It is generally agreed that the revelation of Rome's future in the last part of Book VI marks the crucial turning point in the Aeneid. Before it Aeneas has little interest or understanding of his fated future. He is weak and vacillating. His interest is directed nostalgically back to Troy, not forward to the future. But in Book VI he fully sees what his mission entails.

Rome did have a glorious history and it would have been easy to fill this section with one notable achievement after another. Of course, Vergil does include glowing praises of Rome (781-787, 847-853), of Augustus' (791-805), and of many heroes from Rome's past. However, it is normal in the Aeneid for the light passages to be counteracted and subverted by dark passages, a technique which was widely noticed in antiquity.

Here, in the revelation of Rome's future in Book VI, the three longest descriptions of men, besides that of Augustus, emphasize pain, suffering, and loss. They are the description of Lucius Junius Brutus (817-823), Julius Caesar and Pompey (826-835), and Marcellus (868-886). In this article I will attempt to demonstrate that the Julius Caesar-Pompey passage is a very open and serious attack on Augustus' propaganda.

The most striking aspect of this passage is that although both Pompey and Caesar made great contributions to the Roman state, these are not even hinted at. Instead, Vergil concentrates completely on the destruction that their civil war will cause. Indeed, they are "covered by night" (827), which implies that they are not among the heroes in Elysium, who "know their own sun and their own stars" (641). Furthermore, the only time that one of them is treated separately is at the end (834-835), where Anchises tells Caesar, "you first ... throw the weapon from your hand ... . This puts the responsibility for the war on Caesar. Thus Vergil chose one of the high points of the Aeneid to attack Augustus' adoptive father, to which relationship Augustus owed his power and position. Moreover, as will be demonstrated later, by attacking Julius Caesar's participation in civil war, Vergil was indirectly attacking Augustus at his most vulnerable point.

Two arguments have been advanced to prove that this passage is not anti-Augustan. One finds support among two very eminent commentators. Servius interpreted Anchises' instructions to Caesar, "you first spare ... throw the weapon from your hand" (834-835), as referring to his much vaunted clemency. Eduard Norden accepted this and asserted that by extension Vergil is supporting Augustus' boast of his own mercy to defeated enemies. However, that clearly is not the meaning. Throughout this exposition of Rome's future, Anchises speaks as if it were possible to alter the future that he foresees. So in lines 828-829 he
saying of Caesar and Pompey, “if they attain the light of day” (cf. 770, 882). In lines 832–833 he dissuades them both from fighting the civil war. Then in 834–835, as a natural extension, he turns to Caesar and tells him to take the initiative in this. The very wording of these lines makes the Servius-Norden interpretation impossible. Caesar is told that he should be the first (prior) to spare and disarm. This can apply only to the situation at the beginning of the war, not to clemency after it.

The second argument has much more support and requires a much more detailed refutation, since by refuting it I shall prove my own thesis. It is that after Augustus firmly established his rule, he found Caesar's career to be embarrassing and played down the human Caesar, although the god Caesar was still useful propaganda. This theory is widely held. However, I have found no systematic defence of it. Consequently, in order to have an antagonist at whom I can direct my argument, I choose as an adversary Ronald Syme, who is by far the most eminent supporter of this view and the scholar who, in various works, gives the fullest defence of it.4

Neither Syme nor any other supporter of this theory attempts to deal with the abundant evidence for the importance of Julius Caesar in Augustan propaganda. Indeed Augustus was known by the very name Caesar, a name to which, as both his friends and enemies pointed out, he owed everything.5 After the first constitutional settlement his full title was “Imperator Caesar Divi filius Augustus”. When Julius Caesar had adopted the title Imperator as a proper name, it was a radical and unprecedented step.6 Not only was Augustus “Imperator Caesar, son of a god”, but he also accepted the title “father of his country” (pater patriae). He took great pride in this title which was important in his propaganda.7 It also was a title which Julius Caesar bore while he was alive. Indeed, after Caesar's death there was erected in the Forum a stone column nearly twenty feet high in his honour, inscribed “to the father of his country” (parenti patriae), of which Suetonius says, “at it for a long time [the people] continued to sacrifice, make vows, and settle certain disputes by oaths sworn in Caesar's name”.8

Not only did Augustus adopt appellations that clearly linked him with Julius Caesar, but much of the mechanism of his rule was taken from Julius Caesar's precedent, which his contemporaries must have realized. For instance, in 36 B.C. he acquired the sacrosanctity of the tribunes and the right to sit on the tribunes' benches in the Circus, thus making this status public.9 These had been important aspects of Caesar's power.10 Furthermore, Caesar's birthday was celebrated as a public religious festival during Augustus' reign.11 This practice was first introduced by Julius Caesar himself during his lifetime.12 It had no Roman precedent, but seems to have been the practice of Asiatic and Hellenistic monarchs.13 Even more strikingly, the practice that Julius Caesar instituted of having new magistrates swear not to oppose his acts14 was followed after his death until at least 66 A.D.15

Furthermore, Syme’s defence of his position is thin. He mentions only one
historical fact: according to Cassius Dio (LVI, 34, 2), at Augustus's funeral the image of Caesar was not among those of his dead relatives (Tacitus, p. 433). But Dio explains that this was because Caesar was considered to be divine. Furthermore, in the funeral oration of Tiberius, which Dio records immediately after this (36, 2), he justifies Augustus' conduct during the civil wars by declaring that he "avenged sufficiently his father" (i.e. Julius Caesar). Indeed, this funeral oration was delivered in front of the temple of the Deified Julius.\footnote{16}

Besides that, Syme bases his argument completely on the lack of praise of Caesar in Vergil, Horace, and Livy. Thus he is completely dependent on his assumption that these authors "faithfully reflect governmental opinion" (Tacitus, pp. 432–433). He regards Aeneid VI, 826–835 as the "clearest testimony" of this view, (Tacitus, p. 433). As for Horace, he states, "The discreet silence of Horace in the Odes is not impaired by 'Iulium sidus' (I, 12, 47) or 'Caesaris ultor' (I, 2, 44)" (Ovid, p. 191, nt. 1). But if Horace were following a systematic policy of excluding mention of Caesar, then there should not be even two references to him, especially since one refers to Augustus's very important defence of his activities during the civil war: that he was avenging Caesar.

