The battle of Actium (31 BC), which made Octavianus the sole ruler of Rome, closed a much-troubled period; that period had been marked by ceaseless civil wars, which not only led to the collapse of the Roman republic, but also seriously degraded the Roman civic sense, moral and religious values. The last century of the republic had pointed out, by the 'violence' of the struggle for power, that the old Roman constitution was no longer in keeping with necessities of the period. The Roman historians close to that period understood these necessities. Thus, Tacitus, through having the nostalgia of the republic, mentioned that, unfortunately, the republic could no longer stand, and that, it was "...to the benefit of peace that all power should come into the hands of a single person." Augustus, a political man of great insight, realized that the principality, a form of government characterized by the personal power of the emperor, could become valid only if it were accepted by the majority of the Romans. The sad experience of the civil wars had clearly shown that the support of the army only, though it was essential, was not sufficient. A broader consensus was needed, resulting from the advantages which the citizens and the provinces would get from a monarchical regime (masked as republican); that regime was supposed to ensure external and internal peace. Consequently, an intense (but subtle) propaganda was directed by the emperor himself, in order to justify the new order and to glorify Caesar's deeds; the emperor appeared as the maker of peace (pax Augusti), the giver of liberty (libertas), and the restorer of the moral and religious values of the empire (mores maiorum). The themes of this political propaganda, conceived at the imperial court are the ones contained in Augustus' political testament, Res gestae divi Augusti; the latter presents the official conception regarding the emperor's rule, the purpose being to justify it, and to show the princeps as an ideal ruler, as he was supposed to be imagined by the Roman citizens.

One of the most effective means in that propagandistic campaign was the evocation of Rome's past. For Augustus, the restoration of those mores maiorum, shattered during the civil wars, could be done only by following the good examples of the past. It was not by chance that the emperor, surrounded by respect the memory of the leaders who had raised the Roman people from anonymity to greatness. That's why he restored their edifices, preserving their inscriptions; and at both porches of the Forum he placed the statues of them all, dressed in triumphal clothes; besides, he announced in an edict that he had done all that in order that those great men of the past should serve as an example to the citizens, in their opinion both about himself, while he is still alive, and about the outstanding men of the future.

Suetonius' report is confirmed, to a great extent, by the archeologic research performed between the wars in Forum Augusti of Rome: Here, the Trojan ancestors of the emperor, as...
well as the kings and the illustrious men of the republic were immortalized in statuary groups or in individual statues placed either in the two hemicycles, or under the colonades, along the walls. Some of the inscriptions under those statues, and under others, which had been erected or restored, after the Roman model, in towns like Arretium, Pompeii, and Lavinium, have been preserved and now constitute an important source of information about Augustus’ epoch. As already mentioned, the choice of statues and eulogies was not done at random. The statues chosen for restoration were meant to show the Roman citizens, present and future, where to find examples worth following; the eulogies placed under those statues were, very probably, re-worded, as we can conclude from the fact that there is a certain similarity between them and the phraseology of Res gestae, in whose spirit Caesar’s son was to appear as an embodiment and quintessence of the ancient wisdom and glory. In his intention of creating a halo of sacredness around his own person, the emperor resorted to and cultivated the legendary genealogy of the kin of Julia he belonged to; that pedigree confirmed his divine origin, since the Trojan hero Aineias, his forerunner, was the son of Anchises and of the goddess Venus. The official propaganda, which regarded Augustus as the descendant of celebrated heroes, and attributed the remotest beginnings of Rome to some Trojan colonists, was, in an important extent, by the early spreading of the myth of Aineias among Etruscans and Italics. We may mention that Aineias’ departure from Troy, together with his father, Anchises, was depicted on Ionian and black-figure pottery, present in Italy, especially in Etruria, as early as the end of the 6th century B.C. If we can suppose that the hero had been popularized in Italy either by the Phocaean colonists settled on the Tyrrhenian coast, or-through Magna Graecia-due to Stesichoros, whose work, Iliou persis, known through later illustrations known as Tabula Iliaca, presented Aineias’ adventures too.

We do not intend to dwell in this paper, upon the interesting problem of the way and the time in which Aineias was linked to Romulus, and, consequently, came to be considered as the remote forerunner of the Romans. Suffice it to say, in a nutshell, that the myth is to be found, in a primeval form, in Homer; later it developed in the Greek world, and from there it was popularized, as early as the 6th century B.C., among the Etruscans, as a result of the intense exchange (economic and of other kinds) between Greece and Etruria; then it was linked to the origins of Rome, thus inserting the city in the vein of traditional Greek history. Accepted in
Rome, the myth of the Trojan origin was turned to good account by the Romans, especially during the conflicts with the Hellenistic states, as a kind of mythologic justification for political expansion. During the 2nd century B.C. it seemed to withdraw, only to come up again, in the following century (of violent political strife), with a quite manifest propagandistic hue. Augustus' officializing the Trojan Aeneas' myth had an important propagandistic significance, since it meant that Rome represented the supreme synthesis between Orient and Occident, at the same time exalting — in a dynastic sense — the princeps' Trojan ancestry. We have already mentioned the way monumental art served that official propaganda. Literature and historiography were also involved in helping support the new political edifice.

It is notorious that Roman literature during the Republic was not alien to political controversies, but it is only during the second triumvirate that it was placed direct in the service of the political propaganda. Maceenas' circle — Augustus' chief of cabinet — played an important part in that development, attracting the most prominent writers of the time to supporting the principality-ideology. Although Augustus himself attached great importance to literary activities and accepted the praise by the greatest poets only, it would be a mistake to assume that poets and historians such as Vergilius, Horatius, and Titus Livius were simple instrumenta regni. The conscious acceptance of political necessities of the Rome of their time would be a better explanation to their cultivating the Augustan propaganda themes.

