to ill-health at the end of 28 BC, his regime would still have left a vast impact on the city. Indeed, of the most prominent 'Augustan' monuments, only the Theatre of Marcellus, the temple of Mars Ultor and the Naumachia across the Tiber had not yet been built.

Even from the quite limited information available to us, we can discern that the regime of Emperor Caesar in 36-28 BC will have made a massive impact, on the population of Rome above all, but also on the communities of Italy. What we lack very conspicuously is dated documents from this period, reflecting the relations between communities in Italy and the western provinces and the new ruler. In this precise respect there is a clear contrast with what we know of Emperor Caesar in the Greek East in 31-29 BC, and his interactions with communities and local rulers there. For the West, we can do more than spell out the implications of Augustus' own allusions to this phase in his *Res gestae*, and those of the only continuous and detailed narrative source for this period, Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, along with passing references in other sources.

In fact, rather than collect scattered items of evidence here, it may be more useful to emphasise the sheer scale of the operations of government, in Rome and Italy, which are recorded, retrospectively, in the *Res gestae*, for the years 30-28 BC. From this point of view it is unfortunate that Augustus, when speaking of the vast sums paid out to local communities in Italy and the provinces for land for veterans, puts together the operations conducted in 30 BC and later in 14 BC. So we cannot divide

³⁴ See above all W. ECK, "Senatorial Self-representation: Developments in the Augustan Period", in *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, ed. by F. MILLAR and E. SEGAL (Oxford 1984), 129-167, revised as "Autorappresentazione senatoria ed epigrafia imperiale", in W. ECK, *Tra epigrafia, prosopografia ed archeologia* (Roma 1996), 271-298.

between the two phases the enormous sums involved: 600 million *sesterces* in Italy, and 160 million in the provinces (*RG* 16, 1). But we do gain some impression of the scale of the measures taken from his report in *Res gestae* (15, 3) that the 1,000 *sesterces* given in 29 BC, at the time of his triumph, to each of the veterans of his who were already settled in colonies, was received by 120,000 men. The total was therefore 120 million *sesterces*. On the same occasion he reports that he remitted 25,000 pounds of *aurum coronarium* offered for his triumph by the *municipia* and *coloniae* of Italy (21, 3). Each *pondus* was worth 4,200 *sesterces*; so the total here was similar, 147 million *sesterces*³⁵. If we add to that impression of scale his report of the conduct of a census by himself and Marcus Agrippa in 28 BC (*RG* 8, 2), which produced a total of 4,063,000 — nearly all of whom must have been inhabitants of Italy — we get some impression of both the practical and the diplomatic exchanges which marked the relations between *tota Italia* and Emperor Caesar in the years after Actium. As we know from the *Tabula Heracleensis*, at the moment of the taking of a census each community in Italy had to make up a list locally, and have it delivered to Rome by *legati*³⁶. Given this procedure, the involvement of local communities in the census was no mere abstract matter, but will have involved the appearance in Rome of at least several hundred delegates from all over the peninsula.

If we consider also both the recruitment of citizen soldiers in Italy, and the often contentious issue of their discharge and settlement, we can see that, whether the oath taken by *tota Italia* was spontaneous or not, Italy was in some ways approaching the condition of a national state, with a capital city, a national army, and a single ruler in whom authority rested. Rome and its inhabitants of course retained a special status, and Augustus

³⁵ See M. REINHOLD, *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 49-52 (36-29 BC)* (Atlanta 1988), 156.

³⁶ *Tabula Heracleensis* ll. 142-156. See M. CRAWFORD (ed.), *Roman Statutes I* (London 1996), no. 24.

also duly records in the *Res gestae*, speaking of the year 29 BC, that he had then distributed 400 *sesterces* per head to the *plebs urbana* out of the spoils of war (15, 1). Later in the same passage he records that his *congiaria* had never reached less than 250,000 men; so the total given out in 29 BC will have been at least 100 million *sesterces*. He also records that he had three times given a *gladiatorium munus* — one of which, as we know from Cassius Dio, was in 29, and another in 28³⁷. The concentration in these years of *munificentia* directed to the *plebs urbana*, to the cities of Italy and to the veterans is highly significant.

The distribution of cash, the two *munera*, and of course above all the triple triumph, involved the personal appearance by Emperor Caesar before the *plebs Romana* and whoever else was present in the city. Here again, it is not a matter of a symbolic, or abstract, relationship, but of an actual, visible one. But, as was mentioned earlier, one major change which has taken place in our approach to Roman history since *The Roman Revolution* was published 60 years ago is precisely the importance attached, following the lead given by Paul Zanker, to visual symbolism and its reception by the public. So the statues which represented Emperor Caesar in Rome become of great significance. None of those in this period are preserved in the original, but some are known from literary sources and some from representations on coins. Thus a *denarius* which Zanker suggests was minted after Naulochus, reproduces the image of a statue of 'Caesar, Divi f.', represented nude, with his foot on a globe³⁸. At the same moment, as we know from Appian, it was voted that a statue of Caesar should be placed on a column decorated with beaks from the ships of the defeated fleet. A *denarius* which may belong to the 30's or early 20's shows this also, with a laureled portrait on the obverse, and the *columna rostrata* topped by the statue on the

³⁷ Dio Cass. 51,22,4; 53,1,5.

³⁸ ZANKER, *Power of Images* (cit. n.25), 39, with fig. 31a) on p. 41; *RIC*² I 59, no. 256.

reverse, identified by the legend IMP. CAESAR³⁹. The column may well have stood in the Forum, as probably did four bronze columns made from the beaks of Cleopatra's ships which were set up after Actium, and were later removed by Domitian⁴⁰. It was now that the 'Actium Arch', also represented on coins, was erected on the south side of the temple of Divus Julius. If we follow the strong arguments recently put forward by John Rich, this was the only arch 'of Augustus' to be erected in the old Forum; for the alleged 'Parthian Arch', supposed to have stood on the other side of the temple, is not securely attested⁴¹. If this is correct, then another centrally-important symbolic and monumental element of 'Augustan Rome' belongs in fact to the regime of Emperor Caesar, and not to the 'Augustan principate'.