Nor were the Odes completely governmental propaganda. Of course, they contain many fulsome praises of Augustus and Rome, just as the Aeneid does. But there are also definite doubts expressed about the Augustan Restoration and the value of Roman patriotism. For lack of space I will leave out of discussion the attempts to show that some of Horace's praise is only superficially propagandistic but in fact ironic,\footnote{17} and concentrate on more blatant literary subversion. An example is his assertion that he is a poet of love, not suited to glorify the achievements of Augustus or his favourites (e.g. I, 6; II, 12), which could include Julius Caesar. Indeed, he states that Maecenas himself would value amorous play above all else (II, 12, 21–28).\footnote{18} Also, to take the crucial concept of pietas, in III, 21, 4 Horace uses the adjective pius ironically to refer to a jug of wine. In II, 14, 1–4 he says that pietas is useless and futile in the face of approaching old age and annihilation by death. Similarly in I, 24, 10–12 he states that Vergil is pius in vain when it comes to recalling his friend from the dead. Again in IV, 7, 21–24 he says that pietas cannot restore the dead to life. Very pointedly he had stated earlier in this Ode (14–16): "When we have descended to where pius Aeneas, rich Tullus and Ancus are, we are dust and ashes".

As for Augustus himself, in II, 1 Horace advises Pollio against writing a history of the civil wars beginning in 60 B.C. since it would be "very dangerous", like "walking through fires hidden under tricky ashes" (6–8). This history included significant praises of Brutus and Cassius.\footnote{19} Suggestive of Octavian's civil wars is the tremendous outpouring of Italian blood (29–36) and the "friendship of leaders" (4). After all, Octavian did much more fighting in Italy than Julius Caesar, and the second triumvirate was much more open and recent than the first. Furthermore, had it been official Augustan propaganda to denigrate Julius Caesar, the record of his civil wars would not be dangerous. The publication of II, 1 therefore shows a lack of concern for Augustus' reputation.
This situation is even clearer with regard to Livy. Syme observes, “Livy was moved to grave doubts—was the birth of Caesar a blessing or a curse? Augustus twitted him with being a Pompeian” (Roman Revolution, p. 317). But about the first statement, Seneca, who records it (N. Q. V, 18, 4), says that Livy was simply reporting a common saying. The second is recorded by Tacitus (Annals IV, 34, 4). But this reference is adduced to show Augustus’ tolerance for views opposed to his own. Cremutius Cordus, defending himself against a charge of sedition for praising Brutus and Cassius, says that Augustus remained friendly with Livy despite the fact that he praised Pompey. The Pompeian sympathies of T. Labienus, a man of less discretion than Livy, caused Augustus to have his books burnt.20 Livy’s willingness to defy Augustus by his pro-Pompeian attitude is also reflected in other aspects of his work. Definitely casting doubt on the worth of Augustus’ programme is the statement in his Preface, published after Octavian had taken the title Augustus (I, 19, 3), that one of the pleasant aspects of writing history is that it diverts his mind “from the sight of the troubles which our age has seen through so many years” (5) and that “we have arrived at a time when we can endure neither our vices nor their cures” (9). Furthermore, a strong argument has been advanced that in Book I Livy attacked by innuendo certain important activities of Augustus.21 Certainly the periocha of Book CXI indicates that Livy devoted it largely to the mass slaughter of the proscription of 43 B.C. and did not shrink from describing Octavian’s leading role in it. Livy’s uneasiness with Augustus’ policies might account for the lack of political history of the periochae of Books CXXXIII to CXLII (31-9 B.C.), which is their most striking feature. Even so, they may have contained material that would anger Augustus. For the periocha of CXXI states that it, and presumably the later books, was published after Augustus’ death. Or, perhaps, Augustus’ anger at CXXI caused both the publication of the later books after his death and their lack of political history.

Moreover, in most Augustan propaganda literature Julius Caesar plays a prominent part. Propertius’ lament for the death of Augustus’ nephew and heir Marcellus (III, 18, 33-34) mentions as his two great dead ancestors, who had previously “left the human way for the stars”, M. Claudius Marcellus from his father’s family and Julius Caesar from his mother’s (i.e. Augustus’) family. Later, when celebrating Augustus’ victory at Actium, Propertius refers to his ships as “Julian prows” and states, “father Caesar watches in wonder from his Idalian star” (i.e. a star pertaining to Venus): ‘I am a god and that victory of yours is proof of your descent from me’” (IV, 6, 54-60).

Ovid’s Fasti and Metamorphoses are the works that should reflect most clearly the official Augustan attitude to Julius Caesar since, as L. Wilkinson points out, they “display the . . . spirit of unbridled adulation [of Augustus] which goes beyond anything . . . [in the other Augustans] and presages the excesses of the Silver Age poets”.22 They contain many fulsome praises of Julius Caesar.23 Moreover, Augustus is frequently linked with Caesar by terms which emphasize physical paternity: offspring (propago, progenies), his father (huius pater), having
begotten (\textit{genitus}), and sprung from his seed (\textit{semine creatus}),\textsuperscript{24} even though Caesar was only his adoptive father. This close linkage between them is natural, since, as Ovid says, Augustus owed his relationship to Romulus, Iulus, Aeneas and Venus to “adopted nobility” (\textit{Fasti} IV, 21 ff.). Because of his membership in the Julian family, Venus cared for his interests (\textit{Fasti} VI, 673–676) and he was related to Vesta (\textit{Fasti} III, 425–426; IV, 949–950). This major principle of propaganda is summed up in the opening dedication of the \textit{Fasti} to Germanicus (I, 10): “often you will read about your father and grandfather”.\textsuperscript{25}

Similarly, Manilius ends the first book of his \textit{Astronomica}, which was written in the last five years of Augustus’ reign,\textsuperscript{26} with a propagandistic account of Octavian’s civil war, including how at Actium Rome was threatened with a female yoke and “the thunderbolts clashed with the sistrum of Isis” (918–919). Of Philippi he says, “through the footsteps of his father, father Augustus conquered” (913).