Aeneas' myth — a commonplace in the Augustan literature — raised extremely delicate questions for the writers of the time. It suggested that the Romans were, to a great extent, the descendants of the Trojans, those of the Trojans who, having escaped the disaster provoked by the Greeks, found a new country from where, several centuries later, they started to conquer Greece, thus taking revenge for the mythical defeat. That is why, during the Augustan epoch, around Aeneas' myth developed a propagandistic literature, placed either on a philo-Roman (or philo-Italic) position or on a philo-Hellenic one, which had as main promoters, of opposed tendencies, Vergilius and Dionyssios of Halicarnassus, the former trying to point out the Trojan and Italic origin of the Romans — with an important Etruscan participation —, the latter trying to demonstrate the original Greekness of the Romans.


First recorded in detail by the poet Naevius, the myth of Aeneas is also present in the Histories of Fabius Pieter. The latter's narration of the origins of Rome is based on a Greek source, Dicole of Paretos, whose work was probably entitled The Foundation of Rome. Cf. FGrHist 820 F 1; J. Perret, op. cit., p. 460 sqq. Naturally, the myth, though not having a popular character, bestowed cultural identity on that city. Cf. H. Enking, P. Vergilis Maro Vates Etruseus, MDIAR, LXVI, 1959, p. 25; G. K. Galinsky, Troiae qui primus ab oris... (Aeneid, I. 1), Latomus, XXXVIII, 1969, p. 13; E. Weber, Die kannische Abstammung der Römer als politisches Argument, WSI, VI, 1972, p. 215 sqq.


See above p. 151 sqq. The same requirement was met by A. Paccis and possibly by his museomuse; Cl. Ph. Hennestad, op. cit., p. 127 sqq.; R. Moss Holloway, The Tomb of Augustus and the Princes of Troy, AJA, LXII, 2, 1966, p. 171 sqq.


Suet., Aug., LXXXIII, 8: restintas et benigne et pacientem auditis, nec lanum carmina et historiae, sed orationes et dialogos componi temen aleguid de se misi et sero et prae- nostantis offendebatur.

The above two tendencies find their explanation in the history of the Greek-Roman relationships which fluctuated depending on the Roman policy to the Hellenistic states and on the Greek influence on Rome. 29 The Greek influence, present during every period of Rome's history, was especially felt beginning with the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. 30, before the Latin literature appeared, and intensified during the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C., once the progress of the Roman expansion over the Greek cities in Magna Graecia and Sicily began. Then, Latin literature - by imitating Greek models - began increasing the prestige of Homer's language among Romans; and, supported by the large number of Greeks brought to Italy as a consequence of the Roman conquests in the East in the 2nd century B.C., influenced spoken Latin to a great extent; Greek being familiar to a large number of Romans belonging to all social layers. 31 The rapid and profound penetration of the Greek language, fashion, and education hurt the Roman pride; thus occurring an anti-Greek reaction, supported by an essential psychological element, meant to diminish the social prestige of the Greek language and customs. To the Romans it was humiliating to be defeated by a defeated nation, especially when the Greeks in Rome had humble professions and most of them were slaves. 32 The anti-Greek feelings - already obvious during Plautus' time, viz. his references to pergraeacari and Graeco fides 33 - cultivated in the Scipios' circle through the contemptuous name Gracquit, found in Cato the Elder a strong supporter. 34 During the last century of the Republic, Gracquit insult was in current use, 35, the Greeks being called such infamous names as leuis, logoua, insignis, fallax, oiosis, etc. 36.

The political developments during the last years of the second triumvirate and of the beginning of the principality placed the Hellenistic world in a less favorable light toward Rome. Antonius' policy in the East, 37, his relationship with Cleopatra, his ruling and living style which differed so much from the Roman traditions, and anti-Roman propaganda in the East 38 were shrewdly used by Octavianus. He and his 'staff' actively supported a public opinion against Antonius and Cleopatra by spreading rumors about official papers that had been so far doubtful. 40 Thus, before the battle of Actium, there was the rumor that Antonius - before Caesar's assassination, under Cleopatra's evil influence - intended to move the empire's capital to Alexandria in case he won; Rome and the Roman state being placed under Egyptian rule; Cleopatra becoming the administrator of justice in the Capitol. 41 Such rumors were the result of a real fact. Alexandra had become, especially after 34 B.C., when Antonius proclaimed Cleopatra 'queen of the kings', i.e. she became the ruler of a true oriental empire, separated from the Roman one - the capital of a powerful and vast state that would have been able, according to Octavianus', circles, to ruin Rome's power. According to the same sources, Antonius would have bequeathed the Egyptian queen and her children, 'among which Caesarion, recognized as Caesar's legitimate son, vast territories in the East, which, officially belonging to the Roman people would have asked to be buried in Alexandria, next to Cleopatra, in a mausoleum. 42

Octavianus' propaganda, which in fact prepared Roman public opinion for the war against Antonius, put the blame for the moral degradation and the extinction of the patriotic feeling mainly on Cleopatra, 'an insatiable woman when it came to Aphrodite's pleasures' 39 who 'got the kingdom of Egypt through her craftsmanship in the art of love'; hoping to rule over the Romans by the same deceitful method. 44