It is of course generally accepted, and needs no proof, that it was in the 40's and 30's BC that the coinage of the Roman world came quite rapidly to reflect the emergence of domination by individuals, by placing images of living persons on coins. The expression 'coinage of the Roman world', however, means two different things: the coinage of the Roman state itself on the one hand, and local coinages, issued by communities or cities or kings and dynasts, on the other. Perhaps the most important single step in our understanding of this period since the publication of *The Roman Revolution* has been the appearance in 1992 of the first volume of *Roman Provincial Coinage*, covering the period from 44 BC to AD 69⁴². For now, for the first time, we can 'read' the images and words through which communities from the Atlantic to the Euphrates represented both themselves

³⁹ ZANKER, *Power of Images*, 41-2, with fig. 32; *RIC*² I 60, no. 271.

⁴⁰ ZANKER, *Power of Images*, 81. They are recorded by Servius, *Georg.* 3,29, who however notes only that they were removed by Domitian to the Capitol, not that this was in order to make way for the Equus Domitiani. See *LTUR* I, s.v. 'Columna rostrata Augusti'.

⁴¹ J. RICH, "Augustus' Parthian honours, the temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum", in *PBSR* 66 (1998), 71-128.

⁴² A. BURNETT, M. AMANDRY, P.P. RIPOLLÈS, *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I: *From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC — AD 69)* (London 1992) (henceforward *RPC*).

and also, progressively, the single ruler under whose power they now found themselves to be living. Every one of these coins must represent a deliberate choice, in both images and words, and each therefore embodies, vividly and precisely, the 'reception' of the distant Emperor. The overwhelming majority of the people in whose names these coins were produced will never have seen their Roman ruler in person; images of him on coins, or statues of him in their cities, had to substitute for the reality. None the less, we should not underestimate the volume of traffic in embassies, bearing census-lists or *aurum coronarium* or letters of congratulation or complaint, which really did appear before the ruler in person, and could therefore bring back with them a remembered image of him. The importance of this element will appear more clearly when we come to the story of Emperor Caesar in the Greek East in 31-29 BC.

If we return first to the two types of coinage concerned, the 'Roman' coinage of the Republic too has been put on an entirely new footing since the publication of *The Roman Revolution*, by the work of Michael Crawford⁴³. From this we can see that the decisive step in what Crawford calls 'the approach to Empire' had already been taken at the end of Julius Caesar's life: coins both bearing his image and naming him (CAESAR IMP.) begin in 44 BC⁴⁴. So the mere fact that portraits of both Antonius and Emperor Caesar, and some others, appear on Roman coins, in the Triumviral period, is no surprise. But there appears, however, to be no clearly datable coinage representing Emperor Caesar in the years immediately before Actium. A series of *aurei* and *denarii* with portraits of Emperor Caesar and the legend IMP. CAESAR DIVI F(ilius) IIIVIR ITER seems to date to 37 and 36⁴⁵. After that is only with the

⁴³ M. CRAWFORD, *Roman Republican Coinage I-II* (Cambridge 1974) (henceforward *RRC*). For the 'Approach to Empire' see the discussion in II 734-44.

⁴⁴ CRAWFORD, *RRC* no. 480.

⁴⁵ CRAWFORD, *RRC* nos. 538, 540. For a survey of the place of coins in the history of the period see now D.R. SEAR, *The History and Coinage of the Roman Emperors 49-27 BC* (London 1998).

legend CAESAR COS. VI that we encounter coins dated by the consulate of Caesar, 28 BC⁴⁶. Surprisingly, there are only a few examples of the representation through the medium of coins of Emperor Caesar and his role and achievements in the period shortly after Actium: the silver *cistophori*, apparently minted in Asia, with LIBERTATIS P(opuli) R(omani) VIN-DEX, already mentioned, and dated to his sixth consulship, 28 BC⁴⁷; and *denarii* from Rome or elsewhere in Italy, also apparently of 29-7 BC, with AEGYPTO CAPTA or ASIA RECEPTA⁴⁸.

The 'Roman' coinage thus did not represent the last few years of the regime of Emperor Caesar as vividly as did other media — inscriptions, statues, arches, temples, the Curia Julia, the Mausoleum. The move towards the universal representation, and naming, of the Emperor on the Roman coinage of the Augustan period proper, and after, might have seemed, until very recently, less immediately decisive than one might expect. But the new *aureus* of 28 BC, discussed above, adds a wholly novel element to the picture.

A not much clearer story is told by the local, or provincial, coinages collected in *Roman Provincial Coinage*. In the period before Actium, and in the western provinces, coins naming and representing Emperor Caesar, often along with Divus Julius, were produced only at the recently-founded *coloniae* of Gaul, namely Lugdunum and Vienna (and possibly Narbo and Arausio)⁴⁹. In other words, the practice of representing and naming Roman holders of power on local coins had not yet become prevalent in this area; it was to come to an end anyway within less than a century, when all local minting in the west ceased, for reasons which are still not clear. In the Greek East, on the other hand, a slightly longer list of places produced coins naming or representing Antonius. Some of these, however, were

⁴⁶ See *RIC*² I 60.

⁴⁷ *RIC*² I 79.

⁴⁸ *RIC*² I 60-1.

⁴⁹ BURNETT, AMANDRY, RIPOLLÈS, *RPC* I, nos. 514; 517; 518; 533.

also *coloniae*, such as Corinth and Philippi. Others were genuinely local, Greek, reflections of the tenure of power: from Cyrenaica (Antonius and the queen, Cleopatra); Thessalonica (Antonius with Caesar); perhaps Byzantium (a dubious head of Antonius); Ephesus (portraits of the Triumvirs and Octavian); and in Syria, from Antioch, Balanea, Aradus, Marathus, Tripolis and Ptolemais, portraits of Cleopatra or Antonius, or both⁵⁰.