The two extant authors from Tiberius’ reign who can be trusted to present orthodox official ideology both express the same view. Velleius Paterculus praised Caesar in superlative terms (II, 41) and tried to portray as close a tie as possible between him and the young Octavian (II, 59–60). Valerius Maximus spoke of the “gentle mind of the divine prince” and his “divine works” (V, 1, 10).

But for the purpose of this discussion the most significant evidence for the importance of Julius Caesar in Augustus’ propaganda are the official propaganda sections of the \textit{Aeneid} itself. A good example is that of the athletic competitions in Book V. An important function of the contests is to demonstrate Aeneas’ devotion (\textit{pietas}) to the memory of his father. But they had another important function, which would have been immediately understood by Vergil’s contemporaries and was intimately connected with this primary function: to point out the parallel devotion of Octavian to Julius Caesar.\textsuperscript{27}

Even more interesting are the appearances of Julius Caesar in those passages of the \textit{Aeneid} which are explicit and blatant propaganda for Augustus. The first is Jupiter’s stirring prediction of Rome’s great future (I, 257–296). After a glowing account of Aeneas’ descendants and Roman power, Jupiter predicts (286–290), “From this splendid ancestry will be born a Trojan Caesar, who will limit his empire by the ocean and his reputation by the stars. His name, derived from great Iulus, will be Julius. In the future you [Venus]... will receive in heaven this man weighted down with the spoils of the East. He also will be invoked in prayers”. After this, Jupiter predicts Augustus’ bringing of peace (291–295). Servius and many subsequent commentators have construed lines 286 to 290 as referring to Julius Caesar. But others claim that they indicate Augustus. The arguments on both sides are succinctly discussed by R. Austin, who concludes, “If a decision must be faced, my preference would probably be to take the Caesar of 286 to be Julius. But is not the whole matter a case of deliberate Vergilian ambiguity...?... [Vergil could not] refuse to include the Dictator in a passage of such importance as this, in which the links of the genus \textit{Iulia} with Trojan Aeneas are set out”.\textsuperscript{28}
The second passage of explicit Augustan propaganda is VI, 788–807. It begins with Anchises telling Aeneas, “Turn your twin keennesses-of-sight [acies] here, look at this people, your Romans. Here is Caesar and the entire offspring of Iulus” (788–790). These sentences emphasize the importance of the Julian family in the future history of Rome as something that requires Aeneas’ special attention. This is especially true of the first clause with its archaic and grandiloquent phrasing. Indeed, in a way the first sentence equates the Julian family with the Roman people by ambiguity. The word I and most translators render as “people” is gens, one of whose primary meanings is “family”. But in this sentence it is coupled with “Romanosque tuos”. Since que in the Aeneid very often indicates an explication, not an addition, the reader’s first inclination is to interpret this sentence as referring to the Roman people. However, the second sentence shows that it refers to the Julian family. So the reader must also reinterpret “your Romans” as “Romans of your stock”, an interpretation which is facilitated by the emphatic tuos at the end of the sentence. The second sentence establishes Julius Caesar as the most important member of that family. As Norden points out, line 789 has a very rare metrical ending (-U/U/-U/U/-), which is caused by the desire to have both Caesar and Iuli joined in the same line, with Iulus at the end. This mention of Caesar and the Julian family forms the introduction to the glowing praise of Augustus, who is introduced as “son of a god” (792).

The last explicit passage of Augustan propaganda is the description of the battle of Actium and Octavian’s subsequent triumphs on Aeneas’ shield in Book VIII, 675–728. There, in line 681, Vergil says of Augustus, “his father’s star appears on his head”. In the two longest propaganda sections discussed above Julius Caesar is mentioned or suggested as the main link between Augustus and the Julian family. This fact is essential. As Servius noted in the introduction to his commentary on the Aeneid, insofar as it is propaganda for Augustus, a vital element of the praise of Augustus is “from his ancestors” (a parentibus). But these ancestors were Augustus’ primarily through his status as adopted son of Julius Caesar. Otherwise, his only connection with the Julian family was his maternal grandmother. Without his adoption by Julius Caesar, Augustus’ family was completely mediocre and a source of ridicule for his enemies. As Syme himself noted, he immediately entitled himself Gaius Julius Caesar, “(... spurning the ‘Octavianus’ that would have perpetuated the memory of his real parentage) and was able to parade as ‘Divi filius’ as soon as the Senate and people consecrated his adoptive father in 42 B.C.” In fact, the whole drive of the Aeneid, with its concentration on Aeneas’ family, including his mother Venus as the divine champion of Rome, reflects very strongly Julius Caesar’s propaganda, and this fact would have been very obvious to his contemporaries. Similarly in Propertius’ glorification of Actium (IV, 6), where Julius Caesar’s role is emphasized in connection with Venus (59–60), Octavian’s ships are twice described as “Julian” (17, 64) and Augustus is called “Teucrian

Quirinus" (21).