33 A pertinent example as to the esteem of the Hellenic civilization in Rome is that the Greek origin of Rome was put forth as far back as that time. Cf. E. Mamm, Sulla più antiche relazioni fra Roma e il mondo ellenistico, PaP, XI; 1956, p. 179 sqq.; E. Gabba, op. cit., p. 639 sqq.; E. Beyer, op. cit., p. 305 sqq.
35 Cf. J. Kramer, op. cit., p. 130.
36 Plant., Bcech, 831; Mast., 22, 64, 860; Poen., 603; Truc., 884; Op. cit., 130; Cf. Fittitios op. Paul. ex Fest., 250 L.
37 Cic., Tusc., 1, 35, 66; Fam., 7, 18, 1.
38 Cf. Plut., Caio Maii, 9, 22; Polyb., XXXV, 6; Macrobius., 11, 14, 9. See and J. Bayet, Litterature Latine, Paris, 1965,
40 Cic., Verr., II, 2, 72; Rabb., Post., 36; De Orat., I, 102; Ad Quint., I, 1, 16; Sall., Jug., 85, 32, cf. Ep. de Caec., I, 9, 3; Nep., Preel., 2; Bell., Alex., 15. The examples are collected by H. Hill, Dionysos of Holmestrand and the Origins of Rome, JRS, 11, 1961, p. 90. It has been noticed that Cicero, who was against the invasion of Hellenic words into Latin, resorted to few Helenisms in his works meant for wide circulation, to fewer than Terentius himself, whereas
41 Their number was much greater in his letters. Cf. P. Oksala, Die griechischen Lohnhörer in der Prosaschrift Ciceros, Heinek., 1953, p. 158 sqq.; J. Kramer, op. cit., p. 130.
43 The anti-Roman propaganda in the East, at the court of the Seleucids especially at the court of Mitridates VI Eu- palator; by the activity of Diodot of Adramytton and Metrodor of Skepsis, is illustrated in the latter period of the civil wars by Sibylline Oracle, III, 350 - 350. Cf. Th. Reinach, Mitridate Eupator; roi de Pont, Paris, 1800, p. 282; E. Gabba, RSI, LXXXVI, 4, 1974, p. 641; A. Peretti, La Bibbia ba-
45 On the 'authenticity' of Antonius's will, see P. Ceausescu, Rome et Augustus, a Research into the Imperial Ideology (a typewritten doctoral thesis, published in Romanian), Bucharest, 1977, p. 22.
47 Cf. P. Ceausescu, the works quoted in the previous note: As to the complex position of Antonius in the East, see the note 29 above; also W. W. Tarn - M. P. Charlesworth, Octavian, Ahtioga and Cleopatra, Cambridge, 1965.
means. She would have been the one who, by charms, witchcraft and wine, had succeeded in corrupting a true Roman. Thus Octavianus, who did not declare Antonius, "enemy of the Roman people," and nor did he mention him in Res gestae; shrewdly avoids saying that he is preparing a fratricidal war, but he is going to fight against Egypt that had become hostis externus. Thus the battle of Actium looked like a confrontation between the western and the eastern, helenistic, parts of the empire, between two mentalities, the Roman matrix and the oriental one dominated by the Greek spirit.

Conjurario totius Italiae — political attitude that was meant by Octavianus to render the occidental element evident — found its reflection in the poetical works of the poets connected with Maceenas’ circle. Thus Vergil, whose Georgics had already been finished when Octavianus came back to Italy, sang the defeat of the Orient by the great Caesar’s sword, fulminat Euphratem bellerum victorique volentes per populos dat iva. To Horatius, Cleopatra was the one who, seized with mad dreams of conquest, threatened, in the lead of a horde of base people, Rome which was saved thanks to Octavianus, who caused a great relief among the Romans (Nunus est bibendum). In Epode IX, dedicated to Maceenas, Venusia’s poet makes an allusion to Antonius who, unbelievably (posteri negatibus), had let himself be subjected by Cleopatra, thus becoming the slave of her eunuchs. But 2,000 Gaulish horseman oblige the enemy ships to take refuge in the port. To Propertius, a less submissive adherent to the idea of principality, Cleopatra — meretrix regina — was the embodiment of the baseness, debauchery and oriental idleness that, as a reward for her relationship with Antonius, demanded Rome’s surrender and the senators’ submission to her power. Moreover, she dared to oppose the monstrous oriental deities to the Roman gods, to replace the noble tube by the thrysus, etc. With that poet, the conflict opposing the two worlds was symbolized by the Tiber and the Nile (cum Tiberi Nilo gratia nulla futur), in spite of the threats the Nile reviled against the Tiber (Tiberiam Nili coegerere ferre minus), the latter would finally win... attractus (sci. Nilus) in Urmene septem captivis debitis ibat acabris.

The Tiber’s supremacy over the Nile meant Octavianus’ victory over Antonius and Cleopatra, the Occident’s over the Orient, of the simple Roman life over the oriental refinement, and idleness. In that point, we must take it into account that Cleopatra and the Orient represented to the common Roman citizen the Greek wealthy class which had a style that differed from the one praised by the Latin poets, to whom the austere life and bravery in the service of the country were qualities identified with the typical Roman and Italic virtues. That victory also had another significance which the Augustan poets subtly suggest: it removed a danger that, during the previous decade, had threatened Rome, viz., the political centre of the empire be transferred to Troy or to Alexandria. Indeed, during Caesar’s reign, there had been rumors about the dictator’s intention to give a new magnificence to the old city of Dardanus, his ancestor, by removing the capital there, and anyone could well suppose that Octavianus, his adopted son and spiritual successor, would comply with that wish. And the new ruler of Rome gave the people to understand that the city founded by Romulus would preserve its status as long as Troy stayed burnt down; sit Latium, sit Albanum per sacculo regem sit Roma Potens Italia virtute propagi; occidit occiditerique sinas cum nomine Troiae. Troy, Horatius says through Juno’s mouth, should not be rebuilt because, if that should happen, it will be again destroyed by divine will, as Rome’s dominant and civilizing position will be maintained. Dum longus inter se civitatem Iton et Romanique pontus, dum Priami Paridisque busto insulatum armamentum cultura nelle elegie di Propertio, Attene e Roma, 1972, p. 84 sqq.; J. P. Sullivan, Horace and Property — Another Literary Fraud?, SCLI, XVI, 1978, p. 88.