When looked at more closely, however, these coins represent a very rudimentary stage in the visual representation, or the naming, of Roman rulers by local communities. What can be called properly *Roman* provincial coinage has not yet really begun. Under Augustus, taking the reign as a whole, it most certainly did begin, and a long list of places in both West and East named and represented the Emperor, and members of his family, on their coins. But, given that, as in literature, 'Caesar' (or 'Kaisar') in Latin or Greek can often still be used as a means of referring to the Emperor, without the addition of 'Augustus' ('Sebastos'), it does not seem that there is a single case where the coins of a city with the image or name of Caesar can be unambiguously dated to the period between Actium and January of 27. In the longer term, especially of course in the Greek East, the coinage of provincial cities is of exceptional interest and importance; and *Roman Provincial Coinage*, when the full series is complete, will provide a unique repertoire of locally-generated images accompanied by names of communities, of local officials and of Roman officials and rulers. But, in the very short term which is at issue here, they do not serve to illuminate the impact of Actium on the consciousness of those who lived in the provinces.

Where we can trace that impact, by a combination of literary and documentary evidence, is in the movements and activities of Imperator Caesar in the period of rather less than two

⁵⁰ *RPC* I, nos. 924-5 (Cyrenaica); 1551 (Thessalonica); 1770 (Byzantium); 2569-74 (Ephesus); 4135 and 4094-6 (Antioch); 4456 (Balanea); 4466-8 (Aradus); 4494 (Marathus); 4509-10 (Tripolis); 4740-2 (Ptolemais).

years between the victory of Actium and his return to Rome in 29 BC. As mentioned above, this is one case where Ronald Syme's magnificent narrative moved a little too quickly, and did not give space to all of the evidence. In any case, there are now several new items of evidence which fill in the story. The task of telling that story would be easier if only Halfmann's excellent book on imperial journeys had begun in 31 and not in 27 BC⁵¹. Hence I cannot pretend to be sure that I have used all the evidence which is now available. But what there is serves in many ways to foreshadow fundamental themes of imperial history: the importance of imperial journeys, and their impact on the population; the fact that it was possible for a Roman ruler to rule from anywhere where he happened to be in the provinces; the need to seek his favour, and his unfettered ability to take effective decisions, even if these might later be ratified by organs of the *res publica*; the importance of oratory in addressing him and seeking his favour; the role of embassies from the cities, appearing before him and bringing back letters with his decisions; the need on his part to express benevolence, and to be able to confer favours as far as possible — or, when it was not possible, to speak or write in a conciliatory fashion, and to explain with regret his reasons for refusing. There is a very precise sense in which the evidence which we now have for Emperor Caesar in the Greek East in 31-29 BC confirms the judgement of Cassius Dio that it was at Actium that *monarchia* began⁵². Moderns may have doubted this, but contemporaries saw the truth with perfect clarity.

The only detailed narrative which we have is that of Cassius Dio in Book 51, and it is this which provides the thread on which all the other evidence hangs⁵³. Dio also makes clear that

⁵¹ H. HALFMANN, *Itinera Principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich* (Stuttgart 1986).

⁵² Dio Cass. 51,1,1-2.

⁵³ Note the excellent commentary by M. REINHOLD (n. 35 above) and the Budé edition by M.-L. FREYBURGER and J.-M. RODDAZ, *Dion Cassius. Histoire Romaine, Livres 50 et 51* (Paris 1991).

the authoritative disposition by Caesar of political power and constitutional status in the Greek world began immediately after Actium: there were exactions from cities, apparently the removal of powers from the *ekklesiai* of (some?) cities, the deposition of some kings, and confirmation of the rule of others (2,1). Caesar visited Athens and was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, and then went East to 'Asia' (4,1). Dio is no more precise than that, but indicates that Caesar was then called back to Italy by trouble with his veterans, went as far as Brundisium, and then returned via Greece to Asia (4-5). Suetonius says both that he was aiming for winter-quarters on Samos, from where he was called back to Brundisium, and that it was in 'Asia' that he entered on his fourth consulate, of 30 BC⁵⁴. Given these rapid movements to and fro, we cannot hope to place accurately, in sequence or place of origin, the one clearly-dated document, and the two others which very probably belong here, which between them show with striking clarity both how the communities of the Greek East recognised immediately after Actium that their world now had a new individual ruler, and how that ruler replied to them with the authority of a monarch.

Of these texts, the one which is unambiguously located in space and time is the letter which Emperor Caesar wrote to Rhosus from Ephesus towards the end of his third consulate, and which formed part of the dossier of documents relating to Seleucus of Rhosus which was inscribed there. It is surely significant that Seleucus, whose dossier had been published in 1934, achieved only a single passing mention in *The Roman Revolution*, and that was in a footnote⁵⁵. The letter of late 31 BC is the third of the four documents in the dossier, and like

⁵⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 17.

⁵⁵ D. ROUSSEL, "Un Syrien au service de Rome et d'Octave", in *Syria* 15 (1934), 33-74; *IGLS* III, no. 718; R.K. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus* (Baltimore 1969), no. 58. Note also the translation of the dossier by R.K. SHERK, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* (Cambridge 1984), no. 86. The solitary reference to Seleucus in *The Roman Revolution* is on p.236, n. 2.

the other texts of this phase is in Greek. It will be worth quoting it in full⁵⁶:

[Year...], Dystros. Imperator Caesar Divi filius, Imperator for the sixth time, consul for the third time, designated for the fourth, to the magistrates, council and people of Rhodus, the sacred and inviolate and autonomous, greetings. If you are well, it would be good: I too, with the army, am flourishing. The ambassadors sent by you, Seleucus, my naval commander, Heras son of Call[...], [...]eros, Symmachos, good men, from a good people, our friend and ally, having arrived at Ephesos, spoke to me on the matters on which they had instructions. I for my part received them and found them to be patriotic and good men, and accepted the honour and the crown, and [will try?] when I come to your area to be the source of some benefit to you and to preserve the privileges of the city, and will do these things the more gladly on account of Seleucus, my naval commander, who fought alongside me through the time of the war and distinguished himself in every way, and provided every evidence of his goodwill and loyalty. He took every opportunity to intercede on your behalf and gave every sign of effort and enthusiasm over the matters which were of benefit to you. Farewell.

It would be difficult to imagine any document which embodied either a more vivid reflection of the immediate situation after the victory of Actium (including an anticipation of the journey which Imperator Caesar would make through Syria to Egypt, and then back, in the Spring and Autumn of the following year) or of the fundamental pattern of diplomatic exchanges: honour and the presentation of requests on the one hand, and the systematic demonstration of monarchic benevolence on the other.