Since at least a century before Actium the Julian family had gloried in its descent from Iulus, Aeneas, and Venus. Between 135 and 125 B.C. Sextus Julius Caesar issued coins with Venus the Mother (Genetrix) on them. So did Lucius Julius Caesar in 94 B.C. He also took part in a festival at Troy in 77 B.C. His father, Lucius Julius Caesar, exempted Troy from taxes when he was censor in 89 B.C. This ancestry was very important to Gaius Julius Caesar. In addition to normal sentimental feelings, it was, to quote Syme, highly relevant to his disputes with members of the plebeian nobility, "who formed the backbone of the optimates." Early in his career, in a eulogy on his dead aunt, he dwelt on his family's descent from Venus. In our earliest contemporary reference to him, Cicero describes him as being motivated by and acting in accordance with "his dignitas and the greatness of his ancestors". His claim of descent from Venus was so well known that Cicero could identify him by referring to him ironically as "Venus' descendant", as could Caelius in a letter written shortly after the outbreak of the civil war (March, 49 B.C.). During the civil war, Caesar's illustrious descent became an even more important part of his propaganda. Cassius Dio (XL:1, 34, 2) quotes him as telling mutinous soldiers at Placentia on his way back from Spain that he will not be bullied since "I have sprung from Aeneas and Iulus". In 48 B.C. he issued a series of coins showing Venus on the obverse and Aeneas carrying Anchises out of Troy on the reverse. We also have coins that he issued in 47 B.C. with Venus on the obverse and trophies from his Gallic victories on the reverse. Furthermore, the first coins that were issued under his dictatorship had a head of Venus on the obverse and a figure of Cupid on the reverse. But it is from 44 B.C., the year of his assassination, that we have the largest number of coins he issued with Venus on them. On most of these coins Venus is on the reverse. On the obverse is Caesar's head with the title Caesar Imperator. Furthermore, while in Asia, he visited Troy and granted it new privileges, just as his kinsman Lucius Julius Caesar had done. According to Appian (B.C. II, 104) he gave his men the watchword "Venus" at the battle of Munda, as he had done earlier at Pharsalus (B.C. II, 76). Appian also states (B.C. II, 68) that before the battle of Pharsalus, "while sacrificing at midnight . . . he invoked his own progenitor, Venus, and vowed that he would build a temple in Rome for her if he was successful. For the family of the Julii was thought to be descended from Aeneas and Iulus". It was dedicated on September 26, 46 B.C. as the dominating building in his new forum. It was finished by Augustus as part of the programme of which he boasted, "I completed the Julian Forum [which was] begun and almost completed by my father". At the dedication of this temple Caesar also instituted the Trojan game (lusus Troiae), mainly equestrian exercises performed by noble youths. It had been obsolete until it was revived by Sulla. Then it lapsed again until Julius Caesar re instituted it. It was he who first associated it with the Trojan ancestry of the Romans, with which it was originally unconnected. He linked it with the cult
of Venus the Mother and probably brought Iulus, Venus' grandson, into prominence for the first time as a founder. In this form it continued as an important institution under Augustus and the other Julio-Claudian emperors, but then lapsed along with the importance of the Julian family. It is honoured in Aeneid V, 545-595 in the form established by Julius Caesar and continued by Augustus. Vergil also states that Iulus later instituted it at Alba Longa, whence it continued to the present (596-603). As with other aspects of Augustan propaganda, Vergil's contemporaries would have associated it with Julius Caesar, as they would the entire Aeneas story.

Cassius Dio summarized Caesar's ostentatious devotion to his Aenean ancestry in his description of 45 B.C.: Caesar used to wear shoes "in the style of the old kings of Alba, since he claimed that he was related to them through Iulus. In general he was completely devoted to Venus and wanted to persuade everyone that he had the flower of youth from her. Therefore, he used to wear her image on his ring and made her his watchword in most of his greatest dangers".

Even after Caesar's death his connection with Venus remained very important in official propaganda. His bier was placed in a model of the temple of Venus the Mother. A comet appeared at the games of Venus the Mother in 44 B.C. This was interpreted as symbolizing his arrival among the gods. Octavian then set up his statue in Venus' temple with a star over its head. In 42 B.C. the triumvirs had his image carried at the pompa circensis together with that of Venus. Later, Augustus transferred Apelles' famous painting of Venus from Cos to the temple of the Deified Julius at Rome. As Strabo says, "Augustus had dedicated the founder of his family to his father". A few years after the star of Caesar appeared, it was celebrated by Vergil in his Eclogues as "of Caesar, descendant of Dione" (Venus' mother), a cause of fertility (IX, 47-49); and by Horace in Ode I, 12, 46-48, which was written while the Aeneid was being composed. Even after Augustus' death, Caesar's Trojan descent was emphasized by imperial propagandists, who intended to praise him, and by those hostile to him and the political system that resulted from his activities.

Thus, by attacking Julius Caesar during the most crucial turning point of the Aeneid, Vergil is undermining one of the most basic elements of Augustan propaganda in the Aeneid: the significance of Aeneas, Venus, and Iulus as founders of the Julian family and therefore ancestors of Augustus. Vergil's contemporaries were fully aware that this aspect of Augustan propaganda derived from Julius Caesar, for whom it was crucially important, and who was Augustus' entrée into the Julian family.

The undercutting of Augustan propaganda on this point in Book VI is emphasized by a very interesting inconsistency. The common traditional story was that Iulus was not another name for Ascanius, but was Ascanius' son, and that Iulus did not rule in Alba Longa, but that Ascanius was succeeded as king by Silvius, the son of Aeneas and Lavinia, who was the progenitor of the subsequent Alban kings. For one must always keep in mind how unsettled and uncertain the legends about this period were.
As the passage from Cassius Dio (XLIII, 43, 2) cited above indicates, Julius Caesar made a great show of his relationship with the Alban kings through his descent from Iulus. A pliant propagandist, like Ovid, could comply by making Iulus “from whom the Julian family reaches its Trojan ancestors” the son of Aeneas and father of Silvius, and Iulus another name for Ascanius. Thus he moved Iulus one generation closer to Aeneas and Venus, and made him the ancestor of the Alban kings. In this he was following the Aeneid, where Iulus is another name for Ascanius and it is generally implied, although never stated, that he was the progenitor of the subsequent Alban kings, and therefore of Romulus also. This explains Servius’ comment (ad Eclogue VI, 3) that Vergil had begun to write an epic on the deeds of the Alban kings. It probably occurred to Servius to mention that information there since he had just been pointing out in many passages how Eclogue V was a symbolic glorification of Julius Caesar.