46 Verg., Georg., IV, 506 sqq., cf. 1, 509.

47 Hor., Carm., I, 37, 1 sqq. On Horace’s stand against Cleopatra, see V. Cremona, Due Cleopatra a confronto: Propor- rio replica a Orazio, Aeneum, LXI, 1, 1987, p. 123 sqq.

48 Hor., Ep., IX, 9 sqq.


51 Prop., II, 32, 10.

52 Prop., III, 11, 42.

53 Prop., II, 1, 31.

54 Cf., for instance, Hor., Carm., I, 6, 37-44.; Sat., I, 2, 11 (Graecae). On the part Italy should play in Augustus’s plans, see, Autori vari, L’integrazione dell’Italia nella storia romana (Contributi dell’Istituto di storia antica, ed. Maria Sordi, Saggi, pubblicazioni della Università Catolica, vol. I), Milano, 1972, p. 146.


56 Hor., Carm., III, 3, 57—64.

Sed bellissima sola Quirilibus hue tege dieo, ne nimium piti rebusque fidantes autiae tecta velim reparare Troiae. Troiae renascentes alite lugubri Forsulis tria tertiis clade iterabatur ducente vitrier caternas continge me Louis et sorore.
et catules ferocient in dulce, . . ./57. These lines obviously support the Augustan propaganda that tried to calm down the Roman public opinion, excited by the rumors about moving the capital, first, during Caesar's reign, to the old Ilion, and then, as a consequence to Antonius' policy in the Orient, to Alexandria.58

Rome and Italy's ascendency over the Orient may also be found with Titus Livius. His vast historical work is but a hymn of glory dedicated to Rome's past, thus supporting Augustus' political work 59. He speaks ill about the Greeks: they are gens lingua magis strenua quam factis 60, who, unlike the Romans, that used to wage war without any cunning, preferred to cheat their enemy than to defeat them by honest fight, by means of their weapons 61. In a well-known excerptus on Lucius Paprius Cursor, Titus Livius argues with the Greek historians that opposed Alexander the Great's feats to the Roman people's greatness 62. What if Alexander had attacked Italy and Rome? In Italy, says Livius, the luck he had during his entire Asian campaign, would have let him down, since Alexander would have encountered a citizens' army perfectly trained and disciplined, led by generals that were his peers. The Macedonians would have realized that a war against Romans was in no way similar to the one against Darius (non enim Dario rem esse divinam) who used to drag along with him a horde of women and eunuchs and was surrounded by a gorgeous display of luxury, which made of him an easy prey, nor to the one in India which he travelled all over, carousing together with his drunken army 63. But, if the Macedonian king had attacked Italy after he conquered the Persian kingdom, his chances would have been even less as he would have rather looked like Darius than the previous Alexander the Great, since he would have commanded an army weakened by the ill morals of the Persians (degeneratam ian i in Persiam mores) 64. Obviously, in this digression, Titus Livius opposes the myth of Rome to that of Alexander. There is also another possibility, that the theme of the individual's decay in the Orient is aimed at a contemporary reality, viz. Antonius who tried to imitate Alexander, according to some sources 65.

In our opinion, the digression is mainly aimed at a different point. It positively comprises elements furnished by the oldest eulogic historiography on Paprius but the allusions to the contemporaneity make it a document of the Augustan propaganda. Because Titus Livius' polemic with the garrulous and inconsiderate Greeks, who glorify the Parthians and judge them as superior to the Romans 66, as well as the fact that the Greeks praise Cyrus, give us a terminus ante quem of the polemic between the Greeks and the Romans, viz. the year 23 B.C., when Augustus began the first diplomatic negotiations with the Parthians on the occasion of the embassies led by Tridate and Phraates 67. It is difficult to identify today who may have been leuissimi ex Gracco that judged the Parthians' glory as greater than that of the Romans' with whom Titus Livius polonizes 68. But it