The other two documents which may well reflect the aftermath of Actium are not so clearly anchored in space and time. The first is a letter of Imperator Caesar to Mylasa in Caria in reply to an embassy⁵⁷. No place of writing is indicated, and something has gone wrong with the indication of his consulship. For what is given in the text is "and appointed consul for

⁵⁶ The Greek text of the letter occupies ll. 73-84 of the inscription.

⁵⁷ SHERK, *Roman Documents*, no. 60.

the third time" which is necessarily incomplete (ὑπατός τε τὸ τρίτον καθεστάμενος). Moreover, unlike the two letters to Rhosus with which we will be concerned, and that to Ephesos discussed below, the number of his imperial acclamations is not given. It is therefore very likely, though of course it cannot be certain, that the full title will have read "Imperator for the sixth time, consul for the third time, and appointed for the fourth" (αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἕκτον, ὑπατός τὸ τρίτον, τὸ τε τέταρτον καθεσταμένος). The alternative is to accept either that a reference to Emperor Caesar's Triumviral powers has dropped out, in which case the document could belong at any date in the early 30s, or that it belongs to 32 BC, the year before Actium, when indeed his only public position was as *consul designatus* for the third time for 31. But something has certainly dropped out, and the letter, which is very fragmentary, fits best in the aftermath of Actium.

So also, as Ernest Badian has persuasively argued, does the famous subscript of Emperor Caesar to the Samians, which nearly three centuries later was to be incorporated in the 'archive-wall' of Imperial documents from the theatre of Aphrodisias⁵⁸. As it stands, this seems to be a document of after January 27 BC, for Emperor Caesar has in Greek the cognomen Αὐγουστος. But the standard Greek version of 'Augustus' was of course Σεβαστός, and the odds are strongly that this term has been inserted in the version inscribed in the early third century. If so, this too might well be a document from the aftermath of Actium, though possibly the war referred to might be the Parthian invasion led by Labienus. But, as Badian suggests, two considerations speak strongly for the aftermath of Actium: the fact that Emperor Caesar speaks of Aphrodisias 'having taken *my* part in the war'; and the very fact that this is a subscript to the Samians, not a letter. For a natural context for the presentation of a petition, and the giving of a reply,

⁵⁸ REYNOLDS, *Aphrodisias*, no. 13. See E. BADIAN, "Notes on Some Documents from Aphrodisias Concerning Octavian", in *GRBS* 25 (1984), 157-170, on pp.165-170.

would have been while Caesar was wintering there, either in 31/30 or in 30/29 BC. Furthermore, as Badian duly notes, Caesar speaks here as if the question of the freedom or exemption from tribute of Samos was entirely at his own discretion.

If uncertainties persist over the original context, it will still be worth reminding ourselves of the way in which Emperor Caesar expressed himself to the Samians, in not merely giving a reply to their request for freedom and exemption from tribute (not the only appeal about tribute which he would receive in these years, as we will see), but in explaining and justifying his decision. I quote the translation by Joyce Reynolds:

You yourselves can see that I have given the privilege of freedom to no people except the Aphrodisians, who took my side in the war and were captured by storm because of their devotion to us. For it is not right to give the favour of the greatest privilege of all at random and without cause. I am well-disposed to you and should like to do a favour to my wife who is active in your behalf, but not to the point of breaking my custom. For I am not concerned for the money which you pay towards the tribute, but I am not willing to give the most highly prized privileges to anyone without good cause.

Early in the year 30 Emperor Caesar began the sea-voyage southwards towards Syria and the ultimate prize of his victory, Alexandria and Egypt. We might well have guessed that he and his fleet would have stopped at Rhodes, but so far as I know our only specific proof that he did comes from a writer who is of immense importance for the period, Josephus. Neither Ronald Syme nor anyone else writing the history of the Triumviral period, of the domination of Emperor Caesar and then of the long reign of Augustus, has yet used to the full the testimony of Josephus, who tells twice-over the eventful story of the reign of Herod and his relations with the Triumvirs and Augustus, once in the *Jewish War* and again, at much greater length, in the *Antiquities*. His testimony is based on the last part of the *Universal History* written by Nicolaus of Damascus, which itself devoted many books to the account of Herod. There are many problems in Josephus' all too vivid narrative,

which in many parts reads like a romance or a tragedy. But the fact remains that it is based on a very full contemporary source, and provides the only account of the early Imperial regime as seen through the experience of a dependent king⁵⁹.

Herod's forces had in fact not fought at Actium, being engaged on a local conflict against the Nabataeans. But Josephus records, in both the *War* and the *Antiquities*, how Herod saw at once that Actium had changed everything, and that, if he were to keep his royal diadem, urgent steps were needed⁶⁰. He reports in vivid style how Herod hastened to Rhodes to meet Caesar, appeared before him, symbolically without his diadem, and made a speech to argue that his loyalty to Antonius should be understood as a guarantee of future loyalty to the new ruler. Caesar accepted the argument, returned his diadem and gave him other honours, doing so all the more gladly because Didius had reported to him the help given by Herod in the matter of a large band of pro-Antonian gladiators who had been recently on the loose in Syria, and had needed to be brought under control.

Two features of the account are of special importance. One is that Herod made a plea to Caesar for the life of a figure called Alexas, which Caesar felt obliged under the terms of an oath to refuse. Once again, as with his reply to the Samians, he evidently felt the need to explain his reasons for saying no.

The second important aspect is the explicit indication, but in the *Antiquities* only, that Herod's kingdom was granted to him not only by the 'gift' of Caesar but also by a 'decree of (the) Romans' (δόγματι Ῥωμαίων) which Caesar took care to secure for him⁶¹. Whether Josephus meant to refer to a *senatus consultum* or a *lex* is not clear; what matters is the indication that in the period of the sole rule of Emperor Caesar, as under the

⁵⁹ For the reign of Herod as king see *Jewish War* 1,18,4-33,9 (358-673), and in considerably greater detail *Antiquities* 15-17. For Nicolaus see still B.Z. WACHOLDER, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (Berkeley 1962)

⁶⁰ *BJ* 1,20,1-3 (386-93); *AJ* 15,6,5-7 (187-97).

⁶¹ *AJ* 15,6,7 (196). *BJ* 1,20,3 (393) has only δόγματι διεσήμαινεν τὴν δωρεάν.