A very important passage for both these points is Aeneid I, 276–271, part of the blatant Augustan propaganda passage discussed above. The first two lines carefully explain that Iulus is another name for Ascanius. Servius comments aptly on 267 that it “regarded more the family, since the entire Julian clan draws its origin from that source”. Servius Danieis in an earlier part of his note on this line provides a fascinating citation of a certain Lucius Caesar for an explanation of why Ascanius was called Iulus. Similarly, the Origo Gentis Romanae attributes the identity of Iulus with Ascanius to “Caesar, in his second book” (XV, 5). Elsewhere (XVII, 4–5), it accepts the testimony of the Annales Pontificum that Iulus was Ascanius’ son. In Aeneid I, 267–271, after the identification of Iulus with Ascanius, Jupiter proceeds to predict his founding of Alba Longa and his rule there. Nothing is said about his successors. But contemporaries of Vergil, realizing that the identification of Iulus with Ascanius was a strongly Julian account, would naturally assume the rest of the Julian version: that Iulus was the progenitor of the later Alban kings. Richard Heinze argued that the statement in I, 273 that Alba Longa would be ruled “under the Hectorean race” implies that the rulers would only be descendants of the Trojans, not specifically of Iulus. However, Hector was a full brother of Creusa. Thus, as Servius explains in his note on this line, “Ascanius was connected with Hector by descent”, and he cites III, 343, where Hector is called his uncle.

That Iulus would be the ancestor of the Alban and therefore Roman kings is also very strongly implied in IV, 274–276 (cf. IV, 234) where Mercury tells Aeneas to consider “the hope of your heir Iulus…to whom the kingdom of Italy and Roman land are owed.” Again, the tracing of the lusus Troiae to Ascanius in V, 596–602 implies a direct genetic connection. In IX, 642–643, Apollo addresses Iulus as “descendant and ancestor of gods, rightly shall all fated wars sink down under the race [gens] of Assaracus”. Assaracus was Aeneas’ great-grandfather. Ascanius refers to him as his family’s ancestor in IX, 259 when he swears by the “lar of Assaracus.” Thus Augustus is called the offspring of Assaracus in Georgics III, 35, where Servius Danielis comments that it is because of his
descent from Iulus, “from whom the Julian family descended to Caesar” and in Fasti IV, 34. Similarly, in Aeneid VI, 778 Romulus is described as “of the blood of Assaracus.” Romulus might be a descendant of Assaracus through Silvius, but the next thing that Anchises points out is “the entire offspring of Iulus” (789–790) and Caesar and Augustus. Caesarian and Augustan propaganda often linked them with Romulus. Indeed, Octavian nearly took the title Romulus instead of Augustus,71 and in Georgics III, 27 and Propertius IV, 6, 21 Augustus is called “Quirinus”. Thus the natural assumption is that here Romulus is among the race of Iulus and that in IX, 642–643 he is among the gods that will descend from Iulus along with Caesar and Augustus. This would have been possible only if the kings of Alba Longa were Iulus’ descendants.

But all this is undermined in VI, 760–766 where Lavinia’s son Silvius is described as the progenitor of the Alban kings. That this is meant to be a jarring inconsistency is clear from the presence of an additional and gratuitous incongruity. In I, 265–266 it is stated that Aeneas will rule for only three years in Italy. The implication is that after that he will die, especially since the common tradition was that he was killed or disappeared during the wars he fought to establish himself in Italy shortly after his arrival there.72 But in VI, 764 it is said that Silvius will be born to Aeneas “late in old age” (longaevo serum). This must be several decades in the future. Again, although there is no absolutely incontrovertible contradiction, since Aeneas might have lived a long time after giving over power to Ascanius, still there is a very jarring reversal of the implications of the first passage. I can see no reason for introducing such a shock except to underscore the fact that VI, 760–766 is out of harmony with I, 267–271. Those who try to explain away this inconsistency or assert that Vergil would have rewritten it miss the point. It was Vergil’s practice to expound the official propaganda line but then undercut it. Thus he has Aeneas leave Hades through the gate of false dreams and ends the entire Aeneid by having him kill an unarmed, wounded man. Thus he also magnifies the significance of Iulus and glorifies Julius Caesar, only to undermine each in crucial passages in Book VI.

There remains now one argument of Syme’s to be systematically refuted. He states that Augustan propaganda, making a sharp distinction between Caesar the man, and Caesar the god, revered the divine Julius (a fact which it would be impossible to deny73) while denigrating his human career. But this argument has insurmountable weaknesses. First, much of the Augustan propaganda that I referred to earlier did praise various achievements of Caesar, and their value underlay the oath, which I mentioned above, that new magistrates took not to violate them. Second, although Julius Caesar was obviously most valuable as a god, still it makes no sense to build up a cult of the divine Julius Caesar and then attack him as a man. Third, and most important, according to Syme the reason why Caesar was an embarrassment to Augustus was “The power and domination of Augustus was in reality far too similar to that of the Dictator to stand a casual reminder” (Roman Revolution, p. 318). But if that were true, then the most damaging possible thing that a writer could do would be to refer to a
major weakness of Caesar’s, which is exactly what Vergil does in *Aeneid* VI, 826–835. Furthermore, he chose an attack on Caesar which also hit Augustus at his most vulnerable spot: the civil wars he waged to acquire power.