57 Hor., Carm., 111, 3, 37-42.
58 An echo of this theme of Augustan propaganda is apparent in Titus Livius, V, 51-55, cf. 1, 45, 3, in the figure of Marcus Furio Camillus, and his action as saviour, and avenger of Rome, who prevented the Romans from freeing the city and taking refuge at Veii, "the second founder of Rome", who stood for Augustus. Cf. P. Caesareus, op. cit., p. 26 with an older bibliography.
60 Liv., XVII, 22, 8.
61 Liv., XXVI, 120, 5; cf. and 1X, 14, 5, XLI, 47, 7.
64 Liv., IX, 17.
67 Liv., IX, 18, 6: . . . leuissimi ex Gracco qui Parthorum quoque contra ronem Romanum gloriae faenae.
69 Most scholars consider the Greek author hinted at to be Timagenes of Alexandria: G. Schwab, De Linio e Timage gene historiarum scriptoribus oemulis, Stuttgarter, 1834; A.V. Gutscheim, Trogus und Timagenes, RM, XXVI, 1862, p. 548; R. Laquer, Rel., 1936, col. 1063 sqq., s.v.; P. Treves, op. cit., p. 39 sqq.; M. Sordi, Timagenes di Alessandria: un storico ellenocentrico e filobarbaro, ANRN, II, 30, 1, 1982, p. 796 sqq. Though he may have been closer to Antonius, his former friendship with Augustus and Asinius Pollio casts a shadow of doubt on his assumed anti-Roman stand. In this sense, see G. De Sanctis, Ricerche sulla storioria scelletola, Palermo, 1958, p. 146 and G. B. Sumer, Sul presunto antilomanesimo di T. Timagenes, Storia di Storia antica offerti agli alievi a Eugenio Manni, Roma, 1976, p. 91 sqq. See D. Kienast, op. cit., p. 219. The fragments belong to Jacoby, FGrHist 88, 11A, Leiden, 1951, p. 318 sqq. with comments in FGrHist 11C, Leiden, 1963, p. 220 sqq. Also included were Memnon of Heraclea, FGrHist 184, who, for all his eulogies of Alexander, did not take a stand against the Romans, as well as Metrodorus of Skepsis, FGrHist 184, mentioned above for his obvious anti-Roman stand. See L. Braccesi, Livio e la tematica d'Alessandro in ottavo secolo. Autori vari, I canali della propaganda nello mondo antico (Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica, ed. Marta Sordi, vol. IV),
is certain that there were at that time Greek historians who strongly resented the Romans and had, for a time, seen in Cleopatra, the last survivor of Alexander’s political work, his follower in supporting the Orient’s supremacy over Rome, and, after Actium, they looked upon the Parthian dynasts as playing that part.

Indeed, to the Greek historiographers who looked down on Augustus and Rome’s glory such a transfer seemed natural since, after Actium and after the defeat of the last Hellenistic state, the Parthians had remained the only redoubtable enemies to the Romans, with a strong moral ascendency over them through their victories against Crassus and Antonius. It was especially the heavy defeat at Carrhae in 53 B.C., enhanced by the grievous disgrace of the Roman army, which lost several banners of the legions, that deeply embittered the Roman public opinion. Caesar intended to alleviate the disgrace by an Oriental campaign, but his death put an end to such plans as Octavianus could not afford, after long years of internal wars, a campaign against the Parthians that could prove unpredictable. After 23 B.C., through an ingenious diplomacy that combined negotiations with the threat of arms, Augustus persuaded the Parthians to repatriate Crassus’ soldiers and the Roman banners which were displayed at Ctesiphon (20 B.C.). Undoubtedly, it was one of Augustus’ greatest diplomatic triumphs, turned by the official propaganda into a great peaceful victory. It is a pity that we cannot know anything of the Parthians’ opinion about the event, but in Rome, Parta victoris pax and Parthica signa recepta were celebrated with great pomp, as a brilliant success of the princeps over the ancient enemy and poets and artists registered it for the posterity. Augustus himself boasted that he had made the Parthians hand back the banners of three armies and beg for the Roman people’s friendship, and, on the breast of his armour on his statue at Prima Porta, the moment of recovering the three banners is symbolically represented. It is in this context that one must understand Titus Livius’ polemic with levissimi ex Graecis: indeed, the army that was not destroyed by the disasters at Caudium and Cannae could not have been frightened by Alexander (… uno proelio victus Alexander bello victus esset: Romam quem Caudium, quem Cannae non ferretur, quae fregisset aeques?)

On the nature of our information concerning the Parthians, see Wolski’s judicious remarks, Les Parthes et leur attitude envers le monde grec-romain, Assimilation et résistance à la culture grec-romaine dans le monde ancien (Travaux du VI<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d’Études classiques, réunies et présentés par D. M. Pippidi), Bucharest, 1976, p. 455 sqq.

Milano, 1976, p. 184. Th Livy probably considered all the Greek historians who had praised Alexander to have sympathized with the Parthians. Cf. S. Mazzarino, op. cit., II, 1, p. 283 sqq.

Pastré may have had in mind, de fort. Rom. (=Mor. 320 A–B), Livy’s conception on levissimi ex Graecis when, contrary to the latter, he stated that Alexander’s untimely death was the first sign of the Romans’ good fortune. Cf. P. Tresca, op. cit., p. 49 and L. Braccetti, op. cit., p. 189.

Cf. L. Braccetti, op. cit., p. 183.


Res gestae, 29; A. Oltramare, op. cit.

6 N. Hamestad, op. cit., p. 99 sqq.

7 Liv., IX, 19, 9.

8 Liv., IX, 19, 17.

9 L. Braccetti, op. cit., p. 191.


dislike and distrust towards the Greeks. We have pointed out that by selecting Aineias the Trojan as his official ancestor, the emperor proved that there was a 'legendary relationship between Aineias and the Julia family' but, at the same time a concession to the popular anti-Greek feeling in Rome. The official version of the origin of Rome, vigorously supported by the Augustan propaganda, had in Vergil its most famous active element. The Aeneid is the best-known literary work based on the legend of Aineias and that is proved by the numerous handicraftsmen's objects that were inspired by it during the following two centuries. It seems that the subjects of the poem would have been suggested to Vergil by Augustus himself; which would explain the fact that Aeneas Pacis, the biggest monument built in Rome during the Augustan age, conceived after the model of the great altar in Pergamum, was to a great extent a parallel transposition of The Aeneid, a glorification of Aineias' deeds.