Triumvirate, at least some care was exercised to have individual decisions confirmed by the inherited institutions of the *res publica*. Another instance, relating to Egypt, will appear shortly.

As we saw, Caesar was already en route to Egypt when Herod went to meet him on Rhodes. What itinerary he followed first is not clear. But Josephus' narrative, with slightly different details in the *War* and *Antiquities*, makes clear that for part of his journey he passed through Syria. Herod escorted him, entertained him lavishly at Ptolemais (which lay outside his own territory), made available supplies for the journey across the desert, and made him a gift of 800 talents⁶². If the figure is not fantasy, it represents a considerable sum in Roman terms, nearly 10 million *sesterces*.

When news came of Caesar's victory, and of the deaths of Antonius and Cleopatra in mid-summer of 30 BC, Herod went to Egypt in person, and here again very substantial rights were conferred on him. He received seven city territories — Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa and Straton's Tower (the later Caesarea), and was also given a force of 400 Gauls who had been in the service of Cleopatra⁶³. This was of course the historic moment when, as Augustus was later to record in the *Res gestae*, he "added Egypt to the imperium of the Roman people" (*RG* 22, 1). Cornelius Gallus was left to rule the new province as Praefectus, and, if we may believe a passage of Ulpian preserved in the *Digest*, a *lex* was passed in Rome to confirm that he would have powers comparable to those of a proconsul⁶⁴. Such a constitutional act would have been purposeless unless carried through immediately, so it should belong to the Autumn of 30 BC or to the Spring of 29.

This is not the place to review the complex evidence for the creation and organisation of the province of Egypt⁶⁵, but it should be noted that here too Caesar took care to bring him-

⁶² *BJ* 1,20,3 (394-5); *AJ* 15,6,7 (199-200).

⁶³ *BJ* 1,20,3 (396-7); *AJ* 15,7,4 (215-17).

⁶⁴ *Dig.* 1,7,1.

⁶⁵ See esp. G. GERACI, *Genesi della provincia romana d'Egitto* (Bologna 1983).

self in person into relation with the population of Alexandria. Speaking in Greek, he addressed the people and told them, in Cassius Dio's version, that he had spared the city for three reasons: their god Serapis, their founder Alexander, and his own connections to his teacher, Areios, their fellow-citizen⁶⁶.

Dio then records that, after founding the city of Nicopolis in Egypt, Caesar departed via Syria to Asia. Herod escorted him again as far as Antioch⁶⁷, and Suetonius notes that he entered on his fifth consulate, of 29 BC, on Samos⁶⁸.

At some time in his fourth consulate Caesar wrote again to Rhosus, in graciously monarchic style⁶⁹. The occasion may perhaps have been while Caesar was passing through Syria or Cilicia, either en route to Egypt or on his return. Here again, the tone of the letter is so significant for the nature of the new monarchy that the letter deserves to be quoted in full:

[Year...] month Apellaios. Imperator Caesar Divi filius, Imperator for the sixth time, consul for the fourth time, to the magistrates, council and people of Rhosus, the sacred, inviolate and autonomous, greetings. If you are well, it would be well. I and the army are flourishing. Seleucus, who is both your fellow-citizen and my naval commander, having served alongside me in all the wars, and having given many proofs of goodwill and loyalty and courage, as was appropriate for those who have served alongside me and distinguished themselves in war, has been honoured with the privileges of exemption from tribute and (Roman) citizenship. I therefore commend him to you. For such men render one's goodwill more ready also towards their native cities. So, given that I am ready to do all the more gladly everything that is possible for you on account of Seleucus, have confidence and send to me about whatever you want. Farewell.

No ambassadors are mentioned, and it may well be that the letter was prompted by a request from Seleucus himself. It is not unlikely that the emphasis on the value of Seleucus in

⁶⁶ Dio Cass. 51,16,3-4. A different version of his proclaimed motives is given in Plut. *Ant.* 80.

⁶⁷ *AJ.* 15,7,4 (218). Not included in *War.*

⁶⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 26,3.

⁶⁹ SHERK, *Roman Documents*, no. 58, iv (ll. 85-93). Full references in n.55.

terms of future benefits to be received from the ruler reflects tensions and personal hostilities in the city. At all events the future role of Caesar as a source of such benefits is unambiguously advertised.

As we have seen, on January 1, 29 BC, when he entered on his consulship, Caesar was on Samos, and it was not until the summer, according to Cassius Dio⁷⁰, that he set off for Greece and then Italy. This period is also of crucial importance, and is illustrated by several very significant items of evidence. Firstly, Dio's narrative makes it quite explicit that it was while he was still in Asia, between entering on his consulship and his departure westwards, that he "allowed" (ἔφῆκεν or ἐπέτρεψε) the establishment of temples to Roma and Divus Julius to be established in Ephesus and Nicaea, for worship by the Romans resident in those places; as for the others, who identified themselves as 'Hellenes', those in Asia were permitted to establish a temple to himself in Pergamon, and those in Bithynia at Nicomedia. Thus, as Dio notes, an example was given to all the other provinces⁷¹.

This, Dio says, was in the winter, and he adds that the Pergamenes also received the right to celebrate a sacred contest in honour of the temple; there is no need to pursue here the later history of the temple or the contest⁷². What matters is the context and Dio's language, which states quite clearly that Caesar "allowed" all four temples, and therefore implies that all four owed their origin to requests addressed to him by the cities involved; Nicaea and Nicomedia in Bithynia, and Ephesus and Pergamon in Asia. Once again, we see the rapidly evolving pattern of diplomatic exchanges between subject cities and their now clearly-identified sole ruler.

Until recently, this familiar narrative represented all that we could say about exchanges at this moment between the major

⁷⁰ 51,21,1.

⁷¹ 51,20,6-8.

⁷² 51,20,9. See S.R.F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).

cities of Asia Minor and Emperor Caesar. But the huge harvest of Imperial inscriptions from Ephesus has now been enriched by one carrying the text of a letter from Caesar to Ephesus written in his fifth consulate, 29 BC⁷³.