The horror with which the civil wars of Julius Caesar and Octavian were viewed by contemporaries is best illustrated in Horace’s *Epodes* VII and XVI and Vergil’s *Georgics* I, 466–502, which uses a similar phrase, “paribus telis” (489), to *Aeneid* VI, 826 (cf. Lucan I, 7). It is also evident in the passage of the *Aeneid* under discussion and in the fact that when Vergil describes the personified evils at the entrance of Hades, the last and ultimate is *Discordia* (VI, 280–281). Several commentators have noted that this means civil war. It is thus used elsewhere in Vergil’s works, and also by many of his contemporaries. The terrible brutality of the civil wars and Octavian’s part in them were not soon forgotten. According to Tacitus’ *Annals* I, 10, after Augustus’ death his enemies still concentrated their attacks largely on his actions between 44 and 31 B.C. In his *Histories* I, 50, 3 Tacitus says that when civil war broke out a century after Actium, people talked about “the laying waste of Italy and destruction of the provinces, Pharsalia, Philippi, Perusia and Mutina, names famous for public destruction.” Augustus himself in his *Res Gestae* brushed over his civil war activities in an extremely elliptical and abstract manner, not even trying to justify Perusia or the proscription. Similarly, Claudius in his history skipped the period of Octavian’s civil wars, because he knew that he would not be allowed to record them “freely and truly.” For, as T. Labienus observed about civil wars, “the best defence is forgetfulness.” But that is exactly what Vergil does not do here.

Hirtius’ comment in *B.G.* VIII, Praef. 2, Horace’s *Epodes* VII and especially XVI, Vergil’s *Georgics* I, 490, Manilius I, 910–911, Lucan I, 40–43, and Tacitus’ *Histories* I, 50, 3 show that both contemporaries and later observers viewed the civil wars of Julius Caesar and Octavian as one long civil war. Later historians, both those favourable to the Julio-Claudians and those hostile, described the period between 49 B.C. and 28 B.C. as a time of continuous anarchy and *discordia*. Also, the description of the trial of Cremutius Cordus by Cassius Dio (LVII, 24, 3) and Tacitus (*Annals* IV, 34) indicates that under Augustus and Tiberius praise or censure for Caesar and Augustus were bracketed together and regarded as the same thing. The continuity between Julius Caesar’s and Octavian’s civil wars is emphasized in Anchises’ first warning to Caesar and Pompey: “do not accustom such great wars to your minds” (832). As both Tiberius Donatus and Servius noted, this links their civil war with Octavian’s. It indicates that the chief damage they are causing is setting in motion a series of civil wars. Then, when Anchises addresses Julius Caesar specifically he does not name him but refers to him by his descent: “you who draw your race from Olympus... my blood.” (834–835). Both descriptions could just as well refer to Augustus. Indeed, in the *Carmen Saeculare* (50) Horace does refer to Augustus as “blood of Anchises”.

When Anchises addresses Julius Caesar it is to tell him, “you first throw the
weapon from your hand . . . ". This assumes that his excuses for fighting were invalid. Most of them were either personal or particular: for instance, had he gone to Rome without his army, he would have been the victim of a judicial murder, or he had to defend the rights and functions of the tribunes. His general defence was that he acted "in order to deliver into liberty himself and the Roman people, who were oppressed by a faction of a few men" (ut . . . oppressum in libertatem vindicaret) (B.C. I, 22, 5); and in 45 B.C. the Senate called him "Liberator." This was exactly the phrase that was constantly used by Cicero to defend Octavian’s otherwise totally illegal act of raising a private army to oppose a consul. Afterwards, on the obverse of a coin issued in 28 B.C., Octavian is called "Imp. Caesar Divi F. . . Libertatis P.R. Vindex." He began his Res Gestae with the claim, “I delivered into liberty the Republic, which was oppressed by the domination of a faction” (oppressam in libertatem vindicavi) and boasted that he had restored the temple of Jupiter Libertas (XIX, 2).

Augustus made much use of one other defence for his actions during the civil war: he was avenging the murder of his father, Julius Caesar. For example, at the site of Perusia, where Octavian inflicted bloody destruction, sling bullets have been found inscribed “Mars the Avenger” (Mars Ultor), and “Deified Julius” (Divus Julius). During the same period the theme of revenge was an important motto on his coins. Later, in his Res Gestae (II) Augustus boasted, “I drove into exile my father’s murderers.” While the Aeneid was being written, Horace hailed him as “avenger of Caesar” (Ode I, 2, 44). Similarly, Ovid in his Fasti (III, 705–710; V, 569–577) celebrated Octavian’s pietas in avenging his “father’s” murder. In 2 B.C. Augustus completed the temple to Mars the Avenger, which he had vowed at Philippi. It dominated his new forum and was the scene of many important activities. Augustus personally dedicated it despite the fact that he had passed this right to his grandsons. The statue of Mars the Avenger in its apse was flanked on one side by a statue of Venus the Mother and on the other by Julius Caesar. The same defence for Augustus’ civil wars was used by his apologists after his death. So by laying special emphasis on the horrors of Julius Caesar’s civil war and treating it as avoidable, especially on the part of Julius Caesar, Vergil is pointing his finger at the most embarrassing part of Augustus’ career and undermining his excuses for it. For Augustus’ main political justification was the same as Caesar’s. His main personal excuse was to avenge the murder of the man whom Vergil brands as a mass murderer and who, by implication, brought his death on himself by engaging in a gratuitous, murderous civil war.

Furthermore, the Julius Caesar-Pompey episode is not isolated. It is linked with Vergil’s condemnation of Aeneas’ mission. In VI, 826–835 Julius Caesar and Pompey are not named. They are called “father-in-law” (sacer) and “son-in-law” (gener). This was a very common way of referring to them by contemporaries. In Book VII, 545 discordia breaks out between the Trojans and their future Italian countrymen. In line 317 Juno says of the coming war between Aeneas and Latinus, “Let son-in-law and father-in-law come together”. After
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that Aeneas and Latinus are constantly described in this way. This emphasises that Aeneas fights the same type of war that Anchises warned so strongly against in Book VI.

NOTES

1. With regard to proper names, my procedure is the following: I call Caesar's heir Octavian before 27 B.C. and Augustus after, although his most common name was Caesar. I write Julius Caesar, but Iulus (Aeneas' son), even though originally both were written with an "I". I do this because it is conventional and avoids confusion. I also use "lulus" and "Ascanius" interchangeably to refer to the same person, as Vergil does.

All translations in this article are my own.