Besides Aineias' celebration, Augustus' ancestor, which is in fact the most important propagandistic element of the epic, there are other two important aspects which, in our opinion, must be mentioned: on the one hand, Vergil tried to point out the Italian element and especially the Etruscan one in the birth of the Roman people and, on the other hand, to place the Greeks in an unfavourable light, to diminish their contribution to the Italian history. If the stress laid on the Italian element seems a natural tendency, common with the other Augustan poets, of Italian extraction, to praise their native land, Vergil's philo-Etruscan attitude may be explained by his geographical origin, the Mantuan region, and also by the cultural and political circumstances of the time and by certain mythologic precursors. Mantua, his native city, preserved numerous Etruscan traditions. Vergil says that the city, allied to Aineias, owes its force to the Tuscan blood. (Tuscan de sanguine utres) and Pliny, who Tuscum trans Padum sola relictum. The poet's full name may be a proof to his Etruscan descent. The nomen Vergilius is quite widely spread among the Etruscan population, and his cognomen Maro reminds on the connection between Horace's Carmen Seculare and the legend of Aeneas, Sol and the Carmen Saeculare, Latomus, XXVI, 3, 1967, p. 619 sqq.


36 Vergil, Aen., X, 203.

37 Plin., HII, 130.


40 Georg., I, 2, 11, 30–41; IV, 2.


43 Lycophron, Alex. 1239–1254. On the dating of this work, see below, n. 140.

country that feeds him, and happy that they are rid of the dangers in the Greeks' country, celebrated by Trojan games the Actium coast, a clear allusion to Augustus' victory over Antonius. Farther on, Aineias is advised to avoid the Italian coast because it is inhabited everywhere by the infamous Greeks (enemula malis habitantur moenia Graecis) With the same purpose, Lucius Munnius, who in 146 B.C. destroyed Corinth and turned Greece into a Roman province, and Aemilius Paulus, the Roman general who in 168 B.C. had defeated Perseus the king of Macedonia, are regarded as the avengers of Troy (VI, 836 sqq.). And, if there is still any doubt concerning Vergil's referring to the Greeks of his time, the well-known paragraph exportat ali (VI, 847 sqq.) dissipates it, because by these lines the poet tries to justify the inferiority felt by the Romans to the Greeks both in arts and science. Moreover, Rome, born out of the merger between Greeks and Latins, was meant to put an end to the mythical antagonism between the Greeks and the Trojans, by conquering Greece. That conquering of Greece was preceded by Aineias' revenge of the mythical defeat of the Trojans by the Greeks during the Trojan war through his deeds in Italy. That is why — quite significantly — Vergil depicts Turnus, the Italian antagonist of Aineias, as being of Greek descent, being surrounded by Argiva putes, and five of the leaders allied to him are of Greek origin. Turnus, who believes himself as destined to destroy the Trojan race, replaces; a few times, Achilles, Troy's famous enemy. Besides the above examples that show that the Greeks were natural enemies to the Trojans, Rome's ancestors, which was obvious to every contemporary reader, Vergil makes use of other opportunities to minimize the Greek contribution to the foundation of Rome. Those, by their highly elaborate character, were addressed to the educated reader, able to decipher the mythological subtleties. According to a widespread tradition, Aineias could 'leave Troy thanks to the good will of the Greek conquerors. Some people think that such an act of goodwill may be explained by his opinion, that, being a champion of peace, Helen must be returned to Menelaos. Others think that Aineias' piety was the cause of the Greeks' admiration. But, as Vergil hoped that Aineias would become the common Roman citizen the mythical image of Augustus, he could not accept such explanations which must have been known to him. Giving the notion of pides a certain meaning, the poet made Aineias escape the Trojan disaster not thanks to the conquerors' goodwill but to his own accord.

Another illustrative example of Vergil's altering traditions giving an anti-Greek colouring, was about the Greeks' role in the primitive Italy. Traditions referring to the primitive history of Italy gave an essential role to the Greeks. The Pelasgians generally considered as having a Thessalian descent. Evander's Arcadians, Heracles and his companions had been believed as the most important founders in the Italian peninsula and were placed, according to the traditional chronology, in a period previous to the Trojan war, that is much earlier than Aineias' Trojans. But, even to the generation of the Trojan war, the oldest tradition spoke not of Aineias the Trojan but of Odysseus the Greek as being the hero that left Troy heading West, to Italy, even to Latium. Thus, an excerpt from Hesiod's Theogony that could hardly be previous to the mid-7th century, tells that Agris and Latins, sons to Circe and Odysseus, ruled over the Tyrrenians. Odysseus' priority is also proved by craftsmen's objects discovered in Etruria. A Krater of Aristonothos, made in Caere and da...
toward the half of the 7th cent. B.C., represents Odysseus blinding Polyphemos the cyclops 113. Only toward the half of the 5th c. B.C. Hellanics brings Aineias in Latium and makes him the founder of Rome. But his narrative, preserved by Dionysios of Halicarnassus 114, unveils the fact that, in the time of the logograph of Mytilene, Odysseus' antiquity in Italy was known, because Aineias became founder of Rome (οικοστήγα τάς πάλινζων) coming to Italy together with (μετά Ωδωσάων), or, perhaps, after Odysseus (μετά Ωδωσάων) 115. During the following centuries, Odysseus and Aineias' adventures in Italy did not disappear from the Greek and Latin literature. Moreover, the theme enjoyed an important development, the two myths influencing and intermingling with each other under various circumstances, among which the political ones played an important part 116. It is only natural to assume that Vergil knew of the tradition telling about Odysseus' presence in Italy prior to Aineias, which thus made Rome a Greek foundation 117. But that tradition contradicted the poet's anti-Greek feelings as well as his intention to make The Aeneid the "national" epic of not only the Romans, but also of all the nations in Italy situated outside the Greater Greece. That is why the first line of The Aeneid 118 has a programmatic character, because in it Vergil denies Odysseus' priority in Italy replacing it by the Trojan Aineias' 119. And, consequently, the poet makes important alterations in the traditional mythological material.