Published in 1993, this very revealing letter does not so far appear to have attracted any attention. Conceived of as a routine letter written by an Emperor in reply to an embassy from an important provincial city, it would be indeed of no special interest. Its significance arises, however, precisely from the fact that we can see in it another instance of how the norms of later forms of diplomatic exchange were established at once, in the immediate aftermath of the civil wars, and while the formal relationship of Emperor Caesar to the Roman *res publica* was still rapidly evolving. For these reasons it too deserves translation in full:

[Imp. Caesar] Divi filius, consul for the fifth time, Emperor for the seventh time, to the council and people of the Ephesians, greetings. If you are well, it would be well. I with the army am flourishing. Theodosius, [Memnon?], Protogenes, Herakleides, Sopatros, Asklepiades, Aristion, Agathenor, Menodo[tos], the ambassadors of the [-ekkle? — or more probably *gerou?*]-sia, [have given] me the decree from the *gerousia* and [have spoken] in accordance with what [is to be found] in it. [Therefore] I [approve?] the constitution? (σύστημα) of the *gerousia*, [and will preserve] your [laws?] and the [honours and?] privileges. [Farewell]

There is nothing in the document to indicate at what time in the year the letter was written, or from where. Formally speaking, it could have been composed on the journey back to Italy, or in Rome itself. But it is, obviously, natural to suppose that, whatever the issue was which concerned the *gerousia* of Ephesus, it will have been brought to Caesar's notice while he was still in Asia, in the period when the arrangements for the major new Imperial festivals were being approved.

⁷³ D. KNIBBE, H. ENGELMANN, B. IPLIKÇIOĞLU, "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos XII", in *JÖAI* 62 (1993), Hauptblatt, 113-150, no. 2; *AE* 1993, no. 1461.

If this large embassy, of apparently nine men, did approach Caesar before he left, it was not to be the last Greek embassy which would set off to appear before him before he got back to Rome. For an important piece of reminiscence by Strabo, who is in many ways among the most significant of all contemporary witnesses to the Roman revolution⁷⁴, takes us back precisely to the summer of 29 BC. Speaking of the Cyclades islands, Strabo says⁷⁵:

Of these islands, putting in at Gyarus, I found a village inhabited by fishermen. Setting sail, we took on board an ambassador from there, chosen as ambassador to Caesar (Caesar was at Corinth on his way to the Actian triumph). While sailing with us, he explained to those who enquired that he was serving as ambassador over the alleviation of tribute. The island was due to pay 150 *drachmae*, when they could pay even 100 with difficulty.

Strabo does not record whether the fisherman ever caught up with Caesar, or whether his embassy was successful. But it is extremely significant that even a very small community such as this had the procedures for selecting an ambassador; that they believed themselves to be entitled to put a case relating to the level of their tribute; that they now knew to which individual they should put that case; and that they had at least an approximate idea of where he was to be found, even though he was in fact in transit between Asia and Italy.

As we saw in the case of Samos, whose petition for freedom and exemption of tribute was at this moment unsuccessful, the question of the tribute due to the *aerarium* in Rome was open to constant negotiation — but now, in the first instance at least, negotiation before a single, all-powerful ruler. The very modest level of the tribute concerned in this case, evidently payable in cash, is also of interest. Even the higher sum, the

⁷⁴ See now K. CLARKE, "In Search of the Author of Strabo's *Geography*", in *JRS* 87 (1997), 92-110; *Between Geography and History. Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford 1999).

⁷⁵ 10,5,3, p.485-6.

one actually demanded, was equivalent only to 600 *sesterces*, or two-thirds of the annual pay of one legionary soldier. It is easy from this to understand the pressures which led Caesar to one of the most drastic measures of his rule in the period before 27 BC, the rapid reduction of the number of legions from perhaps 60 to, it seems, 28, in the period before the disaster of AD 9. At all events, the request which the fisherman from Gyarus hoped to put before Caesar, and which involved sums, admittedly very small ones, due to the *aerarium* at Rome, could well be regarded as the most potent sign of that new order which had now, already, arrived. If we also think for a moment of that truly great work of sixty years ago, *The Roman Revolution*, we can perhaps now see one of its fundamental characteristics — that the story which it told so powerfully was truly that of a *Roman* revolution, a transformation of the political order which prevailed in a Latin-speaking, Roman, society. But there was an equally profound transformation in the Greek-speaking world ruled by Rome, from Achaëa to Asia Minor, to Syria, to Judaea and to Egypt.

This paper will not return to the details of the various honours voted to, and some accepted by, Imperator Caesar in (perhaps) late 30 BC and in 29, or of the other constitutional and practical steps taken in Rome between the summer of 29 and January of 27. Enough has been said, it may be hoped, to emphasise again that many of the most decisive steps — and even more important, the most decisive aspects of a fundamental alteration of mentality and political awareness — had already taken place before 'Imperator Caesar Divi filius' was transformed into 'Imperator Caesar Divi filius Augustus'.

DISCUSSION

Kl.M. Girardet: Sie haben uns mehrere Inschriften mit Briefen des Imperator Caesar aus den Jahren 31 bis 29 v.Chr. vorgestellt, die den Beginn monarchischer Wirklichkeit erkennen lassen. Dies würde vermutlich noch deutlicher, wenn man entsprechendes Quellenmaterial aus dem 2. und frühen 1. Jh. v.Chr. für einen Vergleich besäße. Die Briefe bzw. Inschriften der Jahre 31 bis 29 v.Chr. sind an griechische Gemeinden, aber auch an einzelne Personen gerichtet (mit Privilegien etc.). Meine Frage zielt auf mögliche — politische — Gründe, weshalb diese Dokumente von den Empfängern als Inschriften öffentlich gemacht wurden. Könnte es sein, dass — vom Stolz auf Erreichtes abgesehen — hiermit gleichsam *exempla imitanda* vorgeführt werden sollten? Wer sich um die Sache des Imperator Caesar verdient gemacht hat — und sich künftig um den neuen Herrn verdient macht —, erhält auch die angemessene Belohnung. Das Wechselspiel von *beneficium* und *officium*...

F. Millar: I certainly agree that, in both style and content, we need to compare the letters of Imperator Caesar from the years 31 to 29 BC with earlier letters of Roman *imperatores* to Greek cities, beginning in the early second century BC. It is only unfortunate that there are no such letters from Pompeius, for these would be significant for the emergence of a monarchic tone. The newly-published letter of Lucullus to Mopsuestia is however important (*AE* 1994, no. 1755), as is the remarkable letter of Julius Caesar to Sardes, written only a few days before the Ides of March (*AE* 1989, no. 684).