2. Tiberius Donatus (Prooemium p. 5, lines 27-29 of H. Georgius' Teubner text) says, "scio enim nonnullos cumberland quod sententias suas Vergilius velut contraria sentiendi dissolvat." This tendency to incorporate opposite and contrasting elements was also a basic characteristic of Vergil's style in his choice of vocabulary, phrasing, and syntax. This is discussed succinctly but sensitively by W. Jackson Knight in "Vergil's Latin", Acta Classica 1, 1958, pp. 31-44. However, I think that Knight disregards his own evidence when he asserts that the overall effect would not have struck Vergil's contemporaries as discordant and disturbing.

The passage of the Aeneid that is most often subverted is Jupiter's tremendous speech of Roman and Augustan propaganda in I, 257-296. I will give several examples in this article. But there are many others. For instance, Jupiter forecasts the war between the Trojans and Latins (263), as do Helenus (III, 458-460), the Sibyl (VI, 86-94), Anchises (VI, 890) and Venus (VIII, 613-614). But when the war actually comes, it is spoken of by Vergil (VII, 583-584) and Jupiter (X, 8-9) as happening in conflict with the fates, thus making it worse.


5. E.g. Velleius Paterculus II, 80, 3, and especially Mark Antony, quoted by Cicero, Philippiques XIII, 25. Cf. Cicero ad Att. XIV, 12, 2; Ovid, Fasti I, 615.


10. Cassius Dio XLIV, 4, 2; 5, 3; Livy, Periocha 116. As Syme remarks (Roman Revolution, p. 337) the tribunician power and proconsular imperium "were the Revolution itself." Indeed, one of Syme's great achievements was to show that Augustus did follow in Caesar's footsteps and that "Caesar was a truer Roman than either of them." (Augustus or Pompey) (p. 54).

11. Cassius Dio XLVII, 18, 5; Horace, Epistles I, 5, 9. Porphyry (ad I, 5, 10) points out that the "Caesar" here must be Julius Caesar since the "aestivam ... noctem" on line 11 fits the day on which his birthday was celebrated (the Ides of July). It cannot refer to September, when Augustus was born (Manilius IV, 547).


15. Cassius Dio XLVII, 18, 3; Tacitus, Annals XVI, 22, 5.


18. Jasper Griffin’s article, “Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury,” J.R.S., 66, 1976, pp. 87–104 demonstrates very powerfully that such recusations were not merely literary conventions, but statements of preference for a real lifestyle that was diametrically opposed to the officially approved one. The extremely scandalous nature of II, 12, 21–28 is indicated by Gordon Williams (“Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome,” J.R.S. 52, 1962, p. 35–38), although he tries to make it respectable with a very unconvincing explanation. It was especially shocking in view of Maecenas’ uxoriousness (Suetonius, Augustus LXVI, 3) and his wife’s domineering nature (Seneca, Letters XCIV, 6).

19. Tacitus, Annals IV, 34, 6. Cf. Pollio’s observations on the terrible destruction of Italy and Italians at the battle of Mutina (Cicero, Ad Fam X, 33, 1). Also interesting is Pollio’s close friendship with the anti-Augustan and anti-Roman Greek historian Timagenes (G. Bowersock, Augustus and the Greek World, London, 1965, p. 110).


24. Fasti I, 533, 616; III, 157; IV, 21–22, 124; Metamorphoses XV, 745 ff. Allen notes in the concluding section of her article (note 22 above) that “the eternity of the city is linked inseparably with the permanence of the Julian dynasty.” In most of the praises of Augustus mentioned in note 22 above, he is linked in some way with Julius Caesar.

25. Recently several scholars have argued that especially in the Metamorphoses Ovid’s praises of Augustus are parodies. But the important fact for the present article is that he regarded praise for Caesar and connections between him and Augustus to be a central aspect of Augustus’ propaganda.

26. That this was written after 9 A.D. is established by the mention of the defeat of Quintilius Varus in I, 899. The dedication to Augustus is certain because of the title “father of his country” (925) (pater patriae), a title never adopted by Tiberius (Suetonius, Tiberius XXVI, 2; Tacitus, Annals I, 72, 1.)


29. This last point is made by John Conington, The Works of Virgil, II, revised by Henry Nettleship, 4 ed., 1884, rpt. Hildesheim, 1963, p. 338. He also comments on the tuos in line 789.

30. James Henry (Aeneidae III, 1883, rept. N.Y., 1972, pp. 415–416) argues that tuos is not emphatic by position. But his statement, “The second word in a line, when it... closes a sentence, is never emphatic,” is simply not true when a usually weak word like tuos is involved. Furthermore, part of his argument is based on a failure to understand the ambivalence of gens.

31. That this Caesar is Julius is most probable from the phrasing of the next few lines. At very least it is ambiguous, since Julius Caesar is naturally suggested by the name Caesar and descent from Julius. If Vergil meant to keep all thought of Julius Caesar out of these crucial and carefully composed propaganda passages, he has been very remiss.