In The Aeneid, Aineias and his Trojans are called Dardanus and Dardanidae 120. Accordig to a wide-spread tradition, Dardanos, the Trojans' mythic ancestor, was the son of Zeus and the Atlantide Electra. He was a native of Samothrace which he left and settled on the Asia Minor coast founding the city of Dardany 121. According to another tradition that may be traced up to Hellanics, Dardanos seems to be a Greek from Arcadia 122. But with Vergil, Dardanos, Aineias' ancestor, does not come from Samothrace, nor from Arcadia, but from Italy, to be more precise from Corythus, where he left for Phrygia and Samothrace. Also from Italy come his Trojans 123. In other words, Aineias' coming in Italy is not a simple conquest, but represents in fact a return to his former country 124. Thus Vergil saves the ancestry of the Julia family and of Rome making them strongly connected to the Italian land and protecting them from the aversion that might be caused if they were regarded as intruders, and at the same time justifying Italy's claim of ruling the world based on a divine predestination 125. Corythus (or Corythus), as place in Italy where Dardanos came from 126, occurs for the first time in Vergil's epic and only later Corythus was considered Dardanus' father 127. Apparently the name is not Vergil's invention because an obscure mythic character, Κέρυλος, appears sometimes in the stories about Telephos 128. He is connected to Tegea, where a dême bears his name 129. We might think that, in selecting the name, Vergil was inspired by the Arcadian legends which were

prima lalii tellus, velum us urbe lacto acpectet reduces.

111, 163 sqq.:
Est locus, Hesperion Grai cognomine dient, terra antiquo, potens armis augeb ubeque glaber; Oenotri coluere uiri: nunc fama minores
Italiam divisse duece de nomine gentem: lube nobis proprie sedes, hinc Dardanun ortus Iasiusque poter, genus a quae principe nostrum.
Surge aequ et haec lacte longueno dieta parenti
haut diutinanda refer: Corythus terrasque requirat
Aenusias; Dileaca negal tibi Jupiter arum.

Cl. VII, 205 sqq.
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wide-spread in Rome, as well as by the mythical connections between Tegae and central Italy. Thus, Varro and his Greek sources made Dardanus Areclidian. Ovid associates Evander with Tegae and Vergil with the Pheneus, a river in Western Arcadia, Salius of Tegae being one of Aeneas' companions.

But that would place at the origin of Aeneas and Rome's ancestors a Greek element which would have been against the anti-Greek feelings that pervade the whole of The Iliad. So we must look elsewhere. In Vergil, Corythus is a place situated with certainty in Etruria, and the ancient annotators of The Iliad call it mons, appodium or civitas Tusciæ. Its name must be connected to Telephos, not that in Arcadia but that of Mysia. The character was used by the Greek scholars as a Hellenic alternative to the Lydian, barbarian genealogy of the Etruscans (cf. Hdt. I, 94), not interesting to them. Indeed, by means of pseudo-scholarly speculations, during the interval of time when Herodotus and Lycophon wrote, Tyriphonos, the Etruscans' eponym, turned from the son to Atys the Lydian and brother to Lydos, into the son to Telephos, the one descending from Heraldes, and brother to Tarchon. That variant co-existed in the Etruscan environment together with that of the Lydian origin, if we may trust Tacitus (Ann., IV, 55), and it is attested by representations of numerous Telephos' adventures that have been preserved on coins, vessels, cistae, mirrors and sarcophagus discovered in Etruria or in areas in which the Etruscan influence is certain. The popularity of the legend of Telephos the Mysian is accompanied by the popularity of the Trojan legend which, besides the painted representations we mentioned above, may be seen also in the frequency of the name Troy which occurs in the Etruscan inscriptions: Tusia, Tusie, Tusiaeos Tusionus, etc. That is why we must admit that the names Corythus and Dardanus, known in Etruria through the Greek mythological stories, were regarded here as natural, especially during the last century of the Republic, when the interest in the Etruscans' past was largely widespread, through the activity of Marcus Terentius Varro, A. Caecina, Nigidius Figulus and Tarquinius Priscus. We think that the hypothesis we advanced above may be proved by the three Etruscan inscriptions that were found in Tunisia long ago but have only been studied for the recent years. The inscriptions, dated in the former half of the 1st cent. B.C., and written by an Etruscan population emigrated in North Africa probably because of the civil wars ravaging Etruria, read about a 'tul' (terravitus) Dardanum, Vergil, making Dardanus a hero native of Corythus, once more proves his Etruscan liking, because,
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if Aineias — Augustus' ancestor — cannot be considered Etruscan by birth, his ancestors certainly are 146.

If the Italic writers were actively supporting the Augustan propaganda 147, which by its mythical bases had an anti-Greek colouring, the Greek writers chose a different way. They did not fight against the propaganda but interpreted the mythical facts in a way that should not hurt the Greeks' pride and, moreover, as is the case of Dionysios of Halicarnassus, to show Rome itself as a result of the Greeks' actions. Certainly, there were expressions of opposition against that propaganda, and the best known example is Trogus Pompeius. He was not a Greek by birth but, being familiar with the Greek literature, chose the way of the so-called „philobarbarian” historians who, writing the history of Greece in Latin, did not deal with the greatness of Greece (whose foundation was also connected to Greece) 148, very carefully analysing instead the glorious deeds of the Greeks, as well as those of other peoples who fought against the Greeks. His critical attitude to Rome may also be proved by the fact that the historian of Gallia Narbonensis had as his main source the work of Timagenes of Alexandria who, writing in Rome in late 1st cent. B.C., exalted the deeds of Alexander the Great and those of his successors and criticised Rome's past at the same time. But Strabo and Dionysios of Halicarnassus 149 generally have a favourable attitude to Rome and their writings meet the official propaganda. Thus, Strabo praises Augustus and the necessity of replacing the old Roman constitution, the benefactive effects of peace and the emperor's respect to divinity 150. Aineias' myth is treated according to the tradition 152. At the same time, aware of the anti-Greek feeling prevalent in Rome 153, the work of the geographer from Amaseia is pervaded by sympathy and admiration to the achievements of the people he belonged to. The sources of Geographia are Greek, avoiding the Latin ones, since, Strabo writes, the Roman historiographers imitated the Greek scholars and what was personal in their works did not prove great love for science 154.

The place occupied by Dionysios of Halicarnassus in the context of the Augustan propaganda is opposite to that of Vergil. Recent and highly careful research more and more support the idea that the historic work of Dionysios of Halicarnassus, far from being in a conscious opposition to the Augustan propaganda 155, is a hymn of praise to the Rome prior to the Punic wars, written in order to surpass — within an ecomonical empire — the traditional opposition between Rome, barbaric but victorious, and the Greek world, conquered but superior in spiritual achievements 156. The appearance of the Roman Antiquities by Dionysios of Halicarnassus is illustrative. According to his own confession 157, Dionysios began writing this work in 30 B.C., that is as soon as he settled in Rome, and finished it in the year 7 A.D., quite a long period of time when in Rome worked some of the most prominent Roman writers and historians. During that time Vergil's Eneid appeared, a true national epic of the Romans, Horatius published his poems; between the years 27 and 20 B.C. Titus Livius wrote the first ten books of his history and, soon after he came to Rome, in 28 B.C. Varro died, the famous scholar of the Roman ancient history 158. At the same time, Dionysios is aware of the emperor's supporting the studies on the sources of the Roman greatness and that such studies depict the Greeks in an unfavourable light. Being conscious of the political reality of his time, Dionysios intended — as his work proves — that, observing the official propaganda, to create a different image of the relationship between Rome and Greece. Thus he did a long and vast ethnographic and historic research on the origins of Rome and of the various peoples in Italy that for the first time succeeded in gathering
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156 Dion. Hal., I, 3, 7.
the data from the research of the literary sources and from the study of the monuments. He spoke both to the Romans, whom he wanted to admire his own people, and to the Greeks, among whom at that time only small Roman history compendia were circulated, and whom he wanted to make familiar, through the pen of a true writer, with the illustrious Roman men. The fundamental idea in Dionysios of Halicarnassus, completely differing from Vergil, is that, ultimately, Rome was founded from the fusion of several Greek peoples that came to Italy (cf. I, 5, 1; 90, 2). The Greek tribes that contributed to Rome’s founding in Dionysios’ opinion, were: the aborigines, the Pelasgians of Arcadian origin, Evander’s Arcadians, Greeks of various descent that accompanied Heracles and, lastly, Aineias’ Trojans. Dardanus, Aineias’ ancestor, is not, as is in Vergil, a native of the Italian Corethys since Dionysios agrees with the older idea according to which the hero came from Arcadia (see supra). In other words, gens Iuliana to which Augustus belonged, was of Greek descent, an idea that was supported by the cultural Greek-Roman merger that followed after the battle of Actium. The historian of Halicarnassus places the Roman state within the series of the hegemonies of the Greek states, the Romans deserving their supremacy as they are the best of the Greeks, considering as a natural law the concept, already existing in the works of Polybios, Panetios and Posidonius, on the rule of the superior people ( siguientes) over the inferior ( inferiores). The theory that, originally, Rome is a Greek city, which is not new in the Greek and Roman historiography, is proved by Dionysios by means of numerous examples taken from several Greek and Latin writers, quoted nominally or left anonymous, as well as from the study of the institutions, laws, traditions and religious beliefs that the Romans preserved from their Greek ancestors. In order to strengthen his assertions, Dionysios reinforces them with “linguistic” evidences, using the thesis, already popular among the Greek and Roman scholars, according to which the Latin language was a Hellenic language, more precisely, an Aeolic type dialect.

Stressing the Greek origin of the various elements that contributed to founding Rome, Dionysios felt himself obliged to argue against some theories considered as axioms. Thus by considering the Pelasgians as having a Greek origin, the historian could not ignore the widespread opinion that they were thought of as Tyrrhenians ( = Etruscans), population whose language and traditions differed from the Greeks’ and Romans’. That is why Dionysios supports the autochthony of the Etruscans, based on old writers and on linguistic and ethnographic facts. The Hellenic vision of Italy’s prehistory, the way it is presented in the Roman Antiquities by Dionysios, did not displeased the Romans, who thus felt culturally ennobil and justified in playing their part the world policy of the time. Also, the way Aineias’ legend is narrated met the ideals of restoring the moral and religious values, propagated by Augustus. In this point, the careful analysis of the historic work of Dionysios of Halicarnassus, revealed the insidious and efficient presence of the Augustan propaganda, concealed by the secrecy of any allusion to Augustus. The propaganda is indirect, by the presence of the mythic heroes Heracles, Evander, Aineias and Romulus, who, by their civilized actions and their moral and religious qualities heralded Augustus.
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