You are correct also in emphasising that we must ask in each case not only what circumstances gave rise to the writing of each letter, but in whose interests it was to have it inscribed,

and what purposes would be served by its being inscribed and put up in public.

The case of Seleucus of Rhosus is particularly apposite, since by its nature the entire dossier stresses the role of an individual, the privileges which he had received, and his potential importance as the channel for future benefits to his very modest home city. In the years before Actium Rhosus had clearly lain in Antonius' sphere, and it is difficult to imagine that the ships which Seleucus had commanded could have been Rhosian ones, supplied by the *polis* of Rhosus itself. So his relations with his fellow-citizens may well have been delicate, and public evidence of the favours which he enjoyed from Imperator Caesar may have been very useful to him.

G. Rowe: I think it is likely (though of course unattested) that Seleucus himself paid for the inscription.

I wonder, whether we should describe what occurred between 36 and 28 BC as the coalescence of power of a single ruler — or instead a sharing of power that later became explicitly dynastic? I am thinking of Agrippa and Livia. When considering building in Rome between 36 and 31 BC, one must emphasise Agrippa's aedileship in 33 BC. A decade later, while Augustus was in Rome, it was Agrippa who would tour the Greek half of the empire and respond to petitioners (23-21 BC, 16-13 BC) — something for which we happen to have testimony directly from Nicolaus (*FGrH* 90 F 134). In 12 BC, Augustus would remember Agrippa in the funeral oration as having been his peer. As for Livia, in Imperator Caesar's response to the Samians, Caesar need not have mentioned Livia's attempt to influence his decision, but he chose to do so in the conciliatory phrases he addressed to the Samians: Livia's influence was part of the image of power which he deliberately projected. Lastly, when Caesar returned to Rome in the middle of 29 BC and celebrated his triple triumph, he appeared flanked by Livia's son Tiberius and by his own nephew Marcellus. So, for the period 36-28 BC, perhaps one should speak

of Emperor Caesar first sharing real, 'monarchical' power with Agrippa and Livia, then, in 29 BC, deliberately broadcasting a dynastic message.

F. Millar: You are absolutely correct to suggest that a representation of events which focuses on the individual role of Emperor Caesar — or of him as Augustus, or of later Emperors — suffers from incompleteness. I think that it has to be confessed that in *The Emperor in the Roman World* I did not succeed in finding, within the structure of the book, an appropriate place for other members of the successive Imperial families, including Emperors' wives, or for their major associates, except as members of the *consilium*, and as Praetorian Prefects.

Livia surely occupied a more prominent public role than any subsequent female member of any Imperial family, and it is striking that her independent status and importance is still stressed, half a century later, by Tiberius, in writing to Gythion.

But the really difficult case to assess is Agrippa. For, given that both his functional and his formal role was exceptionally prominent — and that in the period when the role of Emperor Caesar himself was still in the process of definition — there seems to be no clear indication anywhere in our evidence that he was conceived of, even potentially, as a co-Emperor, or rival Emperor. This was perhaps another respect in which everything was owed to the name of 'Caesar'. It is surely significant also that neither the administrative steps taken in January 27 BC nor the honours voted then gave any place to Agrippa.

It is curious that the inscription of him as *consul III* which Hadrian retained on his rebuilt Pantheon gives his name a more prominent place in contemporary Rome than that of Augustus himself.

T. Hölscher: Sie haben in der ideologischen Selbstdarstellung Octavians von 27 v.Chr. das Fehlen einer Propaganda für eine monarchische Machtposition und die Präntention an Bewah-

rung der alten *res publica* hervorgehoben. Bedeutet aber nicht die Residenz auf dem Palatin, gebaut zwischen 36 und 28 v.Chr., einen offen dargestellten Anspruch auf eine einzigartige Stellung? Sie wurde offenbar bewusst als Zentrum eines Dreiecks von hoch-ideologischen Bauten geplant: des Tempels seines Schutzgottes Apollo, mit direktem Zugang zu dem Tempelareal; des Tempels der Magna Mater, die die troianischen Ursprünge Roms verkörperte, und der angeblichen Hütte des Stadtgründers Romulus. Paul Zanker hat darauf hingewiesen, dass urhellenistische Könige ihre Paläste in solcher Weite positioniert haben.

Entsprechend scheinen mir die Bauprojekte von Triumphatoren der Triumviratszeit nicht mehr die alte republikanische Selbständigkeit der Bautätigkeit zu dokumentieren. In meinem eigenen Beitrag hoffe ich deutlich zu machen, dass diese Bauten schon Teil eines Spiels mit verteilten Rollen war, dessen Regie fest in der Hand Octavians lag.

Wenn dennoch in öffentlichen Verlautbarungen immer wieder hervorgehoben wurde, dass damals die alte Ordnung wieder hergestellt worden sei, so stellt sich die Frage, warum ein Bewusstsein dafür entstanden ist, dass dies nicht mehr die bisherige, sondern eine neue *res publica* war: nicht nur eine neuere, glücklichere Zeit unter besserer politischer Führung, sondern eine grundsätzlich neue Staatsordnung. Wo sind die frühesten expliziten Zeugnisse für ein solches Bewusstsein?

F. Millar: You have made three important points. Firstly, as regards the implicit message conveyed by the construction of Caesar's new residence on the Palatine, in close conjunction with the memorials of Romulus, with the temple of Magna Mater and above all with the new temple of Apollo, I entirely agree that it would have been extremely difficult for any contemporary Roman not to draw the conclusion that a new political order was coming into being. Following Konrad Kraft, I would say the same of the Mausoleum, which was surely under construction already before Actium.

What I wanted to stress was only that this very clear emerging symbolism had not, so far as we know, been preceded by any explicit argument to the effect that individual rule was desirable, or represented the only cure for Rome's problems, and nor was it even accompanied by any such argument. Atticus, as Cornelius Nepos represents him, *recognised* that the conflict was about individual power, and so presumably did others. But it really does not seem that arguments in favour of the need for monarchic power were ever explicitly presented.

As for the *triumphatores* and their building projects, I am sure that you are right that they do not represent any real independence. Their significance emerges only retrospectively, when the *Fasti Triumphales* break off in 19 BC. In that sense we could see the 30's and the 20's BC, taken together, as a final phase in one aspect of the compromise between old and new, or between republican tradition and monarchy.

Finally, I think that there is actually an answer to the question of when we first find an explicit public acknowledgment of the fact that power has now passed into the hands of a single ruler: the preface to the first book of Vitruvius' *De architectura*. This is all the more significant in that it lays a clear emphasis on Divus Julius, of a sort which Syme had been disposed to deny. Of course, this preface would be even more important if only we could determine exactly when it was written. But it was surely not later than the 20's BC.

A. Wallace-Hadrill: It would be hard to take issue with what Fergus Millar says about the importance of the period preceding Actium and its effect in laying the basis for the future regime. But when he speaks of a 'revolution of consciousness', we are brought up against the old dilemma, that it is at the level of consciousness that monarchy fails to find linguistic expression. Nobody could doubt monarchy as a *fact* after Actium, and it is significant that in the sphere of architecture and art so much already pointed symbolically to monarchy.

Greek sources too, as he has shown, speak without difficulty of *μοναρχία*. This makes it the more interesting that Latin sources do *not* articulate the change ideologically as a 'revolution of consciousness'.

Syme was able to evade this problem in two ways: through his denial that ideological issues matter, and through the insistence that political reality not constitutional form is what matters, so that 'monarchy' too is a cover for oligarchy.

But it surely is interesting to ask how the Romans accommodated ideologically such a massive transformation. Part of the answer lies in a denial of change, or perhaps better put, in the representation of change as continuity. The image of Emperor Caesar in his *sella curulis* 'restoring' the LEGES ET IVRA is a powerfully ambivalent one: is this a consul embodying tradition, or an emperor embodying change? The ideology appears to insist on a continuity with tradition (clearly evoked by religious 'restorations'), which at the same time succeeds in distancing itself from the period *before* Actium as one of discontinuity. Just who is responsible for the discontinuity (who took away *leges et iura*) remains unexpressed.

F. Millar: It is surely correct that Greek writers found it easier than did Roman contemporaries writing in Latin to acknowledge explicitly the transfer of power to an individual (though, as we have just been saying, I would regard the preface of Vitruvius as coming very close indeed to such an open recognition).

One problem is that we have no Greek source which belongs specifically to the years just after Actium. So, obviously enough, when Cassius Dio asserts categorically that *monarchia* began at the moment of the victory he was offering a retrospective analysis from nearly three centuries later. Strabo (17,3,25, p.840) is in effect equally explicit — but even his work did not receive its finishing touches until the reign of Tiberius. Perhaps the closest in time is what Nicolaus of Damascus says in his *Vita* of Augustus. But that is cast only in very general terms.

In fact, provided that we do not insist on precise constitutional language, there are many expressions which can easily be culled from Augustan poetry which do reflect a recognition of monarchic power — or, at least, do not embody any collective effort to obscure this fact.

I would perhaps rather wish to put the emphasis on the prominence in public ideology of the *populus Romanus*: on the *aureus* of 28 BC, in Augustan and Tiberian inscriptions, in the *Tabula Siarensis* and in the *Res gestae*. It is to the *populus Romanus* that the new ruler restores *iura et leges*, to the *imperium* of the *populus Romanus* that he adds Egypt, and from the *populus*, or the SPQR, that he receives exceptional honours and powers.

J. Scheid: Le problème de la perception des pouvoirs 'monarchiques' du jeune César est effectivement important. En écoutant la présentation, par M. Millar, de son action en Orient, je me suis demandé en quoi sa conduite différait de celle d'autres détenteurs d'*imperium* spécial, comme par exemple Pompée. Mais l'observation que je voudrais faire concerne plutôt Rome et le régime mis en place entre 36 et 27.

L'analyse des initiatives religieuses datant de ces années confirme les conclusions de M. Millar. Pendant cette période, le jeune César et ses amis ont jeté les fondations de ce qui sera, au fond, l'expression religieuse du principat augustéen: si l'on exclut les jeux séculaires, la fondation des Augustalia et quelques autres mesures impossibles à prendre avant la mort de Lépide, les mesures prises avant 27 représentent à peu près toutes les initiatives en matière religieuse. D'un côté, et sans revenir sur la restauration des temples que M. Millar a évoquée, un certain nombre de rites ou de sacerdoces furent réanimés ou restaurés: on peut citer le rite du fétial (32), la prise de l'*augurium salutis* (29), la fermeture du Janus (29), ainsi que la transformation en prêtrises publiques des Frères Arvales et des *sodales Titii* (29/28), liée, comme la restauration du temple de Jupiter Feretrius, au mythe de Romulus. A la même date les

sacerdotes publics furent restructurés, dotés de moyens et de privilèges nouveaux. Toutes ces mesures avaient pour objectif et effet, comme A. Wallace-Hadrill l'a dit, de mettre en vue une rupture: les guerres civiles étaient le résultat de l'*impietas*, le régime actuel représentant la reprise des actes de *pietas*, des restaurations religieuses construisaient en quelque sorte la cause des malheurs précédents et la rupture. D'un autre côté, les privilèges religieux accordés à l'Empereur César et à sa famille depuis 36 ainsi que l'obligation d'offrir une libation au Génie du prince lors des banquets préfigurent, avec le culte du Divus Iulius, ce qu'on appelle le culte impérial.

F. Millar: I am very happy to accept the observations of John Scheid, which (I am glad to say) support the tendency of my arguments, that major innovations (even if under the guise of restorations) mark the years before the votes of January 27 BC. On the political or constitutional plane, a very similar tendency will be seen in the excellent paper of Williams and Rich on the new *aureus* of 28 BC.

I would wish only to stress what seems to me the considerable importance of the report by Cornelius Nepos (*Att.* 20,3) that it had been at the *admonitus* of Atticus, before his death in 32 BC, that Caesar had undertaken the repair of the temple of Iuppiter Feretrius on the Capitol, founded by Romulus. That serves to open up the question of from where the inspiration for Caesar's programme of restoration, physical, institutional and moral, had really derived.