32. Note 3 above, p. 323.


41. *in Catilinam IV*, 9. This statement clearly shows the connection between his *dignitas*, which was so crucially important to him (B. C. I, 7, 7; III, 91, 2; Cicero, *ad Att.* VII, 11, 1) and his ancestry.
42. Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* XLIX, 3.
44. Grueber, note 35 above, II, p. 469, nos. 31-35; Sydenham, note 35 above, no. 1013.
45. Sydenham, note 35 above, nos. 1014-1016.
47. Grueber, note 35 above, I, nos. 4137-4148, 4152, 4155, 4160, 4164, 4185; p. 544; Sydenham, note 35 above, nos. 1055, 1059, 1060, 1062, 1064, 1067, 1070.
53. Plutarch, *Cato the Younger* III, 1.
55. For Augustus, see Cassius Dio XI-VIII, 20, 2; III, 22, 4; IV, 26, 1; Suetonius, *Augustus* XLIII, 2; *Tiberius* IV, 4. For the later Julio-Claudians, see Marquardt, note 54 above, p. 526.
56. The Julian connection with Troy was still a consideration for Nero (Tacitus, *Annales* XII, 58, 1).
60. Cassius Dio XLVI, 18, 4.
62. Cassius Dio (quoted by Johannes Tzetzes in Lycophron of Alexandria, 1232); Diodorus Siculus VII, 5, 8; Dionysius of Halicarnassus I, 70, 3; Festus, p. 460 (in Wallace Lindsay's Teubner edition, Leipzig, 1913). Livy (I, 3, 2) says that Julius might have been Ascanius' older brother. Strabo (XIII, 595) calls Iulus "one of the offspring (ἀνόγονος) of Aeneas," which implies that he was not his son.
63. Diodorus Siculus VII, 5, 8; Dionysius of Halicarnassus I, 70, 3-4; Festus, *Ibid.;* Cato (as quoted by Servius ad *Aen.* VI, 760) states that Ascanius died childless and so was succeeded by Silvius.
64. For instance, Porphyrio (*ad Carmen Saeculare* 41) records a story that Aeneas betrayed Troy. As for Ascanius, Livy (I, 1, 11) states that he was Lavinia's son, a story that was familiar to Appian (*R. H.* 1, 1). Amazingly, Servius (*ad Aen.* I, 7) states that it is uncertain whether Ascanius was the son of Creusa or Lavinia. Even more striking is the story that Aeneas returned from Italy to the Troad, where Ascanius ruled after him (Dionysius of Halicarnassus I, 53, 4; Strabo XIII, 607).
65. *Fasti* IV, 39-42. Livy (I, 3, 2-6) also records Silvius as being Ascanius' son, but see notes 62 and 64 above.
66. *Metamorphoses* XIV, 609; cf. 583. Throughout Ovid's work Iulus is the son of Aeneas: *Aneores* III, 9, 14; *Heroides* VII, 75, 83, 137, 153; *Ex Ponto* II, 11, 15. Property IV, 1, 48 addresses Iulus as if he led the Trojans to Italy. This follows immediately after the lines: "Venus brought the very arms of Caesar, carrying arms of a reborn Troy."
67. Edited by F. Pichlmayr as part of his Teubner edition of Aurelius Victor (Leipzig, 1961), at p. 16. This passage also cites Cato's *Origines."
69. Apollodorus III, 12, 5; Ovid, *Ex Pontio* II, 11, 15, where Hector is mentioned as Iulus’ uncle, perhaps in imitation of *Aen.* III, 343.
70. Apollodorus III, 12, 2; Diodorus Siculus IV, 75, 5; Homer, *Iliad* XX, 239–240; Servius Danzelii, *ad Georgies* III, 35, who cites Ennius.
72. Cato (in Servius *ad Aen.* I, 267; IV, 620); Livy I, 2, 6; Ovid, *Ex Ponto* II, II, 15, where Hector is mentioned as lulus’ uncle, perhaps in imitation of *Aen.* III, 343.
75. *Eclogues* I, 71; *Georgics* II, 496; *Aen.* XII, 583; Cicero, *De Fratibus* I, 13, 44; *Phil.* XIII, I, 1; *Dirae* 83; Sallust, *Catiline*, V, 2.
76. Suetonius, *Claudius* XLI, 2.
78. Similarly, in X, 557–560 he depicts Aeneas gloating because an enemy will not receive a proper burial, in X, 531–532 Aeneas coldly rejecting the father-son relationship as a plea for one’s life being saved, and in X, 517–520 and XI, 81–82 offering a human sacrifice. These reproduce the worst charges made by Octavian’s enemies during the civil wars, as recorded by Suetonius, *Augustus* XIII and XV; Cassius Dio XLVIII, 14, 4; and Seneca, *De Clementia* I, I, 1.
79. Cf. Cicero, *Phil.* II, 42, 108: Thanks to Cinna, Sulla, and Caesar we have become insensitive through habituation to civic violence; and Lucan I, 325–326: Pompey became accustomed to civil war as a student of Sulla.
80. Tacitus *Annals* III, 28, 2–3; Velleius Paterculus II, 48, 3.
82. Julius Caesar, B. C. I, 5, 1–2; 7, 2–4; Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* XXX, 1–2.
83. Cassius Dio XI, 34, 1 (‘Ελευθεριωτής).
84. *Phil.* III, 5; IV, 2; V, 44, 46; XIV, 26. The fact that this phrase was a common defence for revolutionary activity (Chaim Wirszubski, *Libertas*, Cambridge, 1950, p. 103) does not vitiate my point. First, as Wirszubski points out (p. 104), the very fact that it was a conventional expression made it more useful. Second, Vergil’s contemporaries would have remembered only two people who used this phrase as a slogan: Julius Caesar and Augustus.
85. Mattingly, note 7 above, I, p. 112, No. 691 and plate 17, 4. Augustus’ claim to have defended liberty is closely connected with his claim to have restored peace, which claim he also inherited from Caesar (Stefan Weinstock, “*Pax* and the ‘Ara Pacis’”, J.R.S. 50, 1960, pp. 44–58, esp. 46–48). Of course, this claim is completely refuted by *Aen.* VI, 826–835.
86. Even Velleius Paterculus could not deny that Perusia was brutally destroyed, but he was careful to throw the blame on the soldiers’ anger rather than on Octavian’s wish (II, 74, 4).
89. Ov. *Fasti* V, 569–577; Suetonius *Augustus* XXIX, 1–2; Velleius Paterculus II, 100, 2.
91. Cassius Dio LIII, 18, 2; LVI 36, 2; *Octavia* 480–481; Suetonius, *Augustus* X, 1: “the beginning and cause of all [Octavian’s civil] wars . . . was to avenge his uncle’s death and to protect his achievements”; *Tacitus*, *Annals* I, 9, 4.
93. X, 79; XI, 105, 355, 440, 472; XII, 31, 63, 192, 193, 613.
Acta Classica

Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to: