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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the Roman idea of *pietas* in the late 1st century BC. It concentrates on the development of the idea from a marker of familial and religious responsibilities to its usage as a political tool of the late Roman Republic. The work examines the philosophical writings and letters of Cicero, the histories of Appian and Cassius Dio, and the Latin poetry of the late Republic and early principate. I will argue that *pietas* functions on a basis of gratitude which prompts obligation and reciprocal duty. These characteristics will be shown to be the basis of Roman familial and political relationships. Cicero’s philosophical writings on the term will be compared to his personal letters to show the distinction between the ideal of *pietas* and its actual, pragmatic usage at the end of the Roman Republic. In turn, *pietas* will then be shown to be a tool used by those who had a hand in the reordering of the Roman state. Those who sought to advance their own claims to power utilized *pietas* as an articulation of the mutual debts shared between leaders and subordinates. This was done within the framework of traditional Roman views of the obligations and duties inherent in their relationships. This language of mutual responsibility characterizes the Roman understanding of *pietas*. This ancillary language of debt and reciprocity, obligation and responsibility signifies expressions of *pietas*. Both the Latin and Greek terms associated with *pietas* show that it maintained a fixed set of principles but nevertheless came to be used to a variety of ends. Finally, I will turn to the poets of the end of the 1st century BC to show the use of *pietas* as an expression of a complicated set of principles important to the Augustans. *Pietas* was used to define a justification for the new principate after the civil wars. This principate was represented by these poets as underpinned by a
traditional relationship among the gods, family and the state. These relationships, despite their new political context, were still governed by traditional Roman religious and familial notions of mutual obligation and *pietas*. 
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Introduction

My main purpose in this work is to study the expression of the idea of *pietas* and the nature of its connectedness with political developments of the late Roman Republic. The intention is to show the means by which an indigenous Roman religious concept with roots in religion and the family came to function as a political tool. The nature and characteristics of *pietas* will be shown to be marked by obligation and reciprocal duty in keeping with Roman pragmatism. This is distinguished from any abstract religious ideal.\(^1\) A deeply pragmatic aspect will then be demonstrated to be the defining characteristic of *pietas*. For it fosters relationships based on mutual duty and responsibility which permeated all strata of Roman society. The common underlying virtues of which *pietas* is comprised may be seen as cultural and social concepts of the greatest relevance. *Pietas* encompasses dutiful devotion towards family, state and gods and stands in the Roman conception of it as the chief virtue from which all others stem. Consequently, this term encapsulates a number of connotations which render it a symbol emblematic of an entire age and one denoted by a complex set of signifiers.\(^2\)

The idea is informed by Hellenistic philosophy and its product humanitas, whereas the basis of the understanding of *pietas* is found in Roman religion. This religious understanding is shown to be the reason for Roman supremacy. The relationship to the gods is considered by the Romans the greatest advantage they

\(^1\) Wagenvoort 1947, 142; Traina (1983, 93) as “eccessivo.” Cf. Fugier, 1963, 380 n. 28: G. Royen sees the origins of *pietas* as existing in relationships of mutual respect between individuals whereas Wagenvoort places the religious function of *pietas* above all other considerations.

\(^2\) Traina, 97 “But *pietas* is not only a lexeme or concept: it is a manner of comportment, which can be described without being denoted or it can be denoted by semantic equivalents.”
possess in relation to other peoples. This virtue maintains the proper relationship to the
gods and guarantees the continuance of the state. Its basis affected the understanding
of the relationship between man and gods and among individual Romans themselves.

With the acceptance of the *clupeus virtutum*, Augustus enshrined *pietas* as one
of the most valued virtues in the Augustan mindset. It will be the purpose of this study
to examine the underpinnings of such a monumental term and to examine the
foundations of it to be found in the sociological, cultural, historical and literary
expressions surrounding *pietas* as well as in the related vocabulary that signifies its
expression. I will use this work to show the foundations of the term and to display that it
did not function as an abstract philosophical ideal but was inherently tied to action. The
period after the post-Sullan restoration, up until the final victories of Octavian, which
extinguished all competing claims to *pietas* by his rivals, provide the richest material
from which to discern the meaning of *pietas* to Romans and the inter-play between a
societal ideal and political reality.

---

3 *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 34: *clupeusque aureus in curia Iulia positus, quem mihi senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietas* caussa testatum est per eius clúpei inscriptionem.

 ordinances το τρεσ φυσούν ἐν τϊ βουλευτηρίωι ἀνατεθέν ὑπὸ τε τῆς συνκλήτου καὶ τοῦ δῆμου τῶν Ῥωμαιων διὰ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς ἄρετήν καὶ ἐπείκειαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ εὐσέβειαν ἐμοὶ μαρτυρεῖ.

“a golden shield was placed in the Curia Julia whose inscription testified that the senate and the Roman people gave me this in recognition of my valour, my clemency, my justice, and my *pietas*.”

The bilingual *Res Gestae* provides the Greek approximation of the term *pietas*, *εὐσέβεια*, which is important in the later histories of Appian and Cassius Dio, who relate the period before the principate of Augustus and shed much light on the cultural contexts surrounding the term as it comes to be associated with historical events and the rationales surrounding them.

4 The scope of this study will roughly cover the 40 years between Cicero’s valuable studies on the subject of inter-personal relationships and ethical behaviour and the final defeat of Antony by Octavian.
The channels of communication used to convey the Roman understanding of the concept include the following: funerary epitaphs and legal texts; the legal speeches, philosophical writings and the personal correspondence of Cicero; and the histories relating the period before the rise of the Augustan principate. Though composed much later, these represent a consistent and pervasive Roman culture of *pietas* only amplified by the uniformity of its expression even in later Greek historians; finally, the Augustan poets helped to shape the notions surrounding *pietas* as they reflect the efforts of the *princeps* to shape and appropriate the term after the difficulties of the civil-war period. A part of this appropriation included the Roman state, imagined as a family bound by *pietas*, with the *princeps* at its head. Such draws upon the concept of the *paterfamilias*.

The emotional state of the Roman household is of particular importance to our understanding of the relationship between Romans and those in power, via the bridge between the two entities that *pietas* represents. The *paterfamilias* sheds light on the expectations, gratitude and sense of obligation owed to this figure. *Pietas* acts as a means by which a subject elicits action based on duty and obligation. In this regard, *pietas* may be seen as an emotion, but one that is eminently practical. It is a term that reflects Roman pragmatism as it governs relationships.

In fact, the demands of *pietas* are troublesome at times as they help to perpetuate the antagonisms visible in the political exchanges of late-Republican Rome. At the time, the demands of *pietas* within Rome’s leading families and their various retinues became projected onto the state. The *grata voluntas* that Cicero speaks of and its desire for action based on gratitude begins to characterize the term. *Pietas* is an
insistent and inescapable set of obligations that are the sociopolitical baggage of Roman life. Every Roman was influenced by notions of the concept and was expected to act upon its demands. This is what it meant to a Roman to act in accordance with the gods and the mos maiorum. Pietas is the constant reminder of one’s duties and responsibilities to family, state and gods according to the dictates of never-ending occasions of indebtedness that begin with the granting of life and that guide the Roman in his approach to inter-personal relationships.

Notions of the function of pietas within the larger framework of the state are also crucial as the commonality between familial and state ideals of pietas makes the term an important signifier of the obligations and expectations inherent in the vertical relationships between figures of authority in the state and the citizen. In order to characterize the Roman concept of pietas, this study examines the writings of Cicero who presents to us these concepts and their significance within the historical contexts of the late Republic – it was then that they functioned in the realms of family and friendships as well as in politics. The idea of pietas is shown as being the precondition qualifying Rome to wield power. In turn, such notions of power and associated responsibility act as justification for the Roman Empire. By nature of its pragmatic utility, pietas was appropriated by individuals who challenged the established order of the Roman state and who functioned within the inter-play between ideals and political reality.

---

5 Informed by earlier notions of a common humanitas that were derived from Greek intermediaries.
We will see that Cicero depicts *pietas* as contingent upon a developed sense of gratitude, one that subsequently produces the obligation of reciprocity showing *pietas* as a potent marker of interpersonal relationships. It guides and governs the expectations and sense of responsibility Romans observed. This idea guaranteed that one could rely on those in whom gratitude instilled a sense of obligation. *Pietas* served to act as the final comfort in uncertain times that there was a definite inter-personal bond inescapable both in benefit and responsibility. This promise was afforded to all Romans and was guaranteed by a divine substructure that made it, in the Roman mindset, an inescapable aspect of existence.

The understanding of *pietas* to emerge shows it functioning in a manner creating internal inconsistencies that Romans faced in regard to the demands of *pietas*. These demands are played out amid the backdrop of the obligations, often competing ones, within the Roman *patron/clientela* system, also governed by expressions of *pietas*. By nature of this system there are a number of inherent problems with *pietas*. It was possible to both act in a *pius* manner towards family, patrons, or clients while acting in an *impius* fashion towards other entities, such as the state or even those who have recourse to demands of obligation and reciprocal action as dictated by Roman societal conventions. The appropriation of *pietas* in a variety of modes to a variety of ends will be of significant concern to this study, and will show that, by its nature, *pietas* is particularly suited to the communication of specific Roman ideals and expectations that came to be shaped by those in power and which were subsequently accepted (although
not passively) by the greater population. The nature of reciprocal action and of the mutual responsibilities and obligations inherent in it portray a sophisticated societal idea holding an important number of connotations that can define a society in accordance to a symbol tying Romans of all classes together.

**Pietas: Traditional Understanding**

_Pietas_, traditionally interpreted as ‘the typical Roman attitude toward gods, fatherland, and parents and other kinsmen,’ maintained a preeminent position in the social organization of Roman society. The term provided a unifying motif which, in its various incarnations, displays a wide variety of modes of utilization. Despite this, the definition of _pietas_ remained remarkably consistent with regards to its understanding by Romans within the familial and the political realms. That is to say, the instances of _pietas_ culled from a variety of sources remain intrinsically tethered to the basic definition encompassing the idea of dutiful obligation, consistent with the religious and familial expectations of Romans. Familial notions of _pietas_ translate to the larger ‘state family’ of inter-connected patrons and clients, and provide a common basis for the term’s function. Subsequently, _pietas_ appealed on an emotional as well as a pragmatic level, to all the strata of Roman society. It acted as a unifier bridging the rigid social groupings of Roman society by displaying the importance and power of _pietas_ in Republican and Imperial Rome as a functioning social mechanism capable of regulating obligation, debt

---

6 That is to say that there was a mutual stake held by leaders and subordinates and there were mutual obligations and responsibilities shared by the two entities. Traina 1983, 84 terms this ascending and descending expression of _pietas_ its “bipolarità”, a very important linking aspect that exemplifies how the masses had a stake in the expressions of _pietas_ towards them.

7 Hornblower & Spawforth 1996, 1182.
and repayment, it infused these with religious connotations. *Pietas* is an understanding based on reciprocal behaviour underpinned by Roman societal conventions and religious belief, but is also marked by bonds of obligation. It is an expression of one’s dutiful reverence for the family and the institutions of Rome ideally expressed to maintain harmony in society. This harmony is contingent upon Romans fulfilling their duty to the gods and one another.

The previous definition gives rise to the question of how *pietas* with its religious and familial origins functioned within the family and how this translates to the political workings of Rome. Néraudau characterizes the term as expressed towards a superior entity, whether gods, parents, or homeland. The inscriptional evidence also includes a son or daughter commemorated as *pius/a* displaying the possibility for *pietas*. *Pietas* was be expressed to those in an inferior position within the family. The understanding that *pietas* flowed exclusively upwards from those in an inferior position to those in a superior one is termed ‘asymmetrical.’ This viewpoint is informed by the term’s order of mention in Cicero’s *De Inventione*:

\[
\text{appellant pietatem quae erga patriam aut parentes aut alios sanguine coniunctos officium conservare moneat.}^{10}
\]

If the reader continues in the same work, he will note, however, how the definition remains the same but with the order reversed, such that it placed blood relatives before

---

8 Néraudau 1984, 121.

9 Saller 1994, 105 n.12. Manson 1975, 22 argues that in Republican literature the term is represented as *pietas erga parentes* and never *pietas erga liberos*.

10 Cic. *De Inv.* II.22.66: “They term it *pietas* which advises to observe *officium* towards homeland, parents, or others joined by blood.”
the state.\footnote{Cic. De Inv. II.53.161. Wagenvoort 1980, 7.} Pietas is a ‘versatile’ idea that encompasses both ascending and descending expressions of devotion within the family, as well as between individuals and the state. It may be beneficial to clarify the nature of pietas in regard to its ascending or descending nature in the family.\footnote{That is to say whether used in reference to children by parents, or vice-versa.} Saller’s analysis of the use of the term in the Digest highlights the term used in both ways – in fact, references to pietas paterna and materna outnumber those to filial pietas.\footnote{Saller 1994, 112 n.35.} It is remarkable that a concept which is often seen as functioning upwards from inferiors to superiors, accomplished with a heavy emphasis on the relationship between men and gods and men and the state, is actually an indicator of the two-way expression of duty and devotion represented within the family and the state.

One further connotation may now be admitted in familial pietas, that of expectation. This concept and its connection to pietas is of significant importance in the evaluation of the worth of the offspring. The likelihood that expectations of duties marked by obligation will be fulfilled in a spirit of pietas will also bear relevance to the inter-connectedness we have noted between family and state. Very often these familial expectations were frustrated by the untimely death of a dependent who might have fulfilled the expectations of the parents regarding their care in old age and their eventual
burials.\textsuperscript{14} Both examples display the importance attached to the proper interment of the deceased as well as to the anxiety associated with the prospect of frustrated expectations in this *officium*.

There is a distinct commemorative pattern in the inscriptive record that distinguishes *pietas* as uniquely important to the valuation of the commemorated. Said pattern distinguishes *pietas* as unique in its importance for our understanding of relationships within the family. The numbers from the inscriptive evidence depict *pietas*, as Sigismund-Nielsen has argued, as showing the dichotomy evident between the two important epithets of *dulcissimus* and *piisimus/pientissimus*.\textsuperscript{15} Such reveals the interesting aspect of the expectations represented in the offspring and in the function *pietas* had, as opposed to that of *dulcis*.\textsuperscript{16} Among those commemorations representative of familial relations, there is a significant preponderance towards *pietas* as a marker of the possibility of fulfilling the commemorators’ expectations. Conversely,  

\textsuperscript{14} Notions of great importance to the Romans:

*Horace Carmina* 1.28.36: *quamquam festinas, non est mora longa: licebit*

\begin{quote}
*inieto ter pulvere curras.*
\end{quote}

“although you are in a rush, the delay will not be long:

you’ll be able to carry on after you’ve thrown down three handfuls of dirt.”

*Propertius* 1.22.5-8: *sic mihi praecipue, pulvis Etrusca, dolor,*

\begin{quote}
*tu proiecta mei perpessa es membra propinqui,*

*tu nullo miseri contegis ossa solo.*
\end{quote}

*there is this chief sorrow for me, Etruscan dust,*

*you permitted the bones of my kin to be scattered*  

*you cover the bones with no paltry soil.*”

\textsuperscript{15} Sigismund-Nielsen 2007.

\textsuperscript{16} Sigismund-Nielsen 2007, 10.
*dulcis* is indicative of a passivity reflective of infancy and youth. It may be noted in the inscriptive evidence that after the 15-19 age group, *dulcis* ceases to be used as an epithet whereas in this group commemorations related to *pietas* abound.

**Expectations and the Complete Life**

*Pietas* is a marker of action based upon the understanding of one’s duties to various entities in Roman society. The ability to comprehend and act upon a sense of obligation is the starting point from which the expectations associated with *pietas* begin. Without the ability to comprehend and act, there can be no expectation of reciprocity, a crucially important aspect of *pietas*. An example from the younger Pliny’s letters serves to characterize the Roman mentality toward the utility of offspring and the expectations of the parents: in fact, it may be viewed in terms of frustrated expectations of reciprocal action.\(^{17}\) The letter relates the death of Minicia Marcella, daughter of Fundanus. An inscription survives commemorating her, although affording little other than her name, age, and father:

\[
D(is) \ M(anibus) / Miniciae / Marcellae / Fundani f(iliae) / v(ixit) a(nnos) XII m(enses) XI d(ies) \]

\(\text{VII.}^{18}\)

It is fortunate that we have a literary appraisal of the young girl thus granting us supplemental information regarding her personal attributes and life. Pliny states that the

\(^{17}\) Pliny *Epistulae* 5.16.

\(^{18}\) CIL VI, 16631.
girl had not yet reached her fourteenth year, and mentions the sadness of the event by framing it with memories of the girl’s pleasantness and fondness for her father:

"ut illa patris cervicibus inhaerabat!"  

Whereas this affectionate description may seem to be the point of Pliny’s letter, upon further examination the following lines begin to catalogue the qualities the girl represented in ascending order: First, there is her geniality; secondly, she maintained a dignified and proper Roman mode of carrying herself as she died; finally, Pliny leaves us with the greatest sadness concerning this death – he then moves on to the father’s grief – that is, the girl died while betrothed and at the point of marriage to an egregio iuveni. Her wedding day had been set and her potential as a Roman woman was to be realized. Suddenly, we see that his girl is mentioned on account of the frustrated expectations she would have embodied, namely marriage and childbirth. Taken in conjunction with the passage from Pliny, we begin to see that Minicia represents a future possibility of fulfilling certain societal and familial expectations. In Minicia’s case, this pietas is not explicitly mentioned, yet Pliny’s letter alludes to the expectations of marriage and offspring. Thus, the expectations associated with her potential to express and demand pietas is frustrated by her untimely death.

We may now view this as a societal benchmark to evaluate one’s life.

Wiedemann’s examination of the place of the child in the Classical world presents the ancient understanding of the bereavement process as incongruous with our own notions

---

19 Pliny Epist. 5.16.3: “how she clung to her father’s neck.”

20 Epist. 5.16.3-4: She displayed temperantia, patentia, and constantia.

21 Epist. 5.16.6.3.
of loss and grief. The idea of reciprocity is key in this valuation of the offspring; therefore, it is shown to be the driving factor in the inter-generational relations of the ancients. This reciprocity is a defining characteristic of *pietas* and a significant driver of its function by way of the events surrounding its expression, regardless of whether in a familial, legal or political context. It may well be this aspect of the mutual reliance between generations of the family that dictates a movement away from the starkest depictions of the power of the *paterfamilias*. It may also be the case that this reciprocal nature explains why the term moved from a purely familial understanding to one encompassing a much larger scope, one superimposed on the entire Roman state. It ...
may be this aspect of the mutual reliance between generations of the family that
dictates a movement away from the starkest depictions of the power of the *paterfamilias*
which to be presented below.

An epitaph from Umbria states, ‘premature death took him before he was able to
reciprocate his well-deserving parents.’ The *mors immatura* elicited a sense of grief
felt by a parent for a lost child. Such grief stemmed in large part from the sense of a
premature end to the individual’s life. Modern standards judge the untimeliness of the
passing by the age at death in comparison to the average life-expectancy. The valuation
in the ancient world was contingent upon milestones within the individual’s life. For
boys, one of these milestones was the assumption of the *toga virilis* and the
propagation of the family; for girls there was marriage and childbirth. Minicia represents
the case of a girl having died prematurely, in that she died unmarried and without
children. This notion of the course and end of life can be found in the Aristotelian
concept of the *telos*, or natural end of life. This *telos* was not judged by time
exclusively, but also by those societal markers attained. Minicia typifies the ones who
passed before reaching the significant marker of marriage, thus frustrating their
potential as wives and mothers. Thus the loss her father feels is predominantly
characterized by the frustrated expectation of utility and potential, which stood as
central aspects of the valuation of the offspring.

---

24 *CIL* 06, 24659=*CLE* 00093.

25 Wiedemann 1989, 41.
The Classical record does not foster a nostalgia or fondness for the simplicity of youth, but rather an understanding that it represents an age of decreased utility and ability to act reciprocally:

`ἀλλὰ τοὺς τούτων θανάτους ραδίως φέρομεν καὶ εὐθύμως, τὺς δὲ τῶν ἡδη προβεβηκότων δυσχερῶς καὶ πενθικῶς διὰ τὸν ἐκ ματαίων ἐλπίδων ἀναπλασμόν...`

Our passage states that the death of the very young can be borne easily and cheerfully (ῥᾳδίως φέρομεν καὶ εὐθύμως) but it is more difficult to bear the emotions as a result of the deaths of those who have been born only to frustrate the hope (ἐλπίς), or expectations of those grieving, (διὰ τὸν ἐκ ματαίων ἐλπίδων ἀναπλασμόν).

**Pietas, the Paterfamilias and Familial Relations**

My argument paints a somewhat unexpected understanding of Roman familial relations. The focus on pragmatic bonds among family members creates the context for interpretations of the face of the value of paternal authority. Such characteristics, examined by some of the early voices of kinship studies, were deemed to present a family structure with a tyrannical paternal figure at its head. This figure’s power was characterized as, “passing beyond the bounds of reason into an excess of domination.” Such a viewpoint prompted others, such as Grant, to see some violent aspects of Roman society as symptomatic of the organization of the Roman family, and, particularly, of the power of the paterfamilias. The Romans’ love of blood-sport stemmed

---

26 Plutarch *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 113 D: But such deaths we bear easily and cheerfully, but the deaths of those who have already lived for some time with distress and mourning because of our fanciful notion, born of vain hopes...

27 Morgan 1877, 466.
from the violent bent of their society, typified by the “absolute mastery of the early
Roman *paterfamilias* over his children.”  

This, in turn, led to Veyne’s argument that it
was indeed not affection but the limits of the father’s power that acted as the bond
between the generations of a family. In fact, the child’s lot is represented as no different
from the slave’s as far as the power of the father is concerned.  

In arguing against
such a rigid interpretation of the *paterfamilias*’ power, Saller cites J. Crook who argues
against an overly simplistic appraisal of the father’s power informed by a study of legal
documents.  

Cautioning against an over-reliance on legal documents to characterize
the Roman family, he states that Roman law tended to push issues to the limits of logic
and, in this exposition, the roles of the *paterfamilias* were rigorously drawn.

Furthermore, he argues that Romans strictly kept law separate from religion and morals.
This created the situation whereby the legal character of the father stands out in
“sociologically misleading clarity.” The question of whether the father was a tyrannical
figure whose position was maintained by fear and coercion, or whether the relationships
were based on *pietas* and a reciprocal understanding of duty and obligations, is key.

Crook argues for a more nuanced understanding of the *paterfamilias* outside of the

---


29 Veyne 1987, 16-17.

30 Saller 1994, 105.

31 Crook *CQ* 1967, 114.
starkest representations we have in the ancient sources.\textsuperscript{32} In reality the expression of paternal power may have been mitigated by social conventions.\textsuperscript{33}

Thus the importance of \textit{pietas} as a bonding social construct becomes even more apparent if we view familial relations in the light of the alienation and detachment on a personal level characterizing the Roman family. This concept was also well-suited to a familial organization of the state. The representatives of the state’s power and authority understood the pervasiveness of \textit{pietas} within the Roman mind. As the late-Republican Roman state began to move towards monarchy, the dynasts comprehended the opportunity to appropriate the language of \textit{pietas} in support of their own interests. The eventual position of the emperor as \textit{paterfamilias} provided an ideal means by which the people could identify with the position of the emperor in relation to themselves in familiar

\textsuperscript{32} Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing at the height of the Augustan period, carries on this stark literary tradition depicting the power of the patriarch as absolute in his power over those in his \textit{domus}. It is based in the earliest laws of the Romans handed down to Romulus.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.26.4: “But the lawgiver of the Romans gave virtually full power to the father over his son, even during his whole life, whether he thought proper to imprison him, to scourge him, to put him in chains and keep him at work in the fields, or to put him to death, and this even though the son were already engaged in public affairs, though he were numbered among the highest magistrates, and though he were celebrated for his zeal for the commonwealth. Indeed, in virtue of this law men of distinction, while delivering speeches from the rostra hostile to the senate and pleasing to the people, have been dragged down from thence and carried away by their fathers to undergo such punishment as these thought fit; and while they were being led away through the Forum, none present, neither consul, tribune, nor the very populace, which was flattered by them and thought all power inferior to its own, could rescue them.” Cf. Sallust \textit{Catilina} 40.3 re: Fulvius, a senator’s son, executed on the orders of his father for complicity in the conspiracy and Vergil \textit{Aeneid} 6.815 re: Brutus and his sons.

\textsuperscript{33} Sextus Empiricus 3.211: “The Roman lawgivers also ordain that the children are subjects and slaves of their fathers, and that power over their children’s property belongs to the fathers and not the children, until the children have obtained their freedom like bought slaves; but this custom is rejected by others as being despotic.”
language. It was also helpful that, for many Romans, the *paterfamilias* was an individual who commanded dutiful respect and devotion primarily and then emotional attachment.

Roman relations valued the individual on a deeply pragmatic level. The landscape of familial relations has been shown to be concerned with practical matters concerning family members, with an emphasis on the individual’s place within the state and familial network. This places our notions of the ancient family, in some respects, at odds with our own conceptions of familial bonding. However, given the set of circumstances in the ancient world, including the high infant mortality rate and the lack of social institutions to aid the family, the value of the individual can be ascertained to be a function of the person’s ability to reciprocate.

**Pietas and the Political Climate in Late-Republican and Early Imperial Rome**

The political climate at Rome in the late Republic also bears relevance to the understanding of *pietas* as a concept. Writing on the progression of the term, Wagenvoort notes that around 45 BCE Cicero’s philosophical works begin to present *pietas* as relating to one’s country, parents and relatives secondarily and primarily to the gods. He continues arguing that the change in thinking in regard to the term is

---

34 *Res Gestae* 35: *senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus appellavit me patrem patriae.*

“The Senate and the entire equestrian order as well as the people universally called me *patrem patriae.*”

35 Wagenvoort, 9: “...up to the year 46 Cicero uses *pietas* at one moment in connection with blood relations and at another with the fatherland, and frequently, with both.”
reflective of the political realities of the civil wars and the fall of the Republic. He argues that the overarching impetus for this change of thought displays an attempt by Cicero to reconcile the Roman imperialist expansionist policy with Hellenistic philosophical ideas, by which he had been captivated and into which he had retreated in his retirement from public life.\textsuperscript{36} Furthermore, these philosophical ideals are seen as being reconciled to the principate of Augustus by the revision of \textit{pietas} to act as a bridge between the seemingly incongruous aspects it seeks to bring together.\textsuperscript{37} It is this revision that I will seek to examine. This is the political rationale behind the use of the language of \textit{pietas} in the late-Republic and the early principate.

The examination of the terminology associated with expressions of \textit{pietas} does much to show its function. It functions alongside a sea of related words, all bearing their own relevance to specific aspects of Roman social discourse and converging upon \textit{pietas}. In the analysis of these terms within the historical and societal context in which they function, we come closer to an understanding of \textit{pietas} vast pragmatic importance to Romans.

\textit{Pietas} is intrinsically linked to loyalty – \textit{fides}.\textsuperscript{38} This \textit{fides} is a marker of the relationships “of the Roman of high station with his retinue, that is his \textit{clientela}.”\textsuperscript{39} The distinguishing characteristic between \textit{fides} and \textit{pietas}, however, is the link of the latter to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Wagenvoort, 10.
\item Wagenvoort, 12. “...it was an attempt to provide a moral justification for the Roman policy of conquest and, at the same time, the philosophical background, the philosophical sanction, of Augustus’ principate.”
\item Cicero \textit{Philippics} 14.29.4: \textit{Est autem fidei pietatisque nostrae declarare fortissimis militibus quam memores simus quamque grati}; Hellegouarc’h, 152
\item Boyancé, 77.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the gods and family, a phenomenon that lends it a solemn and more emotional aspect. *Pietas*, by these features, predates the state and and looks back to a time when the only services or tasks that existed were those to family and the “divine parents.”40 This loyalty produced a pure spirit in Roman thought.41 Such a spirit was made purer by the dutiful execution of services by the one charged to do them. *Pietas* may thus be linked with the underpinning notion of *officium*.42 By way of *pietas’* connection to duty (*officium*) we see *pietas* closely aligned with notions of indebtedness and the obligation to repay debt incurred. It can be said therefore that, “the *pius* man is he who has fulfilled his *officia*.”43

*Pietas* stands atop a triad of *beneficium* and *officium*, terms associated with reciprocal action marked by obligation.44 *Officium* and *Beneficium* come together at times and are sometimes used interchangeably.45 These terms are markers of the language surrounding expressions of *pietas*. *Fides*, as we have seen, is also connected to *pietas*, and it stands as the basis for relationships of *amicitia*. Hellegouarc’h points out that this natural bond between loyalty and Roman friendship functioned with the notion of *officium* to serve as the pillars of *amicitia*: “*amicitia* is expressed concretely in the domain of social relations by a group of actions and obligations under the global

40 Hellegouarc’h, 276.
41 Fugier 375; Beaujeu; 280; Wissowa *Ausführliches Lexicon*, 2499.
42 Hellegouarc’h, 152.
43 Hellegouarc’h, 275.
44 Plautus *Persa*, 762: nam impróbus est homo qui beneficium scit accipere et reddère nescit.
   “it is the worthless man who knows to accept a *beneficium* but who does not know to repay it.”
45 Hellegouarc’h, 151.
term of officium.” As part the expression of friendship, officium appeals to fides. In fact, it can be said that officium is the concrete link to fides within a friendship. Officium carries with it an element of reciprocity, an act that permits its expression both from patron to amicus (client) as from client to patron.

A friend or client becomes a debtor to a friend or patron by this officium which is evident from its Latin usage. It is often marked by the verb debeto. Within this classification of officium there are two designations: publica and privata. Publica Officia are concerned with:

a) Keeping an absent relation apprised of events at Rome;

b) Financial concerns by which an individual is compelled to lend aid to a friend in need;

c) The final and most significant duty was to defend a friend in the courts of law.

---

46 Hellegouarc’h, 152; Cic. pro Plancio 81, De Officiis 1.4.7.

47 In particular the expression praestare officium alicui: Caesar de Bello Gallico 4.25.3. Likewise in officio esse, equivalent to in fide esse. Cf. Caesar de Bello Gallico 5.4.3. Cicero ad Atticum 1.10.2. Bailey, 59.

48 Cic. pro Sextius Roscius 111.11: Idcirco amicitiae comparantur ut commune commodum mutuis officiis gubernetur.

49 Cic. ad Fam. 6.1.7; Cf. Ariston Testimonia et fragmenta Fr.359.9, Chrysippus Fragmenta moralia Fr. 486.3, Fr. 689.1.

50 Hellegouac’h 156 n.8. e.g. Cicero and Atticus or Cicero and P. Lentulus Spinther.

51 ad Att. 12.52.1: Cicero appeals to Atticus for aid in clearing L. Tullius Martanus’ debt. Cf. ad Fam. 14.1.5: pertinet ad nostrum officium.

52 Cic. pro Murena 6.13: Ac de officio defensionis meae...

“And concerning the duty of my defense...”
It is clear from the final expression of *privata officia* that these duties translate from the private sphere to the public at this juncture. As we know this loyalty was complicated by political affiliations and also by the fact that the courts were used as weapons against enemies by the Roman elite. The public aspect of these duties are said to be “concerned with the protection or elevation of the man of politics.”

This assistance sought to secure four aspects of the Roman political man's life:

1) *Dignitas*;  
2) *Salus*;  
3) *Commendatio*;  
4) *Observantia.*

Cicero will be shown to echo associations made between *fides* and *pietas* connecting them to political and familial relationships. In families we have lateral relationships such as those between siblings, but more importantly for our purposes we have the relationships between parents and children and vice-versa, as they are marked by *pietas*. Furthermore, these *vertical* relationships and the ramifications of action prompted by obligation within them emanate by nature of Roman society outwards into the political world. This continuum from familial obligations to political ones lends *pietas* an emphasized representation in Roman relationships via the

53 Hellegouarch 157 n.3: *ad Fam* 10.1.3, *cf.* 5.8.3; 11.5.3; *Murena* 69.  
54 Linked to *defensio.*  
55 “Safety.” The *defensio salutis* was a part of the concern for an exiled friend to secure his restoration.  
56 The *commendatio* amounted to entrusting a protégé in the *fides* of one of high station. A part of this was to be recommended for office – *suffragatio.*  
57 This term is related to *officium* in that it represents bearing in mind one’s *officia* with an attitude of obligation.
common-ground between the familial, the familiar (i.e. amicitiae), and the state. He who was pius was purus;\(^{58}\) that is to say that the pius man achieved a state of purity by the accomplishment of obligations that had befallen him.\(^{59}\) With officium acting as an important mechanism in the expression of pietas, we see it planted firmly as the hub of a conglomeration of Roman societal norms underpinned by notions of indebtedness and obligation.

The basis of pietas, rooted in Roman religion, shows the eminently practical aspect of Roman beliefs with regards to the divine. Roman religious practice routinely saw the practitioner “repay” the gods for services rendered. Pietas is related to religio, in that it is more particularly associated with these same services rendered to the gods. Pietas, then, stands between the strictly legal represented by fides and the strictly religious represented by religio.\(^{60}\)

Pietas, notoriously difficult to translate in a word, is generally said to correspond to εὐσέβεια,\(^{61}\) although there is the notable exception of Polybius’ rendering of Pius

\(^{58}\) Ernout & Meillet, 546-7; Fugier, 332 also examines the etymology of the pi- root and shows its connection to purus.

\(^{59}\) Hellegouarch, 276.

\(^{60}\) Hellegouarch p.276: “Finding again in pietas the concept of one who fulfills his obligations. In this regard, pietas may appear the same as fides as an eminently social quality...with pietas essentially applied to deeds with regard to higher powers (the divine included) and the family. Thus pietas and religio are found to be associated.”

\(^{61}\) Liegle, 98, on the concordance of the Greek and Latin expressions of the term citing Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.18: ἀλλ’ ἐγνώ διότι νόμοι στοιχαίοι καὶ καλῶν ζήλος ἐπιτηδευμάτων εὐσεβή (pietas) καὶ σωφρονία (temperantia – clementia) καὶ τὰ δίκαια ἀσκούσαν (iustitia) καὶ τὰ πολέμια ἀγαθήν (virtus) ἐξεργάζονται πόλιν; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.4-5; Appian Punica 399. Liscu, 252 cites Arnim’s St. Vet. Fr. II, n.1017: ἔστι γὰρ εὐσέβεια ἐπιστήμη θεῶν θεραπείας. Arnim St. Vet. Fr. III, n.264: τῇ δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ [ὑποτατεσθαι] εὐσέβειαν χρηστοτητα, εὐκοινωνίαν, εὐσυναλλαξιαν. The terms for justice (δικαιοσύνη), and φιλανθρωπία (humanitas) are also essential to the development of pietas. Cicero also gives a concordance when citing lines from Euripides’ Phoenissae translated to Latin. Below 85 n.231.
Aeneas as δείσιδαιμονία. As is often the case with highly developed philosophical ideals pietas is suspected to have developed from earlier Greek intermediaries, particularly Platonic ones, that motivate action inspired by one’s responsibilities. This gives rise to the notion of pietas as existing within the sphere of emotion. Pietas acts as a means by which a subject elicits action based on duty and obligation. Necessarily this draws subsidiary considerations: “pietas is not only a virtue, it is also an emotion” and, according to Schultz’ appraisal, it is a “dutiful love.” This reciprocal nature extends pietas’ operations to friendship (amicitia) and, as we shall see, in Roman politics it extends to an idealized sense of responsibility to the state.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus echoes earlier Roman patrician dogma when he states that Roman rule is ὀσίόν τε καὶ θεμιτὸν allowing for governance with the “peace of the gods.” The state of this relationship between the gods and the Romans – natural rulers countenanced by them – roughly equates with the Latin sacred formula pium et fas. The patrician appropriation of pietas to their own ruling agenda was not, however, exclusive of those ruled – the greater populace is also mentioned as part of the compact guaranteeing the goodwill and protection of the gods:

62 Hellegouarc’h, 202.
63 Traina, 93; Boyancé, 78; Wagenvoort 1980, 9.
64 Traina, 93
65 Schultz, 175.
66 Dörrie, 6 & 20; Hellegouarc’h, 277ff.
67 Dionysius of Halicarnassus Antiquitates Romanae 11.56.2.5-11.56.3.1: “pius and just.”
68 Fugier 1963, 377: examines this “paix des dieux.”
69 Fugier 378.
Notions of the connection between the Romans and empire granted by the gods are seen in Greek inscriptions of the mid-2nd century BC. They are forerunners of later similar sentiments articulated in Latin. These inscriptions speak of the εὐμενία παρὰ τοῦ δαίμονιον in conjunction with πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβεια.71 Conversely, the defeat of an enemy of Rome is attributed to their ἀσέβεια.72 The attitude of justification for empire seated in the superior morality of the Roman people is delineated by Propertius as he places the Augustan seal on the development of pietas to serve as rationale for expressions of Roman power.73 This Roman preoccupation after the victories of the 3rd to 1st centuries BC sought to justify the lot of the vanquished now beneath them.

The underpinning rationale of Roman rule being based upon the Romans’ relationship to the gods presupposes that the divine takes an active role in human affairs and intervenes in them.74 However, we know that pietas is a function of reciprocal actions between humans as well.75 Fugier sees pietas emerging from mutual respect

70 Younger Pliny Panegyricus 74.5.1: “The civilization that is piously devoted to religious things is always worthy of the eternal forbearance of the gods…”.

71 Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 2.601: “the goodwill of the gods…pietas towards the gods.”

72 “Impietas.” Dittenberger, Syll. 2.643; Cf. Polybius 2.12.4-8 also echoed by Valerius Maximus 6.6.5.

73 Propertius Elegiae 3.22.20-22: Famam, Roma, tuae non pudet historiae. nam quantum ferro tantum pietate potentes stamus... “Fame is not ashamed of your history Rome. For we are powerful as much by pietas as by the sword…”


75 Royen, 713-716.
between individuals. He points out that *pietas* is exercised, according to the Roman moralists, *erga deos* just as it is *erga parentes, erga patriam.* The interdependence of fulfilling the obligations of *pietas* to these disparate entities creates various tensions and problems in the climate of the late Roman Republic. The difficulties find comment in Cicero’s writings helping to define *pietas* and show its actual ramifications. From Cicero’s definitions we get *pietas* as a notion exercised in regard to others (*in communione*) creating an inter-connectedness marked by the term.

*Pietas* is characterized as a fundamental natural law that obliges an individual to fulfill his obligations be they towards a father; from a slave to a master; towards a mother; between brothers; between spouses; towards children; from a client who is obligated to aid and protect a patron; and, finally, as an expression of a universal humanity binding us all. These various aspects of inter-personal *pietas* also, by nature of the radiating influence of the term, come to express *pietas* to the homeland.

---

76 Fugier, 380 contra Wagenvoort’s views of *pietas* and “ritual purity.”

77 Fugier, 380: “towards the gods...towards parents, towards the homeland.”

78 Cicero *pro Plancio* 11.28; *ad Fam.* 13.10.1; *Brutus* 1; *in Verrem* 1.37.

79 Cic. *De Partitione Oratorica* 22.78; *De Officiis* 3.90.

80 Vergil *Aeneid* 3.480.

81 Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.204.


83 Ovid *Met.* 9.460.

84 Ovid *Met.* 6.635.

85 Ovid *Met.* 6.629.


87 Vergil *Aeneid* 9.493; Fugier 381, Wagenvoort, 12.

88 Cic. *Pro Plancius* 11.28; *cf. ad Familiares* 13.10.1; *Brutus* 1; *in Verrem* 1.37.
underscores the commonality held by all citizens and the obligation emanating from the magistracies of the Roman state and the responsibilities shared by one citizen for another. This devotion tying citizens to one another also binds the individual to the conglomeration of all citizens, the state. By this association pietas exerts its influence within the realm of politics and in the relationship of the state’s authority towards individual citizen within a context of reciprocal obligation.

We may see proof of the connection mentioned above in its opposite: civil wars are almost uniformly termed impii; if one individual of a populus is part of a state “family”, then raising arms against a fellow citizen is impius erga fratrem.89

The irony of the warlord victor of the final rounds of nearly a century of civil wars eventually emerging as a paternal and pius figure who ushered in a new golden era under the banner of pietas is evident. This irony required a concerted effort to explain the costs and benefits of Augustan pietas. The irony was further strengthened by the recent memory of the resurgent Julian gens under Caesar, and his actions in regards to pietas that go from problematic origins to an effective assimilation and appropriation of it. In the same age as other virtues were being deified, a temple by M. Acilius Glabrio the consul of 191 BC was also dedicated to pietas.90 This same temple was destroyed as part of Julius Caesar’s forum building program, which only finally came to fruition under Augustus. The opening of the Theatre of Marcellus on the temple’s former location is symbolically significant. The destruction of the temple of pietas to eventually reconstruct on the same site a popular monument to a notable member of the imperial

89 Fugier, 383.

90 Hellegouarc’h, 276 & Traina, 93.
family summarizes the appropriation of an ancient notion to suit very contemporary concerns by the new principate at Rome. The princeps had taken the iconography of important Roman social custom to utilize it in the name of continuity and sacred orthodoxy for very partisan ends.

The very nature of pietas, with its tripartite emphasis on familial, divine and patriotic loyalty and dutifulness, creates a climate rife with the possibility of conflicting obligations. Pietas is the bedrock of the Roman understanding of the natural function of life. Debt and obligations must be incurred and, in turn, they must be repaid. The very act of living carries with it inescapable responsibilities to those who granted that life. The homo pius is “qui debitum reddat.”91 This is the ideal which the Roman was expected by force of nature itself to not simply aspire to but to actualize. Romans were expected to observe and act upon pietas because of an innate set of obligations which bound all Romans under a single ideal. Pietas also functions in regard to notions of responsibility and the obligation to reciprocate beneficii in the sociopolitical realm. As a condensation symbol, pietas encompasses an associated set of terms commonly used in the expression of Roman familial and political relationships.92

The need to repay indebtedness and satisfy the demands of its shorthand expression, pietas also creates the basis for relationships between those of higher and lower status, with an emphasis on mutual responsibility independent of station. The expression of such a relationship between patron and client extends pietas’ function

91 Historiae Augustae, Iuli Capitolini Antoninus Pius 2.3.4.

92 Edelman, 15: “Condensation symbols evoke the emotions associated with the situation. They condense into one symbolic event, sign, or act of patriotic pride, anxieties, remembrances of past glories or humiliations, promises of future greatness: some one of these or all of them. Where condensation symbols are involved, the constant check of the immediate environment is lacking.”
past its most ancient manifestation and into the realms of business, politics and friendship.\textsuperscript{93} The fact that familial affiliation stood out so prominently in Roman political expression creates the climate for \textit{pietas} to be a motivating factor in the function of government as well. When the strain of the collective weight of conflicting obligations undermined the Republic of Rome, it was \textit{pietas} that both filled the vacuum of the failed political mechanisms and propelled the state towards monarchy.\textsuperscript{94} Monarchy at Rome finally represented the completion of the natural cycle of reciprocal behaviour as dictated by \textit{pietas}, as the patriotic and familial, countenanced by the divine, all came to be associated with the physical embodiment of the \textit{princeps}.

In the familial sphere \textit{pietas} pertains to relations between children and parents.\textsuperscript{95} This filial concern is, also, however not without parallels in the political world.\textsuperscript{96} We have also seen the manner in which \textit{pietas} is connected to the larger sphere of \textit{amicitia}.\textsuperscript{97} The use of \textit{pietas} often points to its usage as a means by which the relationship is given more weight, imbued as it is with an air of religious solemnity.\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Pietas} then is a reinforcing and effective superlative term among lesser and more generic terms, such as \textit{amor, benevolentia}, and \textit{voluntas}. \textit{Pietas’} propensity for inter-connectedness to a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{Amicitia} with all the connotations it held for the elite at Rome in their dealings from the mundane to the direction of state.
    \item \textit{Pietas} expressed towards the people by those who held magistracies and the gratitude/obligation elected magistrates took on because of it were noted by the Republicans to be in jeopardy in the report of Cassius’ speech before Philippis (App. \textit{BC} 4.12.93).
    \item \textit{Pro Plancio} \textit{80: voluntas grata}. Cf. Below 40, 42, 46, 53, 64.
    \item Hellegouarc’h 277 n.3; Cicero \textit{pro Murena} 12; \textit{Caelius} 2; \textit{Philippicae} 9.12; Livy 7.5.2; 10.4.
    \item Cicero offers specific examples of this: \textit{pro Sestius} 3; \textit{pro Plancius} 98; \textit{pro Milone} 100.
    \item Fugier, 390
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
complex set of terms eventually leads to a connection to *clementia* in the imperial period as this became the sacred virtue of the emperor’s obligation to his subjects.\textsuperscript{99}

*Pietas* is closely linked to the *mos maiorum*, considered an essential aspect of Roman society.\textsuperscript{100} Even more importantly to the course of Roman history, *pietas* became the rallying cry of the various parties in the civil wars of the late Republic when familial and cliental obligations displayed the troubling contradictions of adherence to the ideal. In this way *pietas* became progressively elevated from an expression of familial duty to one towards the state. This association arises by means of the Roman belief that the gods acted as protectors of Rome as well as guarantors of her power. By this religious connection *pietas* is linked to notions of *patria* and the state which is ordered on the ancient plan of the Roman *gentes*.\textsuperscript{101} In this way the state was due *pietas* just as it was due to parents within the family. Cicero combines these two forms of *pietas* in his *de Republica*\textsuperscript{102} making them dependent upon each other in his *de Officiis*,\textsuperscript{103} thereby showing *pietas* to be the superlative of *fides* towards homeland.

For those in power at Rome, *pietas* signified that one of elevated rank fulfilled his obligations as a patron. The term obtains even more importance when we take into account the aristocratic point of view that the Roman state was a network of *amicitiae* and *clientelae* inherited from their ancestors and we begin to see *pietas* as a pervasive

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{99} Hellegouarc’h 277 n.8
\item \textsuperscript{100} Cf. Rech, 28 who sees *pietas* as linked to the *mos maiorum*.
\item \textsuperscript{101} Hellegouarc’h 278
\item \textsuperscript{102} Cicero *de Republica* 6.16.
\item \textsuperscript{103} Cicero *de Officiis* 3.90.
\end{itemize}
influence in the Romans’ social interactions with much more utility than any abstract religious or social ideal.
Chapter 1: Cicero and *Pietas*

In order to come to a better understanding of *pietas*’ function in inter-personal relationships, we turn to Cicero. As one of the most important sources for both political and personal thought in the late Republic, Cicero examines *pietas* in a number of instances related to political events. The term is an important guarantor of inter-personal relationships in Cicero’s conception of it and is an accompanying consideration in many historical events. These relationships are based on mutual duty and responsibility. *Pietas* acts in many instances as the symbol for a number of associated connotations that accompany such relationships. We are able to discern complex meanings when we view their usage in instances related by Cicero that bridge the practical usages and the idealized notions of the concept.

*Pro Quinctio* is concerned with the dispute between the heir of Caius Quinctius’ estate, his brother Publius and Caius’ former business partner Sextus Naevius. The matter at hand gives us a view into the thought surrounding the dictates of *pietas* as they extend into business dealings and, specifically, friendships. The important consideration is that we begin to see *pietas* envisioned as functioning in a wider role than initially envisaged and one with has effects extending to public dealings. *Pro Quinctio* 26.4 presents *pietas* as a social construct that bonds individuals:
Etenim si veritate amicitia, fide societas, pietate propinquitas colitur, necesse est iste qui amicum, socium, adfinem fama ac fortunis spoliare conatus est vanum se et perfidiosum et impium esse fateatur.¹⁰⁴

This sense of responsibility demands a certain manner of interaction with relations. The term is cast with friendship and society to show that it acts as a means by which individuals regulate their conduct within relationships. They are cultivated by pietas – it is the basis on which these relationships stand. This was interpreted as a social-construct founded on the wisdom of natural law:

\[ \text{initium ergo eius ab natura ductum videtur; quaedam autem ex utilitatis ratione aut perspicua} \]
\[ \text{nobis aut obscura in consuetudinem venisse; post autem adprobata quaedam a consuetudine aut} \]
\[ \text{vero utilia visa legibus esse firmata; ac naturae quidem ius esse, quod nobis non opinio, sed} \]
\[ \text{quaedam innata vis adferat, ut religionem, pietatem, gratiam, vindicationem, observantiam,} \]
\[ \text{veritatem.} \]¹⁰⁵

The natural element of pietas is further examined by Cicero in *De Finibus* 2.110.2, where he describes the simulacrum of it presented by animals:

\[ \text{partim cursu et peragratione laetantur, congregatione aliae coetum quodam modo civitatis} \]
\[ \text{imitantur; videmus in quodam volucrium genere non nulla indicia pietatis, cognitionem,} \]
\[ \text{memoriam, in multis etiam desideria videmus. ergo in bestiis erunt secreta e voluptate} \]

¹⁰⁴ *Pro Quinctio* 26.4: “Indeed if friendship is cultivated by truthfulness, society by loyalty, relationships by pietas, it is necessary that he who tries to despoil a friend, a relation, an associate in fame and fortune, he must be called treacherous and impius.”

¹⁰⁵ *De Inv*. 2.65.10: “Therefore its beginning seems drawn from nature; however, certain things come into currency either by reason of utility or by our insight or for obscure reasons. Although, afterwards certain things are sanctioned by familiarity or indeed by their manifest usefulness confirmed by the laws. And this law is of a nature which comes to us not by opinion but by a certain innate force, just as religion, pietas, gratitude, retribution, observance and truth.”
This statement serves to emphasize Cicero’s view that the concept stands as a human construct. It is shown to be selfless. In fact, *pietas* is often associated in Roman thought with sacrifice and subordination of individual desire in deference to the community, gods, or family. It is this intrinsic trait that establishes the parameters of Romans’ understanding of the notion of their individual obligations and the associated characteristics which comprise the idea.

**Pietas and Gratitude**

The actions and individuals involved in the prosecution of the Catilinarian conspirators provided a subtext for Cicero’s explication of the nature of *pietas* and provides a political backdrop for the use of the term vis-à-vis the difficulties that accompanied the fall of the Republic. This term, when applied to the realities of Roman social discourse, inherently connotes sacrifice to the cause of the humanity it represents. This selflessness manifests itself in danger for Lucius Flaccus, who was placed in jeopardy on account of his actions for the sake of others.  

In seeking to bring his audience to view Flaccus as a good and virtuous man, Cicero utilizes the imagery of *pietas*. In this case, Flaccus’ *pietas* induces him to incur peril in behalf of the state.

---

106 *De Finibus* 2.110.2: “Some delight in roaming about, others imitate a type of society. We see that in a certain type of birds a certain indication of *pietas*. We see thought, memory and even desire in many of these. Therefore when there are feigned likenesses, divorced from pleasure, of human virtues in beasts, will there be no virtue in men themselves except for the sake of pleasure?”

107 *Pro Flacco* 104.5. Flaccus acted as one of Cicero’s confederates in thwarting Catiline’s designs.

108 Somewhat cynically invoking the Catiline conspiracy to draw attention away from the charges of Plancus’ corrupt election practices (54 BC).
The theme of incurring peril as a result of action prompted by *pietas* occurs much more personally for Cicero from his experience as an exile. He presents *pietas* as the last guarantee there be beneficial relationships maintained with reciprocal duty ingrained within them, regardless of the vicissitudes of life. It is this that prompts the statesman to characterize the loyalty displayed by his brother Quintus who continued to champion Cicero’s cause during his exile. He was acting with *incredibili pietate*.

This passage also conveys the notion that *pietas* acts as a bulwark against the uncertainty of the future, a symbol of unshakeable stability resting on a firm foundation guaranteed by the gods, nature and society. Such characteristics bridge the political and the familial. Therefore, *pietas* functions in the space between the personal and the public.

*Pietas* in the private realm is marked by the concepts of gratitude and reciprocity. *Pro Plancio* 3.5 shows that the mutual duties and responsibilities of *pietas* extend from the gratitude felt by Cicero, whom Plancius shielded from the threat from the residuals of the Catilinarian faction when in exile. Gratitude prompts Cicero to speak of Plancius’ *pietas* while defending him. In this instance, the term is used as an expression of the impulse that prompts Plancius to harbour the exiled Cicero. The impulse is based on their friendship and the responsibilities it entails for Plancius. Consequently, it creates a sense of gratitude which demands the obligations of *pietas* from Cicero. This acts as a function of the basic human principle of reciprocity. Cicero explicitly states that he defends Plancius on account of gratitude and *pietas*:

> audi, audi atque attende, Laterensis, ut scias quid ego Plancio debeam, confiteareque aliquando

---

109. *Post Red. ad Pop.* 5.10. *cf. Pro Sestio* 145.11, where the same words are used to describe the situation.

110. 58 BC. Plancius was quaestor in Macedonia at the time.
me quod faciam et grate et pie facere.¹¹¹

He explains that he undertakes the defense in repayment for the risk Plancius incurred in providing protection for him when in exile. This displays an excellent example of the dynamic of personal obligation, governed by pietas, as it functions in the public realm, and its connection to the Romans’ understanding of friendship. The inter-play of mutual duty and responsibility is evident even outside of the family, the traditional locus of pietas’ expression. It is this mobility which affords pietas aspects of a political and legal nature as well as social. It may be said with confidence that this mobility creates a system in which a common concept is able to permeate all strata of Roman society while governing and regulating relationships along the lines of an ideal of action driven by obligation.

The intrinsic commonality of pietas is again depicted by Cicero in the legal arena with imagery of the family. In Pro Ligario, fraternal pietas is said to ensure that all brothers will face a common fate if harm should come to one of them. The brothers are tied together by duty. Drawing on the common emotional appeal of such a scene, Cicero pleads for the judges to be moved by the pietas and the tears of the brothers of the defendant:

Noli, Caesar, putare de unius capite nos agere: aut tres Ligarii retinendi in civitate sunt aut tres ex civitate exterminandi. Quodvis exsilium his est optatius quam patria, quam domus, quam di

¹¹¹ Pro Planc. 98.7 ff.: “…listen, listen and pay attention, Laterensis, that you may know that which I owe to Plancius and I confess that whatever I do at any time I will due in a spirit of gratitude and pietas.”
penates, illo uno exsulante. Si fraterne, si pie, si cum dolore faciunt, moveant te horum lacrimae, moveat pietas, moveat germanitas.\textsuperscript{112}

Given the emotional aspect of \textit{pietas}, with its deeply personal connotations, we may be prompted to view it as an undeveloped, visceral reaction in its practitioners; in fact it may be criticized as superstitious fear. Despite its basis on emotional commonality, \textit{pietas} did not find its characteristics in superstition or other more base properties. Cicero specifically separates the superstition from more noble motivations, once again drawing attention to the divine:

\begin{quote}
\textit{cultus autem deorum est optumus idemque castissimus atque sanctissimus plenissimusque pietatis, ut eos semper pura integra incorrupta et mente et voce veneremur. non enim philosophi solum verum etiam maiores nostri superstitionem a religione separaverunt. nam qui totos dies precabantur et immolabant, ut sibi sui liberi superstites essent, superstitiosi sunt appellati, quod nomen patuit postea latius.}\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Instead, Cicero presents \textit{pietas} as based on reason, natural law and a perceived benefit for society.\textsuperscript{114} The notion of \textit{pietas} as a function of reason is found at a number of points in his works. \textit{De Officiis} 2.46.5 affords the highest esteem to rational pursuits which bring gratitude and, therefore, lead to \textit{pietas}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ut igitur in reliquis rebus multo maiora opera sunt animi quam corporis, sic eae res quas ingenio}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Pro Ligario} 33.1-8: “Don’t think, Caesar, that we argue for one alone: either the three Ligarii must be allowed to remain in the state or all three must be driven out. Any exile is preferable to these than their homeland, their household, their gods if this one should be banished. If they do this in a spirit of brotherhood, if so because of \textit{pietas}, if so with anguish, may their tears, their \textit{pietas}, their brotherhood move you.”

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{De Natura Deorum} 2.71.5-2.72.4: “But the observance of the gods is best and, likewise, the purest and most sacred and most replete with \textit{pietas} when we venerate them purely and with integrity both uncorrupted of mind and speech. For not only the philosophers but even our ancestors separated superstition from religion. For those who prayed and sacrificed all days so that their children would survive them were called ‘superstitious,’ which name eventually became used more widely.”

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{De Legibus} 2.19 ff.; 2.28 ff.
Whereas Cicero displays this gratitude based on benevolence viewed as innate when expressed in the familial realm, it is also cultivated in other capacities to the benefit of society. The characterization of filial *pietas* stems from gratitude towards one’s parents:


\[
\text{Haec enim est una virtus non solum maxima sed etiam mater virtutum omnium reliquarum. Quid est pietas nisi grata voluntas in parentes?}
\]

This gratitude, presumably for having given life, marks filial *pietas* thereby demanding duties and responsibilities from the offspring. Cicero shows the concept to be the object that forcefully reminds (i.e. *moneat*) an individual to observe one’s duty, either to homeland, parents, or kin:

\[
\text{pietatem, quae erga patriam aut parentes aut alios sanguine coniunctos officium conservare moneat: gratiam, quae in memoria et remuneratione officiorum et honoris et amicitiarum observatiam teneat.}
\]

This admonition shows that the inherent call to responsibility, represented by *pietas*, transcended the strictures of an exclusively familial, political or religious term. It is by

---

115 *De Officiis* 2.46.1: “As, therefore, in the remaining affairs works of the spirit are much greater than those of the body, thus these things which we pursue by thought and reason, garner more gratitude than those pursued by strength. The chief commendation derives from modesty, then *pietas* towards parents, in goodwill towards them.” Dyck 1996, 429 cites this passage as “an example of the intellectualism of Panaetius, particularly striking in his treatment of *μεγαλοψυχία*.”

116 *Pro Planc.* 80.3: “For this singular virtue is not only the greatest but also the mother of all other virtues. For what is *pietas* if not a goodwill in gratitude towards parents.” Cf. *Pro Planc.* 29.1.3: “...nam meo iudicio *pietas* fundamentum est omnium virtutum.” “In my opinion *pietas* is the foundation of all virtues.”

117 *De Inventione* 2.65.8-2.66.6: “*pietas* that which forcefully reminds to observe one’s duty towards homeland or towards one’s parents or others connected by blood; gratitude which retains in memory the recompense of duties and honour and the observance of friendships.”
these characteristics that *pietas* holds resonance for Romans in many facets of their personal relationships as well as in their relations with the state and the gods. These relationships are all marked by *pietas*.

**Pietas and the Divine**

The concept under discussion encompasses a number of different aspects. This is perhaps best shown by the characterization of *pietas*’ polar opposite, *impietas*. In defending Roscius Amerinus on a charge of patricide, Cicero characterizes *impietas* as a conflation of all other sins. That is to say, that a lack of *pietas* must, necessarily, mean that all other depravities are present:

*Occidisse patrem Sex. Roscius arguitur. Scelestum, di immortales! ac nefarium facinus atque eius modi quo uno maleficio scelera omnia complexa esse videantur! Etenim si, id quod praecclare a sapientibus dicitur, voltu saepe laeditur pietas, quod supplicium satis acre reperietur in eum qui mortem obtulerit parenti?*  

Conversely, we see Cicero depict *pietas* as the source from which all virtue flows:

*nam meo iudicio pietas fundamentum est omnium virtutum.*

---

118 *Pro Roscius Amerinus* 37.1: “It is argued that Sextus Roscius killed his father….a wicked deed and within this one evil action of this kind all sins seem contained. Indeed if, as is said most clearly by the wisest men, that *pietas* is harmed by a look, what punishment may be found that is harsh enough against one who brings death to a parent?” *Cf. de Officiis* 1.146. Dyck 109: “*pietas* was originally the fulfillment of the duties imposed by the *di parentes* so as to ensure the family from divine wrath; besides the *parentes*, the *patria* and the *di* eventually generally came to be included, *RE* XX 1.2221.58.”

119 *Pro Planc.* 29.5: “For in my judgement *pietas* is the foundation of all virtues.” *Cf. Pliny the Elder* 35.13.7.
Pietas as a source of orthodox moral behaviour is echoed again in De Natura Deorum, where it is shown to be intrinsically tied to all other virtues:

*Quae contuens animus accedit ad cognitionem deorum, e qua oritur pietas, cui coniuncta iustitia est reliquaeque virtutes, e quibus vita beata existit par et similis deorum...*

Therefore, pietas represents a rationality, a manner of comportment and a marker of the best sort of Roman. By these measures, we see that pietas is an inclusive concept. Its nature lends it the characteristic of a code of conduct in accord with the will of the gods:

*Equidem sic accepi, pontifices, in religionibus susciendi caput esse interpretari quae voluntas deorum immortalium esse videatur; nec est uilla erga deos pietas <nisi sit> honesta de numine eorum ac mente opinio, ut expeti nihil ab iis, quod sit iniustum atque inhonestum,<iustum aut honestum> arbitrere.*

The rationale for gaining knowledge of things divine is to effect a harmonious relationship with the gods. Harmony in religious matters was then believed to be echoed in the daily lives of individuals to the benefit of society. It must be noted that this was considered a rational approach as dictated by Roman religious belief. Traditional Roman religious observance expected reward for proper moral conduct and punishment for improper observance. As a result, all aspects of life were affected, from the outcomes of battles to the fortunes of a single household. Cicero states that pietas

---

120 *De Nat. Deor.* 2.153.7: “Contemplating such things (the heavens) the soul comes to an understanding of the gods, from which pietas arises, to which justice and all remaining virtues are joined, from which things a good life exists and one similar to the gods.”

121 *De Domo Sua* 107.4: “Indeed, priests, I have accepted that, chief among religious undertakings is to interpret what the will of the immortal gods seems to be; nor is pietas towards the gods anything but a sincere opinion regarding their will and mentality, so that you deduce that nothing is to be sought from them which is unjust and dishonest.”
placates the gods and acts as a function of reason, by extension, it also creates a climate in which other men may be of the highest utility to men:

\[\text{Deos placatos pietas efficiet et sanctitas; proxime autem et secundum deos homines hominibus maxime utiles esse possunt.}\]  

An aspect of this utility is the benefit of a proper religious attitude within the state. Cicero shows that a good relationship with the gods is beneficial to society, using Pythagoras as an authority:

\[\text{Adfert enim haec opinio religionem utilem ciuitatibus, si quidem et illud bene dictum est a Pythagora doctissimo viro, 'βέλτιστοι γιγνόμεθα πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς βαδίζοντες.'}\]

This attitude requires an understanding that the gods are involved in human affairs and have concern for the outcome of these events. Cicero states that the gods do observe and guide these affairs:

\[\text{Sit igitur hoc iam a principio persuasum ciuibus, dominos esse omnium rerum ac moderatores deos, eaque quae gerantur eorum geri iudicio ac numine, eosdemque optime de genere De Off. 2.11.10: 'pietas and sanctity bring it about that the gods are contented. Next, however and following the gods men are able to be greatly helpful to other men.'}\]

\[\text{De Legibus 2.26.10: 'This opinion puts forth that religion is useful to states, if indeed that statement was said well by the most learned man Pythagoras, 'we become better when approaching the gods.'}\]

\[\text{Cf. Plutarch Moralia 9.169 E: ἕστεφανωμένος ὡριζότα' ϊεί καὶ φοβεῖται, εὐχεταί φωνῇ παλλομένη καίχεραν ἐπιθυμίᾳ τρεμοῦσαι, καὶ ὅλως ἀπωδεικνυσιτόν Πυθαγόρου λόγον φλύαροι ἐπίπεντος ὅτι βέλτιστοι γιγνόμεθα πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς βαδίζοντες· τότε γὰρ ἀθλιώτατα καὶ κάκιστα πράττουσιν οἰδιειδιαίμονες, ὥσπερ ἄρκτων φωλειῶν ἢ χειαίων δρακόντων ἢ μυχοίς κητῶν τοῖς τῶν θεῶν μεγάροις ἢ ἀνακτόροις προσιόντες.} \]

\[\text{When the garland is on his head he turns pale, he offers sacrifice and feels afraid, he prays with quavering voice, with trembling hands he sprinkles incense, and, in a word, proves how foolish are the words of Pythagoras, who said that we reach our best when we draw near to the gods. For that is the time when the superstitious fare most miserably and wretchedly, for they approach the halls or temples of the gods as they would approach bears' dens or snakes' holes or the haunts of monsters of the deep.'}\]
hominum mereri, et qualis quisque sit, quid agat, quid in se admittat, qua mente, qua pietate colat
religiones, intueri, piorumque et impiorum habere rationem.\textsuperscript{124}

This establishes that the gods display omniscience and concern for human events; in turn requiring \textit{pietas} to maintain a functional religious harmony.\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Pietas} is shown to be the lynch-pin of proper relations with the gods and the means by which to avoid the passions and perturbations that rend states and upset lives:

\textit{in specie autem fictae simulationis sicut reliquae virtutes item pietas inesse non potest; cum qua simul sanctitatem et religionem tolli necesse est, quibus sublatis perturbatio vitae sequitur et magna confusio; atque haud scio an pietate adversus deos sublata fides etiam et societas generis humani et una excellentissima virtus iustitia tollatur.}\textsuperscript{126}

This attitude towards the gods guarantees human society and justice. It was also understood by the ancients that a failure to assume the correct stance toward the gods

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{De Legibus} 2.115.13: “Let this, therefore, be a persuasion to all civilizations, that the gods are the masters and governors of all things, and those things which they conduct are conducted by their judgment and will. These same entities do service to the best sort of men and observe of what sort and who he is, what he does, how he conducts himself and by which mindset and with what \textit{pietas} he observes religious things and they observe the reasonings of the \textit{pius} and \textit{impius}.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{De Nat. Deor} 1.3.4: \textit{Sunt enim philosophi et fuerunt qui omnino nullam habere censerent rerum humanarum procurationem deos. quorum si vera sententia est, quae potest esse pietas quae sanctitas quae religio?}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{De Nat. Deor.} 1.3.14: “\textit{Pietas} however, like the rest of the virtues, cannot exist in mere outward show and speciousness; and, with \textit{pietas}, reverence and religion must likewise disappear. And when these are gone, a disruption of life follows with great confusion; and I do not know whether the loss of \textit{pietas} towards the gods will entail the removal even of loyalty and society among men, and of justice itself, the singularly most excellent of all the virtues.”
\end{flushright}
could well result in the destruction of an entire state.\textsuperscript{127} Again, this echoes the reciprocal understanding of relationships held by Romans, even with the divine.

The notion that \textit{pietas} is the reason for the greatness of the Roman state is echoed in the \textit{De Republica}'s “Dream of Scipio”, where Scipio Africanus tells his grandson Scipio Aemilianus to cultivate \textit{pietas}. Obligation begins with parents and relations extending beyond such relationships to hold ramifications for the state:

\textit{Sed sic, Scipio, ut avus hic tuus, ut ego, qui te genui, iustitiam cole et pietatem, quae cum magna in parentibus et propinquis, tum in patria maxima est; ea vita via est in caelum et in hunc coetum eorum, qui iam vixerunt et corpore laxati illum incolunt locum, quem vides.}\textsuperscript{128}

This provided for Romans a tangible link between behaviour toward family and kin and the success of the state; thereby it served as an important aspect of the Romans’ conceptualization of its divinely sanctioned empire as entrusted to its citizens.

Cicero draws an important connection between \textit{pietas} and \textit{gratia}. He introduces his reader to what would become a defining characteristic of \textit{pietas} when the murder of Caesar became the rationale for the Caesarian party’s policy of revenge:

religio est, quae superioris cuiusdam naturae, quam divinam vocant, curam caerimoniamque affert; \textit{pietas}, per quam sanguine coniunctis patriaeque benivolum officium et diligens tribuitur cultus; gratia, in

\textsuperscript{127} Cf. Xenophon \textit{Hellenica} 5.4.1, Xenophon’s comment on the downfall of the Spartans: Πολλά μὲν οὖν ἄν τις ἔχοι καὶ ἄλλα λέγειν καὶ Ἑλληνικά καὶ βαρβαρικά, ὡς θεοὶ οὐτε τῶν ἁσβούντων οὔτε τῶν ἄνδρων ποιοῦντων ἀμελοῦσι.

“And so one would be able to say many other things both Greek and barbarian, to the effect that the gods do not care for the impious and those doing sacrilegious acts.”

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{De Republica} 6.16.2: “But just as your grandfather and I who sired you, Scipio, cultivate justice and \textit{pietas} which when it is great towards parents and relations, is then greatest towards homeland. This is the road to the heavens and to the congregation of those who now live released from the body and who inhabit that region which you see.”
qua amicitiarum et officiorum alterius memoria et remunerandi voluntas continetur, vindicatio, per quam
vis aut injuria et omnino omne, quod obfuturum est, defendendo aut ulciscendo propulsatur.  

_Pietas_ is again intimately connected with a _benivolum officium_ representing the concept
as a civilizing force providing a divine impetus for proper familial and inter-personal
relations. With this concept projected onto the state level, Rome’s greatness is shown to
be a reflection of the proper attitude toward the gods, as the result of the practice of
_pietas_. In this way, _pietas_ represents a specific social-order marked by traditional
Roman familial and religious orthodoxy. There is also in these examples the promise
that _pietas_ will elevate the human being to celestial heights. _De Legibus_ lays out the
laws to be followed in the ideal commonwealth, described in _De Republica_. Here _pietas_
is represented as a unifying principle between the divine and the earthly, a feature
holding particular resonance in the daily lives of Romans:

> ast olla propter quae datur homini ascensus in caelum, Mentem, Virtutem, Pietatem,
> Fidem, earumque laudum delubra sunto nec ulla utiorum sacra sollemnia obeunto.

---

129 _De Inventione_ 2.161.6: “Religion brings care and observance to a certain elevated nature which they
call divine; _pietas_, through which a well-meaning sense of dutifulness for those joined by blood and for the
fatherland and a diligent concern is fostered; gratitude, in which the memory of the friendships and favors
of others and the desire for recompense is contained; vindication, through which force or injury in
whichever guise, which may come forth, is repelled by defending or by seeking revenge.”

_Cf._ Seneca _de Ben._ 2.35.1: _illi beneficio, quod actio perficit, relata gratia est, si illud benevole excipimus;
illod alterum, quod re continetur, nondum reddidimus, sed volemus reddere. Voluntati voluntate satis
fecimus, rei rem debemus. Itaque, quamvis rettulisse illum gratiam dicamus, qui beneficium libenter
accipit, iubemus tamen et simile aliquid ei, quod accepit, reddere._

“To that benefit, which an action causes, gratitude is returned, if we accept it with goodwill; that other
which is contained in the affair, we have not yet repaid, but we wish to do so. We make enough of
goodwill for goodwill, we owe a thing for a thing. And thus although we say that he returned the gratitude,
he who freely accepts a favour, nevertheless we demand that he return something similar to him,
because the former party previously accepted it.”

130 _De Leg._ 2.19: “Let due honor be likewise paid to those virtues, by which man is exalted to heaven —
as Intelligence, Valor, Piety, Fidelity; and let temples be consecrated to their honour.”
Individuals were able to envisage an active role in a successful and harmonious Roman state, one based upon an observance of traditional Roman religious belief.

**Pietas, Roman Dominion and Justice: Hellenistic Ideas**

The subject of *pietas* and its connection to justice has been raised and it would seem useful to examine the heritage of these terms as they came to be associated with each other. It is at this point that we can detect an affinity between *pietas* and Roman success as perceived by Hellenistic philosophy. The bridge from the world of Greek thought and the interpretations of Cicero are found in Posidonian fragments. In Athenaeus, we have remnants of Posidonius’ writings, that display to us Greek thought with regard to the Romans. They also afford an opinion that later influenced Cicero’s own. The fragments we have from Athenaeus represent the virtues of Romans.131 The Romans are lauded for their simplicity and austerity, and these aspects are presented within the context of imperial expansion. Romans, in previous times, (ἐν τοῖς πάλαι χρόνοις) “preserved their own ancestral ideals, but also took whatever was χρήσιμον καὶ καλόν, that is “useful and good” from the different people they conquered.”132 The Greeks who speak of the Romans and their ancient virtues often turn to their piety.

---


132 Edelstein & Kidd, 911.
Polybius represents Roman *pietas* as a great tool for the organization of the state.\(^{133}\) In Athenaeus, we see the statement that the combination of *pietas* and justice was a Greek concept reverting back at least to Plato.\(^{134}\) Posidonius’ fragments in Athenaeus state that M. Claudius Marcellus was the first to show the Greeks that the Romans were able to display justice as well as being fierce warriors by dint of such virtues they had the right to rule.\(^{135}\) The Roman understanding of the nature of the gods leads to justice as well as to the practice of all other virtues by way of *pietas* – according to this line of thinking. These virtues are then rewarded by success at a state level. Also, we have seen that *Pietas* is presented as the first and chief virtue deriving its importance from the gods themselves. In this framework, Roman thought held it that imperial dominion was based on the will of the gods. It may also be seen that Cicero viewed Rome’s power as divinely sanctioned and a function of her exceptional *pietas*, which found comment in both Greek and Roman sources.

Cicero sees *humanitas* as the line of demarkation between man, a reasoning creature, and all other animals. As a result of this, Cicero depicts humans as desirous of

\(^{133}\) *Polyb.* 6.56.6ff: “But the most important difference for the better which the Roman commonwealth appears to me to display is in their religious beliefs. For I conceive that what in other nations is looked upon as a reproach, I mean a scrupulous fear of the gods, is the very thing which keeps the Roman commonwealth together... Many people might think this unaccountable; but in my opinion their object is to use it as a check upon the common people. If it were possible to form a state wholly of philosophers, such a custom would perhaps be unnecessary. But seeing that every multitude is fickle, and full of lawless desires, unreasoning anger, and violent passion, the only resource is to keep them in check by mysterious terrors and scenic effects of this sort... whereas among the Romans, in their magistracies and embassies, men have the handling of a great amount of money, and yet from pure respect to their oath keep their faith intact. And, again, in other nations it is a rare thing to find a man who keeps his hands out of the public purse, and is entirely pure in such matters: but among the Romans it is a rare thing to detect a man in the act of committing such a crime.”

\(^{134}\) Edelstein & Kidd, 915. υπαξία.

\(^{135}\) Posidonius F.266 = Athenaeus 274A; Edelstein & Kidd, 915.
community.\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Pietas} has an aspect of social-organization connected to it. To wit, Cicero orders the various entities that comprise the Roman world bound in obligation to each other by \textit{pietas}. It is this that forms any basis for a \textit{concordia ordinum}, Cicero’s prescription for the malady afflicting the Roman Republic. In \textit{De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum}, Cicero orders society on a basis of justice, previously considered to be dependent upon \textit{pietas}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{quae animi affectio suum cuique tribuens atque hanc, quam dico, societatem coniunctionis humanae munifice et aeque tuens iustitia dicitur, cui sunt adiunctae pietas, bonitas, liberalitas, benignitas, comitas, quaeque sunt generis eiusdem.}\textsuperscript{137}
\end{quote}

Cicero further establishes the importance of justice based on \textit{pietas}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{In communione autem quae posita pars est, iustitia dicitur, eaque erga deos religio, erga parentes pietas, vulgo autem bonitas, creditis in rebus fides, in moderatione animadvertendi lenitas, amicitia in benevolentia nominatur.}\textsuperscript{138}
\end{quote}

The concept is depicted as part of a system ensuring proper conduct towards gods and family; it also carries implications for magisterial power in the affinity drawn with \textit{lenitas}, an important aspect in the exercise of power.\textsuperscript{139} This is all underscored by a \textit{benevolentia} that arises from obligations of \textit{pietas}. Such a multi-faceted view of \textit{pietas} is

\textsuperscript{136} Cf. Aristotle \textit{Politics} 1253a1.

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{De Fin.} 5 .65.10-15: “Which affection of the soul assigning its own to each and this which I call the generous society of human relations and viewing it with equity is termed justice, to which \textit{pietas}, goodness, liberality, gentleness, kindness and whichever are of this kind.”

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{De Partitione Oratoria} 78.1: “Although which part is placed in common is termed justice, and this is called religion towards the gods, \textit{pietas} towards parents, but goodness in the vernacular, loyalty in confidential affairs, moderation in punishment, goodwill in friendship.”

\textsuperscript{139} This also holds ramifications for the expression of the power of the \textit{paterfamilias}. 
again presented by Cicero as he argues that the concept is a conflation of ideas drawn from various sectors:

\[
\text{}\text{Institutio autem aequitatis tripartita est: una pars legimita est, altera conveniens, tertia moris vetustate firmata. Atque etiam aequitas tripartita dicitur esse: una ad superos deos, altera ad manes, tertia ad homines pertinere. Prima pietas, secunda sanctitas, tertia iustitia aut aequitas nominatur.}^{140}
\]

\textit{Pietas} falls under the overall institution of \textit{aequitas}, it holds a tripartite composition. The first part is said to be \textit{legitima}, the second \textit{conveniens}, and the third \textit{moris vetustate firmata}. The three aspects of the gods, the \textit{manes} and men are examined and also shown to be interrelated. Whereas \textit{pietas} is stated to be the \textit{legitima} notion of \textit{aequitas} to the gods, it also carries connotations of ancestor worship (\textit{manes}) and justice among men. This inter-connectedness necessarily influenced the understanding Romans had espoused about their fundamental duties and obligations. Therefore, \textit{pietas} demands dutiful devotion towards family, state and gods.

\textit{Pietas as Condensation Symbol: Radiating Outwards from Family to all Aspects of Society}

Cicero presents humans as desirous of community. This community radiates outwards to encompass all Roman relations, from the familial to those they had with other peoples:

\footnote{\textit{Topica 90.4}: “But the institution of equity is tripartite: one part is legalistic, another of convenience, the third established by the antiquity of custom. And even equity is said to be of three parts: one towards the gods above, another to the shades of the dead and the third towards men. The first is called \textit{pietas}, the second reverence and the third justice or equity.”}
This ethic is said to be looking outwards, *foras spectans*. The outward view provided a basis upon which society could function; it was reflective of the nature and will of the gods, thereby providing stability and consistency. The ideas presented by Cicero are underscored by the belief of a divine basis for Roman social-organization. In order for this community to function, there are certain criteria which must be met. One of these preconditions is justice. *Pietas* is explicitly characterized as the very act of justice towards the gods and the precondition of any towards humans:

\[ \text{est enim pietas iustitia adversum deos; cum quibus quid potest nobis esse iuris, cum homini nulla cum deo sit communitas?} \]

Thus a system is created in which humans practicing justice towards the gods (i.e. *pietas*) results in a reciprocation in kind. Reciprocity is of great importance in all human relations. *Pietas* is emblematic of this behaviour and bears even greater societal importance. Consequently, concepts such as *pietas*, containing a number of complex associations, are termed condensation symbols and hold complex associations that extend beyond any simple expression and that

---

141 *De Fin.* 5.67.9-14: “Since therefore there is in every virtue a certain concern as though looking outwards and seeking and embracing others. This stands out, since friends, since brothers, since relations, since acquaintances, since citizens, and finally since all things – because we wish to be a singular society of men – on account of themselves are to be sought.”

142 *De Nat. Deor.* 1.116.8: “For *pietas* is justice towards the gods, what law could there be for us when there would be no community of man with god?”
are woven into the fabric of Roman life. Instead, such terms tend to encompass a range of underlying factors which inform the overall understanding of the condensation symbol.\textsuperscript{143} Pietas is one such symbol, unique in its ability to combine a number of connotations, yet with a remarkably fixed understanding of definition. It is in this way that pietas is able to stand out as a complex symbol for an entire society. It is also on account of this complexity that the concept carried such broad appeal for Romans.

\textbf{Cicero’s Epistulae ad Familiares}

The best means available for examining the personal role of pietas is found in Cicero’s correspondence with his intimates and political contacts. \textit{Epistulae ad Familiares} present to us the political and personal ramifications of pietas as it functioned in the period of its burgeoning importance. The principles of obligation and responsibility and what they mean when faced with the political realities at Rome are examined as expressions of pietas. The letters were compiled by Cicero’s freedman Tiro and are sporadic until the year after Cicero’s consulship.\textsuperscript{144} After this point, they provide for us a contemporaneous view, from a personal standpoint, of the momentous period of the late Republic. The importance of pietas as a guiding factor and consideration in relationships, both personal and public, is evident in Cicero’s correspondences. Roman society as Cicero depicts it functioned on a series of transactions. This presents a

\textsuperscript{143} Gottlieb, 26: “I emphasize the connection between single references and the condensation into an all-encompassing complex. This connection, realized by Augustus with...pietas, shows how the politics of Augustus and his use of symbols are oriented towards utilization, empirical learning and perception....We can demonstrate with regard to consensus and pietas the conglomeration of single aspects and the condensation into a key-symbol.”

\textsuperscript{144} 62 BC.
society based upon concepts of *meritum*, *officium*, *voluntas*, *beneficium*, *gratia*, and *benevolentia*.\(^{145}\) *Pietas* is emblematic of all these terms. The idea is intrinsically tied to the language of the personal transactions characterizing Roman society. These personal transactions also hold political ramifications, thereby making *pietas* a term associated with interpersonal relationships, key to the direction of Roman history.

In letters to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (cos. 57), we are privy to a view into the obligations and often frustrated expectations associated with *pietas*. The subject matter of these letters concerns Ptolemy XII *Auletes* who appealed to the Senate to restore him to the throne of Egypt.\(^{146}\) 1.1 has Cicero apologetically stating that, despite the gratitude and obligation he feels, he cannot fully repay the services rendered to

\(^{145}\) Hellegouarc’h, 204

\(^{146}\) Ptolemy gained the recognition of Rome, via Caesar’s agency, with a payment of 6,000 talents (Suetonius *Divus Iulius* 54.3). After being driven out by his own subjects, he was the guest at Pompey’s Alban villa (*Pro Rabirio Post. 6*; Dio 34.14.3). At his request, 100 delegates from the Alexandrians who had revolted against him were slain (Dio 1.c.; Strabo, 796). One of the Romans implicated in the crime, P. Asicius, was defended by Cicero and acquitted (*Cael. 24*; Tacitus *Dial. 21.2*.). Asicius had previously acquired an entourage of 100 sword-bearers that Cicero had borrowed on one occasion (*ad Quintem Fratrem 2.9.2*). Ptolemy’s Roman creditors wished to see him restored, and this would likely require force, thus creating an important and lucrative assignment for a Roman notable. The Senate decreed that Lentulus Spinther should see to the matter of the king’s restoration. Shackleton Bailey 1977, 293: “The king had other views” and spent borrowed money to have the commission transferred to Pompey.
him.\textsuperscript{147} Spinther aided Cicero in his efforts to be recalled from exile; for such an intervention he is to be treated with \textit{pietas} by the rhetorician.\textsuperscript{148} Cicero acts from a sense of obligation by attempting to secure the command for Spinther in restoring Ptolemy to the Egyptian throne. Pompey also worked for Cicero’s recall and also wished to have the military charge of restoring the Egyptian monarch himself; and thereby the dynast had a claim to Cicero’s \textit{pietas}.\textsuperscript{149} The reason for Cicero’s inability to fulfill his personal obligations to Spinther is found in the obstruction of the tribune C. Cato who

\begin{quote}
\textit{ad Fam.} 1.1: \textit{Ego omni officio ac potius pietate erga te ceteris satis facio omnibus, mihi ipse numquam satis facio. tanta enim magnitudo est tuorum erga me meritorum ut, quoniam tu nisi perfecta re de me non conquiesti, ego quia non idem in tua causa efficio vitam mihi esse acerbam putem. in causa haec sunt.}

“Whatever attention or \textit{pietas} I may show you, though it may seem sufficient in the eyes of others, can never seem sufficient in my own. For such has been the magnitude of your services to me that, inasmuch as you never rested till my affair was brought to a conclusion, while I cannot effect the same in your cause, I regard my life as a burden. The difficulties are these...”

\textit{Cf. Pro Plancio} 32.78: \textit{Quo quidem etiam magis sum non dicam miser – nam hoc quidem abhorret a virtute verbum – sed certe exercitus, non quia multis debeo – leve enim est onus benefici gratia – , sed quia <nomina> saepe concurrunt, propter aliquorum bene de me meritorum inter ipsos contentiones, ut eodem tempore in omnis verear ne vix possim gratum videri.}

“And I am so much the more, I will not say miserable, (for that is an expression which is inconsistent with the character of a virtuous man) but severely tried not because I am under obligations to many people, (for gratitude for kindness received is a very light burden) but because circumstances often happen, on account of the quarrels of some men who have deserved well of me with one another which make me fear that it is impossible for me to appear grateful to them all at the same time.”

\textit{Cf.} 1.8; 1.9; \textit{ad Quintem Fratrem} 2.3.1. Lintott 244, “C. argues that he treated his restoration through Spinther’s efforts as an inspiration to devote himself to the \textit{res publica}, that is, to defend the \textit{optimates}, even if it meant offending Pompey...Cicero represents himself apologizing to the \textit{res publica} for his desertion of it in favour of maintaining his devotion to Pompey...”

\textsuperscript{147} Shackleton Bailey 1977, 293: “Cicero uses this term (\textit{pietate}) after his restoration in relation to its principal architects, Lentulus (called \textit{parens ac deus nostrae vitae} in \textit{post Red. in Sen.} 8; cf. \textit{post Red. ad Quir.} 11; \textit{Sest.} 144), Milo and Pompey (cf. 1.8.2; \textit{Att.} 9.11a.3),...transferring, ‘to a stranger to whom one owed one’s life or something as valuable as life the affection and reverence due to one’s father’” (Weinstock \textit{Div. Jul.} 256ff.).

\textsuperscript{148} Lentulus Spinther.
led those opposed to the command.\textsuperscript{150} He had produced a Sybilline oracle forbidding Roman intervention in restoring Ptolemy with ‘a multitude’.\textsuperscript{151} M. Calpurnius Bibulus, M. Cato’s son-in-law, moved that both the oracle be heeded and that the command be given to three individuals who do not bear \textit{imperium}.\textsuperscript{152} In so doing, Bibulus attempted to directly exclude Pompey and Spinther\textsuperscript{153}, thereby fulfilling his duty to his father-in-law and furthering the political agenda that the obligation entails.\textsuperscript{154} The adherence to the prophecy’s dictates also negated the previously carried motion granting the business to Spinther. The inter-play between political expediency and the obligations to kin, clients, or even partisans, as represented by \textit{pietas}, is evident here. The Catonian faction exerts the influence of \textit{pietas} to rein in Pompey and Spinther with consequences for Rome’s internal politics and external affairs.\textsuperscript{155} Cicero meanwhile is caught between

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{ad Fam.} 1.1.9: \textit{senatus religionis calumniam non religione sed malevolentia et illius regiae largitionis invidia comprobat.}

“The senate approves the subterfuge not by religion but by ill-will and dislike of his royal largesse.”

\textsuperscript{151} Cassius Dio 39.15.3.

\textsuperscript{152} Shackleton Bailey 1977, 293: “i.e. with an army.” 1.1.3.8: \textit{Bibulus tris legatos ex iis qui privati sint.}

Bibulus was the consular colleague of G. Caesar in 59 BC Those gossiping in the city ironically termed 59 as the consulate of ‘Julius and Caesar’ (Suet. \textit{Div. Jul.} 20.2). After the matter was separated into two motions (\textit{divisio}) the house voted. The first motion against mobilizing an army on religious grounds pertaining to the Sibyline oracle passed and the one giving the matter to three men without \textit{imperium} fell.

\textsuperscript{153} 1.1.3.18: It was Lentulus’ motion that granted Pompey the \textit{imperium} associated with the 5 year office of \textit{curator annonae}. Lintott, 194: “The matter of the command dragged on without resolution until, “the unpopularity of Pompey’s Egyptian entanglement came to the fore and this may have convinced Pompey to give up his own ambitions there (\textit{ad Fam.} 1.5b.1-2).” As for Spinther’s part, “Lentulus persisted and nagged friends and partisans to uphold his interests in the matter. Though unsuccessful in the end, he and others had managed to thwart the designs of Pompey.” (Gruen, 145).

\textsuperscript{154} By this action, the \textit{optimates} led by M. Cato had denied Lentulus, but more importantly Pompey, from taking up the Egyptian command. The use of religious pretenses allowed the Senate to withhold the command from Pompey without openly insulting him by denying it outright. Ptolemy would eventually be restored in 55 by A. Gabinius the governor of Syria.

\textsuperscript{155} Outraged by the corruption surrounding the command, C. Cato attacked Ptolemy and Spinther in a speech shortly after he took up his his tribunate in 57 (Fenestella fr. 21 Peter).
obligations of *pietas* to two powerful men.¹⁵⁶ In this example, we have a view of the political rivalries among various factions marked by familial alignments and those of *amicitia*. These rivalries manifest themselves by the actions resulting from the allegiances marked by *pietas*, they carry with themselves difficulties associated with the inter-connectedness of the parties involved. In this way, the concept acts as a primary motivation that affects the actions of adherents to any particular political affiliation. *Pietas* carried with it considerations of inter-personal relationships, family and *clientelae*. By its connectedness to these terms, *pietas* is the singular most important term we have for the understanding of the manner in which Romans conceived of their relations to each other. These connections also found expression in the way individuals voted in the Senate or popular assemblies, argued in the courts and threw the weight of armies. In this way the concept held important consequences that extended to the political realm and the course of Roman history.

The aspect of *pietas* that compels individuals to act in a specific manner at the behest of a benefactor is presented in letter 1.8.¹⁵⁷ In this instance we have Cicero discussing with Spinther the state of his loyalties, particularly his support of the Pompeian programme. This support is a function of obligation, contingent upon *pietas* as a result of Pompey’s role in restoring Cicero from exile. The sentiment of obligation is articulated by the terms of indebtedness *debeo* and *cogit* as the markers of his

¹⁵⁶ Shackleton Bailey 1977: “Owing Lentulus a great debt of gratitude for his recall from exile Cicero was in duty bound to push his claims, even though he wrote to his brother on the 17th (Q. Fr. II.2.3) ‘Lentulus has done many things which would entice me to feel annoyed with him, if that were not a sin.’ At the same time he made it plain to Quintus that he was doing nothing to offend Pompey.”

¹⁵⁷ 55 BC.
obligation to side with Pompey.\textsuperscript{158} The demands of \textit{pietas} require, on account of the obligation that they embody, concerted action by those bound to each other by it:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ego quidem, ut debeo et ut tute mihi praecepisti et ut me pietas utilitasque cogit, me ad eius rationes adiungo quem tu in meis rationibus tibi esse adiungendum putasti.}\textsuperscript{159}
\end{quote}

Cicero states that he has his misgivings over the consequences of his decision, yet cannot resist lest he do so in a manner not \textit{honeste}.\textsuperscript{160} The movement towards Pompey is noteworthy because it comes two years before the \textit{rapprochement} between the \textit{optimates} and Pompey, and portends the coming conflicts arising from developing factional alignments.\textsuperscript{161} His reservations are based on considerations of the dangerous route to be taken by the Roman state; however, Cicero is bound by obligation and cannot exercise any \textit{libertas} in the face of the spate of \textit{potestates extraordinariae}, of which Pompey was now apparently desirous. It is particularly interesting that Cicero states that there is a loss of political freedom inherent in \textit{pietas}' obligations:

\begin{quote}
\textit{quae enim proposita fuerant nobis cum et honoribus amplissimis et laboribus maximis perfuncti essemus, dignitas in sententiis dicendis, libertas in re publica capessenda, ea}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{158} 1.8.2.2.

\textsuperscript{159} 1.8.2.1-3: “I, however, have done as I was obligated and as is safest for me and as \textit{pietas} and utility have compelled me. I have joined myself to his interests (Pompey’s) whom you thought in my interests you should join yourself.”

\textsuperscript{160} 1.8.2.6. \textit{Cf. ad Att.} 7.6, below 60. This year (55 BC) saw the consulships of Pompey and Crassus, carried through by political “manoeuvring and violence” (Lintott, 209). These consulships were brokered at the renewal of the triumvirate at Luca the year before.

\textsuperscript{161} Shackleton Bailey 1977, 295.
This inability to function with *libertas* in the political realm depicts Cicero as a dependent, a client, one owing a debt of obligation to the emerging group of patrons. In particular, Pompey’s efforts to restore Cicero from exile created the debt of gratitude to him which forces Cicero’s hand. Cicero goes further to explain his obligation to Lentulus and the agenda it represents. He laments the present period in which freedom of political action has effectively been placed outside the grasp of the Roman politician. Traditional political freedom as understood by the Roman nobility (*libertas*) is replaced by the demands of *pietas*, reflective of the re-structuring Roman state.

Arena states that the passage of Caesar’s agrarian laws and the support of them by Pompey was viewed by Cicero as a means by which the men aspired to absolute power. This means was accomplished through the allotments of land to the veterans.

162 1.8.3.7-10: “For which things were set out for me when I had obtained the greatest honours by the greatest of efforts: *dignitas* in political decisions, *libertas* in political action. These things are all entirely lost, no more for me than for all others. For one must assent to the few with no dignity or dissent to no effect.”

163 The first triumvirate had recently re-affirmed their mandate and alliance at Luca (56 BC). Arena, 5 notes that *libertas* is indicative of a recurrent political pattern where the idea is used in relation to the following issues: “in opposing the granting of extraordinary powers to an individual or a group (*potestates extraordinariae*), in supporting the use of the ‘senatus consultum ultimum’ and in opposing land distribution.” All these issues bore special importance to the masses and seem consistently connected to *pietas* and its expression between patrons and clients.

164 Shackleton Bailey 1977, 306: “The sense, of course, is that Pompey will be pleased to see Cicero’s gratitude to Lentulus because it will imply gratitude to Pompey himself, to whom Cicero owes a like debt.” Lintott, 209: “…he reassures Spinther that he will exploit his closeness to Pompey to secure Spinther’s interests.”

165 *ad Fam*: 1.8.4.6: *dignitatem quidem illam consularem fortis et constantis senatoris nihil est quod cogitemus.*

“There is nothing left of that consular dignity of a strong and steady senator.”
This action caused Cato much consternation.\textsuperscript{166} Cato understood the value to the ambitious political man of veteran colonies beholden to benefactor and not Republic, located on Italian soil. These allotments, Cicero feared, would lead to domination by one man and a permanent loss of \textit{libertas} for the traditional ruling class.\textsuperscript{167}

Conversely, the \textit{senatus consultum ultimum}, as we shall see would come to be the \textit{optimates} tool against Caesar and others who endeavoured to obtain extraordinary powers primarily by land redistribution and other benefactions. \textit{Pietas} and its connected \textit{fides} were the cost for the masses of the dynasts’ largesse. In turn, the masses, too, would come to feel the impact of the Senate’s ultimate decree by their political associations underpinned by \textit{pietas}. The \textit{consultum ultimum} was the backlash of the Senate in the face of an emerging politically stifling culture. Being indebted to any individual or group represented for the noble families diminishing political freedom. Cicero laments this loss of \textit{libertas} intrinsically tied to the grand-scale obligations being fostered by the dynasts in the last years of the Roman Republic. This diminished political freedom seen in Cicero’s letter to Lentulus is echoed five years later with sweeping ramifications for the Roman state.

\textsuperscript{166} Arena, 233-235 links Caesar’s agrarian laws, the obligation created by the benefaction and the fear of the Roman elite of such measures “setting up a form of tyranny over the commonwealth.” Plutarch \textit{Cato Minor} 31.5 has Cato declaring that, “he was afraid not of the distribution of land, but of the reward which would be paid for this to those who were enticing the people with such favors.”

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{ad Att.} 2.18.1-2: \textit{tenemur undique, neque iam quo minus serviamus recusamus sed mortem et ejectionem quasi maiora timemus, quae molto sunt minora.}

“We are held down on all sides and we don’t object any longer that we’ve lost our freedom but fear death and expulsion as greater evils though they are by far the lesser.”
In 50 BC, Cicero writes to Atticus that the Senate is on the verge of declaring Caesar *hostis*. Cicero strikes a conciliatory tone arguing that the provocation of Caesar and his armies was not preferable in his opinion to accepting the state of affairs as they stood after the extension of Caesar’s command in Gaul. The schism between Cicero’s public and private personas is shown as he states that his sentiments were rooted in a desire for peace and away from the brinksmanship being displayed by the Senate. However, his obligations dictated that he side with Pompey and those urging for naming Caesar an enemy of the state:

*dices ‘quid tu igitur sensurus es?’ non idem quod dicturus.*

*sentiam enim omnia facienda ne armis decertetur, dicam idem*

*quod Pompeius…*

The demands of *pietas* cause Cicero to do that which he knows will be detrimental to the state, but which he is unable to avoid because of the force of his obligations:

*sed rursus hoc permagnum rei publicae malum, esse quodam*

*modo mihi praeter ceteros non rectum me in tantis rebus a Pompeio dissidere.*

---

168 *ad Att.* 7.6. The letter is from December 18, 50 BC. Caesar was declared public enemy two weeks later, on January 1st.

169 “Why should we stand up to him now…when we gave him his five year extension and accepted his candidature in absentia.” Caesar’s command was the result of the Luca conference. The consuls Pompey and Crassus agreed to vote for a five year extension of Caesar’s command in Gaul.

170 “*ad Att.* 7.6: “You will ask me what line I shall take in the house. Not the same as in my own mind. *There* I shall vote for peace at any price, but in the house I shall echo Pompey…”

171 *ad Att.* 7.6.10: “But it is yet another misfortune for the country that for me especially there is in a way something wrong in dissenting from Pompey on such high matters.” Shackleton Bailey 1999, 209n.2: “Cicero often refers to the debt of gratitude he owed Pompey for coming to his rescue in 57.”
Cicero recognizes that he is unable to uphold the dictates of *pietas* and the best interests of the state in such a climate of conflicting obligations. He understands that this will lead to war and, as we know, to the fall of the Republic.

Three months later, after Pompey and the Senate’s flight in the face of Caesar’s advance into Italy, Cicero writes to Atticus extolling Caesar’s *clementia* and criticizing Pompey’s ineffectuality:

> *quem ego hominem ἀπολιτικώτατον omnium iam ante cognoram, nunc vero etiam ἀστρατηγητότατον.*

In so doing, yet another layer of complexity is displayed by Cicero, as he must now balance his obligations to the *optimates* and his new *benefactor*, Caesar, who extends his *clementia* but who would also expect repayment of incurred debt. The repayment of that debt by those who benefit from his largesse sees Caesar begin to assume the aspect of *pietas*, that fostered an association with the divine:

> *municipia vero deum, nec simulant...faciebant.*

Romans of both high station who accept Caesar’s *clementia* and those of a lower one who benefit from Caesar’s land policies in his new colonies in the Italian townships became indebted to him.

---

172 *ad Att.* 8.16.1.6: “I already knew him to be a hopeless failure as a statesman, and now I find him an equally bad general.” Collins, 101: “In spite of his ambition, he again and again disbanded his armies parting with his sole power, for he had no gift of winning men in civilian intercourse.”

173 *ad Att.* 7.16: “As for the towns, they make a god of him, and no pretense about it either...” The people in these towns were the recipients of Caesar’s benefactions and *clementia*. Cicero characterizes the power Caesar wields as creating the climate where he is loved, because “any evil... he has not done is earning him as much favour (*gratum*) as if he were to have stopped someone else from doing it.”
The impossible task of fulfilling the various competing obligations faced by the Roman politician in the climate of increasing power concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer individuals finds mention in Cicero’s final missive to Spinther. The letter stands as an *apologia* for Cicero’s recent life and as one “easily recognizable as written for eyes other than that of its recipient.”

Letter 1.9 states that Cicero bases his grudging support of late for the triumvirs in a sense of duty and obligation. He makes it very clear to Spinther he understands that a remission of the duties associated with *pietas* is an act of ingratitude, therefore a reprehensible action (*nefario scelere*):

> Periucundae mihi fuerunt litterae tuae, quibus intellexi te perspicere meam in te pietatem; quid enim dicam benevolentiam, cum illud ipsum gravissimum et sanctissimum nomen pietatis levius mihi meritis erga tuis esse videatur? quod autem tibi grata mea erga te studia scribis esse, facis tu quidem abundantia quadam amoris ut etiam grata sint ea quae praetermitti sine nefario scelere non possunt.

---

174 Lintott, 223.

175 Despite his discontent over Pompey and Crassus’ consulship and the general state of the commonwealth (*ad Quintem Fr.* 3.5.4; *ad Att.* 4.19).

Mitchell 1969, 315 takes a different view of Cicero’s motivations: “There is no clearer indication of Cicero’s general uneasiness and sense of insecurity at this time than his ever-present dread that Clodius might strike a second time. It was this fear more than any other consideration which drove him to commit himself after Luca to a course which was contrary to all his instincts and desires and which brought him frustration and unhappiness and forced him to admit that his political life had been a failure.”

176 Shackleton Bailey 1977, 307: “Lentulus’ own position, as a great noble and certainly no revolutionary, but in good relations with Pompey and Caesar, one who had suffered from the spite of leading *optimates* made him a suitable recipient of such an *apologia.*”

177 *ad Fam.* 1.9.1.1-7. “Your letter was very pleasing to me in which I sensed that you appreciate my *pietas* towards you; for which I will say favour, when that very most weighty and most sacred term *pietas* may seem to be trifling in the face of your deeds towards me. Because although you write that you are grateful for my efforts for you, you nevertheless do so out of abundance of love as even these things which are motivated by gratefulness are those which may not be overlooked without being great wickedness.”
The terms *benevolentia, grata mea erga te*, and *meritum* characterize the relationship between Spinther and Cicero as one of goodwill and reciprocal deeds shared between the two. Cicero states that the *gravissimum et sanctissimum nomen pietatis* is the response to *meritis erga me tuis*, infusing an air of solemnity to their relationship’s conduct.\(^{178}\)

Letter 5.8, written to Crassus en route to his ill-fated Eastern military adventure, further represents the formal language of *pietas* written by one constrained by its dictates.\(^{179}\) Cicero again found himself caught up by the obligations that caused him to act against his own wishes on account of his obligations. This is particularly apparent when his words to Crassus are viewed in contrast with his words to Atticus. Cicero recused himself from a Senate debate on financing Crassus’ campaign, seeing this as the lesser of evils given the state of his debts to Pompey. Because of his relationship with Pompey, Cicero found himself forced to offer tacit support to Crassus:\(^{180}\)

> nam aut defendissem quod non placeret aut defuissem cui non oporteret.\(^{181}\)

Cicero assures Crassus he has and will represent the triumvir at Rome and will further ensure his family’s interests are upheld in his absence. Cicero states that in doing so he repays the duty owed to their friendship:

\(^{178}\) On the air of sacred solemnity carried by *pietas* see Boyancé, 79.

\(^{179}\) Shackleton Bailey 1977, 327: “amid hostile demonstrations and evil omens.” Cicero was ostensibly on good terms after Pompey reconciled the men to each other, although we know that his real sentiments were less friendly. See *ad Att*. 4.13 where he called the triumvir *nequam* ‘worthless.’

\(^{180}\) Kelly, 205.

\(^{181}\) *ad Att*. 4.13.2: “For either I would have defended what I did not approve, or failed to support a man I should not have failed.”
Pietas, if we view it as part and parcel of obligation, is shown to persevere and characterize their relationship despite past political complexities:

\[
\textit{Neque mehercule umquam mihi tui aut colendi aut ornandi voluntas defuit. sed quaedam}
\]

\[
\textit{pestes hominum laude aliena dolentium et te non numquam a me alienarunt et me aliquando}
\]

\[
\textit{immutarunt tibi.}\]

The formal language between Cicero and Crassus presents nothing of warmth but much of the understanding that Cicero was bound by a \textit{foedus} on account of his debt to Pompey.\footnote{Lintott, 217: “...he (Cicero) asks Crassus to regard the letter as a treaty (\textit{foedus}), guaranteeing his further support.”} This treaty was underpinned by a burdensome \textit{pietas} to which Cicero was made to conform by the weight of \textit{pietas} and the expectations included with it.

\textit{Pietas and the Absent Represented at Rome}

The aspect of \textit{pietas} that carried much weight for Cicero as it shaped his actions and ushered in many obligations was related to his exile and his representation of others who shared this fate. Vast distances of the Empire and early communications caused an absent individual, whether made so by exile\footnote{Sources for the events leading up to Cicero’s exile include Drumann, 5.624-630; Gelzer, 135-140; Mitchell, 98-140.}, military campaign or

\footnote{\textit{ad Fam.} 5.8.1.8: “Now I’ve repaid the longstanding debt owed but left aside by the many collected vagaries of this time.”}

\footnote{\textit{ad Fam.} 5.8.2.1-4: “Certainly the will was never lacking in me either of fostering our relationship or of honouring you. But certain troublesome men deriving sadness from the praise of another not only alienated you from me but also changed my feelings towards you.” Shackleton Bailey 1977, “a conscious insincerity accounts for the verbose and repetitive character of this letter.”}
diplomatic embassy, to find himself at a political and legal disadvantage back at Rome. The importance of confederates working in the city to ensure that a departed person’s political agenda is continued or that an exile had a voice urging restoration among the Roman people was of great importance to the political functionary. Cicero describes his own experiences in his letters in a number of instances to this effect.\textsuperscript{186} In these passages, it is clear that the mechanism which ensures this remembrance at Rome is \textit{pietas} and its associated obligations.

We have already seen Cicero mention his obligation to others as a result of their efforts, during his exile, to have him restored. Also mentioned are the gratitude and connected ramifications associated with those efforts.\textsuperscript{187} The notion of representation at Rome becomes even more important in the face of exile, if one were to ever hope for restoration. Cicero examines the familial role of \textit{pietas} as it relates to the exile to show that it stands for the memory that the ties of \textit{pietas} preserved. \textit{Ad Familiares} 5.17, addressed to P. Sittius\textsuperscript{188} has Cicero again make mention of his faithfulness and concern for Sittius’ affairs as he is in exile after being condemned on an unknown charge related to a shortage of grain at Rome. The tone urges Sittius to take heart as Cicero defends him in his absence, and exhorts him to remember his present lot is a function of the political climate, not only of Rome, but of any state wielding great power

\textsuperscript{186} \textit{ad Fam.} 5.8; 5.17; 6.13; 6.14; 6.20; 14.1.

\textsuperscript{187} Among those individuals who were recipients of such gratitude are T. Annius Milo, P. Lentulus Spinther, and Cn. Pompeius Magnus.

\textsuperscript{188} P. Sittius was implicated in the Catilinarian conspiracy, but was vigorously defended by Cicero (Cic. \textit{Pro Sull.} 56). After being convicted of another charge, he sold his Italian holdings and gathered mercenary forces in Mauretania. He would eventually be instrumental in destroying the Pompeian remnants after Thapsus, for which he was rewarded by Caesar with a colony on Cirta.
(rerum potitae). Cicero understands that empire inherently gives rise to iniustis iudiciis (unjust judgments) against fortissimis atque optimis viris (the bravest and best men). Furthermore, Cicero states that this turn of fortune cannot be avoided by anyone or by any compact (pacto):

...communem incertumque casum, quem neque vitare quisquam nostrum nec praestare ullo pacto potest.190

The entire setting for this is underscored by a state where there is little hope for a good man:

illud utinam ne ver<re> scriberem, ea te re publica carere in qua neminem prudentem hominem res ulla delectet!91

The juxtaposition of the dysfunction of the Roman res and the functionality of pietas presents an interesting dichotomy that displays the importance now placed in the concept with the other institutions of the state in decline. Cicero continues to state that despite Sittius' separation from Rome and its workings, he may consider the pietas of his son to be in his possession wherever he may find himself:

sed tamen prudentissime facies si illius pietatem, virtutem, industriam, ubicumque eris, tuam esse, tecum esse duces.192

---

189 ad Fam. 5.17.3.8.

190 ad Fam. 5.17.3.5: “...universal and uncertain chance, which not anyone is able to avoid nor is it able to be overcome by any agreement.”

191 ad Fam. 5.17.3.9: “I wish that it were not true that you are deprived of a republic in which anything pleases a sensible man.”

192 ad Fam. 5.17.4.4: “But nevertheless you will act most prudently if you consider his (Sittius’ son) pietas, character, and energy, wherever you will be, will be with you.”
Pietas afforded the Roman, regardless of his physical location and circumstance, a divinely ordained and fixed principle, immune to the vagaries of the late-Republican political climate. Particularly in the combination of Sittius’ son’s pietas and industria, we see the inherent hope for restoration. In light of this, we can see that pietas remains, in Cicero’s conception, the last remaining functional aspect of Roman society, one which holds promise for the maintenance of any hope for those afflicted by their political enemies.

As the civil war between Caesar and Pompey approached, it is possible to detect the influence that pietas is ascribed in the choosing of allegiances. In 57 BC, Titus Annius Milo worked in his office of tribune to have Cicero reinstated from exile. These efforts entailed the unseemly work of organizing armed gangs to stand against those of P. Clodius Pulcher, the populares’ thug. In the previous year, Clodius had initially used his tribunate to exile Cicero, and, subsequently, used gangs and influence over the urban plebs to keep the orator in exile. This period is marked by the overt breakdown of the Roman constitution.\textsuperscript{193} The consuls had sold the following year’s consulships\textsuperscript{194} and had been exposed by Pompey.\textsuperscript{195} This created a crisis resulting in no consuls for the year 53 and calls for Pompey to assume the office of dictator.\textsuperscript{196} 52 saw Milo stand for the consulship and comprises the subject matter for \textit{ad Fam.} 2.6. The letter, written to

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{ad Fam.} 2.5.1: omnia debilitata iam <et> prope extincta.

\textquote{all institutions are hobbled and virtually extinct.} \\

\textsuperscript{194} \textit{ad Att.} 4.15.7. \\

\textsuperscript{195} Syme 1939, 38. \\

\textsuperscript{196} Pompey’s cousin L. Lucilius Hirrus put forth the proposal in 53 BC.
Scribonius Curio in 53 BC, details Cicero’s obligation to Milo and the subsequent aid for Milo in his efforts to secure the consulship. Milo had previously used his power as tribune of the plebs to restore Cicero to Rome in 57. Milo was the point-man for the optimates, by fulfilling the obligations to him, Cicero was further drawn towards the optimates. Cicero was constrained by pietas to take the course he took at this momentous period. In so doing, however, he risked alienating Pompey, who opposed Milo’s ambition and nominated his own men, Quintus Caecilius Metellus Scipio and Publius Plautius Hypsaeus, for the consulship. Pompey was also tacitly supportive of Clodius, who was agitating unrest, so much so that the elections of 52 were altogether cancelled. The gang-warfare between Milo and Clodius’ factions continued and culminated in Clodius’ death with the subsequent outpouring of popular sentiment that resulted in the burning of the curia. The alarm raised by such disturbances brought forth a proposal from Bibulus that Pompey stand as sole consul. One of Pompey’s first acts was to enact a law regarding vis which saw Milo unsuccessfully defended by

---

197 ad Fam. 2.6.3.1: *Ego omnia mea studia, omnem operam, curam, industrium, cogitationem, mentem denique omnem in Milonis consulatu fixi et locavi statuque in eo me non offici solum fructum sed etiam pietatis laudem debere quaerere.*

I have firmly concentrated all my efforts, all my time, care, energy and thought to the consulship of Milo.

198 Clark, 30.

199 Gruen, 454: “Pompey engaged in vigorous activity, primarily to block the candidacy of T. Annius Milo.”

200 Collins, 104: “With Caesar in the west discovering Britain and Crassus ingloriously dead in Armenia, the murderous gangs that infested Rome got quite out of hand and it became impossible to hold elections. So in 52 BC Pompey was made sole consul, anticipating Caesar’s despotism without his far-sighted consciousness of destiny.”

201 Clodius’ supporters set his pyre ablaze in the Senate-house.

202 Appian *Bellum Civile* 2.28.7: “Pompey…. Having been given these things (a third consulship, provinces and armies), was charged with the maintenance of the state.”
Cicero as Pompey’s soldiers intimidated the court. The shifting sands of allegiances in this period underscore the impossible task of maintaining all of one’s obligations which it demanded. The hope that Cicero entertained in all this uncertainty seems to be that he could fulfill his obligations, influence the optimates by ingratiating himself to them and, beyond all hope, direct the state by utilizing pietas as a guiding principle and ligature of relationships. Cicero betrays this hope, when he states,

“fixi et locavi statuque in eo me non offici solum fructum sed etiam pietatis laudem debere quaerere.”

In acting according to his obligations, Cicero seeks not only the material benefit of his officium, but also the public praise of pietas. The concomitant obligations set Cicero at odds with past allies and often the pawn of the optimates’ designs; however, Cicero sees the concept as offering the only tangible benefits a Roman could hope to obtain in those hopeless times. The difficulty of the situation, mirroring the uncertainty of the Republic, seemed to Cicero to require pietas as representative of a functional societal system that could maintain inter-personal relations in the face of Roman institutional failures. Rome, always a dangerous place for those involved in her political life, became even moreso with the rancour between factions. The sacred bond of pietas was thought by Cicero to be a respite from the treachery and instability of the time. It is quite important to recognize that at this point pietas quite literally remains the only

203 Hornblower & Spawforth: “Clodius...was killed on Milo’s orders, chiefly to clear the way for Milo’s candidacy for the consulship of 52, elections for which had been prevented by Clodius with Pompey’s support. After continued rioting Pompey was made sole consul and passed legislation including a strict law on vis, under which Milo was prosecuted. Cicero, intimidated by Pompey’s soldiers guarding the court, broke down and was unable to deliver an effective speech for the defense.”

204 ad Fam. 2.3.3.
means by which one could hope to influence political action. That is to say, that the Roman res had become, essentially, a complicated set of competing claims to pietas. By pietas’ signature characteristic of functioning from the familial level outwards, all classes of Roman society felt its effect. Such a concept may be seen to be both cohesive and destructive, on account of the competing demands placed on individuals in the complex network of Roman political relationships.

**Dolabella’s Advice to Cicero**

In an epistle dated July of 48 BC, two months before the battle of Pharsalus\(^\text{205}\), Dolabella seeks to persuade Cicero of the reality of affairs and the lack of space for idealism:

\begin{quote}
\textit{tu tuis rebus consulas et aliquando tibi potius quam cuivis sis amicus. satis factum est iam a te vel officio vel familiaritati, satis factum etiam partibus et ei rei publicae quam tu probabas. reliquum est, ubi nunc est res publica, ibi simus potius quam, dum illam veterem sequamur, simus in nulla.}\(^\text{206}\)
\end{quote}

Cicero is said to have satisfied his obligations associated with officium and familiaritas, and, according to Dolabella’s counsel, must now consider his own interests. His adherence to the Republic is portrayed as misplaced in the reality of the situation facing the Roman state – Pompey is surrounded and the situation seems dire for the Republican forces:

\(^{205}\) Gelzer 1960, 214 n.193 considers it likely this letter was written on Caesar’s instructions.

\(^{206}\) \textit{ad Fam.} 9.9.2.11: “You have done enough for obligation and friendship; enough even for your party and for that republic which you championed. It remains that we be where the republic is now rather than we now follow that old one, and we find ourselves nowhere.”
Animadvertis Cn. Pompeium nec nominis sui nec rerum gestarum gloria neque etiam regum
ac nationum clientelis, quas ostentare crebro solebat, esse tutum, et hoc etiam quod infimo
cuique contigit illi non posse contingere, ut honeste effugere possit, pulso Italia, amissis
Hispanis, capto exercitu veterano, circumvallato nunc denique, quod nescio an nulli umquam
nostro acciderit imperatori.\textsuperscript{207}

The letter portrays the political and familial pressures faced by individuals as the opposing sides of the impending civil war are drawn up. Dolabella informs Cicero that cleaving to the remnants of a past order is futile and dangerous. Dolabella seems to invoke a tone that warns Cicero of the danger of missteps at the critical juncture they faced. The entire argument is framed in terms of \textit{pietas}; it is Dolabella’s obligation to his father-in-law which prompts him to advise the course Cicero is told to take:

\begin{quote}
praeclipe nunc, iam inclinata victoria, ne possum quidem ullam aliam incidere opinionem
nisi in eam in quascilicet tibi suadere videar quod pie tacere non possim.\textsuperscript{208}
\end{quote}

The statement by Dolabella, that the demands of obligation and not any political affiliation prompt his advice, displays a resort to inter-personal relationships as a basis for allegiance in the increasingly volatile civil-war period. The letter displays a certain understanding that, whereas Dolabella’s advice stems from \textit{pietas}, it also contains a certain aspect of menace, as it informs Cicero of the expectations of the Caesarian

\textsuperscript{207} \textit{ad Fam.} 9.9.2.1: “You recognize that for Gn. Pompeius neither the glory of his name, nor his exploits, nor even king and nation clients, which he was accustomed to repeatedly parade have made him safe, and that even which is afforded to the humblest man is not available to him, that he be able to retreat with dignity. He is expelled from Italy, Spain is lost, his veteran army is captured and now finally he is surrounded, I do not know whether this has ever happened to any of our generals.”

\textsuperscript{208} \textit{ad fam.} 9.9.1.7-9: “But now, when the scales are coming down on our side, I imagine that only one thing can possibly be thought of me, namely that I am proffering advice to you which it would be contrary to my \textit{pietas} as your son-in-law to withhold.”
party regarding to Cicero’s actions. The implications are apparent – Cicero is told he
must join the Caesarians or desist from his present political activities:

\[
\textit{te aut cum Caesare nobiscumque coniungeres aut certe in otium referres},^209
\]

In the words \textit{certe in otium referres} we note the loss of political freedom that such a
dilemma forces upon Cicero.\textsuperscript{210} The guarantee of Caesar’s \textit{humanitas} is given as surety
Cicero will come to no harm, yet it is clearly evident in Dolabella’s words that the
implications of such an action will effectively destroy any political autonomy Cicero
possessed. It also must be said that at this point the consideration may indeed be
academic. Cicero’s political activity was constrained by the forces of obligation and duty
well before this point and these pressures had brought Cicero to the dissatisfactory
situation in which he now found himself. What this letter does accomplish is to present
that the conflicting obligations of the Roman social systems represented by the \textit{pietas}
framework caused a certain difficulty for the politically relevant Roman: the means to
achieving success on the state level also brought with it the concomitant duties and
obligations to often conflicting entities. I believe this shows a significant development in
the nature of \textit{pietas} as it came to be understood in this period and in the following
Augustan age. Through Dolabella, as intermediary between Caesar and Cicero, we see
the nature of relationships marked by \textit{pietas} at this period. They come to be influenced
more and more by those who could claim the obligations of \textit{pietas} and who could affect
the political climate of Rome with this potent symbol of obligation and allegiance.

\textsuperscript{209} \textit{ad Fam.} 9.9.1.5: “You should either join yourself with Caesar and us or you should certainly retire from
public life.”;

\textsuperscript{210} Whereas \textit{otium} is generally regarded as referring to a cessation from the physical aspect of war
(OLD), the word may also imply retirement from political action. It is this that Cicero is faced with in the
words of Dolabella.
The Potency of *Pietas* as Recognized by Caesar

Caesar initiated a system by which his *humanitas*, often expressed in the term of *clementia*, is repaid by the *pietas* of the individual who had become indebted to the ascendant Caesar as a function of associated obligations. The nature of the concept began to be concentrated in its expression in the remaining individual who could levy a demand of *pietas* upon those counted among his clients or to whom he had displayed his *humanitas*. By this impending re-organization of the Roman societal systems, the expressions of *pietas* came to be primarily ascending. This aspect of the nature of *pietas* came to be identified with an over-arching expression to one individual, elevated above the milieu that previously characterized expressions of *pietas*. This characteristic was, however, complex in that the term derives its definition and characteristics from familial and religious aspects of Roman society. Functioning in a capacity that is recognizable to its earliest connotations, *pietas* effected the ordering of the Roman state on a familial basis. It was to Caesar’s credit that he grasped the power such an understanding of obligation and duty could entail to an individual who stood above others in Roman society. This position, on account of the traditional Roman understanding of power, inevitably gave rise to this new state organization with familial connotations. We see this familial understanding begin to occur with the appropriation of the prestige of the title of *pater* or *parens patriae*, that provides the nexus between the family and state under the common emblem of *pietas*. The title was conferred by the Senate on those who had preserved the Roman *res* in extraordinary circumstances or who had delivered it from danger. In 63 BC, Cicero was conferred this title, previously
held by only Romulus and M. Furius Camillus\textsuperscript{211}, for having suppressed the Catilinarian threat. It is particularly significant that the next individual to be conferred this title after Cicero was Caesar.\textsuperscript{212} This action drew attention to the settlements after the civil wars, and Caesar’s \textit{clementia} after Pharsalus and Munda. It is not without thought and foresight that Caesar saw the utility of appropriating the trappings and owed obligation of a ‘state father’. Such a new organization demanded \textit{pietas} from all those who fell beneath his benevolent \textit{aegis} and caused a \textit{de facto} assimilation of Caesarian policies guaranteed by the religious and ethical implications that necessitated compliance via this binding principle. This obligation resonated with all Romans regardless of class. That is to say, the unique background of \textit{pietas} as a religious and familial ideal lent it a more solemn and elevated tone even as it was expressed in Roman lives. In many ways, then, \textit{pietas} is indicative of the Roman desire to seek stability in the tumult of the late Republic, while also reaffirming the basis of traditional Roman values. In this one symbol an individual, such as Caesar, could attempt to create a societal order based on orthodox Roman ethical behaviour, one that carried the weight of an emotional heritage: encapsulating gods, family, relations, and the state itself. All of these aspects were then used under one recognizable catchword of such familiarity to Romans in their understanding of ethical behaviour that it could simply stand as a multi-faceted idea understood in a number of capacities. The ideal thus came to be appropriated by a number of individuals to a number of ends, but the unifying principles of duty and obligation are always present. Despite the uncertainty of the era, those who sought

\textsuperscript{211} Livy \textit{Ab Urbe Condita}: 5.49.7.4.

\textsuperscript{212} The numismatic record shows coins struck \textit{Caesar Prens Patriae} to be followed by Augustus’ own \textit{Augustus Divi F. Prens Patriae}. 
power well understood the importance of a unifying principle readily recognizable and that evinced stability and continuity. These very characteristics led to the proliferation in the expression and usage of *pietas*.

**Pietas and the Republic**

*Pietas* maintained an important relationship to the state and was of key importance to the state’s divine sanction. The state functioned on a basis of *pietas* by way of its bonds within the cliental and friendship framework as it was in Rome. Cicero too displays a keen understanding of the sometimes opposing forces of familial *pietas* and the duty and loyalty to the state arising from this interconnectedness. The inter-play between these two facets of *pietas* are displayed prominently in the historical events of Cicero’s time. He understood well that the norms of Roman society, underpinned by *pietas*, created the basis of a potential antagonism between the expression of *pietas* to those to whom one owed dutiful obligation as well as to the Republic. The obligations placed on an individual required repayment of favors whereas conflicting claims of *pietas* placed individuals in difficult situations with regard to societal expectations.

By the 40s BC, it had become apparent, both in Cicero’s writings and in the course of history, that *pietas* had come to replace the functional Republic as the means by which individuals gauged their loyalty and understood their duties. That is to say, the loyalty formerly reserved for the Republic had now become concentrated in a new form of *hyperpuissant* patron to whom obligation was owed. It superseded any other
including obligation to the state.\textsuperscript{213} These patrons, by nature of their cliental networks, controlled significant portions of the political mechanism in addition to the people and troops who supported it. Initially, this created opposing cliental networks vying for supremacy within the state, and eventually yielded to the Augustan principate. This system was marked by a two-tiered society. By nature of its mixed-constitution and the power of the tribunate that assigned veto power to the representative of the plebs, it became necessary to build up client networks that included this powerful tool.\textsuperscript{214} In order to present a set of connotations understandable across the various strata of Roman society, and that had become interdependent on account of the new reality of Roman politics, a term was needed to resonate with Romans, regardless of class or position. \textit{Pietas} fills this need by combining aspects of the most intimate familiarity with the Romans’ own daily existence, and carried the most solemn responsibilities with it.

The shift towards a more personal attachment to those whose cliental networks had come to rival the state itself displays the utility of a term such as \textit{pietas} to act as an indicator of allegiance and obligation, furthermore, it was supported by traditional Roman \textit{mores}._\textsuperscript{215} Those who owed obligation to this new class of client could understand the concomitant duties and responsibilities as a function of the concept of

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{213} King, 306: “It is also intrinsic to \textit{pietas} that one’s piety did not have to have equal force in all cases, for it could apply to different types of relationships, and one could rank them in a hierarchy of importance. When Valerius Maximus collected the illustrations of \textit{pietas}, he regarded the obligations that citizens owed the state as more important than those between relatives (5.6. \textit{praef.})….One could even be “pious through impiety” (\textit{impietate pia}, Ovid \textit{Met.} 8.477), that is, advance one set of obligations at the expense of other obligations that one regarded as less central.”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{214} The transfer to the plebs by P. Clodius Pulcher displays the lengths to which individuals went, in order to obtain the power of the tribunate.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{215} Cicero \textit{Philippics} 14.29.4: \textit{Est autem fidei pietatisque nostrae declarare fortissimis militibus quam memores simus quamque grati}; Hellegouarc'h, 152 displays the thinking espoused by the political class regarding the inter-connectedness of \textit{pietas} and \textit{fides}.
\end{quote}
pietas. By this concept, then, it becomes possible for the new class of client and his
network of adherents to express in one word all the connotations that it entailed. What
this does is reaffirm that it was of paramount importance to have a standard under
which the adherents of any particular group or faction might rally, it was also able to
summarize their actions. By this action, we see how pietas acts as a condensation
symbol. These symbols carry emotional and intellectual weight, as they represent, not
any individual idea, but a set of connotations founded on the basic beliefs that Romans
shared regarding dutiful action. This, then, establishes the pretext for the friction
between and among these ‘super-patrons’ and their adherents as well as the state.
These cliental networks came to initially concentrate the power of the populace into the
hands of progressively fewer and fewer individuals and, eventually, came to rival the
state itself by nature of the increasingly powerful and inter-connected networks of
obligation. These networks placed the late Republican Roman in a dilemma
characterized by the opposing demands of the state and the immediate cliental network.
It is interesting to note that in the previously discussed letter between Dolabella and
Cicero that the impending failure of Pompey is a failure of his cliental network. Such
individuals acted as figureheads in a system based on and regulated by pietas.

Cicero’s writings outline a set of expectations to which he was beholden and
reflective of the implications of pietas. By nature of the familial and cliental nature of the
expression of pietas, it is possible to detect how the system had its own built-in
difficulties. These difficulties arise from the conflicting nature of the demands of pietas
that occurred on account of the nature of Roman society and the prominence of the
family within it. The courts, political and military power were all utilized in the pursuit of
the specific agendas of prominent individuals at Rome; this relationship affected all aspects of Roman life by their relationship to the ubiquity of *pietas*.

Cicero, indebted to T. Annius Milo for his restoration, had no choice but to represent the *optimates*’ brawler’s interests. This reluctant support points to Cicero’s indebtedness to the *optimates* and their agenda, despite any misgivings he had as to the ramifications for the state of this support. Cicero, keenly aware of this possibility, states that he finds himself caught between conflicting obligations as he realizes his obligations to Milo may well run contrary to those of the state, subsequently such actions would provoke a *scelus*:

> Nam qui possum putare me restitutum, si distrahor ab his per quos restitutus sum? Vtinam di immortales fecissent – pace tua, patria, dixerim: metuo enim ne scelerate dicam in te quod pro Milone dicam pie - utinam P. Clodius non modo viveret sed etiam praetor, consul, dictator esset potius quam hoc spectaculum viderem?²¹⁶

It is this very situation, consisting of conflicting obligations and the societally mandated need for repayment, that complicated the association between inter-personal relationships and the State. *Pietas* has its roots in the earliest conceptions of orthodox Roman behaviour; for this reason it nominally requires dutiful obligation to the state. Yet the reality of the Roman societal system of client and patron and the obligations demanded preclude this State obligation. In this period, Pompey or Caesar had

---
²¹⁶ *Pro Milone* 103.8: “For am I able to think that I am restored, if I am torn away from those through whom I was restored? Would that the gods had done this – by your peace, homeland, I would say: for I fear that I will wickedly say towards you that which I will say with *pietas* towards Milo – were it the case that P. Clodius should not only live but even be praetor, consul, dictator rather than I should witness this spectacle!”
accumulated cliental networks that far outstripped the demands of obligation nominally attributed to the ‘State’. As long as there was competition between conflicting demands of pietas embodied in the networks of these powerful men, there was no hope for any unified action in defense of any conception of the State.

*Ad Familiares* 6.14 is a short letter written to Q. Ligarius in the new climate of transactional pietas owed to the victorious Caesar. In 46 Ligarius was exiled after having taken up the Pompeian side at Thapsus. Cicero defended Ligarius before Caesar and was eventually restored by Caesar. Cicero attributes his impending return to the pietas of Ligarius’ family:

> quibus ego ex eo tempore quo primum ex Africa nuntius venit supplicare una cum fratribus
tuis non destiti; quorum quidem et virtute et pietate et amor<e> in te singulari[s] et adsidua et perpetua cura salutis tuae tantum proficit<ur> ut nihil sit quod non ipsum Caesarem tributurum existimem.²¹⁸

The language of the letter reflects the constraint to which individuals were held on account of pietas. Cicero states that it is fraternal pietas that does not allow any remission of his obligations to Ligarius. Cicero’s understanding of the requirements of pietas towards Ligarius are highlighted by the language of indebtedness:

²¹⁷ Shackleton Bailey, 393: “Q. Ligarius is chiefly known from Cicero’s speech in his defense on the charge of *perduellio*, delivered before Caesar in October 46. In 49, as Legate in Africa to the departed governor, C. Considius Longus, he had taken over the province until the arrival of P. Attius Varus...He was still there on the republican side in 46. Captured after Thapsus...his life was spared (*Bell Afr*. 89.2); but he was not allowed to return to Italy until his acquittal by Caesar. He joined the conspiracy in 44, and probably died in the East (cf. Münzer, *RE* XIII, 522, 55).”

²¹⁸ *ad Fam*. 6.13.2.5: “With whom, from the time when the news first came from Africa, I did not stop pleading along with your brothers, with whose honour and pietas and love towards you and their diligent and persistent concern for your safety it should come about that there is nothing which I should expect Caesar not to concede.”
Furthermore, it shows that Ligarius’ brothers act as agents who guarantee Cicero’s observance of the duty represented by *pietas*. *Patitur* is particularly telling, as it denotes a set of expectations inherent in the concept; there are things that *pietas*, when adhered to, will and will not tolerate. Thereby, we have *pietas* as a guiding principle in the overall framework of how a Roman was expected to act in a particular situation. This aspect of the conceptualization of *pietas* not only upheld the interests of the individual in the public realm, but also served to rally individuals outside the family to heed the obligations signified.

The shortcomings of *clementia*, and eventually the *impietas* of Q. Ligarius, come into consideration in this early example of the motif of immense ingratitude that the Caesarians came to use to such political effect after Caesar’s death. In granting Ligarius’ return, Caesar is displaying his famed *clementia* towards one of his enemies, thereby obliging Ligarius to view Caesar as a patron while creating a bond marked by *pietas* towards him. Despite this, Ligarius eventually became one of the conspirators in the assassination of the dictator.\(^{220}\) This neglect of the principle of *pietas* was not an isolated incident among the conspirators, to wit, it was this breakdown of the

---

\(^{219}\) *ad Fam.* 6.14.1.4: “Exceptional *pietas* and fraternal love allows me to overlook no deed or occasion of duty towards you.”

\(^{220}\) Ligarius’ brothers were proscribed as a result of their involvement, Q. Ligarius likely died in the East cf. Münzer *RE* 13, 522, 55.
conspirators’ observation of *pietas* that condemned them in the eyes of Roman populace.

The reality of Caesar’s position after Pharsalus meant a loss of political freedom (*libertas*) that accompanied the obligations to him, as outlined previously. This diminished capacity for freedom of political action struck at the heart of the *dignitas* of the Roman statesman. It is for this reason that *clementia*, though laudable at the surface level, proved wholly ineffective. It was not possible for the vanquished in the previous civil war to accept the ramifications of Caesar’s policy. *Clementia* was a difficult resolution of affairs for many of those who had struggled against Caesar. The pride and expectations of maintaining political influence from families, such as the Lentuli, Metelli, Scipiones, Claudii Marcelli, and the remnants of the Catonian faction would not allow the relinquishment of political freedom that followed for those who had the status of *clientelae* foisted upon them by Caesar’s *clementia*. After the defeats of Pharsalus and Thapsus, the options for these waning houses were few – accept the status of *clientela*, owe *pietas* and its connected obligations to Caesar, or emancipate themselves and the state from obligation to Caesar by violent and *impius* means. M. Iunius Brutus is emblematic of this situation. His obligations to Caesar are clear after Pharsalus. He received a pardon, a province and a praetorship in 44. Despite these *beneficia*, Brutus’ actions followed what he saw as his greater duty to social class, State and family than to *pietas* owed Caesar for his *clementia*.

---

221 cf. Caesar *Bellum Civile* 1.9.2: *sibi semper primam fuisse dignitatem vitaque potiorem*.

222 Sorensen 1984, 50. This entailed accepting status as a client and the consequential obligation to agreement in political matters.
Pietas is the indicator of the demands placed on those who accepted Caesar’s clementia. Those who had accepted the dictator’s leniency and who were counted among his clients and conspired against him had violated pietas by dint of Roman moral standards. However, it was no simple matter to assign fault when the duty owed to the state is demanded and placed in opposition to the demands of personal obligations.
Pietas in the Period after Caesar’s Death

The expected euphoria after the murder of Caesar never materialized as the conspirators had hoped. Despite the recent unpopularity of Caesar’s extraordinary dictatorship, the public did not react favorably to the tyrannicides. The conspirators’ believed that removing the figurehead of the Caesarian party would check the entire faction and effectively restore the Republic, as though the problems it faced were so easily resolved. Furthermore, the action of fleeing to the Capitoline and seizing Rome’s citadel can be seen as a further bout of naiveté, highlighting the poor grasp the conspirators had of the true state of Roman affairs and the futility of expressions of loyalty to a dead Republic. It is also contravened the aristocratic ideals represented by Cato.

Utilitas and its relation to pietas becomes an important consideration at this point, as the murkiness of moral considerations and the general lack of direction from earlier Republican institutions create the emergence of a new and uncertain moral climate. In his De Officiis, Cicero engages in philosophical arguments regarding the conflict between expedient political action and the moral costs associated with these concerns:

---

223 Caesar was by no means universally loved by all those other than the conspirators. The eventual embrace of Caesar’s memory is a testament to the power of the memory of the dictator fashioned by his supporters after his death. On Augustus’ careful shaping of Caesar’s memory, see Ramage 226 n.16 on libertas and 229 on the Clementia Caesaris versus the Iustitia Augusti.
The examination of the relationship between what must be done in the name of utility and the moral costs or concerns is particularly important to the climate in which Cicero finds himself after Caesar’s assassination. The first example used by Cicero relates the episode in which Brutus the first consul deposed his consular colleague justly, on account of a combination of expediency and moral rectitude which necessitated the removal of the vestiges of the Tarquins. With regard to this episode Cicero states,

“Itaque utilitas valuit propter honestatem, sine qua ne utilitas quidem esse potuisset.”

Further comment can be found in the statement regarding Romulus’ actions towards Remus represented by Cicero as a failure on Romulus’ part to understand true utilitas; he acts on the species, not the true form of the term. It is this species that ‘animum pepulit eius’. The language utilized by Cicero in these passages delineates the moral quandaries inherent in such acts. The issue is said to disturb souls (conturbent animos) whereas Romulus’ animum is depicted as driven and blind to the ramifications of its actions. These terms are commonly utilized in Stoic philosophical discussion and are totally in keeping with the heritage of the De Officiis as a Stoic text.

---

224 De Off. 3.40.1-5: “Many cases occur, which disturb our minds with the appearance of expediency, it should not be deliberated in this whether what is right should be put aside on account of the greatness of something’s usefulness – for this indeed is immoral – but this, whether it is possible that what seems expedient may be done without immorality.”

225 De Off. 3.40.13-14: “And so expediency gained the day because of its moral rightness; for without moral rectitude there could have been no possible expediency.”

226 De Off. 3.41.1-2: “spurred his sentiments.”
The sentiment is further reinforced when Romulus is said to have neglected both his pietas and humanitas (omisit...et pietatem et humanitatem). Cicero goes even further to impugn actions based on expediency without moral grounds. Specifically, Romulus’ excuse of the breach of a wall by his brother as justification is labelled, ‘nec probabilem nec sane idoneam.’ Idoneam shows that there are fitting delineations to any action as well as proper levels of reaction based upon ethical considerations. This gives rise to a complex ethical set when we attempt to quantify and regulate actions on criteria of expediency and moral rectitude. Considering that this work was written soon after the events of the ides of March, one may conceive these statements as connected to the events. The desire to look, albeit obliquely, at the moral questions behind Caesar’s assassination frames the debate of the day in an ethical context – one contingent upon notions of pietas. This situation is indicative of a new conscious understanding of the appropriation of pietas and its hallmarks by those seeking moral authority for any action, particularly those touched by moral ambiguity.

These considerations are further complicated when we factor in the concern, be it feigned or genuine, to further advance one’s own interests or to rectify the dangerous state of Roman affairs. What is of paramount importance is that, despite the exploitation of pietas, it continued to remain the benchmark for the diagnosis of any action from an ethical standpoint for Romans. That an action could be fraught with such duplicitous

---

227 De Off. 3.41.4-5: “he gave up his pietas and humanity.”

Dyck 1996, 545: compared to earlier, idealized references to Romulus, “it was doubtless Caesar’s emphasis on Romulus (cf. Gelzer 1960, 295; Burkert, 356) at a time when he was striving for the kingship that caused Cicero to take quite a different line.”

228 De Off. 3.41.7: “neither reasonable nor adequate at all.”
considerations highlights the inherent difficulty in any action when aspects such as expediency and obligation on multiple levels are to be considered:

_Cui quidem ita sunt Stoici assensi, ut et, quicquid honestum esset, id utile esse censerent, nec utile quicquam, quod non honestum. Quodsi is esset Panaetius, qui virtutem propterea colendam diceret, quod ea efficiens utilitatis esset, ut ii, qui res expetenda vel voluptate vel indolentia metiuntur, liceret ei dicere utilitatem aliquando cum honestate pugnare._

This understanding is the crux of Roman ethics; there is a moral responsibility that goes deeper than _utilitas_, and often this responsibility manifests itself as _pietas_. A dichotomy between the ideal of _pietas_ and its use as a tool appropriated by the figureheads of Rome’s conflicting factions is thus established. The subject matter of fratricide and civil war provides the backdrop for one of Caesar’s favourite verses, summarizing the utilitarian view taken by the ambitious of the Roman elite:

_Nam si violandum est ius, regnandi gratia
Violandum est; aliis rebus pietatem colas._

---

229 *De Off.* 3.12.1-5: “But if Panaetius were the sort of man to say that virtue is worth cultivating only because it is productive of advantage, as do certain philosophers who measure the desirableness of things by the standard of pleasure or of absence of pain, he might argue that expediency sometimes clashes with moral rectitude. But since he is a man who judges that the morally right is the only good, and that those things which come in conflict with it have only the appearance of expediency and cannot make life any better by their presence nor any worse by their absence, it follows that he ought not to have raised a question involving the weighing of what seems expedient against what is morally right.”

230 Euripides *Phoenissae*, 524: εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρή, τυραννιδος πέρι κάλλιστον ἁδίκειν, τὰλλα δ' εὔσεβεῖν χρεών.
_De Off.* 3.82.18: “For if the law must be violated, it is to be violated for the sake of governing; you may cultivate _pietas_ in all other things.” from Euripides’ *Phoenissae_.
_Cf.* Suet. _Div. Iul._ 30.5.11: _Euripidis versus, quos sic ipse convertit:_

nam si violandum est ius, <regnandi> gratia
violandum est: aliis rebus pietatem colas.
At this point Cicero comments on the perfidy displayed between Caesar and Pompey both both of whom have chosen *utilitas* over their obligations. Pompey is impugned for his marriage of Julia, by which Cicero states that Pompey wished to obtain for a father-in-law the man whom he sought to destroy. For Cicero this represents a duplicity which negates any semblance of moral action. For Caesar’s part, Cicero comments that he deserved his treatment for having desired extraordinary power which cannot be seen as morally right:

> *Capitalis, qui id unum, quod omnium sceleratissimum fuerit, exceperit....ecce tibi, qui rex populi Romani dominusque omnium gentium esse concupiverit idque perfecerit.*

He characterizes Caesar’s actions as a patricide against the homeland, being as it is the gravest *impietas* conceivable:

> *Potest enim, di immortales, cuiquam esse utile foedissimum et taeterrimum parricidium patriae, quamvis is, qui se eo obstrinxerit, ab oppressis civibus parens nominetur?*

The placing of Caesar’s appellation of *parens*, given to him after the battle of Munda in 45, next to Cicero’s own proudest moment as he, too, took the title after the unravelling of the Catiline conspiracy in 63, is telling. The distinction between Caesar’s perverse usage of the title and Cicero’s proud acceptance of it, though clear in Cicero’s mind, is

---

231 *De Off.* 3.82.29-83.4: “Why do we gather instances of petty crime…. Behold, here you have a man who was ambitious to be king of the Roman People and master of the whole world; and he achieved it!”

232 *De Off.* 3.83.12-15: “For is it possible, immortal gods, for the basest and most repulsive murder of one’s homeland to be expedient to anyone, even though he who destroyed it for himself should be called parent by an oppressed citizenry?”
not so precisely delineated. Cicero would have it that Caesar’s actions were more detrimental to the state than his own were in 63, and they may well have been; however, the path of extra-constitutional action was taken up by Cicero in executing the conspirators without trial just as Caesar’s actions were also detrimental to the force of Roman law. Nevertheless, from a purely theoretical view the question of expediency versus the obligations of morality, particularly pietas, is resolved by Cicero; utilitas must be measured by moral adroitness:

\[
\text{Honestate igitur dirigenda utilitas est, et quidem sic, ut haec duo verbo inter se discrepare, re unum sonare videantur.}
\]

The issue becomes thorny, if we view the fact that Cicero, as well as some of the conspirators, owed pietas to Caesar on account of his clementia and for other beneficia bestowed upon them. The moral uncertainty that arises from this aspect of the issue complicates Cicero’s own view. Utilitas prescribes the removal of Caesar, yet the obligations of the conspirators, specifically Brutus, to protect the Republic by doing away with Caesar was an impietas.

The danger of violating either one side or the other of this ethical issue was ever-present. The question of the moral weight assigned to any particular action and the considerations of utility versus pragmatism became connected to considerations of the state. Cicero uses the adjective amens to describe the individual who would seek to

---

233 The dichotomy is presented in order to show Cicero’s saviour of the Republic and Caesar as destroyer, although the Caesarians would argue that Cicero’s actions hastened the very demise of the commonwealth which he attributed to Caesar.

234 De Off. 3.83.15-17: “Therefore expediency must be exercised in a moral fashion, and indeed just as these two words seem to sound different they are one and the same.”
subjugate his own homeland. This is in keeping with the diagnosis that actions against the ideals of *pietas* are perturbations and passions unhealthy and detrimental to the individual as well as the larger community. With the importance of ethical action exhibited by Cicero, it becomes apparent there is a disconnect between theory and reality.

\[\text{De Off. 3.83.5: “out of his mind.”}\]
Chapter 2: Between the Ides and the Triumvirate

The discussion of obligation and *pietas* put forth by Cicero outlines an important ideal, one which carried much weight for the elite classes and common Romans alike. These obligations owed to benefactors and allies had allowed for *pietas* to stand out as a marker of and impetus for the transactional nature of not only inter-personal and family concerns, but also of political and military ones. The failure of Caesar’s assassins to observe these societal obligations gave rise to Octavian capitalizing on this lack of *pietas*, shameful when placed against orthodox Roman social behaviour, as the pretext on which to enact his policy *uliscendī*. Notions of the responsibilities for retribution in Romans’ conceptualization of revenge can be found in *Pro Cluentio*. The case is concerned with a sensational poisoning trial of 66 BC. Sassia accused her son Cluentio of poisoning his step-father Oppianicus. In arguing for the defense, Cicero asks why it is that the younger Oppianicus brings the charge of bribing a jury to secure the conviction of an enemy against Cluentius, while leaving one of Cluentius’ confederates unscathed.

*Cicero infers that one bound to seek retribution through the courts would be also bound to pursue all actors in that crime. With this argument, Cicero states that the very demands of *pietas* make this case frivolous on account of its incomprehensible neglect. Thereby, it is a case of selective enmity. Furthermore this expectation displays that, in accordance with Roman moral norms, the actions of those in the Caesarian party after*

236 *Pro Cluentio* 172.6: “Why therefore do you who is excited by *pietas* towards the accused allow Asellius to remain unavenged for so long?”
Caesar’s death was justifiable. The Roman, as Cicero argues, was constrained by _pietas_ to enact and complete its demands. _Pietas_ was a marker of obligation to family as well to others in the patron/client relationship. The familial obligation may be seen as a part of ‘nature’ if we take the right of revenge to be _κατὰ φύσιν_:

_Natura partes habet duas, tributionem sui cuique et ulciscendi ius._\(^{237}\)

This inevitably gives rise to a conflict between obligation at the level of the clan and that owed to larger entities within the functional framework of _pietas_.

In this same vein, the Gracchi represent an important example of familial _pietas_ and its relation to the state. In _Brutus_, Cicero laments the often opposing ideas of the responsibility to the state and the obligations to the family:

_utinam non tam fratri pietatem quam patriae praestare voluisset._\(^{238}\)

The juxtaposition of the conflicting demands of _pietas_, between those of family and cliental obligations and those of the state, provides a moral question pertinent to the events following Caesar’s death. The demands of _pietas_ placed on Octavius and Marcus Antonius shaped the events of history and elicited a response that was fatal to the Republic in the pursuit of redressing wrongs perpetrated to patron and family.

_After the death of Caesar, Antony’s first action was to convene the Senate and induce it to declare a general amnesty, block any investigation into the assassination, and enact Caesar’s published decrees._\(^{239}\) Dolabella, whom Caesar had chosen to succeed him in the consulship upon the dictator’s planned departure for the Parthian

---

\(^{237}\) *Topica* 90.3: “Nature has two parts, a distribution in and of itself and the law of retribution.”

\(^{238}\) _Brutus_ 126.1: “If only he had wished to display _pietas_ not so much to his brother as to his homeland.”

\(^{239}\) Appian _BC_. 2.135.563. Gowing 1992. 99 presents the differing appraisals of Antony’s role after the ides, with Cicero seen as taking the lead by Dio and Antony in Appian.
campaign, despite his approval of the assassination, was not opposed by Antony as he took up the vacant office.\textsuperscript{240} This tacit approval was in contradiction to Antony’s blockage of the issue when he was an augur and while Caesar was still alive. Engaging in a rearguard action, Antony sought to appease those who held Republican sentiments by expressing \textit{pietas} and abolishing the office of dictator, as well as by arranging for Sextus Pompeius to be recompensed for the confiscated property of his father.\textsuperscript{241}

Despite these early concessions to the Republicans, a few days later Antony delivered a funeral oration that troubled the elite with its inflammatory rhetoric and imagery.\textsuperscript{242} It is in this speech that we first see Antony courting the mob. In this instance, Antony resorted to the language of obligation and \textit{pietas} as he reminded those who profited from the benefactions of Caesar, namely the Roman populace, of their responsibilities to their dead benefactor. He reminded the populace that the senators, bound by an oath of loyalty to Caesar, had betrayed the sanctity of Roman religious law in their actions that had invoked the curse they themselves had penned in promising, on

\textsuperscript{240} Cic. \textit{Phil.} 1.13.31; \textit{C.I.L.} i, pp, 440, 466; Vell. 2.58.3; App. \textit{BC} 2.119.500; 122, 511; 129, 538 -9; Cassius Dio 44.53.1.

\textsuperscript{241} Appian \textit{BC}. 3.4.11; Dio 45.10.6.

\textsuperscript{242} Asconius \textit{Pro Milone} 28.17: \textit{Perlatum est corpus Clodi ante primam noctis horam, infimaque plebis et servorum maxima multitudo magno luctu corpus in atrio domus positum circumstetit. Augebat autem facti invidiam uxor Clodi Fulvia quae cum effusa lamentatione vulnera eius ostendebat.}

“The body of Clodius was carried out before evening’s first hour, and the poorest plebs and a large throng of slaves stood around the body placed in the atrium of the house in the greatest grief. Clodius’ wife increased the resentment of the deed when she, with effusive lamentation, displayed his wounds.”

Marshall, 167: “Those talents of energy and determination were displayed in avenging her husband’s death; she helped to maintain the anger of Clodian supporters, and at the trial on the last day for the hearing if witnesses, she and her mother Sempronia stirred the bystanders deeply with their weeping.”
pain of divine punishment, to protect the dictator from all conspirators.\textsuperscript{243} As Antony lifted the blood-stained toga from Caesar’s corpse and waved it, the crowd rushed forth in their indignation seeking to punish the conspirators who had wisely fled. The musical accompaniment that followed contained the line from Pacuvius, “was it to slay me that I gave them life?”\textsuperscript{244} Significantly, this display illustrated with great effect the paternal nature of Caesar’s character, coupled with his benefactions as well as his \textit{clementia} and the debt owed to him. These benefactions, conferred by Caesar on those who assassinated him, were listed further emphasizing the harm done to \textit{pietas}. The sentiment of the people towards Caesar had been wholly inconsistent with the expectations of the conspirators and Antony capitalized on this lack of concord by emphasizing the perfidy of those who owed Caesar a great debt of obligation but repaid it with his murder. In listing the honours and decrees bestowed upon Caesar by the people and Senate, Antony made mention of the title \textit{parens patriae},\textsuperscript{245} adding that this was a testament to his \textit{clementia}. It was this that gave him the \textit{sacrosanctitas} that had also been ignored. The overall message was that the conspirators had betrayed the state, a father figure, and one who enjoyed the sacred protection of the gods. This protection had been won by the people in previous social upheavals and granted to their representatives, the tribunes. It symbolized the ancient struggle for power between common and aristocratic interests. Caesar had been depicted as a friend of the people, betrayed by the oligarchy to the detriment of the state and Roman ethical norms.

\textsuperscript{243} Suet. 84.2; 86.1; Dio 4.7.4

\textsuperscript{244} Appian BC. 2.144.

\textsuperscript{245} Formally granted by the Senate to Caesar. Suetonius \textit{Divus Iulius} 76. Ramage 227 n.20 for the debate over the \textit{pater/parens patriae} nomenclature of both Caesar and Augustus.
Antony, clearly courting the urban masses, reiterated his desire to fulfill his vow to avenge Caesar’s death were it not for the Senatorial decree of amnesty. The difficulty of functioning in the climate of *pietas* and its inherent obligations is again apparent as he champions both vengeance and the amnesty he helped design in the same breath.

Despite Antony’s desire to appease all sides, the calls for retribution began. We see this reaction as the typical one to be expected from Caesar’s confederates, yet there is a moral aspect to it reflecting the specific ethics of Roman behaviour. At this time, with the state failing, individual Romans felt an even greater pull towards the demands of those to whom personal obligation bound an individual. These obligations have been shown to be contingent upon a variety of factors, notably the gratitude for services and favours rendered to require a settling of the societal debt.\(^\text{246}\) The set behaviours, in regard to the receipt of Caesar’s *beneficia* demanded action. The deep shame associated with inaction in the face of obligation is emphasized in the sources we have.\(^\text{247}\) Kienast outlines the risks of ingratitude and the violation of *pietas* that was associated with not seeking revenge in the late Republican political climate.\(^\text{248}\) These same pressures bore down on Octavian, who was perceived as having received more than anyone else from his adoptive father. Combined with the name of Caesar and the goodwill garnered for the late dictator’s benefactions, there were also the duties and responsibilities of *pietas* that bore down on Octavian. Nicolaus of Damascus, one who

\(^{246}\) *ad Att.* 9.2a.2.: Ingratitude, the opposite of adherence to one’s obligations which are dictated by the need to reciprocate benefactions, was a serious charge.

\(^{247}\) *de Off.* 1.47; (cf. 1.74; 2.55); *ad Att.* 9.7.4. See Dyck 1996, where he states that “Cicero/Panaetius value stable relations… à propos *amicitia*…. Indeed lack of reciprocity was grounds for dissolving a friendship.”

\(^{248}\) Kienast 1999, 8ff.
very likely mirrors the intended messages of the Augustan regime, depicts much of the young Octavian’s actions, in terms of obligation and emotion, driven by a sense of pietas. Nicolaus states that it would be ἀνόσιον to overlook the assassination of Caesar.\(^\text{249}\) Octavian wished to make clear that he acted with pietas and wished to convey that the people too clamoured for its expression. In reality there was a much more complex situation afoot. We may view this complexity in Appian’s version of events following Caesar’s death.

Appian gives us an excellent view of the social climate after the ides.\(^\text{250}\) The Senate meeting of March 17, when the debate over whether to condemn Caesar as a tyrant or to treat the conspirators as murderers, is the setting for a deliberation on the intricate coexistence of the obligations presented by Caesar’s assassination. Appian includes considerations of the masses who are made a part of the deliberations by showing their presence in the Forum. To those who sought ‘peace for the Republic’ Antony responded this was his hope, but the situation had become so poisoned that oaths sworn to Caesar had proven so disingenuous that they were broken thus provoking the dictator’s death. Antony, turning to those demanding vengeance, addresses them as εὐορκότερα καὶ εὐσεβέστερα in their desire for retribution.\(^\text{251}\) He then goes on to state that he would gladly join those calling for vengeance were it not for his position as consul, for the office required him to go along with τοῦ λεγομένου

\(^{249}\) Nicolaus of Damascus 27: “ unholy” and impius.

\(^{250}\) App. BC. 2.18.130.

\(^{251}\) “More compliant with their oaths and more pious.”
(the things legislated) rather than τοῦ δικαίου (that which is just). This startling statement displays the disconnect between the moral obligations dictated by Roman social convention and the demands of expediency. Next we hear from Lepidus (2.131) who, in response to shouts for peace, asks on what grounds could a lasting peace could be secured. He states that such things are contingent upon oaths and that they had all trampled these oaths in the infamous act against Caesar. He then goes further to state that the situation is all the more dangerous in that Romans, those who are most adherent to their oaths, had violated them so grievously. By this point we clearly see that the narrative points to those seeking retribution as holding the moral high-ground. We may accordingly detect a dichotomy between the thinking of the various classes on this issue. The arguments put forth by Antony and Lepidus mirror the sentiments of the aristocracy; Antony is bound to the λεγομένα in the Senate house. Lepidus defers, too, to the majority opinion in the Senate. Antony’s final word to the populace is a curious one that portends more ills. He states that as consul he must act in the interest of the commonwealth, but he casts the decision as one made behind closed doors. He then adds the ironic statement that perhaps it was the same regard for the commonwealth that prompted Caesar to grant clementia to those who would later assassinate him. Despite this portentous utterance, the need for compromise carried the day, as Antony

---

252 App. BC. 2.130.20.

253 App. BC. 2.131.17: οἱ τῶν ὄμωμοκότων ἄριστα εἶναι λεγόμενοι.

"Those said to hold be most observant of their oaths."

254 App. BC. 2.130.21: ώδε γὰρ ὑμῖν οἱ ἐνδον παραινοῦσιν.

"For thus those inside exhort you."
conveyed to the Senate the danger of an outright condemnation of Caesar’s memory which, he argues, would lead to fresh rounds of civil war.

Antony’s words point to Caesar as the State, yet his death could not end his programme lest the state suffer for it. The Roman world now indelibly bore the stamp of his decrees and the expectations held by ‘cities, provinces, princes and kings’ who prospered under him and required the ongoing good-name of Caesar; to nullify his acts would be to destroy the Roman world. With this in mind, Antony also argues that Caesar’s benefactions had created a domestic need for appeasement. At the end of the passage, he asks what the Senate expects if they condemn Caesar’s memory and nullify his acts. He adds that the parties that must be considered are the soldiers and colonists loyal to Caesar, who would be unlikely to accept a repeal of Caesar’s decrees without unrest, as the reciprocal obligation of pietas to them would be left aside. His proposal was to ratify Caesar’s acts, thus providing an amnesty for the conspirators which would amount to another round of Caesarian clementia. This situation can be viewed as untenable if we accept the initial unlikelihood that those receiving clementia would accept the requisite relinquishment of political freedom they had sought to reclaim with Caesar’s death.

The reading of Caesar’s will shows the overt obligation of the masses to his memory. Their pietas was secured by the material bequeathment of 300 sesterces to

---

255 Again, wholly unacceptable to the traditional ruling class. The same issue that plagued the first round of Caesar’s leniency again arose. This time, however, it was enacted under Antony who sought to cause the conspirators, via the ramifications of accepting clementia and all that it entailed, to acquiesce to his political will. Gowing 1992, 67 points out that “Antony worked “both parties in turn” (παρὰ μὲρος τεχνάζοντος) but the decision to safeguard the assassins was made “under compulsion” and against Antony’s better judgment. It was therefore not so much a question of should but could Antony have acted otherwise.”
each Roman in the city. Also, the reaction to the naming of Decimus Brutus, one of the assassins, as a secondary heir to Caesar showed the results of the masses’ *pietas*. This development stirred the populace to anger. As for D. Brutus, his overt repudiation of Caesar’s benefactions is termed as exceptionally pitiful *οἰκτιστὸν* in their eyes. It is said that the crowds viewed the whole situation as *δεινὸν καὶ ἀθέμιστον*. In light of the recent benefaction made by Caesar to the people, it is possible to see how they could compare their own feelings of obligation and gratitude with the actions of D. Brutus and the other conspirators in their reaction to Caesar’s *beneficia*. This alignment of viewpoints represents the major communications coup of the Caesarians. The transactional nature of Roman society and debts of obligation touched all levels of Roman society. All that was left was for an individual of sufficient perspicacity to wield this powerful aspect of Roman society in a manner relatable to the burgeoning source of power found in the soldiery and the masses. This was a relations coup, from Caesar beyond the grave with his gifts to the people, and from Octavian, who saw the opportunity in exploiting the sentiment and making it the centre-piece of his communications from this period.

Again, during Caesar’s funeral, we see the masses moved to anger by what they viewed as a sight too pitiful for them to bear. A passage from Antony’s funeral speech in Cassius Dio sums up the relationship of the masses to Caesar’s memory, stating that

---

256 App. BC. 2.20.143.9: ὑποσαλεύετο αὖθις ἐς ὀργὴν ὁ δῆμος.

“The populace was again excited to anger.”

257 App. BC. 2.20.143.16: “terrible and unjust.”

258 App. BC. 2.20.147.8-9: τὴν ὄψιν...οἰκτιτῆν.

“The pitiful sight.”
they had profited most from Caesar’s virtues and thus demanded they be acknowledged.

Physical commemorations of Caesar as a father-figure continued to intensify, brought on by popular sentiment and exploited by those who sought to gain in the political climate at Rome. The mob, in their grief, erected a marble column in the forum inscribed with the words, “To the father of his country.” By this popular sentiment the assassins had come to be viewed as parricides. The urban masses were enraged; the popular conception of pietas reinforced by the benefactions of Caesar loomed large in the collective sentiment of the plebs.

An individual named Amatius or Herophilus, who claimed descent from Marius incited the masses to violence against the conspirators. Popular sentiment reached such a pitch that the conspirators fled, not without the aid of Antony who brought forth a resolution allowing for Brutus, urban Praetor at the time, to be exempt from the law forbidding one holding the magistracy from being absent from Rome for more than ten days. Antony, unwilling to vie with Amatius’ popularity and looking to regain some of the Senate’s trust in the wake of his inflammatory rhetoric at Caesar’s funeral, executed him without trial. This action by Antony was praised by the elite and displayed, once again, the propensity of those who sought to hold power to act extra-constitutionally and

---

259 Val. Max. 1.c.

260 ad Att. 12.49.1; Phil. 1.2.5; 2.36.91; 2.42.107; Val. Max., 9.15.1; Suet. Div. Iul. 85; Appian BC. 3.2.2-3. On the political interpretation of this episode Taylor, 82 &87-8.

261 ad Att. 14.6.1; Phil. 2.13.31.
contrary to the expectations of *pietas*. The supporters of Amatius had gathered in the Forum for the formal dedication of the marble pillar commemorating Caesar. They there demanded the state officially sacrifice to his soul. The response against the people was swift, brutal and, once again, extra-constitutional; Dolabella forced the mob out of the Forum, crucified the slave contingent, and had the citizens thrown from the Tarpeian rock. Dolabella had, by this action, intimated that the Caesarian supporters from the lowest classes were traitors. This action had garnered the reproach of the consul-designate Pansa and the praise of Cicero. The elite classes had again misjudged the temperament of the masses – Cicero’s statement of approval evinces a naivety apparent at the outset with the assassination of Caesar. In fact it continued afterwards as the elite, still aiming at that oligarchic domination fostered by the late-Republic, would or could not see the popular movement that reacted to the peace and benefactions under a tyrant more readily than to the violence, repression and punishment offered by the aristocratic faction.

---

262 *ad Att.* 14.8.1; *Philippics* 1.5; Livy *Epit.* 116; Appian *BC.* 3.3.6. Gowing 1992, 101: “The Senate had censured Antony for the consequences of his speech (3.2.2). Loss of support from this sector apparently troubled Antony, but, Appian writes, “he changed it from bad to good feeling toward himself by one capital stroke of policy”…. The execution of this *ψευδομαρίος* roused the people against Antony and rioting ensued, which Antony put down with a firm hand. Predictably, “the extreme fondness of the plebeians for Antony was turned to extreme hatred” (3.4.10). See Magnino 1984 on 3.6; Mommsen 141 n.3, cites this as an example of *coercitio*. An alternate version may be found in Valerius Maximus 9.15.1 where it is said that Amatius was, “*iusse patrum necatus in carcere.*”

263 Appian *BC.* 3.3.21. The power of the identification of Caesar with the divine for the masses is evident here.

264 Being thrown from the Tarpeian rock was reserved for traitors and the most notorious criminals. Cadeux, 205; 214; 216 n.72; 217; 218-21 discusses with examples the history of this feature of Roman punishment.

265 Appian *BC.* 3.3.7-9; *ad Fam.* 12.1.1; *Phil.* 2.42.107.
Two months after the spectacle of the statue in the temple of Venus *Genetrix*, the populace began to take notice of Antony’s obstructionist stance against the exhibition of Caesar’s religious relics. To counter this perception and to avoid the risk of alienating the masses and soldiery Antony added an additional day to the games honouring Caesar’s divinity. He also erected a statue in the *Rostra* inscribed with the words *Parenti Optimo Maximo*.266 By this act, Antony began to exploit the value of the familial aspect of Caesar’s worship and the power this association had with the populace and soldiers. He, in essence, mimicked the actions of the executed Amatius, associating himself with the paternal image of Caesar. He had also, by these public displays, accomplished the task of depicting the conspirators as parricides and himself as *pius* with regard to Caesar as his father figure.267

Shortly after his arrival at Rome, Octavius approached the Urban Praetor Gaius Antonius,268 formally announcing the acknowledgment and acceptance of his adoption. After this, Octavian gave a speech in the Forum that alarmed Cicero in its tone.269 Antony, who was in Campania overseeing the distribution of lands to the discharged veterans, returned to Rome.270 Antony understood the popularity Octavian enjoyed by the association with Caesar’s name. Furthermore, his statements of intent to avenge

---

266 *Phil.* 2.110; *ad Fam.* 12.3.1; Cass. Dio 45.7.1-2; Suet. *Iul.* 88; Ovid *Met.* 15.847-50; Val. Max. 3.2.19.

267 Huzar, 96.

268 Brother of Mark Antony.

269 *ad Att.* 15.2.3: *de Octavi contione idem sentio quod tu, ludorumque eius apparatus et Matius ac Postumus mihi procuratores non placent.*

“...concerning Octavian’s speech, I feel the same as you do, the preparations for his games (in honour of Caesar; 20-30 July) and Matius and Postumus as his confederates are displeasing to me.”

270 *Phil.* 5.4.10 carrying out the *Lex Antonia de coloniis in agros deducendis.*
Caesar could wrest from Antony the initiative he had obtained after Caesar’s death. Aware of Octavian’s agenda, he sought to thwart him. When Octavian met with Antony to demand his inheritance, he criticized him for not seeking vengeance upon the conspirators but rather for conciliating them.\textsuperscript{271} When Antony demurred on the issue of the entire inheritance, Octavian thought it more likely he had a reasonable chance of receiving the monies necessary to pay the legacies laid out by Caesar.\textsuperscript{272} Antony stonewalled, refusing to grant these monies to Octavian, surely further alienating the masses and Caesar’s troops.

Octavian, unwilling to allow Caesar’s benefactions to remain undistributed, sold the property bequeathed to him in Caesar’s will, and paid out his legacies.\textsuperscript{273} This was the first significant action of Octavian’s career. It created a \textit{clientela} for him bound by mutual obligations. After ensuring this aspect of Caesar’s wishes was carried out, in the Forum Octavian asked that the people there to support him.\textsuperscript{274} The action reinforced the important image of Caesar’s planned \textit{beneficia} carried out as an expression of the filial \textit{pietas} of Octavian. Consequently, there was an incipient tension between Antony and Octavian, caused by Octavian’s attempts to honour Caesar and by Antony’s attempts to block Octavian from profiting from the association with Caesar.

The first such instance is connected to the meeting between the two in Pompey’s house, where Antony was residing. It was here where Antony refused Octavian his

\begin{footnotes}
\item[271] 3/4 of Caesar’s estate.
\item[273] Appian \textit{BC}. 3.21.77.
\item[274] The connection between the benefactions and loyalty is made explicitly clear in this.
\end{footnotes}
inheritance from Caesar. At that time Octavian sought to have Caesar’s gilded chair, quickly becoming a symbol of his divinity, and the diadem from the *Lupercalia* put on display in the Circus. The Aediles, under Antony’s orders, had blocked the measure. Octavian again attempted to have the chair and diadem displayed at the *ludi victoriae Caesaris*, and was prevented from doing so by Antony. Nevertheless, the desired effect was elicited by Octavian. He was applauded by the people and the soldiers, all of whom were angered by Antony’s actions and the slight to Caesar’s memory.

Octavian’s *pietas* in these acts impressed the populace; his next act further aligned the young man with the important aspect of dutifulness to both the paternal and the divine. Octavian proceeded to disburse still more monies to the people from those he procured, thereby aligning Caesar’s benefactions with his own person, thereby showing Antony to be opposed to Caesar’s wishes as well as his heir’s desire to carry them out.

During this same festival that famous comet appeared. Its appearance further reinforced Caesar’s divinity in the public mind. Octavian took this opportunity to erect a statue of Caesar in the temple of Venus *Genetrix* with a star above its head. Antony was greatly bothered by this; consequently, the enmity between the two grew.

Ill-will towards Antony welled-up on account of these actions. As Appian states, the populace

---

275 Appian BC. 3.4.28.107; Dio 45.6.4-5. See Ramage, 225 on the importance of Caesar’s diadem and Curule chair to Octavian’s evolving use of imagery which accentuate a nuanced understanding of his relationship to the deceased Caesar. *Cf.* Ramage, 230 on Ovid *Met.* 15.760: “Caesar had to be made a god so that Augustus would not be created from mortal seed.”

276 Appian BC. 3.4.28.108; Nlc. Dam. 28.

277 Val. Max. 3.2.19; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 2.25.93-4; Seneca *Nat. Quaest.* 7.17.2; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 88; Dio 45.7.1. Fishwick, 65-73: “A comet interpreted as Caesar's soul in heaven was named the "Julian star" (sidus Iulium) and in 42 BC, with the ‘full consent of the Senate and people of Rome’, Caesar's young heir, his great-nephew Octavian, held ceremonial apotheosis for his adoptive father.”

278 Appian BC. 3.4.28.
began to detest Antony, not because he seemed to be moved by a feeling of rivalry with the younger Caesar as much as by an ungrateful purpose to insult the memory of the older one.\textsuperscript{279} This strategy proved successful, as the soldiers went over to the side of Octavian, partly on account of the memory of Caesar, partly on account of financial incentives. Both rationales resonated with them along lines their expectations of recompense. At any rate, the narrative displays the popular reception of Octavian’s concern for Caesar’s legacy. It is said he moved about the city with a crowd representative of those with whom he shared reciprocal bonds of \textit{pietas}: the plebs, those who received benefactions from Caesar and also those who had served under him in war.\textsuperscript{280}

One episode in particular displays this growing enmity and its resolution by the will of the soldiers. That the base of power within the army and populace was potent and manipulated by Octavian on terms of obligation and \textit{pietas} is evident in the actions of these entities. Previously, as the crowd at the \textit{ludi} and now as the army forced a reconciliation on the two men who seemed to be increasingly at variance the troops, the power of the Roman masses was on public display.

Octavian chose this time to begin to draw attention to the treatment he was receiving from Antony. He had already garnered the support of the masses with the events surrounding Caesar’s chair and diadem. Antony’s resistance to the display of divine paraphernalia had benefitted Octavian, so much so he now began to voice his

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{279} Appian BC. 3.4.28: \textit{μῖσος...ἐκ πάντων ἐς τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐγίγνετο}.

“Antony became hated by all.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{280} Appian \textit{BC}. 3.4.29.
\end{flushright}
displeasure with Antony more openly. Appian relates the episode where Octavian, in response to Antony’s actions, whipped the attendant throng into a state of agitation by ascending to an elevated spot whenever he had the opportunity to remind those listening it was their duty to defend Caesar, their benefactor, against Antony. The context of the insult to Caesar’s memory is depicted as contingent upon the payment of benefactions to the citizens. Octavian tells Antony to plunder Caesar’s estate if he so pleases, but definitely to ensure the payment of his legacy to the masses. Octavian places himself in the position of guarantor of the responsibilities of Caesar’s beneficia. In doing so, Octavian fosters the imagery the filial duty of pietas, for he states that the payment of Caesar’s legacy, combined with his father’s memory, will suffice for him to be satisfied. This argument proved popular with the interested parties, eliciting more anger against Antony. Antony continued with insults and threats that further alienated the populace, at least until the tribunes intervened. The tribunes, veterans of Caesar’s campaigns, who carried much weight with the soldiery, urged Antony to refrain from insult, as he had benefitted under Caesar. In fact he did himself a disservice by these actions. Antony, recognizing the negative possibilities of this policy and being ashamed (αιδούμενος) on account of his perceived ingratitude as well as needing the aid of Octavian with the people to secure a planned transfer of provinces, acquiesced to the tribunes and sought a reconciliation.

---

281 Appian BC. 3.4.28.

282 Appian BC. 3.4.29: παρὰ πάντων... ἐγίγνοντο καὶ φανερὰ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου βοαί. cf. Dio 45.8.

“All around there were open cries against Antony.”
This reconciliation was not ideologically impossible - Antony and Octavian shared no deep-seated *inimicitia*, despite the overtures of both to the *Pompeiani*, they were of a singular mind in their final ambition to see the Caesarian party gain ascendancy; in addition they could use *pietas* to Caesar’s memory as a compelling reason for the enactment of their personal agendas.

The reconciliation was openly reinforced in the proceedings regarding the transfer of Decimus Brutus’ province to Antony. The plebiscite for the transfer was arranged with the Senate showing great disapproval. The proposal was eventually carried by the influence of Octavian who urged those in the Forum to vote for Antony’s proposal. The populace did this despite being, as we are told, ἀχθόμενος τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ. In this we can see the adeptness Octavian was showing himself to possess in political machinations, particularly in the attainment of allies and confederates, which was backed by his skill in utilizing the language of obligation and *pietas*. In doing so, he had managed to sow the seeds of a new round of civil war between D. Brutus and Antony. While ensuring this conflict would take place, Octavian still could remain aloof as he chose the advantageous side to which he could throw his resources. He had managed, from a safe distance, to marginalize D. Brutus, on the grounds that he was one of the conspirators. He did so by playing to the Caesarian obligation of revenge and its root in *pietas*. At the same time he had managed to secure a short-lived reconciliation with Antony that effected the wishes of the soldiers and

---

283 Appian BC. 3.4.30: “being enraged against Antony.”

Ehrenwirth, 68-9 discusses the difficulties with regards to the identification of these provinces and the chronology of their assignment.
populace. In accomplishing these things, Octavian now held Antony to an obligation on account of the aid given. He had used his influence with the masses to do just that but had proven himself to be their champion by passionately arguing for payment of Caesar’s legacy along the lines of dutiful responsibility and gratitude.

**Pietas in the Lead-up to Mutina**

On June 2nd of 44 Antony obtained by plebiscite an extension of provincial commands for consuls from two to five years. This action was in contravention of one of Caesar’s laws, which the Senate, under Antony’s influence after the ides, had resolved to recognize. This plebiscite transferred control of Macedonia for Cisalpine and Transpadine Gaul to Antony, while retaining the Macedonian legions. This action caused the hostilities at Mutina that precipitated the coalescing of the various factions of the Caesarian party and the final defeat of the Republicans.

Antony had used the people to further his own agenda while Octavian had been concerted in his efforts to align Caesar’s name and legacy to himself. At this point, Cicero entertained the hope Octavian would prove a loyal and controllable tool of the Republican faction. The reins of power were no longer wielded by Cicero and the Republicans – Cicero was absent from the Senate from shortly after the Ides to the 1st of September, 44 BC, whereas the other Senatorial leaders had, too, abdicated control to Antony. Cicero eventually made his way to Rome, encouraged by a false report of

---

284 Dio 63.25.3.

285 Huzar 98; *Phil.* 1.11; 8.22; 8.31; *Brut.* 1.16; *ad Fam* 10.1; 11.5; 12.2; *ad Att.* 14.4; 14.9.2; 14.13.1; 14.13.6; 14.14.2; 15.4; 15.11; 15.12; 15.20.2; 15.29.1; 16.2.3.
Antony’s new conciliatory tone, one that promised the renunciation of the threat of violence against the state and his claims to the Gallic provinces. This, in conjunction with the conspirators’ public declaration of willingness to live in perpetual exile, granted that the Republic be restored, seemed a workable compromise if not untenable and overly idealistic. In this section, Velleius Paterculus frames the issue again in terms of gratitude and obligation:

Caesaris adeo nulla habita mentio, ut legati, qui ad exercitum eius missi erant, iuberentur summoto eo milites adloqui. Non fuit tam ingratus exercitus, quam fuerat senatus; nam cum eam iniuriam dissimulando Caesar ipse ferret, negavere milites sine imperatoresuo ulla se audituros mandata.

The conspirators sought satisfaction as though they still had claims to redress in the situation. The Senate, now seemingly freed from their fear of Antony, proceeded to grant Brutus and Cassius legal sanction for their provinces, Octavian, in their ingratitude, was given no mention. Another sign of this ingratitude can be found in the statement by Cicero that apparently reached Octavian’s ears, that he was to be laudandum, ornandum, tollendum.

---

286 Velleius Paterculus 2.62.3.

287 Velleius Paterculus 2.62.5-7. “Of Caesar not a word was said. The senate even went so far as to instruct its envoys, who had been sent to Caesar's army, to confer with the soldiers alone, without the presence of their general. But the ingratitude of the senate was not shared by the army; for, though Caesar himself pretended not to see the slight, the soldiers refused to listen to any orders without the presence of their commander.”

288 Vell. Pat. 2.62.5.

289 ad Fam. 11.20.1.7; Vell. Pat 2.62.6: “praised, decorated, cast aside.”
The favour granted by Octavian to Antony regarding the re-allotment of provinces of the Macedonian and Gallic provinces was quickly forgotten when the matter of the election of a new tribune arose. Antony publicly declared that Octavian would face the full prosecution of the law under Antony as consul if he should attempt anything illegal in the election. In light of Antony’s obligation to Octavian, his statement is described as ingratitude and outrage ἀχαρίστου...ὑβριστικῆς, insulting to the people who urged him to take up the office. Antony promptly dissolved the comitia that was to decide the issue, feeling that popular sentiment would carry the election for Octavian. The short-lived reconciliation effected by the tribunes was over, and Octavian then turned to his base of power. He sent envoys to the colonies founded by Caesar and gave news about his ill-treatment at the hands of Antony. He also sought to undermine Antony’s ranks by sending agents disguised as traders to infiltrate the soldiery where they could induce the boldest to change sides. Meanwhile, others distributed leaflets to the troops.

Again the tribunes effected a reconciliation with the two commanders on the verge of hostility. Their reasons were pragmatic: they wished to retain Antony’s prowess as commander and maintain the cohesiveness of the Caesarian party in the face of a resurgent Republican side presently ‘doing violence’ to Syria and Macedonia. They did not wish to see a split that would accomplish their enemies’ aims. Significantly, at this point the tribunes give their main inducement on which this reconciliation should be

---

290 App. BC 3.31.120: “As this edict was an act of ingratitude toward Octavian, and was an insult both to him and to the people, the latter were extremely angry and took steps to defeat Antony's wishes in the election.” Magnino 1984, 130: “Perhaps derived from Augustus’ autobiography, utilizing the source tradition of this book” (Gabba 1956, 154).
based – something very close to pietas towards Caesar.\textsuperscript{291} The element of a common enemy was emphasized to remind the Caesarians that their obligations served the cause of avenging Caesar and that safety could only be found as a result of the leaders’ obligation to their followers. This reciprocal relationship displays the intrinsic cohesive nature of pietas as it binds confederates in the face of the threats of an enemy. At this point the threat comes from the Republicans and their figureheads. To Caesarian eyes, they were conspirators alongside their Republican confederates in the Senate. At a later point, with the assassins no longer an issue, the machinery came to be used to portray Sextus Pompeius as this external threat and, finally, this same construction of an external threat, standing apart from Roman cultural norms, would be represented by Antony. This required the depiction of one’s enemies as divorced from societal norms in their manner of comportment, as well this would portray them as alienated to the moral climate prevalent in the group laying claim to action by pietas.

The major themes presented by Appian with regard to Antony’s response after the tribunes sought the reconciliation revolve around notions of duty, indebtedness and obligation, as they affect expectations of loyalty on the grounds of pietas towards the masses. Antony gives his apology against the charges put forth by Octavian by using this language.\textsuperscript{292} These charges, aside from the usual protestations against insult to

\begin{quote}
\textit{App. BC. 3.5.32: ὅσιας τε χάριν ἐς τὸν Καίσαρα}

“For the sake of religious dutifulness towards Caesar.”
\end{quote}

Blumenthal, 126 argues this passage is derived from Augustus’ autobiography. The message is indicative of the framing of the issue according to the wishes of the future Emperor.

\begin{quote}
\textit{App. BC. 3.5.33-8.} For an overarching analysis of Antony’s explanation of his actions from Caesar’s death to this point see Gabba 1956, 157ff.
\end{quote}
dignity and a failure to punish the conspirators, are not specifically known, but we may
discern Octavian’s message more or less from Antony’s speech. As an excuse for
failure to punish the assassins in the first Senate meeting after the ides, Antony pleaded
initial fear, since at the time the particular targets of the conspiracy were unknown. The
Senate, were it not for him, would have voted honours for the conspirators, thus
declaring them tyrannicides and Caesar a tyrant. This act, Antony argues, would have
endangered them all, and branding Caesar’s allies as enemies of the state. Antony then
states that the only way to avoid this set of circumstances was to negate the fear of their
enemies who thought that, if Caesar were not declared a tyrant, they would be
convicted as murderers. These were the reasons for the amnesty. His actions were, in
his words, θρασύτατον...εὐμηχανον.293

Appian depicts Antony as working to obtain the favour of the people, citing his
words and actions at Caesar’s funeral. Antony credits this act with inciting the masses
against the assassins. It resulted in their flight from Rome. As evidence of this concern,
the goal was accomplished by indirect but effectual methods. These methods displayed
the same artifice he employed to procure provinces and armies for Caesarians. They
also left Brutus and Cassius with the strategically irrelevant Cyrene and Crete. He finally
summarized that his actions brought safety and that all was done with the nation’s gods
and by virtue of the “intent of pietas” (σὺν εὐσεβεῖ γνώμη).294 Antony’s speech is
preoccupied with refuting the message Octavian had likely been communicating, for it
represented Antony as acting in a self-interested manner, with total disregard for the

---

293 App. 3.5.34.15: “bold...skillfully crafted.”

294 App. BC. 3.5.38.11. See above 25 n.61.
strictures of **pietas**, as demanded upon Caesar’s death. The final statement in Antony’s speech again emphasizes the overriding issue of gratitude and its attendant properties. Antony ends his speech by promising to keep the soldiers as *κοινωνόυς* of both his deeds and words. The more significant charges we may infer Antony is trying to refute are those of ingratitude and *impietas* towards Caesar’s memory and the Caesarian party. It had by now become apparent by which measures the moral questions surrounding the historical events had taken shape. The issue is framed in the notions of gratitude and reciprocity, terms closely related to *pietas*. The concept acts as a cohesive principle and demanding of action.

The brokered entente between the two proved short-lived, as Antony soon accused Octavian of a plot to assassinate him. Octavian denied any involvement, though the ancient sources are ambivalent in their assessments. Appian states there was an uproar in response to the plot, yet it was primarily because few knew enough to understand that Octavian still needed Antony to counter the faction of the conspirators and that it would be in his best interest to overlook Ἀντώνιον...βλάπτοντα. The people, are shown to believe the plot is credible because of the repeated insults

---


296 Those that doubt Octavian’s plot: App. *BC*. 3.29-30; 3.39-40; Dio 45.7.3-8.3; 45.11; Nic. Dam. 29-31; Plutarch *Brutus* 23; Plut. *Antony* 16. Cicero believes Antony’s charges and approves of Octavian’s design: *ad Fam.* 12.23.2: *in primisque Caesaris Octaviani conatum. de quo multitudini factum ab Antonio crimen videtur, ut in pecuniam adulescentis impetum faceret; prudentes autem et boni viri et credunt factum et probant.*

“...especially about Octavian’s attempt. About which to the multitude it seems the plot was made up by Antony, so that he could get at his money; those in the know and the good men, however, believe in the deed and approve of it.”


suffered by Octavian. Even with these perceived injustices imputed on Octavian, the people considered such a plot against a consul to be *impius*. Octavian’s response was to vehemently deny the charges. He ran about in a frenzy, shouting it was Antony who conspired against him to “remove the φιλίαν of the people, the only thing that he had left.” He went to Antony’s door where he called the gods as witnesses and swore many oaths, but Antony did not come forth to face him. Finally Octavian departed, calling on the people to bear witness that if any harm should come to him it would be as a result of Antony’s scheming. The issue boils down to some believing it was a sham to throw their enemies off balance or that Antony had initiated the entire affair to increase his bodyguard or to gain the upper hand in troop loyalty.!

Interestingly, our pro-Augustan source Nicolaus relates a somewhat different set of events. Whereas Appian has the accusation of the plot occur at Rome, Nicolaus

---


“They considered the conspiracy neither *pius* nor tolerable.”

Again reinforcing the relationship between the prestige of symbols of the Republic’s authority and the obligations of *pietas*.


“Octavian ran about with anger and shouted that he was plotted against by Antony to take away the love of the people, the only thing he still had left.”

Magnino 1984, 155 comments on the contrast between the dramatic tone taken by Appian (Blumenthal terms it “ornamented with curlicues”) with that of Nicolaus who depicts Octavian as serene in the tumult of the situation.

300 *ad Fam.* 12.23.2.7-9: Antonius autem, noster familiaris, tanto se odio esse intellegit ut cum interfectores suos domi comperderit rem proferre non audeat.

“However, our friend Antony, senses himself to be held with such hatred that when he caught his would-be assassins in his house he would not dare to bring the affair into the open.”

Cicero provides another reason for Antony’s unwillingness to face the issue.

presents it at Brundisium and makes it part of Antony’s pattern of violent and dangerous behaviour. Antimony, insecure in that Octavian enjoyed the favour of the people, seized the opportunity and arrested some of his troops for being complicit in the plot against him. Antony then hinted it was Octavian who was behind the attempt on his life, but did not overtly name him. The Augustan source seeks to portray the events as indicative of Antony’s dysfunctional relationship with the troops and populace, significant in terms of pietas. Octavian, on the other hand, is depicted as concerned, innocent, helpful (he offered his retinue to Antony for protection) and prescient enough not to run from the problem, as some advised. The entire passage is constructed to elucidate the personal nature of the events as well as the straightforward innocence of Octavian in contrast to Antony’s deceptiveness. The colouring we see in Nicolaus is diminished in Appian, though Dio treats the whole episode with only a few words of back and forth recriminations, devoid of details. Evidently the Augustan message wishes to portray Octavian as ethically superior and a victim of prodding, after numerous provocations, he was to retaliate seeking a less conciliatory policy towards Antony. This narrative provides the moral justification for the hostilities Octavian was to initiate. That Octavian had indeed sent agents to foment unrest and defections within Antony’s ranks is conveniently omitted from Nicolaus’ narrative.

October and November of 44 BC saw Antony in Brundisium where he took control of the Macedonian legions. This action prompted Octavian, now openly hostile to Antony, to raise an army of his own. There is a particularly Augustan element in the

303 Dio 45.8.
Appianic narrative regarding these events. Appian’s narrative shows the troops whom Octavian courted motivated by obligation to Caesar’s memory. 3.40 has Octavian’s agents within Antony’s ranks report that the army at Brundisium and the colonized soldiers were furious\(^{304}\) with Antony because of his failure to punish the conspirators. Furthermore, they would support Octavian to that end. It is for the reason of possible sedition that Appian ascribes Antony’s journey to the troops, whereas Dio presents it as a merely strategic move by which Antony could consolidate his power in Italy. The depiction in terms of *pietas* is again voiced in 3.43 where the soldiers impugn Antony for not avenging Caesar and fulfilling the duty of vengeance. Before this, however, Octavian had already effectively declared war against Antony.\(^{305}\)

Having raised troops in Campania and judging Antony a threat, Octavian showed his hand. Through the agency of the tribune Tiberius Cannutius, he sought to instigate a military action against Antony. At this point, we have Octavian’s first overture to the state itself as Cannutius uses the language of the Republicans whom, through Cicero, Octavian was courting. Cannutius warned that Octavian was approaching Antony’s forces with hostile intent; for that reason those who feared Antony’s actions ἐπὶ τυραννίδι should side with him.\(^{306}\) Octavian himself then said he was the servant of the State, prepared to face Antony to protect it. This strategy was not successful since the soldiers sought in the first instance to avenge Caesar’s death and, secondarily, to

\(^{304}\) App. BC. 3.6.40: ἐν ὀργῇ!

“in anger”

\(^{305}\) App. BC. 3.6.41.

\(^{306}\) App. BC. 3.6.41.5: “with a view to tyranny.”
protect Octavian as his heir. Neither of these mandates included open hostility against Antony, for they refused Octavian’s call to arms. The seat of the soldiers’ obligations is seen to be with Caesar’s memory, those were tied to the soldiers by bonds of *pietas* under common cause. Considering the anger of the soldiers seen in 3.40 and 3.43 at the inaction against the conspirators, as well as the soldiers’ single-minded desire to avenge Caesar, we see that the obligation to Caesar’s memory was of paramount importance in the eyes of the troops. It superseded any attempts at domination by any faction within their party.

The cohesiveness created by mutual bonds of *pietas* meant the troops could be swayed from one side of the Caesarian party to another, but would not lose sight of their obligations to it, and see it torn asunder. The payments and legacies made by Octavian and Antony to the people and troops served not as simple bribery, but as a tangible connection to Caesar’s estate which, in turn, relied on the protection of the troops and the goodwill of the people. This state of affairs did not foster any favour for either man in relation to the other among the masses. It did, however, foster a cohesive raison d’être for the Caesarian party, by enacting the requisite cycle of benefaction, obligation and subsequent action. That Octavian had come to grasp this sooner than Antony is evident from the actions of both men regarding the events surrounding the defection of the Fourth and Martian legions.

This period saw Octavian building up forces, as he used the name of Caesar. He also promoted the *pietas* owed to his memory and disbursed cash payments of 2000 sesterces to bring troops to his side. The same period saw Antony try to turn back the
tide that saw the troops incentivized for their loyalty. The defection of the Fourth and Martian legions displayed the power of the soldiery and the economic considerations those necessary benefactions raised. The power the army wielded had developed over the course of Roman history from loyalty to the Republic to loyalty to individual commanders, often contingent on the benefits that the troops hoped to receive. Caesar had made this clear most recently when, despite Pompey’s threat he could raise an Italian army with the stamp of his foot, Caesar’s benefactions brought troops and colonies to his side after crossing the Rubicon. These troops now understood that in the culture of reciprocity they wielded a not inconsiderable amount of power. Octavian and Antony found themselves at the mercy of this fact. The emergence of *pietas*, as a functioning aspect between leaders and subordinates, is reflective of Roman societal norms translated onto Rome’s military framework.

The picture drawn by Appian of Antony’s reception at Brundisium at this time is designed to represent him as unwilling, in the opinion of the soldiers, to avenge Caesar. Gratitude again frames the passage, as Antony, after being received in silence by the reproachful troops, loses his temper and charges they have displayed “ingratitude.” Antony reminds them they should be glad to be in Italy and not on the prospective Parthian campaign. He also rebukes them for not handing over Octavian’s agents among them. In contrast, at roughly the same time Dio places Octavian near Capua where he is winning over the people. The citizens of the area had received their land and city from Caesar and his heir Octavian exploited this advantage to full effect.
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307 App. BC. 3.7.43.7: ἀχαριστίαν
308 Dio 45.12.2.
Octavian won their support with the tools of Caesar’s name, his own pledge to avenge his ‘father’ and 2000 sesterces per man.\textsuperscript{309}

Antony, on the other hand, offered the troops 400 sesterces each. Whereas Appian’s version of events focuses on his anger at perceived ingratitude, Dio’s concentrates on the troops’ expectations. Dio presents Antony as well-received by the troops who believed he had more to offer than Octavian and that they would desire direct benefit from him. When Antony frustrated these expectations, the troops became restless, and Antony, giving vent to his anger, had some of the troops executed. In this ‘decimation’ Antony chose to execute more than was prescribed, in order to strike fear into the troops.\textsuperscript{310} It may well have been that Antony foresaw the long-term difficulties of such allotments to the troops. He therefore sought to mitigate their impact by resorting to ‘traditional’ military discipline. This carried little weight within the burgeoning sense of worth evident in the ranks.

Octavian’s agents intensified their efforts by distributing more handbills that reminded the soldiers of Antony’ tightfistedness and cruelty. Appian 3.7.44 depicts Antony, alarmed by the reaction to his executions going before the army and resorting to legalistic arguments to explain his actions. He states that these things had been done υπὸ ἀνάγκης στρατιωτικῆς and that this happened to a few in the place of the many

\textsuperscript{309} Dio 45.12.3.

\textsuperscript{310} App. BC. 3.7.43.23-26: διεκλήρωσε τῷ στρατιωτικῷ νόμῳ καὶ οὐ τὸ δέκατον ἀπαν, ἀλλὰ μέρος ἐκτεινὲ τοῦ δεκάτου, νομίζων σφάς ὡς καταπλήξειν δι’ ὀλίγου. οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἐς φόβον μᾶλλον ἢ ἐς ὀργήν ἀπὸ τοῦδε καὶ μίσος ἔτρεποντο.

“From these he chose by lot a certain number according to military law, and he put to death not every tenth man, but a smaller number, thinking that he would quickly strike terror into them. But the others were turned to anger and hatred rather than fear by this act.”
whom the law could have punished.\textsuperscript{311} The combined narratives represent the obligation created by Octavian’s benefactions in the name of Caesar as a much more effective policy than Antony’s resort to a return to Republican military discipline. This is evident in the subsequent defections of the Fourth and Martian legions. Antony, rushing to Alba to try to persuade the defectors to rejoin his ranks, was met by a volley of arrows shot from the walls.\textsuperscript{312} He finally seemed to comprehend the situation by this point and, matching Octavian’s 2000 sesterces payments, forwarded the monies to the other legions to ensure their loyalty.

Both Appian and Dio comment on the status of relations with the masses.\textsuperscript{313} Dio characterizes the relationship as marked by an advantage held by Octavian. According to his account the people identified with him because of the promises he made to them and his connection to Caesar’s memory.\textsuperscript{314} The situation was even more complex, considering the affection of the people and its transitory nature. Another factor was the popular dislike of Antony’s accruing power and Octavian’s seemingly inferior position. The masses loved neither man (ἐφιλουν...οὐδέτερον), but they fostered revolutionary thoughts (νέων πραγμάτων) and were swayed to the side they felt could further their own designs.\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{311} App. \textit{BC}. 3.7.44.13: “because of military necessity.”

\textsuperscript{312} App. \textit{BC}. 3.7.45.21. Chrissanthos, 71 mentions Antonius’ earlier experience with mutinous troops in Campania in 47 BC: “Antonius did not possess the necessary ‘prestige, power, or wealth to resolve the issues’ (Huzar, 69). The assessment of Antonius’ position at the time provides the context for Antony’s disciplinary stance.

\textsuperscript{313} App. \textit{BC}. 3.6.42; Dio 45.11.

\textsuperscript{314} Dio 45.11.2.

\textsuperscript{315} Dio 45.11.4.
The mob’s nature is described as eager to overthrow the stronger party, while elevating the weaker, as well as playing both against each other. Appian 3.42 outlines the fickleness of the masses in the events following Octavian’s and Cannutius’ coup attempt. Appian depicts the soldiers as having second thoughts when they contemplated their return to agrarian labour and the forfeiture of Octavian’s promised incentives. As an unruly mass (ὄχλος ἀνώμαλος) was wont to do, they shifted allegiance.316 Appian gives us another example of the consciousness of the situation regarding the masses in the speech of Antony to Octavian in the first meeting between the two after the ides of March. Antony is doling out advice, while counseling Octavian to placate those disaffected towards him, rather than the people whom he sees as unruly and an entity to be appeased but not trusted. Antony goes on to state, “The people, however, as you ought to have learned in the Greek studies you have been lately pursuing, are as unstable as the waves of the sea, now advancing, now retreating. In like manner, among us also, the people are forever exalting their favourites and casting them down again.”317 If we take into consideration this conception of the emotional state of the mob, we may see the importance of tangible incentives towards loyalty which were not based upon the slippery issue of the affections of the masses. Rather it relied upon one of mutually pragmatic action. The chief two of these incentives and the most reliable in the present situation can be seen as the power of Caesar’s
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316 App. BC. 3.6.42.27.
317 App. BC. 3.2.20.23ff: “...ἀστάθμητον ὡσπερ ἐν θαλάσσῃ κύμα κινούμενον· ὁ μὲν ἡλθεν, ὁ δ ’ ἀπῆλθεν. ὃς λόγῳ καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων αἰεί τούς δημοκόπους ὁ δήμος ἐπὶ πλείστον ἔξαρας ἐς γόνυ ἔρριψε.”
318 Newly imbued with divine associations that served to intensify the sanctity of pietas to the figure.
memory\textsuperscript{318} and the \textit{pietas} owed to it as a result of previous benefactions as well as the new bestowed by Octavian.

In Nicolaus’ account, we receive a clear view of the culture surrounding these issues from Augustus’ point of view. What is immediately notable is that there is no moral stigma attached to the dispensation of payouts to ensure the loyalty underpinned by Caesarian \textit{pietas}. When Octavian decided to openly attack Antony, he understood he needed to seek out some sort of help to oppose Antony’s forces. After deliberating, he went to Caesar’s colonies, reminded the inhabitants of the dead leader’s benefactions and used money to win them over.\textsuperscript{319} Octavian thought this the only safe course of action and that, rather than place him at a moral disadvantage, these acts would add to his reputation and redeem the prestige of his family.\textsuperscript{320} Octavian is later said to go to Campania to sell Caesar’s holdings there, in order to raise monies for “those things his father had previously laid-out.”\textsuperscript{321} In this we see that for Octavian it was a good policy without any moral ignominy associated with it to use available wealth to buy loyalty.

The overall societal expectations reflected the ingrained \textit{ethos} of benefaction and reciprocated obligation that had emerged with the failure of the State and the breakdown of the traditional oligarchic networks. At this stage, obligations marked by \textit{pietas} associated with Caesar’s name and his acts begin to accrue. This created the opportunity for Octavian to present himself as continuing his father’s work, with \textit{pietas}

\textsuperscript{319} Nic. Dam. 30=Fr. 101.962.

\textsuperscript{320} Nic. Dam. 30=Fr. 101.963.

\textsuperscript{321} Nic. Dam 30=101.969: προσέταξεν
standing as the reason for action. This also enabled him to demand a repayment of the obligation brought about by benefactions, particularly with allotments of land or the distribution of funds. The Senate, unwilling or unable to effect such a set of obligations, is seen at this time to be ineffectually voting honours or granting amnesties, but their legislative powers now increasingly stood outside the functional machinery of the state.

One of the last gasps of free Senatorial power came in the lead-up to the war at Mutina in late 44-early 43 BC. This period saw old antagonisms set aside and new alliances created in an *ad hoc* environment. The situation was indicative of the uncertain footing of all parties involved. Octavian courted the Republicans and Cicero, whereas the Republicans put aside their fears of Octavian’s vows of familial vengeance by embracing his legions. These were desperately needed to resist Antony and his mandate, granted by the people, whom the Senate claimed to be protecting. This seemingly strange detente between Caesar’s heir and the dictator’s enemies would prove short lived, but it is characteristic of the relationships formed at this time. Octavian came to call Cicero ‘father.’ Furthermore, the orator hoped to be able to control and utilize the young man to his own devices.

Octavian, for his part, was doing the unlikely by allying himself and the army he had raised to avenge Caesar with elements of the enemy he swore to punish. It is for these reasons that Mutina stands out as vitally important to our understanding of the way in which social norms and, in particular, issues of gratitude and reciprocal obligation functioned in the sphere of politics and warfare. This period saw Cicero’s *Philippics*,

322 *Cic. ad Brutum* 1.17.5: The appellation was viewed with skepticism and the subsequent events would prove this reception fitting.
where many of the ethical issues surrounding his conception of *pietas* were voiced. It is here where Cicero claims Antony was a threat to them all. Antony, too, had his responses to these invectives, as we will see in the reported speeches in the Senate from his confederate Piso. The latter upheld his own obligations in the spirit of *pietas*, much as Cicero had in the courts for those to whom he had owed a debt of obligation.

The events surrounding the siege of Mutina stand out as marking a major fissure within the Caesarian faction. Octavian took up arms with Republicans against Antony in defense of D. Brutus’, one of Caesar’s assassins, claim to Gaul. The situation presented Octavian with an opportunity to gain legitimacy within the state, insofar as most of the established entities within it were concerned Octavian was an upstart. Octavian would use the leverage gained from these events to acquire the consulship as well as legitimize his policy *ulciscendi*. He effected this while providing the Republicans the only viable forces with which to oppose Antony in northern Italy. All the while, Octavian had Cicero as mentor and representative, despite the misgivings of others.

November of 44 BC saw Antony convene the Senate to allot 13 provinces and pursue his claim on Cisalpine Gaul, which he claimed was rightfully his because of the plebiscite that had granted it to him in June. D. Brutus answered Antony’s demand he hand over the province by reaffirming his adherence to the previous command of the Senate which had granted him the province. Brutus could also claim Caesar had assigned him the province, and he held it under that authority, one affirmed in the Senatorial amnesty after his death. Unable to resist Antony in the field, D. Brutus entered Mutina where he prepared to withstand a protracted siege.
Shortly thereafter Cicero arrived in Rome to play out his final political gambit. The accommodation reached between Cicero and Octavian was confirmed, in his mind, by Octavian’s acceptance without complaint of Casca, one of Caesar’s assassins, as tribune in the elections. The pieces had now fallen into place to bring about the unlikely relationship between Cicero and Octavian. It is a testament to the pragmatism of the age that Cicero urged D. Brutus, who had his misgivings of Octavian’s ambition, to act without Senatorial approval in the upcoming conflict. He states that Brutus waited for no Senatorial auctoritas in preserving the liberty and safety of the Roman people on the Ides of March and he should not wait for any such authority from a Senate ‘impeded by fear’. This statement presents the traditional source of the Senate’s power, its auctoritas, as now rendered obsolete in the new reality. In the place of this authority, Cicero turns to the network or faction as arbiter of moral action. In commending Octavian to Brutus, he informs him that, if Octavian were a danger and had acted rashly, then his personal army would be illegal and the 4th and Martian legions had would also have acted illegally in going over to him. With this circular argument, Cicero assures us that this isn’t the case.

Cicero states that Octavian wishes to use his army to uphold the causam publicam and the defection of Antony’s legions proved the goodwill of the veterans was with the young man. The man who had repeatedly boasted that “if he had been at the

323 Cic. ad Att. 16.15.3; cf. Phil. 13.15.31; Dio 46.49.1.

324 ad Fam. 11.7.2.

325 ad Fam. 11.7.2: primum milites veteranos.
“firstly the veteran soldiers.”
feast of the Ides, there would have been no leavings!"\textsuperscript{326} had chosen to regard the present danger posed by Antony’s looming legions to the north as more pressing than the unease he would have felt at Octavian’s declaration of intent to avenge Caesar. Despite Octavian retaining the prerogative to act according to his declaration of vengeance, Cicero felt that on the basis of common interests against Antony he could trust Octavian. Surely, Cicero counted the experience of the ‘boy’ and his own deft political acumen as potent factors; he would subsequently deal with Octavian when Antony was eliminated.

If nothing else, this line of thought shows the lack of understanding that the ‘Pompeiani’ had with regard to the cohesiveness of the Caesarian party under pietas to Caesar. Despite the illusion of control, Cicero had done little other than act as mediator in a squabble within the Caesarian faction. Antony and Octavian’s differences, framed in terms of ingratitude towards Octavian by Antony, had now bubbled over and brought them into conflict. Yet the overall loyalty of neither was to constitutional government as Cicero imagined it. The common enemies of the Caesareans would eventually be faced, but first the internal struggles had to be played out. This, of course, was no surprise. D. Brutus echoed Cicero’s own reservations about Octavian.\textsuperscript{327} Furthermore, the consuls at the head of the ‘Senatorial’ army were Hirtius and Pansa, consuls designated by Caesar, and Hirtius, according to Cicero, was ‘not sound’.\textsuperscript{328}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{326} i.e. Antony. \textit{ad Fam.} 10.28; 12.3; 12.4.
\textsuperscript{327} \textit{Att.} 16.14.1.
\textsuperscript{328} \textit{Att.} 15.1a.3.
\end{flushleft}
The position of the Republicans must have seemed advantageous at this point. Their hope to divide the Caesarians and defeat them is apparent. This strategy, however, required the troops’ loyalty to the oligarchical conception of the Republic, which would need to supersede that to the memory of Caesar and the expected obligations inherent in those who received benefactions from him.

Cicero and Plancus: *Patria* and Paternalism

The tension between the pragmatic and the idealistic is visible in the person of L. Munatius Plancus. Plancus professed his loyalty to the Republic, yet vacillated between it and M. Antonius at the critical moment of advantage for the Republicans when Antony was defeated and fled Mutina. Later, it was within his hands to raise the siege at Perusia where Antony’s wife Fulvia and brother L. Antonius had made a stand against Octavian’s land confiscations. Plancus’ inaction at Perusia, seemingly flying in the face of his previous allegiances with the Antonians, has done much to paint his character as one of slippery opportunism and shifting loyalties – as caught between the two versions to *pietas* that I have just mentioned. A further pragmatic factor in his conduct can be found in the report he had recommended his brother for the triumviral proscription lists in 43. Plancus represents the new breed of man, loyal as far as opportunism will take
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329 *ad Fam.* 10.4 Plancus later helped seal Antony’s fate with his defection to Octavian and his salacious reports from Cleopatra’s court. Cass. Dio. 50.3; Plutarch *Antony* 58.2.

330 41-40 BC. Plancus left L. Antonius (*Pietas*) and M. Antonius’ wife to their own devices at Perusia where they were defeated by Octavian.
him, dangerous to enemy and ally alike, and despised by his contemporaries.\footnote{Syme, 211: “The soldierly Ventidius knew that Plancus had called him a muleteer and a brigand; and Pollio hated Plancus.”}

Plancus’ personality exhibits not just tensions between its adoption of \textit{pietas}, between its pragmatic and the idealistic aspects, but also in regard to notions of responsibility and the obligation to reciprocal \textit{beneficia}.

It is no easy task to disentangle the personal motives behind the composition of the historical record regarding Plancus.\footnote{The traditional explanation of Plancus’ vilification stems from Velleius Paterculus’ depiction of Plancus, that was influenced by the hostility directed, in Velleius’ time, against Munatia Plancina. Plancina was the daughter or granddaughter of Plancus, wife of Cn. Calpurnius Piso, and, in the popular imagination, the poisoner of Germanicus. There may also have been the presence of propaganda of the 30s BC, in which the Augustan victors blackened the reputation of the Antonian losers. Wright 179 n.4.} Nevertheless, this individual stands out as representing the new ethical mode of behaviour now prevalent among those who sought to gain advantage in the climate of the time. The idealized expression of Plancus’ obligation to Cicero is shown to be in response to previous \textit{beneficia} on the part of Cicero, further perpetuating the specific language we have seen in social discourse relating to idealistic \textit{pietas} thus far. The incentives which Cicero offers to Plancus on behalf of the Republic are the reciprocated payments for his loyalty to the State. Whereas the letters eventually portray a distaste for Plancus’ double-gamesmanship and opportunistic ethical comportment, they do much to characterize the language and concepts espoused by Plancus with regard to influential men who sought his services. For his part, Plancus shows himself to be of a sort that was not uncommon at the time in his desire to extract favourable terms in a given relationship for services rendered in a loyal fashion.
Despite Cicero’s attempts to obtain Plancus’ legions in the name of preserving the state to which Plancus owed his pietas, we find Plancus eventually abandoning Cicero, D. Brutus, and the entire Republican cause. And so, in the character of Plancus, we are afforded a view of the shifting loyalties and opportunistic actions of an individual who appropriated the language of pietas at the end of the Republic as many must have done. Cicero, for his part, sees the relationship function upon a template of affection and paternal concern for political advancement is used to remind Plancus of his obligations to the Republicans’ agenda as well as the basis of an indebtedness to this entity. The exchanges of Plancus offer a view to the plastic nature of fides within the State, its connection to pietas and the resultant moral climate in which individuals functioned at the end of the Republic.

As proconsul of Transalpine Gaul (Gallia Comata), Plancus found himself in a key position to resist Antony’s attempts at consolidating his power and display his pietas towards the traditional ideas of the republic. Antony set out to acquire his newly acquired province from Caesar’s previous gubernatorial appointment D. Brutus. The conflict at Mutina was the result of hastily assembled extralegal Senate proceedings on the evening of November 28, thus reaffirming the plebiscite that gave the Gallic province to Antony. This province was to the Antonians an acquisition granted by the people to whom Antony now owed a debt. The reciprocation of this debt would provide the Antonians a key plank in their own communications of the mutual responsibilities and obligations between leaders and supporters used to articulate a factional ethic and

333 Above 24.
to point out the mutual benefits of loyalty. All of these actions were reliant upon expressions of *pietas*.

Plancus was instrumental in the Republican’s interests in checking Antony’s designs on obtaining the territory with its strategic advantages. The debt of which Cicero would remind Plancus came with an expected repayment in loyalty and resources by his protégé. With the issue of Antony’s command about to be contested, the correspondence between Cicero and Plancus is instructive, in the manner in which it presents the notions of obligation and duty as well as incentive accompanying expressions of *pietas*.

The tension displayed by Plancus’ actions between the idealistic and the pragmatic notions of *pietas*, in turn, bore relevance to the course of the Roman state. The tone used, however, was that of the family and the obligations therein. This expression points to the manner in which the social discourse focusing on affection, familial ties, and loyalty, all in a paternalistic tone, is used for issues of much greater importance than the function of a single relationship or family. Rather, it is used to remind Plancus of his debt and obligation to the Republic as well as the system of benefaction and recompense represented by it among the Republican elite. This tone is evocative of many of the relationships between one of higher station with more political influence and another of lesser standing who holds the levers of great influence; the latter is drawn into the discourse of what is owed and to whom. The situation is marked by a transactional exchange of actions both beneficial to the Republic, as Cicero’s
object of pietas, and to Plancus’ own standing within it if he acted according to the dictates of pietas.

Cicero began an important correspondence with Plancus centred around notions of familial connection and obligation as he sought to impress upon him the consequences of his decisions and how they functioned in the greater context of action inspired by pietas. The language used is notably marked by terms of affection and reciprocity. The resort to this personal aspect in their correspondence is, perhaps, reflective of Plancus’ unknown plans and the means by which Cicero could influence them. The expression of a coercive aspect marked by obligation is evident in the correspondence as well as one of potential recompense from those with the wherewithal to effect significant beneficia on Plancus’ behalf. The means of convincing Plancus to support the Republicans centres on the notion of a society of men bound to each other by reciprocal bonds of gratitude and indebtedness who hold the Republic and its divine underpinnings as the focal point of a Roman citizen’s pietas.

In drawing from the language of pietas, Cicero paints the expectations he holds in regard to Plancus in both public and private affectional terms. Despite the coercive power represented by the conglomeration of notions encompassed by Ciceronian, traditional pietas, in the end Plancus would prove a disappointment to Cicero and the means of compulsion he sought to use to influence Plancus. The idealistic conception espoused by Cicero is overwhelmed by other considerations of safety and profit which pulled Plancus away from obligation to the State and towards a closer, more tangible
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334 ad Fam. 15.9.1; de Inv. 2.66.2; Pro Flacco 96.2.
set of loyalties to the emerging power structure under the future Triumvirs. This is what I have termed the pragmatic version of *pietas*. Plancus would eventually abandon D. Brutus to his fate, handing over his legions to Antony. As a result his character would forever be branded as treacherous.\(^{335}\)

Roman conventions of transactional relationships underpinned by affection based upon familial associations are on full display in this correspondence. Cicero’s letters provide us a view into the social basis of the workings of the faltering mechanisms of government, as the opportunism of civil war stands in contrast to Roman expectations in line with *pietas*. The recompense for Plancus’ allegiance and obedience to the Republic and the cause of “good men” described by Cicero hinges on notions of both filial duty and that of citizen to State. These sentiments reminded Plancus of the obligations he owes as well as the potentially reciprocated *beneficia*, *studium*, and society with influential men.

When the Republic had not yet passed into the hands of the triumvirate, while Cicero still held out hope of “*iterum rem publicam servarem*”\(^{336}\), Plancus was a key to defeating Antony. This utility then created a situation where Plancus was enticed by Cicero with incentives and warned off of the wrong path by admonishments tinged with notions of *pietas* and the associated debts and obligations Plancus inescapably faced.

\(^{335}\) Vell. Pat. 63.3: *dubia, id sua est, fide*. Bertrand, 191 n.275: “Abandoned by Plancus, in an extremely unfavourable state, Brutus had no other choice but to attempt to join the Caesar’s assassins in the East…en route he was abandoned by the greater part of his troops…was captured by a certain Camillus (App. III, 98; Vell. 2,64,1). 192 n.277: “As a result of the successive defections of Plancus and Brutus’ soldiers, Antony and Lepidus had a sizeable force at their disposal: 23 legions in total (App. *BC* IV, 3; Brunt 1971, 485).”

\(^{336}\) *ad Att.* 16.11.6; *In Pisonem* 78.5; *Philippicae* 6.2.6; *Pro Sestio* 49.13: “…save the Republic for a second time.”
In doing so, Cicero maintained an affectionate relationship, marked by a number of paternal indicators that signified an attempt to compel Plancus to act according to Cicero’s stated moral ideals. These ideals, represented by *pietas*, are contingent upon personal obligations and greater societal obligations centred in Plancus and Cicero’s relationship. The discourse contained in their exchanges utilizes the language of *pietas* associated normally with less weighty issues, to be sure, yet with the same characteristics and basic manner of functioning. The workings of a relationship bearing the hallmarks under discussion within a more weighty issue with relevance to the direction of the Roman state can be extrapolated from examples within the letters of Cicero, particularly those at the end of 44 and the beginning of 43 BC.

First, however we must look at their earliest mutual correspondence that we have from what is likely the beginning of 46 BC, in order to establish the dynamics of reciprocal action between the men and the bearing they would have on historical events. At this time, Plancus was with Caesar in Africa, on the eve of the battle of Thapsus. By this point, Cicero had accepted Caesar’s *clementia* and was going about his business in Rome. Part of this business involved securing a favour for C. Ateius Capito, who stood to inherit the estate of his relative T. Antistius. By using *pietas* as leverage in his relationship with Plancus, Cicero sought to influence him in this matter and fostered the hope that, in turn, Plancus could influence Caesar. The familial basis for expressions of *pietas* can be seen as Cicero used the language of close relations to call for aid in this issue. The first statement by Cicero called to mind the *necessarii* which Plancus’ father had furnished for him with Cicero standing as the
coniunctissimum of the lot. Furthermore, this relationship was not based on those criteria (iis...causis) which only held the speciem of a great connection, but on familiaritate et consuetudine. This deep connection was because of Cicero’s relationship with his father. From these beginnings, Cicero states, his affection (in te amor) towards Plancus increased the obligation he felt toward his father.

In noting the considerable ties of common interests and pursuits which they share Cicero draws the parameters of a mutually beneficial relationship marked by pietas. This reminder serves to bring up the notion of officium and its associated responsibilities and obligations. As he explains, “not without a great and just reason.”

This note to Plancus is meant to facilitate a reciprocal exchange between mentor and protégé, contingent upon the request that Antistius’ estate pass to Capito. Cicero’s use of the language of affection and obligation seeks to mitigate the underlying difficulty of the situation: appearances would suggest that Antistius had aided the Pompeians, and Cicero, a former Pompeian, now requested a favour from his former adversary. The explanation given by Cicero for Antistius’ actions is that as quaestor he was in Macedonia when Pompey and his army arrived; for that reason he had no choice but to accommodate him. Cicero apologizes for the fact that Antistius minted monies for the Pompeians, stating that he was present for only “2 or 3 months” while this occurred.

---

337 ad Fam. 13.29.1: Shackleton Bailey 1977, 442: “This letter was apparently written to L. Munatius Plancus while he was serving with Caesar in the African campaign (Bell. Afr. 4.1.). Why he in particular was approached is open to conjecture. He clearly had much influence with Caesar, who appointed him a City Prefect later in the year. As such he handled the disposal of confiscated property and it is possible that he was already known as advising Caesar on such matters.”

338 ad Fam. 13.29.1.6: auxit paternam necessitudinem.

339 ad Fam. 13.29.2.3 Magna iustaque causa. The prerequisite of a higher and greater cause as the rationale for the completion of pietas’ dictates is seen here. 13.29.8.3 Capito is deemed “officiosissimum.”
Antistius, we are told, then went to a far-off corner of the province to avoid all military activity. After Pharsalus, he went to Bithynia, to meet Caesar, who received him with nothing harsh or bitter to say.

The great commonality represented by the mutual ties of *pietas* and the burdensome call to settle societal debts is presented by Cicero as being the mechanism by which he, just as Antistius, had been caught. He draws a parallel between Antistius and himself, as both were caught up in the civil war by “others” advocating for it. In this war, Cicero characterized himself as the *moderatior et temperatior quam in ea parte quisquam*. The reason for this attitude of his was, according to Cicero, Capito. Capito always maintained a close relationship with Caesar and now stood to benefit from it, if only Caesar would allow the estate to pass to Antistius’ relative. He then draws attention to the state of affairs leading up to Pharsalus, with expectedly euphemistic tones, depicting the conflict as being against his wishes. Finally, whatever action of his that had run contrary to Caesar’s wishes was characterized as *aliorum consilio, hortatu, auctoritate*.

Cicero’s apologetic statement argues that he had acted as necessary under compulsion of obligations he held to others. It continues that if his *reliqui necessarii* had also accepted the mitigating wisdom of Capito, the State would be on a better footing and Cicero in a better position than they were now post-Pharsalus. The final summary at the end of the letter presents the true face of Roman relationships in addition to their

---

340 *ad Fam.* 13.29.7.9: “the more moderate and level headed in this party.”

341 *ad Fam.* 13.29.7: “by the plan, exhortation and authority of others.”
transactional aspects – their reliance on an idealistic version of *pietas*. Cicero states that if Plancus will bring about the desired result from Caesar, he will confirm his own affection and repay Cicero’s towards him. In so doing, Plancus will add Capito, a very useful fellow, to his network in repayment for Plancus’ *beneficia*.

Cicero argues that just as he had been compelled by notions of obligation to choose the side he did after the crossing of the Rubicon, so too Capito had been caught up in the affair by his relative Antistius. Cicero argues that Capito, an ardent Caesarian, ought not to be punished because of Antistius’ circumstances at the time of his enmity with Caesar. He seeks to highlight the treatment that Capito should expect in the culture of *pietas*. The association with Antistius was unfortunate, but it did not expunge Capito’s obligations to Caesar and, as such, he should recognize this obligation and reciprocate it with the granting of the estate to Capito. The radiating spheres of influence marked by mutual obligations and indebtedness had brought these men to petition Plancus, whom they believed could influence Caesar, in the hope of a favourable reception.

Despite its optimism, Cicero’s missive is not so bold as to omit the requisite *mea culpa* needed to be voiced, one considering the faction he chose to support in the preceding civil war and with which men he had shared debts and obligations. The new reality for Cicero, however, required he acquiesce to Caesar’s domination if his request on Capito’s behalf was to be received favourably. The key to this potentially closed door was the relationship of Plancus and Caesar, the influence that the former had with the latter and the influence that Cicero could call to bear in his relationship with Plancus. Notions of traditional *pietas*, contingent upon *officia* and *beneficia*, are used by Cicero in
his position of disadvantage to compel Plancus to influence Caesar, with whom his protégé likely shared a bond of pietas.

Cicero’s letters to Plancus regarding the situation at Mutina provide instances where pietas is used as a means of compulsion whereas Cicero calls on Plancus to aid the Republican forces against Antony. This action was a part of his obligations to the society of good men and the Republic itself. Letter 10.1 is written after Cicero’s return to Rome from Rhegium. L. Munatius Plancus, consul-Designate for 42 along with D. Brutus, had gone to his province of Transalpine Gaul as proconsul after Caesar’s murder. There he stood with his legions as the only resistance force the Republicans could hope to muster in the vicinity. Cicero understood at a very early stage that Plancus would be a key strategic ally in the coming events; so he professes great expectations for Plancus’ upcoming consulship. The basis of this hope for Plancus’ political future and, consequently, the Republic is the affection Cicero has cultivated for Plancus in the spirit of Republican pietas. This emotional attachment allows Cicero to urge Plancus to work to preserve the Republic and for Plancus to reciprocate the personal relationship with actions that have a far greater bearing than the minutiae of a personal relationship. The elder statesman links considerations of Plancus’ fides to his own obligation to repay Plancus for his loyalty in the coming events. Cicero tells Plancus that he can count on him to devote his consilium, studium, officium, operam,

342 *ad Fam.* 10.1.
Cicero explicitly frames the conflict in terms of pietas and, particularly, impietas: Philippicae 13.1: ...huius belli, patres conscripti, quod cum impis civibus consceleratisque susceprimus.”
“...(of) this war which we take up with impius citizens.”

laborem, diligentiam ad amplitudinem tuam as repayment for this pietas to the state. Cicero understood the coercive power of pietas, exploiting it by emphasizing the reciprocated beneficia to accrue from Plancus’ debt of obligation to the State and to the men with which Cicero identifies the Roman res. Playing upon the Roman sense of obligation, Cicero hopes to secure Plancus’ loyalty to the cause against Antony, in keeping with the dictates of Republican pietas.

Letter 10.3 (December 44) again establishes the link between Cicero’s affection for Plancus and the interests of the “best state of the Republic,” as the two notions are conflated to create an association between personal affection and duty. These also include directing these notions as obligation to the state. Cicero begins by calling to mind the ties cum domo vestra that predate his relationship with Plancus. He then states that the affection towards him began from earliest childhood. For these reasons, Cicero has taken an active interest in Plancus’ dignitas because, after all, it was reflective of his own:

faveo dignitati tuae, quam me tecum statuo habere communem.

Now, we are told, on the back of wise counsels and fortune, Plancus found himself in the position to give aid to the Republic and augment his dignitas while expressing traditional family-ties of pietas.

---

344 ad Fam. 10.1.3: “advice, diligence, effort towards your advancement.”
345 ad Fam. 10.3.2.11: “optimo rei publicae statu.”
346 ad Fam. 10.3.2: amorem...erga te.
347 ad Fam. 10.3.2.5-6: “I carefully tend to your dignity, which I consider to be the same as mine.” The maintenance of the dignitas of an amicus was an aspect of pietas and the reciprocity within the statement aligns it with notions of pietas.
Cicero’s following statement addresses the pragmatic nature of Plancus’ past dealings, which had cast him as a self-serving opportunist. But Cicero says this is a misunderstanding of the power he had at hand to influence events at the time. Cicero turns the page on Plancus’ past conduct, likely because Plancus is now consul-elect, in possession of an army. Therefore, his utility outstrips any previous moral shortcomings. Cicero called on Plancus’ fides and resources at this time of uncertainty to link these considerations to affectionate sentiments underpinned by pietas. This is explicitly stated by Cicero, who gives affection rather than admonition and advice as the reasons for such correspondence. What Cicero is attempting is to pull Plancus into the group of good men Cicero identifies with the Republic. This is not without philosophical undertones as well. The establishment of Plancus as an important ally and philosophical brother is a significant aspect of this letter. Cicero is calling Plancus to join a group of gentlemen who all shared similar beliefs in both the private and public spheres. The point for Plancus is that he is being courted by both the promise of continued advancement and future benefits that could accrue from his relationship to Cicero and the Republicans while they stood to benefit from the dutiful obligation Plancus could express towards these men and their Republic at a critical moment.

348 ad Fam. 10.3.3: Scis profecto (nihil enim te fugere potuit) fuisse quoddam tempus cum homines existimarent te nimir servire temporibus. “You of course know (for nothing was able to escape you) there was a certain time when men considered that you were too much at the service of the times.” Shackleton-Bailey 1977, 496: Plancus alludes to this in his reply (10.4.2) tanta sunt [sc. in me bona] ut praeter bonam famam nihil desiderare videantur.”

349 ad Fam. 10.3.4.

350 ad Fam. 10.3.4.3: sciebam enim ex iisdem te haec haurire fontibus ex quibus ipse hauseram. “For I know that you drank these same things from the founts from which I myself drank.”
Plancus’ response in 10.4 is replete with the cordial formalities attendant to the discourse surrounding pietas. Albeit it is articulated in a fashion more reflective of Plancus’ ability to appropriate the ethical language of the Republicans, divorced as they are from any adherence to the Republican ideal. Plancus mirrors Cicero in mentioning the relations of Cicero and Plancus’ father; he adds that he has causas plurimas as reason for his obligation to Cicero:

\[
\text{nullum enim in te officium ne minimum quidem sine maxima culpa videor posse praeterire, in quo tuendo habeo causas plurimas vel paternae necessitudinis vel meae a pueritia observantiae vel tui erga me mutui amoris.}
\]

The causas plurimas are representative of the connection through his father and the observantia Plancus displayed for Cicero from boyhood. Most importantly, however,

---

351 White, 157-8: “There were no alternatives to Plancus in the west, and Plancus was at least willing to go through the motions of coming to the rescue—which in itself seems surprising. Since he was on amicable terms with all concerned, unlike Decimus, he had nothing to lose by shirking initiative and standing pat (as Pollio did). Perhaps Cicero does not get as much credit as he deserves for the sway he exercised over Plancus. A second reason for Cicero's forbearance may be that Plancus had a way of wrapping himself in Ciceronian camouflage when writing letters...for example, Cicero had recalled that his tie to Plancus even predated Plancus's birth, thanks to his tie with Plancus' father.... When Cicero noted that Plancus's meteoric career was clouded by his reputation as a timeserver (Fam. 10.3.3 = 355 SB), Plancus echoed back: “All of my successes, whether they have been granted by the kindness of fortune or earned by my exertions—though out of affection you exaggerate them—are so great even from the most hostile perspective that they seem to lack nothing but good repute. Therefore accept this one assurance: all that I can manage through strength and organize through foresight and promote through influence will be dedicated to the nation” (Fam. 10.4.2-3 = 358 SB). Plancus even tops Cicero's evocations of the respublica, using the word thirty-five times for an average of slightly more than three times per letter. In their letters, Cicero and Plancus tend to play off each other's words, to the disadvantage of Cicero, who found it easy to believe that people who talked his talk were talking to the same purpose. None of his correspondents could talk the talk better than his protégé. And so it was a fitting irony that, as the author of the latest datable text (Fam. 10.24 = 428 SB, dated July 28), Plancus the mockingbird turned out to have the last word in our extant corpus of Cicero's works.

352 ad Fam. 10.4.1.4: “For with even the smallest remittance of obligation to you I would seem to be very much to blame, for seeing to which (obligations) I have many reasons: either for my relations with your father or of my concern for you since boyhood or of your reciprocated affection towards me.”

353 Shackleton Bailey 1977, 496: “‘Who could allow no man pride of place with you in virtue of old association’, i.e. in so far as Plancus values a friend according to the length of the friendship he must value no one more than Cicero.”
is the declaration of an affection deemed *mutuus*. Plancus then declares that “in cultivating your friendship I have invested you with the sacred character of a father.”

\[
Qua re, mi Cicero, quod mea tuaque patitur aetas, persuade tibi te unum esse in quo ego colendo patriam mihi constituerim sanctitatem.\]

He affirms his loyalty to the Republic because of considerations of *pietas*. This loyalty is also affirmed by association and mutual obligation to the father-figure Cicero who seeks to act as moral and political guide. In this way, the crossover from familial notions of *pietas* to the realm of politics is typified by the exchanges of Cicero and his protégé.

Cicero’s response came two weeks later, at which time tells of the deep satisfaction he feels on account of Plancus’ letter. Seemingly, Cicero had effectively wielded the tool of Republican *pietas* to compel Plancus to act in a fashion beneficial to the interests that his mentor and the Republican cause. Cicero states that he cannot decide which he esteems more: the relationship Plancus confirmed in his letter, particularly the affectionate aspect or his spirit *in rem publicam...aestimandum*. The connection of the two aspects is explicitly drawn. Love of country is paramount, affection (*amor*) and connections (*coniunctio*) hold more *voluntatisque...suavitatis*, and thus are appealing on a personal level. For these reasons, Cicero is doubly pleased; he takes pleasure from the affection, but also from the professional or political

---

\[354\] *ad Fam.* 10.4.1.8; Shackleton Bailey, 497: “your reciprocal affection for me.”

\[355\] *ad Fam.* 10.4.2.2: “Therefore, my dear Cicero, be assured that (as our respective ages allow) in cultivating your friendship I have invested you and only you, with the sacred character of father”; Shackleton Bailey, 498.

\[356\] *ad Fam.* 10.5.1.

\[357\] *ad Fam.* 10.5.1.8-9.
satisfaction he obtains from the declaration (declaratio) of Plancus’ disposition to the Republic. The Republican pietas that Cicero promulgates is reflective of a vertical hierarchy, underpinned by familial notions of responsibility to greater entities such as the state or the oligarchic group with which it was identified. It extends to the power of the father-figure. This figure provided guidance to the son, who stood to benefit from his duty to this system, both from a moral and material standpoint. Furthermore, this hierarchy is representative of beliefs which place the health of the State as paramount in the view of the gods who guarantee its success. States function harmoniously when the obligations and responsibilities of the citizen are properly observed within the framework of pietas: a religious and social hierarchy reliant upon reciprocal action within ascending and descending relationships is thus created.

In return for Plancus’ declaratio, Cicero offers glory and renown, the traditional commodities of the Republic, in exchange for service to constitutional government. Cicero repeats an earlier statement that, up to this point, Plancus’ successes can be attributed to good fortune and circumstances.\footnote{ad Fam. 10.5.3. Cf. 10.3.2.} Now, however, Plancus would have the opportunity to act ‘on his own’ and reap the rewards of such actions.\footnote{ad Fam. 10.5.3.6: “(your actions)...will be utterly and completely your own.”} The rewards mentioned are both in material advancement and in reputation among influential men. Cicero contrasts the glory of service with the odium directed at Antony by all, with the exception of criminals (latronibus exceptis).\footnote{ad Fam. 10.5.3.7-8; Shackleton Bailey 1977, 499: “A stock word for Antony’s supporters in letters and speeches of the period.”} In Plancus and his army, there is great
hope and, more importantly, a *magna expectatio* that Plancus will not miss this opportunity:

\[\textit{magna spes in te et in tuo exercitu, magna exspectatio; cuius, per deos, gratiae gloriaeque cave tempus amittas.}\]

Doing nothing is equivalent to surrender, for Cicero, and the *pietas* he alludes to demands action. This action will be repaid by “gratitude and glory,” the former pointing to future *beneficia* from Republican ‘good men’, and the latter to the reciprocated aspect that would come from the state itself for acting in a spirit of Republican *pietas*. This notion of *pietas* valued the interests of the Roman elite, who offered *beneficia*, within a vertical hierarchy to individuals such as Plancus, in return for their adherence to this ethic.

Cicero’s final exhortation summarizes the sentiments as it intensifies the coercive message of the previous letter. In particular, we see the statement of 10.3.4 overturned explicitly in 10.5.3. Whereas the former letter denied a tone of parental advice in favour of paternal affection, the latter sums up all that Cicero has told Plancus is effectuated in the spirit of a fatherly warning. What Cicero is now describing is a reciprocal, dutiful relationship with the elements of familial affection and the hallmarks of *pietas* and associated filial obedience. Cicero stands as a paternal figure in this hierarchical relationship, one that supports the traditional Republican power structure within the

---

361 *ad Fam.* 10.5.3.8-10: “There is great hope in you and in your army, great expectations; by the gods, take care that you do not let the opportunity pass for gratitude and glory.” The connection between *pietas*, expectation and obligation is again underscored as integral to the language of the concept.

362 *ad Fam.* 10.5.3.10 *sic moneo ut filium*: “thus I warn/advise you as a son.”
State. Notions of familial responsibility and that to the state are conflated by this understanding. The allusions to Cicero as *pater* points to traditional expectations of familial duty and obligation between father and son. It hereby mirrors dutiful action towards the State.\(^{363}\) In this instance, the aspect of filial duty is called upon on behalf of the State via Cicero’s use of the language of *pietas*. This register of language is indicative of the expectation of dutiful action based on a set of obligations inherited via an indebtedness to a higher entity or individual existing above the indebted party within this hierarchical structure.

The following letter (10.6) comes two months later. On the 20th of March 43, in the consulships of Hirtius and Pansa, the Senate has recently heard from Lepidus and Plancus, both urging peace with Antony and opposing Cicero’s hawkish inclinations. Cicero, of course, was displeased with Plancus’ actions. There is a change of tone as Cicero censures Plancus for not grasping the initiative. He appeals to his *fidelisque prudentia*\(^{364}\) by offering him a *praecetum* carrying the full weight of Cicero’s *auctoritas* and numerous connections:

\[
\textit{vellem tamen meae quoque auctoritatis pro plurimis nostris necessitudinibus praecetum ad}
\]
\[
\textit{te aliquod pervenire}.\(^{365}\)
\]

---

\(^{363}\) Pliny *NH* 7.122: *P. Catienus Philotimus patronum adeo dilexit, ut heres omnibus bonis institutus in rogum eius se iaceret.*

*P. Catienus Philotimus cared for his patron to such an extent that when named as an heir he threw himself on the funeral pyre with all his patrons goods.*

An extreme example which has the client follow the patron to the grave.

\(^{364}\) Shackleton Bailey 1977, 510: “‘Loyal good sense’ = *fidesque prudentia.*”

\(^{365}\) *ad Fam.* 10.6.2.4-6: “To wish that a word of advice, to which the many ties between us ought to lend some weight, should also reach you from myself.” Shackleton-Bailey 1977, 501: “Take *meae...auctoritas* as attributive ‘carrying my authority.’”
In this piece of advice, he tells Plancus all the honours and renown obtained will be but *vocabula* if Plancus does not join himself to the freedom of the Roman people and the authority of the Senate, to do so is in opposition to Antony. Cicero is now fully admonishing Plancus, warning him off of relationships marked, not by the bonds (*vincla*) of his good judgment (*tuum iudicium*) but by the bonds of circumstances (*temporum*). In particular, Cicero warns him of the citizens whom he fears have enchanted him. Cicero is talking here of Antony, but not likely of Lepidus, and advises him to disassociate himself from this *impius* element in the Roman state:

\[ \text{talem igitur te esse oportet qui primum te ab impiorum civium tui dissimiliorum societate seiungas.} \]

The choice for Plancus, according to Cicero, is clear: side with the Senate and Cicero, and thereby fulfill his duty to *pietas* and the State, or frustrate these expectations and forever blacken the titles of consul and consular that await him. Cicero’s call to loyalty, demanded by the obligation inherent in their relationship, is, by his statement, still *impulsus benevolentia*, though written *paulo severius*. On the surface, Cicero’s

---

366 *ad Fam.* 10.6.2.9-10: *eos honorum vocabula habituros, non dignitatis insignia, nisi te cum libertate populi Romani et cum senatus auctoritate coniuxeris.*

"these will seem but the trappings of honours not signs of dignity, unless you join yourself with the liberty of the people and with the authority of the senate."

367 Shackleton Bailey 1977, 510: "Generally of the Antonians and their sympathizers… Not Lepidus, in particular, with whom Plancus was already on bad terms (cf. 10.15.1; 10.18; 10.23). *ad Fam.* 10.11a “inimicissimo.”

368 *ad Fam.* 10.6.3.4-5: “Therefore you ought to be such a type who dissociates yourself from the society of *impius* citizens unlike you.” cf. 12.4.

369 Shackleton Bailey, 510: “ Plancus must choose between two *rationes* – collaboration with miscreants and loyalty to the republic.”

370 *ad Fam.* 10.6.3.12: “Driven by *benevolentia*...though written with a touch more severity.”
strategy seemed effective, as the continuing correspondence shows. However, Plancus’ eventual choice of allegiances, in the face of his words of assurance to the contrary, cemented his reputation for posterity. They also, however, offer a view to the prioritization of obligations that he was faced with: maintain loyalty to a moribund State or seek new beneficia in the newly emerging power structure. In contrast to the hierarchy of Republican pietas, that prioritized the gods who sanctioned the state and who, in turn, legitimized the power of Cicero’s ‘good men’ who comprised it, this emerging power structure offered a horizontally expressed pietas. This version placed the titular head of the faction, namely Caesar’s memory, as the object to which obligation exists. The reciprocated beneficia between factional leaders and supporters, between commander and soldier, came to exert an exceptional influence at this time, one which competed with Republican pietas and the ‘traditional’ aspects of the gods, the Republic, the family. It reciprocated gratiam and the resultant fides that underpinned it.

While this letter was en route to Plancus, he was composing a public letter in defense of his actions that hinted at trouble for the Republican conceptualization of pietas. The reason given for his leaving the Senate in suspense as to his intentions was that he had been busy shoring up resources and arranging his forces. He had to do all this with his army while they were often enticed by the prospect of a greater reward from the Caesarians than from the Republic. These rewards I see to be pulling the traditional pietas of the army to the State towards a loyalty to the beneficia that would

---

371 ad Fam. 10.8.3.5-7: confirmandus erat exercitus nobis magnis saepe praemiis sollicitatus, ut ab re publica potius moderata quam ab uno infinita speraret.
“The army’s loyalty had to be assured by us having been often incited by great incentives, so that it hoped for a moderate prize from the Republic rather than a great one from a single individual.” On Plancus’ real motives see Tyrell & Purser VI, 43 n.119.
accrue from loyalty to the faction. He goes on to note that he delayed to ascertain the sentiments of potential allies. 372 All of this, he argues, necessitated his suspect actions. 373 Plancus gauged the perils D. Brutus now faced, judging it imprudent to act hastily in such a climate with unready resources. He then assured the magistrates, Senate and People, that those actions, having been regrettably necessary, now yielded to his readiness to aid the Republic. Plancus is at this point showing himself reticent to fulfill the obligations, as outlined earlier by Cicero at the same time as professing the language of Republican pietas. This language hinged upon familial considerations and reinforced the power structure promulgated by the oligarchic familial networks. The reality was, however, that these networks had been greatly diminished in their capacity to offer any reciprocation of value to individuals such as Plancus, beyond honour and glory for compliance with an apparently idealistic view of the State. That is to say with no concrete beneficia. This concept, held up by those who had state's power in their hands, became less important in the face of the emergence of a parallel power structure in the various factions vying for supremacy. In the face of the material profit to come from the lands and other beneficia on offer for loyalty to the faction and its horizontal understanding of pietas, the Republican conception, as history has shown, became decreasingly relevant. Despite this, the language surrounding pietas remained remarkably consistent regardless of which entity espoused it and to which end it was utilized.

---

372 i.e. G. Asinius Pollio and L. Aemilius Lepidus.
373 ad Fam. 10.8.4.6-7: et simulasse invitum et dissimulasse cum dolore
    “I both simulated unwillingly and pained at my dissimulation.”
Letter 10.10 (30 March 43 BC) advises Plancus of the coming opportunity to serve the Republic. Its content advises the proconsul that the fate of the commonwealth is to be decided in one battle and that Plancus’ assistance would result in future honours as his obligation to the state and his dutiful action towards it would be reciprocated with the remaining currency of the Republic: that is, the promise of the obligations associated with pietas and honour among the State’s influential men. On the eve of the Mutina conflict the subject of honours is raised yet again by Cicero (10.12), as he appraises the conflicting rewards laid out before Plancus. On the one side there are the ephemeral honours that hold only the speciem of glory, marked by ‘empty signs of splendor’. These incentives are contrasted with Cicero’s decus in virtute, most notably displayed in great deeds on behalf of the Republic:

> verum decus in virtute positum est, quae maxime illustratur magnis in rem publicam meritis.\(^{375}\)

Cicero urges Plancus using the language of indebtedness, reciprocity and, by extension, pietas to ensure that by these merita the Republic come to owe him no less than he owes it:

> perfice ut ne minus res publica tibi quam tu rei publicae debeas.\(^{376}\)

\(^{374}\) ad Fam. 10.12.5.

\(^{375}\) ad Fam. 10.12.5.4: true glory is found in virtue which is most illustrated by great deeds worthy of the Republic.

\(^{376}\) ad Fam. 10.12.5.8: “make it that the Republic owe no less to you than you owe to the Republic.” Again, reciprocal acquittal of responsibility marked by the verb debeo denoting the debt owed.
The characterization of the relationship between individual and State in terms of indebtedness is reflective of the mutual obligations expected in the transactional relationships which characterize pietas. Cicero rejoices in Plancus’ (insincere) declaration of intent to defend the Republic. He also looks forward to the day when he can embrace Plancus in a restored commonwealth, but he already derives much joy from Plancus’ increased dignitas resultant from his actions.\textsuperscript{377} In bridging the personal and the public, Cicero acts as intermediary between the Senate and Plancus, telling that the State fathers have never been so impressed as they were with his words of reassurance. In return for these actions by Plancus, Cicero states he will set about securing honours for him. These honours were to be sought from the influential men with whom Plancus had recently ingratiated himself.

Plancus’ reply (10.11) echoes this same transactional language as he professes to be unable to see how he could ever repay Cicero for tantis…officiis, this, unless Cicero should feel, as he had written previously, that he would be repaid if Plancus were to hold this concern for his interests in his memory. This concern is a function of the gratitude that motivates it and the obligation generated by this gratiam to reciprocate it.\textsuperscript{378} This formulaic statement from the language of obligation affirms Plancus’ loyalty

\textsuperscript{377} \textit{ad Fam.} 10.12.1.4.

\textsuperscript{378} \textit{ad Fam.} 10.11.1.5: referre...gratiam

“to repay the gratitude.”

White, 155: “It is worth noticing how often these effusions were triggered by incoming assurances from Plancus. Cicero had called for a vote of commendation when Plancus wrote that he stood at the service of the Senate. He urged ‘recompense for valor’ when Plancus reported that he had led his forces out of his province (Fam. 10.9.3 = 379 SB). He reaffirmed his devotion to Plancus’s glory when Plancus wrote that he was a little farther south, and ‘would prove second to none in spirit, goodwill, and steadfastness’ toward the Senate (\textit{nec animo nec benevolentiae nec patientiae cuiusquam pro vobis cedam}, Fam. 10.11.3 = 382 SB). And so on.”
confirming it for the future. Plancus seeks to reinforce the sentiment by mentioning the filial aspect of his relationship:

\[\textit{si de fili tui dignitate esset actum, amabilius certe nihil facere potuisses.}\]

For these reasons, Plancus pledges a willingness to try to be worthy of Cicero’s praises and his friendship, all marked with gratitude, ‘\textit{amicitia...memorem atque gratum’}.\(^{380}\) He closes the letter with the assurance that he was trying to sway Lepidus to ‘their’ side, for he considered the Republic as his greatest concern. The language used to articulate this continued reciprocal political relationship with its undertones of familial discourse is that of \textit{pietas}.

10.13 shows that Republican symbols of distinction and the \textit{amicitia} of influential men are the reciprocated benefits of \textit{pietas} to the Republic. The letter is from the period after the events of Mutina had been decided, with Antony defeated and seemingly on the verge of complete destruction. Cicero informs Plancus of the honours being prepared for him in repayment for his loyalty. The arrangement has Cicero extend to Plancus the ‘symbols of distinction’ owed to Plancus, despite him asking for nothing.\(^{381}\) The final statement euphemistically characterizes Plancus’ previous reputation as a

\(^{379}\) \textit{ad Fam.} 10.11.1: “If this had been regarding your own son, you could have acted no more lovingly.”

\(^{380}\) \textit{ad Fam.} 10.11.1.13 also Shackleton Bailey 1977: “\textit{tuum munus tuere ‘Act in the spirit of your bounty.’... tueri beneficium, et sim. = ‘live up to a benefaction (whether given or received).’}”

\(^{381}\) \textit{ad Fam.} 10.13.2.3-4: \textit{ego quamquam ex tuis litteris quas mihi misisti perspexeram te magis iudicio bonorum quam insignibus gloriae delectari, tamen considerandum nobis existimavi, etiam si tu nihil postulares, quantum tibi a re publica deberetur.}

“Although I perceived from your letters that you sent me that you desired the judgment of good men more than the trappings of glory, nevertheless I decided we had to consider how much was owed to you by the Republic, even if you asked for nothing.”
crafty rogue; Cicero states that it now fell to Plancus who had the necessary moral authority and resources to complete the task begun and to finish off Antony. Cicero draws a telling comparison when he asserts that it was the crafty Ulysses not Achilles or Ajax who took Troy. And so Plancus, for his earlier moral failings, is suited to the Republican agenda as long as he adheres to the Republican sense of *pietas*.

The reply from Plancus informs Cicero that he has been in contact with Lepidus. It urges him to set-aside enmities and to join in aiding the Republic. According to the intermediary M. Iuventius Laterensis, Lepidus was willing to join Plancus despite their previous inimical relationship. The letter is not without its portents of a gathering storm. This comes in the form of Plancus’ mention of the unstable nature of his forces. Plancus tells of his quick actions to join Lepidus and, it is to be hoped, *corrige et coercere* the part of Lepidus’ army that was seditious. More specifically, this element is said to be *corrupta et ab republica alienata*. What we are presented with here is the soldiers once again determining the course of events upon their own understanding of *pietas*. This understanding rests on their own perception of that which was obligated to them, rather than on notions of acting according to that which was obligated to the oligarchic networks and the Republic. These were the entities that Cicero championed and to which he aimed to have Plancus adhere. This ‘seditious element’, as Cicero terms it, was invested with an agenda driven by the demands they placed upon their leaders to

---

382 *ad Fam.* 10.13.2.7-8.

383 *ad Fam.* 10.15. Cf. *App. BC* 3.12.83 ff.; *Dio* 46.50 ff..

384 “correct...and coerce.”

385 *ad Fam.* 10.15.3.3-4.
repay them for their service. Furthermore, the connected consideration of *pietas* to Caesar’s memory held their loyalty. This represents a truer depiction of the function of the emerging “horizontal” *pietas* than what we saw in the earlier posturing of Cicero and Plancus.

Plancus’ next letter (10.21) informs Cicero of mounting troubles coming from Lepidus. Laterensis the go-between for Lepidus and Cicero had informed Plancus of serious doubts as to the *fides* of Lepidus’ army and even of the man himself. Plancus gives the impression Lepidus was unwilling or unable to contend with the restless elements of his army. Plancus represents this as a de facto alliance between Lepidus and Antony brokered by the army. Plancus says that it would be madness to oppose two combined armies with his own as well as to gamble the Republic in the engagement. Despite this, Plancus pledges to retain his province and to fight if it should be necessary. He requests an army be sent across the Alps to bolster his own forces. In so doing, Plancus hints at his own army’s capacity for restlessness should their enemies continue to cooperate:

*qua re hortor te, mi Cicero, exercitum hoc traiiciendum quam primum cures et matures, prius quam hostes magis corroborentur et nostri perturbentur*.

---

386 *ad Fam.* 10.21.5.

387 *ad Fam.* 10.21.6.5: *nec depugnare, si occasio tulerit, nec obsideri, si necesse fuerit, nec mori, si casus inciderit, pro vobis paratior fuit quisquam.*

“Not anyone was ever more prepared to fight, if the occasion should arise, nor to resist, if it was necessary, nor to die, if it should go that way.”

388 *ad Fam.* 10.21.6.8-9: “To which end I urge you, dear Cicero, that you see to it that you send over an army as soon as possible, before the enemy becomes more organized and our people become restless.”
The tacit knowledge that the Republicans had no available response to the armies inclined as they were towards securing their own agenda and profiting in the process was apparent. Republican *pietas* held little attraction for these troops. Cicero had played his hand, using the tools available to him to leverage the necessary actions from those on whom he could call debts of obligation. He had little or no influence beyond this. He could not use these same tools on the Caesarians who hewed to an alternative factional ethic based on their own concept of the rights and responsibilities of *pietas* within the framework of the Caesarian party. The forceful marginalization of Antony and the prospect of the destruction of the Caesarians’ great general had pushed the faction together. The army of Lepidus saw more commonality with Antony and the potential *beneficia* from the faction than with Cicero and the Senate, and so the factions joined and put forth their own ethical set parallel to Republican *pietas*.

10.22 contains an instance of a failure by Cicero to secure honours and legislative aid for Plancus and the frustrated expectations of reciprocity associated with the discourse of *pietas* undertaken by the men. This is indicative of the degradation of the oligarchic network’s strengths and their ability to reciprocate the *fides* Plancus was asked to display. Or, at the very least, it may have displayed their unwillingness to do so. This letter pertains to the allotment of land for Plancus’ troops. Cicero informs Plancus that a motion favourable to him never was presented in the Senate because of lengthy debate. Cicero lays the blame with another, possibly Servilius Isauricus, who

---

389 cf. *ad Fam.* 10.2; 10.12; 10.22.

390 *ad Fam.* 10.22.2.1. Shackleton-Bailey 1977, 565: “Plancus, like D. Brutus (cf. 11.20.1.1), will have wanted personal control over the assignment of land to his troops.”
had interposed a veto by way of P. Titius.\textsuperscript{391} The movement away from legitimate consular armies directed by the \textit{auctoritas} of the Senate and towards generals whose authority rested upon appeasing their troops necessitated incentives for them.\textsuperscript{392} The land issue was one of retaining control of the troops by countering the promises and inducements of the other side, the results of which had recently been seen in the détente between Antony and Lepidus’ troops. The Senate seems likely to have considered Plancus’ loyalty, despite his pronouncements, questionable and the Republic could ill-afford to lose control of his armies if he should develop into an independent player. From Plancus’ point of view it must have seemed a double affront.

Firstly, there was the issue of maintaining his army’s loyalty; he had complained that his troops were being seduced by the prospect of enrichment by Antony and part of Lepidus’ army, and he received no means to counter this from the Senate. Without preferential treatment in settling lands, Plancus had to rely on goodwill and loyalty to the Republic so as to convince his troops to follow him. These, despite Cicero’s assurances otherwise,\textsuperscript{393} were not proving strong incentives for the troops. The armies had appraised their power and were directing events on considerations of reciprocal conduct. Cicero and the vestiges of the Republic could offer the currency of honours and claims of moral adroitness; however, these things demanded a debt of gratitude and subsequent action that the soldiery now felt no compulsion to undertake.

\textsuperscript{391}\textit{ad Fam.} 10.12.4.1. Shackleton-Bailey 1977, 565: “(Isauricus was) always a stumbling-block where Plancus’ interests were concerned.

\textsuperscript{392} Brunt 1971, 59 for the early precedents in Roman colonial expansion over a century and a half and its effect on this issue.

\textsuperscript{393}\textit{ad Fam.} 10.12.4.8.
Secondly, despite his reputation, Plancus had shown no signs of faltering. It could then be seen as a lack of confidence in Plancus’ judgment on the part of Cicero. Although Cicero claimed the Senate and People were of one mind, Plancus knew he was not getting his due. In the reciprocal culture of benefaction prompting gratitude which in turn prompted loyalty, Plancus found himself pushed away from Cicero’s conception of the state and drawn towards the tangible benefits that came with joining with the Caesarians. In this way, Caesarian *pietas* and its benefits had shown itself a more potent incentive than Republican ideals, the Senate’s agenda, and largely irrelevant claims to embody *pietas* at is best.

The final surviving letter we have between the two men (10.24) displays Plancus’ ability to profess the language of Republican *pietas* at the same time as being on the verge of coming to an accommodation with Antony and Lepidus via the mediation of G. Asinius Pollio.\(^{394}\) Having joined with D. Brutus beforehand, Plancus’ defection left D. Brutus abandoned in Gaul and surrounded by hostile forces with a newly invigorated Antonian army. The enemy was augmented by the legions of Antony’s ally, Ventidius, who was menacing in the vicinity. Plancus’ actions sealed Brutus’ fate, the Caesarians would begin with him to avenge Caesar. While being instrumental in the collapse of

---

\(^{394}\) App. 3.97; Cass. Dio 46.53. Gowing 1992, 132, “Once he had won over Pollio and Plancus – a process facilitated by Lepidus’ defection – Antony would have a combined force of twenty legions (Brunt 1971, 484; *ad Fam.* 10.32.4; Vell. Pat. 2.63.3; App. *BC* 3.97; Cass. Dio 46.53.2.).
Republican armed influence on the Italian peninsula by means of his forthcoming
defection, Plancus places the blame for recent events at the feet of Octavian.\textsuperscript{395}

Plancus and Octavian present something of a parallel in their mutual abandonment
of D. Brutus. It is not surprising that the treachery of Plancus became a platitude of later
histories, and Octavian did so much to depict his own part in these events spurred as
they were by the extraordinary ingratitude of the Republicans. Clearly a number of
motivating factors caused Plancus to act as he did. His motives matter only in so far as
they display a changed understanding of \textit{pietas}. Caesar had previously shown the lower
classes that there was profit in embracing the “right side” of a civil-conflict and now the
people and the troops, rallying under \textit{pietas} to Caesar’s memory, were serving as the
basis of the Caesarians’ power. The call to punish Caesar’s assassins still provided a
potent pretext on which the symbolic power of \textit{pietas} rested.\textsuperscript{396} In order for this mindset
to prevail, the discourse had to be reflective of considerations of gratitude and
reciprocation within the faction. The Caesarians understood this, as the historical
narratives pick up on this point and repeatedly frame the issues in such terms.

On the 29th of May 43, Cicero writes to Plancus concerning a letter Cicero had
received from D. Brutus, dated from the Ides of that month. Brutus’ missive informed

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{395} Lintott, 418, “If only they could be joined by veteran soldiers from Africa or by Octavianus’ army, they
could happily join battle. Octavianus had been deaf to his requests. Like Cicero he had tried to show
goodwill to the young man. However, and he was writing more with regret than hostility, the fact that
Antonius was still alive, that Lepidus was with him, that they had far from contemptible forces, hope, and
courage, those two could regard as a debt they owed to Octavianus. With his help the armies of Plancus
and D. Brutus could have finished the war. He could not understand what had made Octavianus change
his mind and seek a two-month consulship through demands backed by terror.”

\item \textsuperscript{396} Ovid’s \textit{Fasti} 5.59-69 speaks of Octavian ‘\textit{pia arma}’ which are used to prosecute the vendetta against
the conspirators in his description of the monument to filial \textit{pietas} and its component of redress, the
temple of Mars \textit{Ultor}. Newlands, 66-7 on the poetic tradition surrounding \textit{pietas} and Augustus’ filial duty to
Caesar.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Cicero that Plancus had written notifying him that Lepidus was barring Antony’s entry into Gallia Narbonensis. Cicero scolds Plancus for being evasive and possibly duplicitous in this as he had not kept Cicero apprised of the situation. Cicero hints at distrust for Plancus, an action that betrays an unease in the relationship between the two despite earlier professions between them of a relationship bound by important Republican aspects of pietas. Citing a previous letter from Plancus which professed Lepidus’ goodwill and which turned out to be ill-founded, Cicero wonders about the reliability of the most recent assurance regarding Lepidus.397 Cicero comes very close to accusing Plancus of duplicitousness (a lack of fides) when he states that it was very difficult to believe such a clever person could be tricked twice on the same matter:

\[
\text{verum ut errare, mi Plance, potuisti (quis enim id effugerit?), sic decipi te non potuisse quis non videt? nunc vero etiam [iam] erroris causa sublata est; culpa enim illa 'bis ad eundem' vulgari reprehensa proverbio est.}^{398}
\]

Despite these misgivings, Cicero professes the hope that Plancus will be the man to finish the war.399 Plancus is reminded at this point of Cicero’s studia...erga te which are reciprocated aspects of the gratitude that ensure the fruits of these studia will be maiora et graviora:

---

397 *ad Fam.* 10.15.

398 *ad Fam.* 10.20.2.5: “Indeed, dear Plancus, you were able to err (for who could avoid that?), but who did not see that you could not be deceived? Now even the reason for a mistake is gone; for there is the common proverb that blames the one fooled twice.” Shackleton Bailey, 550: “cf. ‘once bitten, twice shy.’ ‘A burnt child fears the fire.”

399 *ad Fam.* 10.20.3.1: *qui reliquias huius belli oppresserit, eum totius belli confectorem fore.* “who suppresses the remnants of this battle, he will be the victor of the entire war.” *Cf.* 10.13; 10.18.
What we can ascertain in all this is that Cicero’s resort to the language of filial obligation and reciprocated political favours is reflective of what many were asked at the time: support the traditional, oligarchic networks in exchange for the currency of the Republic. This currency was *gloria*, *dignitas*, and *virtus* among the good men of the Republic and the influence that could stem from these values.

Both the Caesarians and the Republicans put forth the language of *pietas* to a higher entity, but with one key difference: whereas the Republicans under Cicero sought to use such language as leverage to ensure compliance based on ethical obligations to uphold the Republic, the Caesarians employed similar ethical standards of duty and loyalty but applied them to their own faction. They derived a perceived legitimacy from Caesar’s divine memory and their duty to it in light of their indebtedness in the face of his *beneficia*. The Republicans focused on utilizing the language of *pietas* owed to the State and the oligarchic networks represented by it in an attempt to return to the former Republic. The State, however, was in flux, while the Caesarians were also presenting tangible incentives based on the language of *pietas*. Caesar had previously

---

400 *ad Fam. 10.20.3.3*: “That you appreciate my efforts on your behalf, which certainly could not have been any greater, as much as I thought you would I scarcely wonder at and about which I am very pleased. Which things indeed, if this goes the right way you will find greater and more weighty.”

401 After 42 BC the legitimacy became enshrined with Caesar’s official deification. Ramage, 236 “the Romans were deluged with propaganda reminding them that he had been made a god. This served a number of important purposes. It was certainly a show of *pietas* on Octavian’s part towards his adoptive father. Moreover, it related Octavian to deity and so gave him a power base as he rose to dominate the state.”
displayed to the supporting classes there was profit in loyalty to the faction. Now the people and the troops, rallying under pietas to Caesar’s memory, were serving as the basis of the Caesarians’ power in the same hope of reciprocated beneficia. The call to punish Caesar’s assassins still provided a potent pretext on which the symbolic power of pietas rested and which outstripped Cicero and the Republicans’ call to their own conceptualization of pietas.

The exchanges between Cicero and Plancus display a tension between the idealistic and pragmatic modes of pietas. Incentives were offered to Plancus on behalf of the Republic through the paternal figure of Cicero, who represented the “good men” (Boni) of the state. Plancus, for his part, represents the shifting loyalties and opportunism at the end of the Republic and the rise of a pragmatic pietas.

Cicero argues that Plancus owes a debt of loyalty to the state and is obligated to use his resources towards its maintenance. These demands set up a conflict between an idealistic pietas and the pragmatic one. The correspondence between the two men functions within the language of familial connection. Pietas and obligation owed to Cicero via his connection to Plancus’ family are to be extended towards the State. Idealism, however, is overwhelmed by considerations of tangible rewards for loyalty and an emerging pragmatic, “horizontal” pietas. In the idealistic conception of pietas, Plancus’ fides would be reciprocated by the beneficia, studium and mutual obligations shared with the influential men of the Republic. Cicero attempted to compel Plancus to adhere to this conception of pietas based on his officia and on the promise of reciprocated beneficia.
These concerns then establish the dynamic of the relationship Cicero seeks to foster between Plancus and the Republic. *Fides* from Plancus was to be reciprocated with *consilium, studium, officium, opera, labor,* and *diligentia* from Cicero and his Republican associates. The relationship is marked by a familial affection, but one which is linked to Cicero’s “best state of the Republic.” Cicero’s *paternal* affection and the connected obligation was promised to bring advancement and benefits to Plancus for his reciprocated dutiful obligation to the Republic. The affection is deemed *mutuus,* again pointing to the reciprocal nature of the relationship. In response to these inducements Plancus offers a *declaratio of fides* to the Republic in which Cicero reciprocates with the promise of glory and renown. This idealistic conception of Republican *pietas* espoused by Cicero attempts to maintain a vertical hierarchy by emphasizing the concepts of familial affection and filial obedience centred in Plancus, related to the paternal figure of Cicero and the overarching entity of the state.

The usage of paternal language and the term *pater* by Cicero signifies the attempts at this characterization. This language is then used on behalf of the state via the language of a reciprocal, dutiful relationship with familial undertones. In the end, Plancus was offered a decision between the *impius* element present in the late Republic or a *pius* expression of *fides* to the state. Plancus’ was faced with the decision whether to show loyalty to a failing political and system and its oligarchical networks or to find tangible *beneficia* in the emerging power structure. This then gives rise to the notions of “horizontal” *pietas* between soldiers and commanders and its conflict with “vertical” expressions of *pietas* with a focus on gods, republic and family. The benefit of the latter system was reciprocated *gratiam* in return for *fides.* This *gratiam* offered the promise
that influential men would be obligated, in a reciprocated spirit of *pietas*, to Plancus. All these incentives and liabilities are framed within Cicero’s paternalistic language towards Plancus.

The Republicans, however, failed to reciprocate Plancus’ declared *fides* as his requests that the influential men of the state bring legislation to pass to his benefit went unfulfilled. The failure to secure land to settle Plancus’ troops showed that an adherence to Republican *pietas*, while offering honours and moral standing, could not provide the tangible benefits that the Caesarians put forth. In the end, Plancus chose the tangible *beneficia* promised by the Caesarians over the idealistic inducements of Cicero and the Republicans.

**Antonian Obligations to the State and the People**

With the loss of Cicero as a historical source, we must turn to the Greek historical narratives available. There are certain difficulties evident in relying on documents far-removed in time and also written in the Greek language, such as those of Appian and Cassius Dio. However, as we shall see from my examination, the Greeks used parallel terms or equivalents in the descriptions of the ethical set of values associated with *pietas*. Such Greek terms display their profound importance connected to *pietas* within the available narrative surrounding the shift of the Roman state to monarchy.

The mutual responsibilities between clients and patrons have been noted and bear important significance to the actions taken by Antony. His response to the Republicans’ actions surrounding Mutina has him turning to the people to whom he, as
one of the likely inheritors of the leadership of the populares, considered himself to be obligated. These same people were the beneficiaries of this Antonian *pietas*, that bound them to their leadership. This period of transition and shifting perceptions of what constituted the State caused earlier Republican *pietas* to give way to a pragmatic one contingent upon the mutual risks and benefits shared within the faction.

Previously, Cicero and the Republicans based their own justifications for action on an understanding of traditional government, based on the demands of obligation represented by *pietas* within the oligarchic family networks. This one side resorted to invocations of an ethically justified rationale for extra-constitutional actions to once again “lay the foundations of the Republic,”⁴⁰² whereas the other held up the People’s obligation to the deified Caesar’s memory and *beneficia* as a rallying standard in their drive to *restore* this same Republic.⁴⁰³ Examples of the ambiguity surrounding the legitimacy of expressions of *pietas* within the state included the Republicans’ earlier endorsement of Octavian’s raising of a private army and the approbation of the actions of the (4th and Martian) legions that deserted their consul, Antony, in the field. On the other side stood the Caesarians who, fearing destruction at the hands of the Republicans, promulgated an alternative *pietas* based within the faction. The Caesarian party’s *pietas* to the higher entity, represented by their benefactor Caesar had, in its drive to avenge him, brought the Republic to its knees. I have shown the authority which countenanced these actions to be located in the trappings of *pietas* and in the

---


⁴⁰³ *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 1.9: *Populus...et trium virum rei publicae constituendae creavit.*
“the people made me a triumvir to reestablish the Republic.”
associated language surrounding gratitude and obligation. This language of *pietas*, obligation and gratitude is, therefore, pervasive in depicting the Roman State as moulded by competing notions of *pietas*.

Below is a concordance of Greek terms related to *pietas* found in Appian’s and Cassius Dio’s narratives and their Latin equivalents. These terms are integral part of the characterization of the moral climate represented by these narratives. The expectation is that the table of possible ‘translations’ of crucial Latin terms will help our understanding of the Greek texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εὐσέβεια, ἡ</td>
<td><em>pietas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀχαριστία, ἡ</td>
<td><em>ingratia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις, ἡ</td>
<td><em>gratia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπικουρία, ἡ</td>
<td><em>beneficium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐεργέτης, ὁ</td>
<td><em>benefactor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαριστήριον ἔχοντες ἀποδοῦναι</td>
<td><em>referre gratiam</em> (to repay the debt of gratitude)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ‘Anti-Philippics’

Antony’s faction and adherents voiced their own particular message within the language of indebtedness and obligation as they fought against the deliberations in the Senate to brand them as *hostes*. This reaction to Cicero’s charges and exhortations during the deliberations against Antony comes with its own articulation of the rights and responsibilities of the Antonian supporters. Such aspects are presented by the leadership of the Antonians as a function of the mutual obligation shared in the conception of *pietas* fostered within the faction. Actions that were perfectly justifiable by measures of orthodox Roman social behaviour but which nevertheless harmed the Republic were perpetrated by Republican and Caesarian alike. Antony had seized Gaul by the assent of the People. With this *beneficium* in hand Antony seemed poised to reenact Caesar’s crossing of the Rubicon with a great army and to bring harm to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πίστις, ἡ/πιστόω</td>
<td>fides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλανθρωπία, ἡ</td>
<td>humanitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποδίδωμι ἀθρόως</td>
<td>referre abundanter (reciprocate abundantly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀτιμάζω/ἀτιμία,</td>
<td>no Latin equivalent (diminishment of dignitas?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State. We may, however, see that in so doing Antony was maintaining both his duty to those who supported him and to the deified Caesar who stood as the higher entity to which the Caesarians had applied notions of *pietas*. Conversely, Cicero himself exacerbated this drift away from constitutional government when he urged figures such as M. Brutus and L. Munatius Plancus to act on their own accord and ignore a Senate paralyzed by fear and subversive members.\(^{404}\) Calls for actions like these moved the decision-making mechanisms further away from the traditional Republican entities and more towards alternative expressions of *pietas*.

The movement away from the legislative mechanisms of the Republic resulted in the need for a readily communicable ethical set of values represented as rationale and justification for actions within the one overarching term of *pietas*. Examples of this usage may be found in the examples of: the Pompeians at the battle of Munda, who had previously used *pietas* as their watchword. It was here that Antony’s brother L. Antonius who took the *cognomen* of *Pietas* to signify his *fides* to the cause. Sextus Pompeius also took up the *cognomen* *Pius* to characterize his actions as invested with the legitimacy of the term. Such was justified by his filial obligation to his father’s memory. And, finally, Octavian, who had also done much to foster a sense of his actions motivated by *pietas* towards his adoptive father, Caesar, as he rose to supreme power in the Roman State. And so, complaints emanate from all sides that the actions of the other have necessitated a reaction demanded by *pietas*, or they point to an adversary

\(^{404}\) Dio 45.42.4.2: ἐπαινέσαντες σφας ἐφ’ οἷς ἰδιογνωμονήσαντες ἐποίησαν. “approving what they have done on their own initiative.”
acting with *impietas*. Nowhere was this more apparent than in Cicero’s zeal to show Antony to be *impius* in his speeches against him.\(^{405}\)

The Antonian response to Cicero’s attacks use the language of *pietas* to recast events in a light much more favourable to their cause. By tying the actions of Antony after the Ides and his actions in Gaul with considerations of duty and obligation, predominantly to the People, Antony reveals a descending aspect of *pietas* between leader and followers.\(^{406}\) The Antonians embraced the usage of such language, just as the Republicans had in the struggle to convey the image of moral authority. The manner employed by all parties to re-cast the pragmatic actions necessary for victory in such struggles was to portray them as dictated by long-held Roman societal traditions. Moral ambiguity, however, was prevalent. At the time, Cicero was trying to brand Antony, a consular who held a popular pro-consular command in Gaul, as *hostis* without trial or representation. At the time, Antony was operating an army in close proximity to Rome that threatened to take the city by force. Both were adhering to loose interpretations of the legalities put forth for their actions. With no extant memoirs from Antony and only a smattering of fragments of his speeches to inform us of the prevailing understanding surrounding his camp, Appian’s speech attributed to Antony’s representative Piso will be discussed as vitally important to this aspect of the ethical climate within the political faction. This climate was based on considerations of the obligation to repay a debt the leadership of a popular party had incurred; it was understood as a function of *pietas*.

\(^{405}\) *Philippicae* 3.36.6; 4.2.4; 4.9.11; 8.16.2; 11.37.14; 12.15.2; 12.18.2; 14.15.2; 14.32.6.

\(^{406}\) May, 152 n.72 on the Ciceronian use of dehumanizing elements against the Antonians.

\(^{406}\) Above 8 n.6 Traina’s “bipolarità” of *pietas*. 
The speech in question and its arguments presented by the Antonians’ representative in the Senate reflect contemporary justifications used with relation to the People, and emphasizes popular issues that distinguished Antony’s actions from those of the Republicans.
Piso and Antony’s Defense

Caesar’s father-in-law, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, provides a defense of Antony’s actions and an articulation of his relationship to the supporting classes and its relation to their mutual obligation. This defense is a function of *pietas*, expressed between *amici* much as Cicero had shown towards Milo and others. In the previous civil war Piso had remained neutral, although he had opposed Antony in the Senate in August of 44. In the coming conflict, Piso strove for peace. The effective ability to mediate, however, at this time was illusory given the culture of inter-personal indebtedness and conflicting expressions of *pietas* that gave rise to the consequent enmities arising in reaction to those attendant demands. The Republican *pietas*, underpinned by the gods and the family networks was in conflict with Caesarian *pietas* with its focus on factional ethics and inter-personal obligations. Piso was an example of this culture – he had refused to support Caesar in the Clodius affair and, after being given Macedonia by a law of Clodius, was attacked by Cicero in his *de Provinciis Consulibus* and *in Pisonem*. Having been both prosecuted by the Republicans and having benefitted from the *populares*, we cannot go so far as to consider Piso a detached observer, but we may consider him a moderate inclined towards the Caesarians. His obligations, therefore, were expressed towards them and it is for this reason that Piso takes up Antony’s defense in the Senate. In this defense I will demonstrate that the language of *pietas* is pervasive.

---

407 Cic. *ad Att.* 16.7.5.7; *ad Fam.* 12.2.1; *Phil.* 1.4.10.
Piso’s defense in Appian first delves into the contentious issue of the command of Gaul which Antony had assumed. He states that the province was given to Antony by a plebiscite. He adds that there were precedents for such grants of governorships.\textsuperscript{408} This draws a parallel between Antony and Caesar, as it seeks to impress upon them the ramifications of the earlier push to declare Caesar \textit{hostis}. Piso then states that it was a provision of the plebiscite to grant the province to Antony that he had the right to declare war on D. Brutus if he should be obstructed by him in his passage to Gaul. For this reason, Piso declares that it is D. Brutus who is acting in contravention of the law as well as against the dictates of \textit{pietas} to the People:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{μέρος \textit{δ} \textit{εστὶ τοῦ νόμου τὸν Αντώνιον, τὴν δεδομένην \textit{οἱ μετιόντα, Δέκμῳ μὴ παραχωροῦντι πολεμεῖν καὶ τὸν στρατὸν ἀντὶ Θρᾷκων}.\textsuperscript{409}}
\end{verbatim}

The responsibilities inherent in \textit{pietas} require the Senate to respect their obligations to the People who were moved by a spirit of \textit{pietas} in granting Gaul to Antony. And, so, Piso argues that it was their will that gave assent to Antony’s actions; it was the Senate that had transgressed by ignoring them in their desire to strengthen the assassins.

Piso frames this argument with the overriding concern being the will of the People in such deliberations, stating it is bad stewardship for the Senate to be at variance with the People, particularly in times of unrest. In fact, it is a dereliction of its obligations to them and a refutation of popular expectations of \textit{pietas}. He goes on to

\textsuperscript{408} Namely, Caesar assuming Gaul by popular vote.

\textsuperscript{409} App. \textit{BC} 3.8.55.6-9: “It was a part of this law that, when Antony should arrive at the province given to him, if Decimus would not yield it Antony should declare war and lead the army into the Gallic province against him, instead of using it against the Thracians.”
declare that the decision on matters of whom were to be named Rome’s public enemies traditionally had belonged to the People, who were the sole arbiters of peace and war. By these traditional precedents, the nobility must act according to their obligation to the People and to the dictates of the pietas owed to this entity. Moreover the province was entrusted (ἀπιστεῖν) to Antony on account of D. Brutus’ involvement in Caesar’s murder (ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ) by these same People who sought to right a situation incongruous with Roman expectations of pietas. And, so, the province was judged by the People to not belong to D. Brutus legitimately because of his ingratitude and impietas towards Caesar. Conversely, the province was entrusted to Antony by the People as a reciprocation of his fides to Caesar’s memory. The final ominous statement of this argument in Antony’s defense reminds the Senate of the People’s potential anger towards them, ‘when they have found a leader’ should they be ignored in their desire to see pietas expressed according to their understanding of it:

μόνος γὰρ ἐκ τῶν πάλαι νόμων ὁ δήμος αὐτοκράτωρ εἰρήνης πέρι καὶ πολέμου
σκοπεῖν. Ὡν μηδὲν ὁ δήμος ἔπιστήσειε μηδὲ ἐπιμηνίσειεν ἡμῖν, προστάτου
λαβόμενος.\(^{411}\)

The ancient laws remind the Senate they are obligated to the People in terms of their power within the state. Pietas should be the guarantor that those representative of the state power-structure will observe their obligations to the People. This would be the case if the Senate were to act according to orthodox societal expectations.

\(^{410}\) Magnino 1984, 168 refers to the public’s take on events: “An allusion to the popular reaction during Caesar’s funeral and afterwards, the effect of which caused many of the assassins to flee the city.”

\(^{411}\) App. BC 3.8.55.21-4: “According to the ancient laws the people are the sole arbiters of peace and war. May they not be reminded of this, and consequently be angry with us when they have found a leader.”
At this point, the defense takes a turn to an emotional appeal on behalf of the *populus* for whom a special place is reserved in this narrative. The People, it may be surmised, stand to suffer most from the disturbances at Rome. For their sake, Piso urges Antony be given Gaul, D. Brutus go to Macedonia and that legions be stationed at Rome from all parties to ensure peaceful legislation.\(^{412}\) Piso urges the ‘moderates,’ those without envy and contentiousness as their guiding principles,\(^{413}\) not to be drawn into factional strife because of others’ personal enmities. They are to allow these proposals to pass.\(^{414}\) In urging the house not to become submerged in factional politics, Piso calls to mind Marcius Coriolanus. In this legendary example, Piso seeks to convince the Senate to avoid impulsive and reckless judgments in its deliberations over Antony.\(^{415}\) A parallel is drawn between this fable and Caesar and, potentially, if the Senate should decree it so, with Antony who it is inferred stood ready to march on Rome. This warning is again framed within considerations of the People’s part in these affairs. The δῆμος are depicted as Antony’s great supporting class in this debate; they are owed their due. It is they who granted him Gaul and it was they who were hostile to the assassin Decimus, whom they expelled from the city in an expression of their *pietas* to their benefactor. Thus, the People’s perception of their duties to Caesar and the

\(^{412}\) App. BC 3.60.2: χάριν τοῦ δῆμου.
"for the sake of the people."

\(^{413}\) App. BC 3.8.60.1: Καὶ τάδε μὲν εἴρηται τοῖς ἄνευ φθόνου καὶ φιλονικίας ἀκρωμένοις.
"I have addressed these words to men who listen to me without malice or the spirit of contention."

\(^{414}\) App. BC 3.8.60.3: δι’ οἰκείαν ἔχθραν.
"on account of private enmity."

\(^{415}\) Plutarch *Comparatio Alcibiadis et Marcii Coriolani*, Livy 2.34-40: Marcius was first hailed as Coriolanus for his capture of Corioli from the Volscii in 493 BC He was later exiled on the grounds that he was acting tyrannically. Coriolanus responded by leading the Volscian army only to be turned away by the entreaties of his mother and wife whose presence reminded him of his obligations to family and state.
Caesarians after him must be factored in to the understanding of *pietas* which, Piso argues, is ignored by those who held power at their own peril.

Piso argues this obligation to the deified Caesar prompted the plebiscite in which the People granted Antony the powers now in question. It was the People who held the prerogative in such cases and the Senate would incur their displeasure if it acted against their will. And so we see the obligations to which those in power were held with regard to the populace. Connected to the People’s expectations is the enmity which they displayed towards D. Brutus stemming from love of Caesar, their benefactor:

\[ τῷ δήμῳ μάλιστα ύπεραρέσκοντο.\]

Caesar’s actions exceeded the demands of the relationship, as the term *ὑπεραρέσκοντος* denotes. What is described is a reciprocal relationship marked by an exchange of commodities and one in which the patron is beneficent in excess of his obligations. The commodities exchanged are *beneficia* (\(τὰ \varepsilon\υεργή\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\))\[417\], *officia* (\(τὰ \kappaα\θή\kappaο\nu\tauα\)) and *fides* (\(\iota \ πίστις\)), the core as it were of *pietas*. The connectedness of these commodities continues in the popular memory. Piso reminds the Senate that Antony has no small share in this good will. It is for *χάριν τοῦ δήμου* that Piso urges Antony should receive Gaul\[418\] It would be an insult to the People to nullify the plebiscite and declare Antony *hostis*. All these considerations are raised in the interest of good governance, as Piso states it is not a sign of effective leadership to be at variance with

\[^416\] App. *BC* 3.8.57.27: “most deserving of gratitude from the people.”

\[^417\] The actions of a *εὐεργέτης*.

\[^418\] App. *BC* 3.60.2: “For the sake of the People.”
the People, especially in times of unrest. Nor is it salutary to forget that they are the arbiters of friends and foes alike:

οὐ γὰρ εὖ βουλευομένων ἐστὶ διαστασίαζεσθαι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἐν καιροῖς μάλιστα ἐπικινδύνοις οὐδὲ ἀμνημονεῖν, ὅτι καὶ τόδε αὐτὸ τοῦ δήμου πρότερον ἦν, τὸ κρίνειν τὰ φίλια καὶ πολέμια.⁴¹⁹

Thus, we have seen the appropriation of notions of responsibility and gratitude and their bearing, as expressed by the Antonian wing of the Caesarian party. The supporting classes were represented as a matter of responsibility for Antony and issues of concern to them are articulated in the Senate by his confederates. These actions were contingent upon notions of principles closely related to pietas. The relationship of benefaction under Caesar and the connected responsibility to the People to which the inheritors of Caesar’s legacy were indebted are shown as central issues for the parties in these events.

After Piso’s defense of Antony’s interests, Appian tells us that Antony’s written response voiced angered astonishment at the Senate’s actions. Cicero bore particular reproach from him for having his life spared by Caesar, only to later embrace the dictator’s assassins.⁴²⁰ The inference of an impius act is made. Antony presents Cicero’s attitude towards D. Brutus as evidence of the rhetorician’s distorted understanding of loyalties: When D. Brutus was a friend of Caesar’s, Cicero despised...

---

⁴¹⁹ App. BC 3.8.55.17-21: “It is not the part of good counsellors to be at variance with the People, especially in times of danger, or to forget that this very power of deciding who are friends and who are enemies formerly belonged to the people.”

⁴²⁰ For the existence of this letter Philippicae 8.28.
him, yet now that Decimus was one of Caesar’s murderers, Cicero embraced him.\textsuperscript{421}

Finally, Antony frames the situation in terms of his adversaries’ failure to reciprocate his good deeds towards them, he had brokered an amnesty that had saved the lives of the assassins, but at the expense of much political capital for himself. This service to the assassins in the name of protection of the structure of the State had been repaid by the very beneficiaries of his efforts with the title of \textit{hostis}. This again displayed the Antonian depiction of the Republicans’ actions as in opposition to the dictates of \textit{pietas}.

Antony’s supplementary written response advised that the People had granted him Gaul and that he would prosecute D. Brutus for not acquiescing to that law. Furthermore, Antony would now punish Decimus as one of Caesar’s murderers, in order to purify the Senate of this “pollution.”\textsuperscript{422} This language is also reflective of the desire to counter the charges of \textit{impietas} against Antony, that now intensified in Cicero’s invectives against him. The attacks ascribed the same quality to his adversary. Despite the efforts of those who defended him in the Senate, Antony was formally declared \textit{hostis}. Additionally, all those who continued to follow him were branded public enemies as well. By this judgment, the consequences for the supporting classes, both positive and negative, that arose from adherence to \textit{pietas} are displayed.

\textsuperscript{421} App. \textit{BC} 3.8.62.

\textsuperscript{422} App. \textit{BC} 3.8.63.7-8: \textit{iēna kai ἡ βουλὴ καθαρεύσῃ ποτέ τοῦ μύσους.} “in order that the Senate, may at last be purged of such pollution.”
Octavian and the Senate’s ‘Ingratitude’

Notions of ingratitude and a lack of reciprocity on the part of the Republicans provided Octavian the justification for his actions after Mutina. The resort to depicting the actions of his enemies in terms of these social considerations continues the usage of the language of *pietas*. The appropriation of this language effected a turn to one’s supporters, who were to be convinced of the consequences of this ingratitude. This intensified factional strife and provided both the initial pretext as well as the continuing rationale for the defense of the rights of the faction. This defense is depicted as a necessary function of orthodox social norms based on *pietas*. These norms demanded a specific response determined by the traditional understanding of the responsibilities inherent in Roman society, as predicated by notions of obligation and indebtedness. By adhering to this ethic the leaders of the various factions drew upon the indignation stemming from a perception of injustice to further alienate and marginalize the adversary. All these actions convey an implicit understanding that the faction acted only as customary within strictures of *pietas* that regarded *dignitas* and both familial and interpersonal obligation.

Having seen the Antonian wing of the Caesarian party resort to a polemical usage of the language of *pietas*, I now turn to the manner in which Octavian appropriated these issues and began to make them the defining characteristics of the Augustan age as well as a model to subsequent Emperors that would become the defining ideal of an entire society. The period immediately following Mutina provided the environment in which the recent differences between Antony and Octavian were set
aside when faced with the repercussions of the emboldened Republicans who sought to destroy them. The war at Mutina was prosecuted and Antony’s defeat on April 21, 43 BC prompted a number of decrees by the Senate that caused the alarmed Caesarians to shore-up their ranks in the face of potential destruction. Emboldened by their recent successes, the Senate displayed their desire to play one side of the Caesarian party against the other. Appian shows the Senate acting strategically to seize the opportunity, then capitalize on the aftermath of the conflict. The chief aim in this was to increase the power and resources of M. Brutus and Cassius in the East. Racked by division, the Cesarians seemed at a disadvantage in the face of the seemingly improving fortunes of the Republicans in the Senate. In this climate the Caesarians found reason to coalesce under pietas to the divine Caesar.

Circumstances demanded that Octavian and the other Caesarians present a readily identifiable raison d’être at this point, one appropriated the language of pietas and countering similar language from more established entities within the Republic. Whereas Octavian had previously accepted Antony’s amnesty to the tyrannicides on the grounds of humanity and pity, and the granting of Gaul to D. Brutus because of his concerns over Antony obtaining absolute power, he could not accept the latest actions of the Senate. These discounted the obligations the Senators had towards Octavian for bringing the issue to such a point of advantage for them. The decrees alarmed him

---

423 App. BC 3.9.64.4: εὐπρέπειαν ἐσχηκέναι φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἔλεον συγγενῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ ὀμοτίμων.

“He had considered the amnesty as an act of humanity and of pity for the relatives and companions of these men.”

424 Magnino 1984, 173: “The reflection attributed here to Octavian comes from a good source, possibly even his autobiography.”
because they represented a strengthening of the Republicans and a weakening of the Caesarians. Octavian considered it an insult that honours were voted only to his soldiers who had defected to him from Antony.\footnote{App. BC 3.9.64.25: \textit{άτιμοῦν=} indignity, with connotations of sacrilege.} On the eve of losing his soldiers to the Senate, that had decided his utility had passed, Octavian addressed his troops.\footnote{Bertrand, 182: “With the reunion of armies on April 27, the Senate wished to retain Octavian’s legions of veterans but he resisted (\textit{ad Fam.} 11.19; 11.14.2.).”} The words are those of obligation and gratitude. Remarkably, Octavian states he owes all he has to the army.\footnote{App. BC 3.9.65.3.} The Senate, he states, only gave him what they begrudgingly did because of the troops. For these reasons, Octavian owes his gratitude (\textit{τὴν χάριν}) to the soldiers and, should the gods grant them success, his gratitude would be abundantly reciprocated (\textit{ἀποδώσοντα ἀθρόως}).\footnote{App. BC 3.9.65.7} Significantly, the language is evocative of Octavian’s debt to his supporters – it was the troops who gave Octavian his command and, in turn, the Senate confirmed it under compulsion by them.\footnote{App. BC 3.9.65.4: \textit{καὶ γὰρ ἡ βουλὴ δι’ ὑμᾶς ἔδωκεν}. “for the Senate granted this because of you.”} Octavian represents himself as merely the figurehead of a sociopolitical entity bound by notions of mutual obligation. Most importantly, this entity had become conscious of its power and place in the impending reform of the Roman political landscape via the continuing development of an expression of \textit{pietas} that functioned mutually between commander and soldiers.

Dio also gives voice to this Augustan viewpoint in his comment on the Senate’s mindset regarding these issues. The Senate considered Octavian dispensable; in fact
they gave all the things for which Octavian ‘had hoped’ to D. Brutus. Dio presents the Senate, driven by ingratitude in the face of Octavian’s recent aid, as actively hostile. They had arranged affairs for all the enemies arrayed against him: Sextus Pompeius was given the fleet; M. Brutus Macedonia; Cassius received Syria and was conducting war against Dolabella. Despite the de facto command of Octavian’s forces passing to the consuls on the eve of Mutina, the Senate balked at taking the troops from him by open decree. The reason given for these troops to be absorbed by stealth turns upon the notion of the goodwill shared between commander and troops (διὰ τὸ εὔνους) and the Senate’s inability to diminish the gratitude and obligations shared between them.

**Octavian’s Consulship *Pietatis***

The period after the siege of Mutina had been lifted saw the Republicans benefit from the outcome and the Caesarians in an increasingly precarious position. This reversal caused Octavian to understand that he required the trappings of Republican power to retain a legitimate command over his legions. These troops were necessary to resist the Republicans and complete the work of *pietas* he vowed to prosecute. This push for the consulship was contemplated with the implicit knowledge that there would be no sympathy in the Senate for an extra-constitutional magistracy wielded by a parvenu. The Republicans, for their part, hoped to further capitalize on the victory

---

430 Dio 46.40.1. D. Brutus was granted a triumph, while Octavian was even denied an ovation. This must have delineated for Octavian the nature of the relationship the Senate was fostering with him.

431 Dio 46.40.2.5-4.1.

432 App. BC 3.9.65: the two crack legions that defected from Antony were taken by Hirtius.

433 Dio 46.40.4.3.
against Antony by seeking to commandeer Octavian’s forces. Such a strategy hinged upon D. Brutus and the Senate obtaining the 4th and Martian legions. They, however, failed to grasp that these troops were primarily motivated by *pietas* to Caesar’s name and the inherent benefits represented by it. The legions, heeding Octavian’s warnings about the enemy’s agenda of division and conquest, were unwilling to serve under one of Caesar’s assassins and refused to join D. Brutus.\(^{434}\) These legions that made Octavian a political force were bound by a pragmatic *pietas*. This superseded any calls from the Republicans for loyalty to the state.

Appian recounts that D. Brutus, subsequent to the deaths of the consuls Hirtius and Pansa, was afraid of Octavian. He sent word he had been misled by a δαιμόνιον and that he had been compelled by obligations towards others to murder Caesar. Despite this apology, Octavian was angered by Decimus’ overtures. In Octavian’s rejection, he gives an account of his actions up to this point, by stating he was not in Gaul to rescue Decimus and support the Republicans, but to fight Antony. This recalibration continues with the proclamation that his quarrel with Antony did not preclude, as would be θέμις, coming to terms with him in the future.\(^{435}\) With this statement, the aspect of justice entrenched within *pietas* is appropriated by Octavian.\(^{436}\) Furthermore, the *pietas* to Caesar that he embraced was not incongruous with a reconciliation of the disparate elements of the Caesarian party. The prospect of reconciliation with Antony is contrasted with any likelihood of a détente with D. Brutus: Octavian cannot speak to or

\(^{434}\) Cic. *ad Fam.* 11.19.1.

\(^{435}\) App. *BC* 3.10.73.14.

\(^{436}\) Above 49.
even see D. Brutus, as nature itself (ἡ φύσις) forbids it. In this we have the Caesarian manifesto, with pietas and its basis in natural law, as a core consideration. Whereas Octavian’s quarrel with Antony had been justified as a reaction to his effrontery, his enmity with D. Brutus and the Republicans was dictated by nature. This nature provided the basis of the obligations to his ‘father’ as represented by pietas.

In seeking to reinforce the troops’ fides in the face of the Senate’s overtures, Appian’s narrative shows Octavian fomenting anger against the Republicans. His words emphasize the ingratitude, ignored obligation and lack of reciprocal behaviour displayed by the Senate. These impius acts were perpetrated ungratefully in response to Octavian and his army’s service. He complained of the hubristic behaviour of the Senators towards him after he had put himself at the disposal of the Republic. He also mentions the insult towards the troops in not paying out the donatives promised to them. The Senate had ignored the debt they had incurred at the hands of the troops and ignored the gratitude they should have felt as a result of their aid at Mutina. This lack of responsibility effected a diminishment of their leader’s dignitas and ignored the soldiers’ expectations of reciprocal behaviour from the Senators. Octavian consequently advised his troops to send emissaries to the Senate, demanding the monetary incentives promised to the troops before Mutina.

The senators responded by sending their own embassy, specifically to the fourth and Martian legions, hoping to enlist them under the senatorial banner. In their

---

437 App. BC 3.10.73.15-6.
438 App. BC 3.12.86.1-5.
ingratitude, the Senate chose to address Octavian’s troops without him present. This pattern of ἀχαριστία was directed towards the individual who had previously granted important beneficia to them. The troops refused to even hear from the emissaries and sent them away. Octavian addressed these troops afterwards, raising two important points, the first being that the Senate had acted outrageously against them. This behaviour caused personal insult to Octavian and a risk of material loss to the troops. Secondly, this behaviour by the Republicans in the Senate is said to be directed towards the end of destroying the Caesarians. Such an argument emphasizes the mutual lot of those bound by pietas. This aspect underscores the message of the safety stemming from unity within the faction. The alternative to unity is called to mind by the recent treatment meted out by the emboldened Pompeians. The Pompeians, as the Caesarians now came to call them, had been the recipients of gifts from Caesar. Rather than reciprocating beneficia, they had shown they could be trusted to make no accommodations for the other Caesarians. This was made even more evident by their recent conduct in naming Antony and his followers hostes. A commonality within the faction is then framed by its connection to notions of familial responsibility. Octavian reinforces this connection by signaling that he would accept whichever fate accompanies the course of action obligated to his pater:


440 “outrages” τὰ υβρίσματα

441 App. BC 3.12.87.1-5 "Ἰστε δέ, " ἐφη, ‘καὶ ἐφ’ οἷς ὁ Αντώνιος ἐναγχος ἤττήθη οἵα τε τούς Πομπηιανοὺς ἐπώθεσθε ἐν ἀστείοις εἰληφότων. τί δή πιστόν ἢ ὑμῖν ὑν ἐλάβετε παρ’ ἐκείνου χωρίων τε και χρημάτων ἢ ἐμοὶ τῆς σωτηρίας, ὥδε ἐν τῇ βουλῇ δυναστευόντων τῶν οἰκείων τοῖς σφαγεύσαι; “You know well”, he said, “for which reasons Antony was recently bettered. You have heard what sort of things the Pompeians have done in the city to those having received certain gifts from Caesar. What expectation can you either have of having the lands and monies for yourselves or of safety for myself when the relatives of the murderers dominate the senate.”
By including his concern for the troops who had undertaken such risk on behalf of him and his father, Octavian emphasizes the bonds of shared risk and reward. This bond is undertaken in the name of *pietas* to Caesar. *Pietas* had exposed the troops and leader alike to danger. These dangers, he argues, should prompt the troops to demand the consulship for Octavian to ensure their safety. Furthermore, he states that, as consul, he could confirm the dispersal of Caesar’s gifts of money and lands to them. Additionally, he would bring Caesar’s murderers to justice. In this way the obligations both of filial *pietas* and of that which existed between patron and client would be fulfilled. The soldiers were convinced by incentives rooted in aspects of *pietas* and sent their centurions to convey the demands to the Senate. When the Senators criticized the centurions for their insolence, the army marched on Rome and, consequently, by the influence of *pietas* Octavian obtained the consulship.

**The Lex Pedia and the Violence of Pietas**

The nature of *pietas* created the context for the policies of the Caesarians. The final aspect to be carried out sought to enforce the right to vengeance, argued to be part of the “natural” aspect of *pietas*. After taking Q. Pedius as consular colleague, Octavian did not wish to stir-up the masses with his plan of vengeance. Instead, he waited until

---

442 App. BC 3.12.87.9: “for it is honourable to suffer anything in the service of a father.”
Magnino 1984, 193: “Again Octavian’s constant resort to the figure of Caesar and to his obligations to him after his adoption reemerges.”

443 App. BC 3.12.87.18: υπὸ δίκην.
the payment of bequests to the troops to move forward with it. Dio comments that the
funds belonged to the State, yet they came to be used by Octavian to further his policies
of vengeance predicated by *pietas*. In this way the State’s resources had become
aligned with the demands of Caesarian *pietas*. The *Lex Pedia* of 43 BC was enacted
against a wide swath of individuals implicated, not only in Caesar’s murder itself, but
also of complicit knowledge of it. Dio states that Octavian convened special courts to
ty cases under this law. Those who acted as accusers in the first round of proscriptions,
according to Dio, did so because they wished to ingratiate themselves with Octavian (ἔς
tῆν τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ χάριν). Those others who were initially hesitant, were
persuaded by the prospect of material benefit (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθλῶν προσαναπειθόμενοι).
And so, the formula of gratitude, benefaction and
reciprocation, functioning within the expression of Octavian’s filial *pietas*, spurred on the
proscriptions. By these same components, the proscriptions were enacted along the
lines of transactional relationships marked by *pietas*. Of those who were on the juries,

---

444 Dio 46.48.1.3-4: καὶ φοβηθεὶς μὴ τῇ τῶν ὄμιλον διὰ τούτ’ ἐκταράξῃ, οὐ πρότερον τὴν ἐαυτοῦ
gνώμην ἐξέφηνε πρὶν τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν καταλειφθέντων σφίσι ποιήσασθαι.
“but being fearful of stirring up the populace more or less in carrying out this plan, he did not make known
his intention until he had seen to the payment of the bequests made to them.”

445 Dio 46.48.1.5-7: ὡς δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς χρήμασι, καίπερ ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ
πολέμου προφάσει συναχθεῖσι, κατελήφθησαν, οὕτω δὴ τοὺς σφαγέας μετῆλθε.
“But when they had been won over by means of the money, although it belonged to the public funds and
had been collected on the pretext of the war, then at length he began to follow up the murderers.”

446 App. BC 3.14.95.4-7.

447 On the proscriptions, see Hinard, 227-318.
the majority voted against the accused for the sake of securing Octavian’s favour via gratitude (τῇ...χάριτι).\(^{448}\)

The enactment of the proscriptions made evident that at this point the courts were nominally endorsing Octavian’s right to the vengeance prescribed by \textit{pietas}.\(^{449}\)

Both Appian and Dio report that individuals, not even in the city at the time of the murder, were indicted. By virtue of this extension of scope Sextus Pompeius, the figure-head of the \textit{Pompeiani}, was implicated.\(^{450}\) He was named not because of any actual part in the plot against Caesar, but as a potent symbol of the unity of the Pompeian faction. Sextus was acting with \textit{pietas} to his own father and his cliental network. The \textit{cognomen Pius} which he adopted was an indicator of the likelihood his dutiful responsibility portended the conflict to come between Pompeian and Caesarian \textit{pietas}.

Shortly after the establishment of the triumvirate, the proscriptions were enacted.\(^{451}\) Octavian, Antony and Lepidus, ostensibly ‘chosen by the People’, agreed to rehabilitate and restore the Republic.\(^{452}\) The presence of five legions per triumvir,

\(^{448}\) Dio 46.49.4-2: \textit{οἱ μὲν πλεῖος τῇ τῇ χάριτι καὶ τῷ δέει τῷ Καίσαρος κατεψηφίζοντο αὐτῶν, ἐνδεικνύμενοι τῇ ὡς καὶ δικαίως αὐτὸ ποιοῦντες... \\
“The majority voted against the accused, by reason of gratitude and fear of Octavian indicating that they were justified in doing this.”

\(^{449}\) Of paramount importance to Octavian (Dio 46.48.3.1): \textit{ἵνα γε μὴ βιαίως ἀλλ’ ἐν δίκῃ τινὶ ποιεῖν αὐτό δόξῃ, νόμον τέ τινα περὶ τῆς κρίσεως αὐτῶν ἐσήνεγκε καὶ δικαστήρια καὶ ἀποῦσι ἐκάθισεν.} \\
“And in order that he might not appear to be doing this by force but in accordance with some principle of justice, he proposed a law about their trial and convened the courts even in their absence.”

\(^{450}\) Dio 46.48.4.2.

\(^{451}\) The \textit{lex Titia} established the triumvirate by law on Nov. 27, 43 BC after the details had been worked out at Bononia in late October-early November.

\(^{452}\) Aug. \textit{RG} 1.12: \textit{Populus autem eodem anno me consulem, cum consul uterque in bello cecidisset, et Triumvirum rei publicae constituendae creavit.} \\
“The people – in the same year that I was consul when both consuls had perished in battle –also created the office of triumvir for the restoration of the Republic.”
however, displayed the authority on which their power actually rested.\textsuperscript{453} The donatives given to the troops further reinforced the prevalent culture of reciprocal gratitude and obligation. Conversely, the rationale for the proscriptions may be seen as a function of a pragmatic necessity driven by \textit{pietas}. The triumvirs argued it was necessary to preclude the Republican propensity for ungrateful and violent action before pursuing the assassins in the fulfillment of Caesarian \textit{pietas}.

Appian relates the triumvirs’ pretext for the proscriptions along lines of previously discussed terminology associated with \textit{pietas}:

\begin{quote}
\begin{greek}
Μᾶρκος Λέπιδος, Μᾶρκος Αντώνιος, Ὅκταουιος Καῖσαρ, οἱ χειροτονηθέντες ἁρμόσαι καὶ διορθῶσαι τὰ κοινά, ὦτως λέγουσιν· εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἀπιστίαν οἱ πονηροὶ δεόμενοι μὲν ἦσαν ἐλεεινοὶ, τυχόντες δὲ ἐγίγνοντο τῶν εὐεργετῶν ἔχθροι, εἶτα ἐπίβουλοι, ὦτ' ἂν Γάιον Καῖσαρα ἀνηρήκεσαν, οὐς ἐκεῖνος δορὶ λαβὼν ἔσωσεν ἑλέω καὶ φίλους θέμενος ἐπὶ ἀρχὰς καὶ τιμὰς καὶ δωρεάς προήγαγεν ἀθρόως, οὐτ' ἂν ἦμεις τοῖς ἐνυβρίσασι καὶ πολεμίσασι, ὦτ' ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀθρόως ἠναγκαζόμεθα χρῆσθαι, νῦν δὲ, ἐξ ὧν ἐπιβεβουλεύμεθα καὶ ἐξ ὧν Γάιος Καῖσαρ ἐπαθεὶ, ἀτιθάσευτον ὀρῶντες
\end{greek}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{453} The army was included in the negotiations as they were offered the incentive of eighteen Italian cities as future colonies to settle. The list includes: Capua, Rhegium, Venusia, Beneventum, Nuceria, Ariminum and Vibo.
τὴν κακίαν ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας, προλαβεῖν τοὺς ἑχθροὺς ἢ παθεῖν αἱρούμεθα. µὴ δὴ τις τὸ ἔργον ἄδικον ή ὁμον ή ἀμετρον ἤργεσθω, ἐς τὸ Γαίον καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς οἷς πεπόνθαμεν ὦρων.454

The text itself cites violations of societal expectations by those who had repaid beneficia (τὰ εὖεργήµατα) and clementia (ἡ ἐπιείκεια) with murder. Friendship (φίλον) was repaid with a lack of fides (ἀπιστία). Those named on the proscription lists would not find themselves indicted had they not sought clementia. Having obtained it, they chose to ungratefully act as enemies of their benefactors (τῶν εὐεργετῶν).455 This pattern of impius behaviour repaid mercy, friendship, honours and gifts with murder.456 For these

454 App. BC 4.2.8: ""Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius, and Octavius Caesar, chosen by the people to set in order and regulate the republic, do declare that, had not perfidious traitors begged for mercy and when they obtained it become the enemies of their benefactors and conspired against them, neither would Gaius Caesar have been slain by those whom he saved by his clemency after capturing them in war, whom he admitted to his friendship and upon whom he heaped offices, honours, and gifts; nor should we have been compelled to use this wide-spread severity against those who have insulted us and declared us public enemies. Now, seeing that the malice of those who have conspired against us and by whose hands Gaius Caesar suffered, cannot be mollified by kindness, we prefer to anticipate our enemies rather than suffer at their hands. Let no one who sees what both Caesar and ourselves have suffered consider our action unjust, cruel, or immoderate."

Appian 4.17.134 reiterates, after an encomium of Brutus’ and Cassius’ noble qualities, the great crime against Caesar: καὶ γάρ ἐς φίλον ἐγίγνετο παραλόγως καὶ ἐς άθεμίστως ἐκπολέμου περισώσαντα ἄχαριστως καὶ ἐς αὐτοκράτορα άθεμίστως καὶ ἐν βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ ἐς ιερέα καὶ ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα ἐπικείμενον καὶ δυνάστην μὲν οἰον οὐχ έτερον, χρησιμώτατον δὲ ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας τῇ τε πατρίδι καὶ τῇ ἡγεμονία γενόμενον.

"for it was committed unexpectedly against a friend, ungratefully and unjustly against a benefactor who had spared them in war, unjustly against the head of the state, in the senate-house, against a pontiff clothed in his sacred vestments, against a ruler without equal, having been most serviceable above all others to homeland and empire."

As does Dio 48.1.1-5: ὥς που τὸ τε δίκαιον ἕφερε καὶ τὸ δαιµόνιον ἤγεν ἀνδρα αὐτοὺς εὔεργέτην αφών ἐς τοσούτον καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς τύχης προσωρήσαντα, ἀποκτείναντας παθεῖν.

"For justice and the Divine Will seem to have led to suffer death themselves men who had killed their benefactor, one who had attained such eminence in both virtue and good fortune."

Both historians stress the religious aspects of the assassins’liberators’ crimes which the gods were unable to leave unpunished. These men, caught between their virtues and responsibilities and the will of heaven, cut a tragic set of figures that characterize the ethical tensions of the age.

455 App. BC 4.2.8.6.

456 App. BC 4.2.8.8-9.
reasons such wickedness (τὴν κακίαν) was untameable (ἀτιθάσευτον) by humanitas (ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας). Religious aspects and the impietas (ἡ ἁσέβεια) of the opposing faction are highlighted as Caesar is depicted as having been murdered while pontifex maximus. This act occurred within the confines of the sacrosanct Senate-house and 'under the eyes of the gods.' Such a crime is then described as a pollution compounded after the fact by those who, instead of punishing the assassins, sent them off to governorships. These governorships were used to terrorize Rome with barbarians hostile to Roman rule. Thus, the impietas of their actions is given universal ramifications for Romans. A divinity, represented by Caesar, was shown great impietas. The State itself was also threatened by those who refused to act according to the dictates of their obligations. This group of individuals had now forced the triumvirs to employ the severity of the proscriptions as a result of the ingratitude they had incurred. Those who had declared them public enemies had repaid beneficia with impietas.

The senatus consultum ultimum is mentioned three times in the proscription declaration. Such an emphasis outlines the reality of the consequences that face the Caesarians should they not forcefully resist their enemies. The declaration of hostes had doomed a multitude of citizens along with the triumvirs who were their patrons. In the eagerness for such a wicked act, the perpetrators had disregarded the impending vengeance of the gods and the reproach of men for their actions. In this way, the

---

457 φιλανθρωπία = humanitas. Above 24 n.61.
458 App. BC 4.2.8.22-23.
459 App. BC 4.2.8.10; 4.2.9.15; 4.2.10.27.
460 App. BC 4.2.10.11
conflict, which had drawn in so many adherents by nature of inter-personal obligations, now continued to implicate a widening swath of Roman society. Sextus Pompeius, one of the more notable of the proscribed, became implicated on account of his name and the familial associations he represented.\textsuperscript{461}

The period is marked as one of pragmatic concerns justified by a moral ideal binding members of the faction in both risk and reward. Antony first exploited this moral climate as he used the language of obligation to characterize his assumption of the Gallic provinces in the period of transition from Republican \textit{pietas} to a more pragmatic one. As a result, the decision-making mechanisms of the State moved further away from traditional Republican entities towards a horizontal expression of \textit{pietas}. Octavian also recognized the situation, characterizing himself as a figurehead of a sociopolitical entity bound by notions of mutual obligation. These figureheads used the language of obligation and responsibility to frame their arguments for the acquisition of provinces, the seizure of the consulship, and the proscription of fellow citizens.

The conflict between the varying conceptions obligation and responsibility was fraught with dangers, for the proscriptions would serve the two-fold purpose of precluding enemies’ ability to again cause harm as well as providing the means to assuage the armies. These troops were characterized after Mutina as being, ‘insulted, provoked and declared public enemies.’\textsuperscript{462} The proscriptions then, by the very text of

\textsuperscript{461} Although Cresci-Marrone 1998, 10 argues for the ‘legal’ justification for the inclusion of Pompeius on the grounds that he ran afoul of the proclamation’s article which states: “Let no one harbour any one of those whose names are hereto appended, or conceal them, or be corrupted by their money. Whoever shall be detected...will be put on the list of the proscribed without allowing any excuse or pardon.” (App. \textit{BC} 4.2.11).

\textsuperscript{462} App. \textit{BC} 4.2.11.16.
their proclamation, sought to exact both blood and resources from an enemy who had repaid previous *clementia* with *impius* aggression. All this paints a picture of a society rent by *pietas*, the ideal of reciprocal dutifulness. As a result, the Roman State was unable to cope with the weight of the obligations *pietas* represented. This created an increasing gulf between legality and legitimacy.\(^{463}\) Those in power to do so exploited this culture with a turn to their understanding of the demands of *pietas*.
Chapter 3: Sextus Pompeius and the Dilemma of Pietas

Sextus Pompeius Magnus (Pius) represents an important nexus in this study. He combines many of the aspects of pietas, both positive and negative. Sextus found himself both the beneficiary and victim of pietas. His familial obligations and responsibilities to the remnants of his father’s cliental network drew him into conflict with Octavian. For Sextus, the assumption of his rightful dignitas and the expression of his proper pietas carried with it an inevitable enmity with Octavian. This conflict arose as both men laid claim to action prompted by pietas. Both Octavian and Sextus Pompeius stood outside of the traditional cursus honorum and had obtained extraordinary distinctions within the failing Republic. Their power rested initially on the impressive resources of their fathers and had little to do with traditional Republican imperium. Pompeius Magnus and the legitimacy derived through him provided the basis for his

---

464 ad Att. 14.13.2.3: si est bellum civile futurum (quod certe erit si Sextus in armis permanebit, quem permansurum esse certo scio)…

“If there will be civil war (which there certainly will be if Sextus remains at arms, whom I certainly know will remain to be…”

465 Augustus (RG 1.4) mentions the imperium granted to him by the Senate at Mutina to detract from the dubious rise through the political ranks the young man completed. Cicero readily admitted that Sextus Pompeius and his brother Gnaeus who were then resisting Caesar in Spain held no imperium, but resisted in the name of pietas to their father (Cic. Phil. 5.39).
son Sextus’ *auctoritas* and claim to *dignitas*. These aspects demanded a reciprocation of *pietas* to his father’s memory as well as his cliental network. Sextus could draw from his father’s client base in Spain and other areas obligated to his memory to carry out the filial duties of *pietas*. Likewise, Caesar’s carving out of a *clientela* among the people of Italy through colonies and benefactions was to the great benefit of Octavian. He profited from his adoptive father’s resources no less than Sextus. These resources allowed Octavian to seize the *imperium* of the consulship and subsequently enact the proscriptions. Similarly, Sextus functioned without any legal *imperium* until he was granted an extraordinary command of the fleet and care of the coasts of the empire in 43. *Auctoritas* and *dignitas*, once the prizes of deeds and reputation, marked by passage through the *cursus*, now gave way to the natural law of *pietas*. Octavian and Sextus committed themselves to this natural law by upholding the obligations to their fathers and by taking up the inherited struggles they received from them. This type of *pietas* differed from the previously discussed Republican *pietas* towards the state and its oligarchic cliental networks.

---

66 Welch 2002, 34; Hadas, 39 shows the importance of the *hausmachtpolitik* so important to the power and influence of the great Republican families. The Pompeii, after the conquest of the region in the 3rd century, counted the citizens of Picenum as their *clinetela* in addition to their clients in the East and Spain. One may also recall the Domitii Ahenobarbi, particularly L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 54) who came into conflict with Caesar over his control of the Domitii’s holdings in Gaul. In 55 L. Domitius, ‘campaigned’ for the upcoming consular elections on the promise that he would recall Caesar from Gaul, asserting his rights as its patron. Cf. Syme, 465: “From his father Cassius inherited a connexion with the Transpadani (Cic. *ad Fam.* 12.5.2)…Bononia was in the *clinetela* of the Antonii (Dio 50.6.3; Plut. *Dio et Brut.* 5; Suet. *Div. Aug.* 17.2; *de Rhet.* 6).

67 Named *praefectus classis et orae maritimae* in April 43 BC, after the reconciliation brokered by Lepidus. This title and associations with *pietas* became central to Sextus’ imagery as shown by his coinage: BMCRR Sicily 13: 42 BC. The Aureus minted in Sicily reads MAG. PIVS, IMP. ITER. before the head of Sextus Pompey all within oak wreath. The obverse shows PRÆF, CLAS. ET. ORÆ/[MA]RIT. EX. S.C along with the bare heads of Pompey Magnus and Cnaeus Pompey on the left.

68 Cicero (*Phil.* 11.27-8) makes mention of this ‘natural law’ when he seeks to legitimize the actions of Brutus and Cassius. Cicero justifies their actions as demanded by *pietas* to the Republic. Octavian’s mention of his *pietas* and its connection to φυσις represents the counter-argument.
Both Sextus and Octavian had also claimed a divinely mandated moral justification for their actions. The men represented their actions as being in keeping with the demands of *pietas* to the gods and to their fathers. In doing so these men had obtained *auctoritas* and all of the rights and privileges that accompanied it. In his *de Beneficiis*, Seneca characterizes the stature of the descendants of Pompeius Magnus as elevated (*attoleret*) on account of ‘such greatness’ displayed by his father. The similarity of both men and their claims to legitimacy, therefore, gave rise to a war of reputation contingent upon the appropriation of *pietas*.

Sextus’ inherited *auctoritas* gave him a place as one of Rome’s leading citizens. The necessary side-effect of taking up the benefits accrued from the memory of his father was to incur the enmity of Octavian. The enmity between the nominal heirs of the *optimates* and *populares* factions was all but assured. These men were destined to continue the earlier struggles of their fathers. There were too many implications associated with the tools of power available from their fathers for the men to peacefully co-exist. Peace, however, is exactly what the People of Rome, exhausted by the civil war and its effects, wanted. As we shall, see this desire for peace resulted in disturbances at Rome amidst Octavian’s and Sextus’ attempts to represent their actions as legitimised by *pietas*. Both men sought to appropriate the moral weight associated with their actions, motivated by expressions of filial *pietas*. Sextus, however, could also claim to be acting in a spirit of *pietas* to his fellow citizens.

In attempting to reevaluate the character of Sextus Pompeius, Powell, Welch and others have argued that Sextus’ reputation had been unduly coloured by Octavian’s
propaganda.\textsuperscript{469} A new focus on the numismatic record left by Sextus and its value as an indicator of the messages Sextus conveyed informs this opinion. Sextus’ coins represent an alternate claim to \textit{pietas} and, therefore, as he saw it, legitimacy. In addition, they represent the wages for soldiers and anti-triumviral elements whose \textit{fides} was repaid by the \textit{pietas} Sextus was obligated to express towards his fellow citizens. Aside from any moral message they provide, these coins also represent the resources of Sextus and the Pompeian resistance to triumviral rule.

The shock of the proscriptions and the general revulsion among those affected had placed the Caesarians in a vulnerable position. The triumvirs found themselves increasingly pained to depict this latest maneuver of the civil conflicts as an expression of \textit{pietas}.\textsuperscript{470} Sextus, however, could point to his protection of the proscribed as such an act towards his fellow citizens. Sextus’ imagery of the oak crown on his coinage and its connection with the adopted title of \textit{Pius} emphasized his \textit{pietas} to these citizens. This \textit{pietas} was that of the statesman to fellow Romans. Consequently, Sextus seized the opportunity and took the initiative to depict his own struggle in terms of \textit{pietas}, both to family and fellow Roman.

With the aspect of filial \textit{pietas} came Pompey Magnus’ name recognition, cliental network and leadership of the Pompeian faction. Moreover, Sextus had received his father’s legacy complete with a faction comprised of a difficult coalition. Sextus’ father was destroyed after sharing in the designs of the oligarchy, and Sextus may have held

\textsuperscript{469} Powell 2002, \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{470} Barden Dowling, 54: “Sextus Pompeius’ policy of amnesty to the proscribed had forced Antony and Octavian to modify their policies of punishment, closing the proscriptions and ceasing to persecute those not yet caught.”
suspicions that he was to fall into the same trap.\textsuperscript{471} The faction was peopled by the
remnants of the Republicans left from Philippi, the traditional landholders, the
proscribed and members of the Senatorial class. Thus, by accepting its leadership
Sextus found himself Octavian’s enemy. He was also, at times, an unwilling champion of
the disparate entities he came to represent.

The relationship between Sextus and the Republic is complicated by a seeming
ambivalence in the relationship of the aristocracy to his father.\textsuperscript{472} Later, Gnaeus, Sextus’
brother, would have to be convinced by Cato not to murder Cicero at Corcyra.\textsuperscript{473}
Eventually, Gnaeus was sent to Spain. His father’s clients ostensibly supported the
rebellion begun against the Caesarian governor Q. Cassius. However, it was also likely
that he was sent away because of his poor relations with the other Republican leaders
in Africa.\textsuperscript{474} There is also physical evidence of a break with the Republicans that
indicates that, after Thapsus, the imagery of the \textit{Pompeiani} rose and that of general
Republican imagery declined.\textsuperscript{475} This appraisal makes it difficult to draw any definitive

\textsuperscript{471} The \textit{Pompeii} were not of the old aristocracy and the prejudices and misgivings on either side, in
addition to recent history, complicated the relationship.

\textsuperscript{472} Gwatkin, 112: Among other frictions, it was the pressure of the aristocrats that convinced Pompey
against his own better judgment to attack at Pharsalus rather than wait out Caesar whose supply lines
were cut.

\textsuperscript{473} Plut. \textit{Cato Minor} 55.3; Cicero 39.1-2.

\textsuperscript{474} Hadas, 42: Gnaeus was likely sent off in 47 BC

\textsuperscript{475} The contrast between the coins issued by Q. Metellus Scipio \textit{RRC} 459/1, 461/1 in Africa and its
Republican themes can be contrasted with the images from Sextus’ coinage \textit{RRC} 477/1-3 post Thapsus
(46 BC) which took up \textit{pietas} to the Pompeian name.
association of Sextus’ *pietas* with Republican *libertas*. His *pietas* more likely drew on the factional ethics previously discussed.  

**The ‘Cursus’ of Sextus Pompeius**

The respective careers of Octavian and Sextus bear many similarities, and, naturally, cast one as the foil of the other. Sextus, for his part, was present when his father was murdered on the Egyptian coast, and Octavian, too, had his ‘father’ struck down amid the intrigue of the late Republic. Later, in Spain, Sextus raised an army from the elements obligated to his family, just as Octavian had raised his own forces in Italy, and, subsequently, defeated the Caesarian commander G. Asinius Pollio. The remnants of Pompeius Magnus’ cliental network, his veterans and client territories came to view his son as a viable alternative to triumviral rule. For that reason they attached themselves to him. This turn of events and influx of resources is said to have made his actions more significant than mere robbery or piracy, as Octavian sought to depict them.

The legitimacy that emanated from success in the field and from the power of acquired legions had no less positive effect on Sextus than it had on Octavian. The

---

476 *Contra* Welch, 2012 who argues for Sextus as the champion of the Republic after Philippi. Sextus’ identification with Republican values is introduced by an examination of his identification with the values of *pietas* and *iustitia*.

477 Sextus coinage prominently displayed the *cognomen* *Pius* in connection with his father’s image and memory and Octavian’s actions had been represented as a response to the *impietas* of his father’s assassins in opposition to his own *pietas* in seeking vengeance against them.

478 Plut. *Pomp.* 78.4.

479 Dio 45.10.4-6: Pollio’s defeat at Baetica in June or July of 44 was so complete that he threw down his general’s cloak to escape unnoticed. Gabba 1970, 153 argues that Dio’s account may come from a source hostile to Pollio.

initial descriptions of guerrilla warfare attributed to Sextus yielded, after Sextus’ show of force in Spain, to a reintegration into the state brokered by Lepidus and Antony. This reintegration resulted in a command that mirrored the earlier extraordinary one granted to his father against the pirates. In similar fashion, both Octavian and Sextus shared a *cursus* reflective of the demise of the Republic. Both men’s careers progressed from private citizen to renegade commander, and eventually to legitimacy conferred by the failing mechanisms of the Republic. By these actions, Octavian had secured the consulship by force, enacted the *leges Pedia* and *Titia*, and sought to stamp out the remnants of Pompeianism via the proscriptions. Sextus had obtained his own command; after his successes in Spain, came to be an alternative to Octavian and the triumvirs. This alternative, too, functioned while expressing *pietas*. The two men nearly mirrored each other in motivation and perceived legitimacy. The triumvirs’ seizure of government as well as their proscriptions afforded Sextus the status of saviour acting in a spirit of *pietas* towards his fellow citizens, when he accepted the enemies of the triumvirs at his base of operations in Sicily.

Kathryn Welch states that the strategy utilized against Sextus by Octavian centred on the ability of the triumvir to exploit the divisions within the opposition to

---

481 *Praefectus Classis et Orae Maritimae* App. BC 3.1.4; 4.9.70; 4.11.84; Dio 46.40.3. Granted to Sextus in 43 BC by the Senate.

482 Powell 2002, 119: “But in 43 and its aftermath, the concept of *pietas*, while overused, was not wholly discredited. Violations of *pietas* were notoriously involved in the lamented civil war and proscriptions; it was probably believed by most Romans that, had *pietas* been practised by all those in power, much slaughter of citizens would not have happened. That belief was open to ingenious and memorable exploitation.”; 127: “*Pietas*, in short, must be applied to the wider community (Val. Max. 5.4; Sen. *de Beneficiis* 6.36.1). Sextus on his *aureus* had made the point that *pietas* towards family and towards citizens was of a piece.”
triumviral rule. This fractured opposition allowed Octavian to cast aspersions on the motivations of Sextus with regard to his adherence to the dictates of pietas and loyalty to the Republic. Consequently, those opposed to Caesar were styled the partes Pompeianae regardless of their diverse motivations. This characterization was first attempted with moderate success by Caesar, and then more effectively by Antony.

*Philippic* 5.32 characterizes Antony’s attempts to depict the struggle as one between two homogenous parties. Cicero points out that the coalition struck at Mutina was comprised of Republicans, and the Caesarians Hirtius, Pansa and Octavian, allied against Antony’s excesses. It was no uniform “Pompeian” faction. After this alliance was defunct, the Senate’s actions towards Octavian and his supporters post-Mutina were depicted as ungrateful, guilty of an abdication of the obligations attached to pietas. Within this framework it served the Caesarians well to label their adversaries Pompeiani while reducing their enemies to a monolithic figurehead. The Caesarians found common cause and group ethic in Caesar, just as they created a personification of their adversaries in Pompey and his son.

*Philippic* 13.38 contains a passage excerpted from a letter of Antony dated March 43, and addressed to Hirtius, Pansa and Octavian whose content seemingly confirmed the Caesarian perception of a Republican strategy of division and conquest. Pietas had served as a bulwark against this strategy as the Caesarians coalesced around the

---

483 Welch 2002, 11. Sextus was hindered by the opposition of both Caesarians and those opposed to the dictator.


485 This Caesarian argument is mirrored in Pansa’s fictitious deathbed speech to Octavian (App. BC 3.10.75.1).
idea. Antony’s initial appeals to the Caesarians fell on deaf ears until it seemed his words were confirmed by the Senate after Mutina. It was of great utility to simplify the issue in terms surrounding *pietas* that were readily identifiable to the Caesarians’ rank and file. This created a polarity of Caesarians and Pompeians. An additional consequence of this development is that it created in Sextus a powerful counter-expression to Octavian’s filial *pietas*.

This situation underscores the troubling double nature of *pietas*. Both Octavian and Sextus were acting as nature and Roman society demanded. Both men could be viewed as functioning in an orthodox moral fashion along the dictates of the Roman understanding of *pietas*. Powell states that, “the son of Pompey the Great was – according to contemporary Roman values – quite simply a better man.” And yet, with victory and effective communications Octavian/Augustus had blackened Sextus’ reputation as an *impius* renegade bent on perpetuating the sins of the oligarchy. Both sides had sought to influence the masses by depicting their struggle as the nobler. Success, more than anything else, along with the redistribution of its spoils, had a great impact on popular perception because of the reciprocation it represented. Powell characterizes this cultural aspect, when he states, “as long as Sextus...resisted and defeated...Octavian, the Roman populace publicly hailed Sextus and execrated Octavian.” The converse, however, also applied when the tide turned in Octavian’s favour.

486 Powell 2002, viii.
487 Powell 2002, x.
The “Public Relations” Problem of Pietas

The great unpopularity of the proscriptions at Rome is depicted in both Appian and Dio. Both historians agree the proscriptions were enacted to exact resources from the triumvirs’ enemies. In addition, Appian devotes considerable space to the excesses of the proscriptions, with particular attention paid to the breakdown of the Roman household. He states that in typical occupations or discord individuals had only the opposing side to fear, but the proscriptions created suspicion within one’s own household. This situation had a very real impact on familial pietas. Sextus’ resistance to the triumvirs, marked by his offer of sanctuary to the proscribed, made Sextus a pius character to a segment of Roman society who contrasted him with the triumvirs. From these actions, Sextus gained ‘high repute,’ contingent upon a perception of pius action.

Powell and Welch cite instances, such as those above, to argue for Sextus as a universally popular figure who fought against the highly unpopular proscriptions only later re-cast as a villain by the Augustans. It is argued that Sextus’ claims to legitimacy outstripped those of Octavian’s because of his popularity with those he harboured from proscription and with the public at Rome. This argues for a

---

488 App. BC 4.2.15; 4.3.18; 4.8.67. Dio 48.7.4; 48.17.5; 48.31.1.
489 App. BC 4.2.5-4.7.1.
490 App. BC 4.3.13.
491 Dio 47.13; Velleius Paterculus 2.77.2.
homogenous attitude at Rome, unaffected by factional considerations, greatly influenced their adherents. The Caesarians had fostered the perception of a polarized Roman society that must be factored into this appraisal. Such polarity was characterized by aspects of *pietas*, for instance gratitude versus ingratitude and the repayment of debts versus the shirking of obligation. Those who identified with the Caesarians had been convinced that the state had been captured by *Pompeiani*, who sought to destroy them because of their adherence to these principles. For them, the proof of this *impius* seizure of government had been made evident in declarations of *hostes*. This *impietas* was initially seen in the rejection of Caesar’s earlier policy of *clementia*, that had exposed him to the ingratitude of his *clientes*. Afterwards, it had been argued that the Senate continued this pattern of *impius* behaviour towards Antony and Octavian. Such *impietas*, they argued, necessitated the triumvirs’ campaign of preemptive vengeance. Conversely, the *senatus consultum ultimum*, being rescinded only after the seizure of the government by the triumvirate, was presented as proof of the promise of *pietas* towards their followers. In the same way that the proscribed welcomed Sextus’ hospitality in Sicily, the Caesarians could just as easily have portrayed it to their supporters as a sacrilegious affront to the spirit and text of the proscription proclamation that sought to redress great *impietas*. This dichotomy, I believe, is more indicative of the true nature of the masses’ attitude towards any particular leadership figure in these struggles.

---

494 App. BC 4.2.11: The invocation of *Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ* in the proscription declaration mirrors the ancient formula *quod felix faustumque sit* and depicts the solemn and religious aspect infused into the issue.
The disturbances which were a consequence of the proscriptions’ land exactions in Italy, as they were already hindering agricultural production, were augmented by Sextus’ blockade of the Italian peninsula. The blockade further reduced Italy to famine.\textsuperscript{495} The general misery this blockade created must be considered in any judgment of the supporting classes’ perception of Sextus’ \textit{pietas} to his fellow citizens.\textsuperscript{496} This consideration is especially integral to any judgment that gauges the ethical standing of individual leaders by the mood of the masses caught between their tormentors. The pragmatic ethic in Roman society embraced the cause that was “\textit{meliora et utiliora}.”\textsuperscript{497} This pragmatism combined with the deep factional divisions of the time complicate any sweeping appraisals of popular favour and moral superiority in a period of great duress for those affected by the actions of the factional leaders.

Sextus Pompeius was able to profit from circumstances from afar for the time being and, from his base of operations in Sicily, proved a viable counter-point to some to the triumvirate. There were, however, avenues of criticism that the Caesarians were able to exploit. Much of the unrest at Rome could be blamed on the famine resulting from Sextus’ ‘piracy’. There were also murders to cast doubt on Sextus’ \textit{pietas} as well

\begin{footnotes}
\item[495] App. \textit{BC} 5.2.15; 5.11.15; 5.3.18; 5.8.67. Dio 48.7.4; 48.17.5; 48.31.1. Appian (\textit{BC} 5.18.72) mentions the interruptions in agricultural production due to the confiscations as a factor. Italy, however, had not been able to feed its population solely from the land of the peninsula for some time and the cessation of grain shipments from Sicily and Africa must be seen as the greater cause of the famine.

\item[496] Modern scholarship has sought to redress Sextus’ treatment and sees criticism of him as driven by Octavianic propaganda. This propaganda is thought to have distorted the image of Sextus to this day. (Powell et al. 2002, \textit{passim}; Gowing 1992, 203).

\item[497] Vell. Pat. 2.84.3.
\end{footnotes}
as the sincerity of his Republican agenda. Even Appian, whose even-handed appraisal of Sextus’ character tempers many of the excesses attributed to him in Dio’s narrative, recoils at the treachery of Sextus in these deaths. The death notice for one such murder, that of Staius Murcus, shows him a Pompeian from the start to whom Sextus had been indebted as his εὐεργέτης.

The perception of Sextus’ impius actions towards his own allies was damaging, causing suspicion among Sextus’ supporters. Here there are echoes of earlier assertions the Pompeiani valued and then ungratefully discarded allies according to their utility. Such an evaluation seemed affirmed.

---

498 App. BC 5.70; Dio 48.19. A. Pompeius Bithynicus was the governor of Sicily who turned over the island to S. Pompeius only to later be treacherously murdered by him. Later Sextus’ murder of Staius Murcus further troubled the Republicans in his camp.

499 App. BC 5.8.70.17-22: οὐ μὴν ἐλάνθανε δεύτερον ἑπὶ Βιθυνικῷ τὸ δὲ μύσος ἐργασάμενος, περὶ ἀνδρὰ καὶ τὰ πολέμια λαμπρὸν καίτης αἱρέσεως ἐγκρατὴς φίλον ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐς αὐτὸν Πομπήιον εὐεργέτην τε ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ γενόμενον καὶ ἐκόντα ἔλθόντα ἐς Σικελίαν.

‘He did not succeed in concealing this crime, — the next one committed by him after the murder of Bithynicus, — Murcus having been a man distinguished for his warlike deeds, who had been strongly attached to that party from the beginning, and had rendered great assistance to Pompeius himself in Spain, and had joined him in Sicily voluntarily.”

This murder was no less problematic from an ethical standpoint in the public mindset than Sextus’ own end at the hands of Marcus Titius, Antony’s lieutenant:

App. BC 5.14.142: Ὅ δὲ Πομπήιος Τίτιῳ μὲν ἀχαριστίας ώργίζετο...

“Pompeius became enraged with Titius on account of his ingratitude…”

Sextus had previously pardoned Titius after he was captured in battle, and he considered it an ingratitude for Titius to act as the intermediary in his fate. It is only more indicative of the attitude of the populace to such treachery that Sextus’ executioner garnered no praise for the act. The populace held a long-standing grudge against Titius for his subversion of Roman societal conventions.

Vell. Pat. 2.79.6: Later, when Titius was giving a spectacle in the theatre of Pompey, the crowd drove him out of the theatre in anger over his earlier actions towards Sextus.

500 Staius Murcus, naval commander and destroyer of the fabled Martian Legion as it was crossing to Philippi (App. BC 4.15.116), was also murdered by Pompey. The fourth Legion was destroyed in the first engagement at Philippi (App. BC 4.16.117). These acts by Sextus, particularly Staius’ death, create a difficulty in any presumed Republican ideals some may find in Sextus.
Suspicion is given as a prime reason for why the proscribed urged Pompey to agree to the terms of the Treaty of Misenum.\textsuperscript{501} The relationship between the proscribed and Sextus was strained by Murcus’ murder. This occurrence makes it difficult to completely ascribe concern for Republican \textit{pietas} as motivation for his actions. The alienation of Sextus’ base of support is under-appreciated for its importance: as a result, the Pompeian supporting class was pushing for an accommodation that would see them return to Rome. It is unlikely that Rome’s elite would deliberately decide to leave a true champion of traditional Republican \textit{pietas} to return to triumviral Rome. Instead, they must have seen Sextus as another dynast who cynically used associations with \textit{pietas} to further his own political agenda. Consequently, Sextus eventually found himself isolated and drained of strategic political resources. The expression of civic \textit{pietas} which acted as a moral counter-weight to the \textit{necessary} misery his blockade was effecting in Italy would come to evaporate. With these opportunities and difficulties in hand, Octavian devised a communications campaign to exploit Sextus’ weaknesses. As a result Sextus came to be depicted as a pirate, a dangerous figure to his own allies, and the sole cause of Italy’s hardships. Octavian worked to control the popular perception of his adversary by a coordinated communications campaign, one that articulated a different view of Sextus and his motivations than his coinage depicts.\textsuperscript{502}

\textsuperscript{501} App. \textit{BC} 5.8.71: \textit{ἐπεὶ καὶ Πομπήιον αὐτὸν ἐδεδοίκεσαν ἤδη διὰ τὸ Μούρκου μύσος}, “since they feared Pompeius on account of his crime against Murcus.”

\textsuperscript{502} Sextus adopted Neptune as a symbol of his father’s sea-exploits and his own divine favour. Dio’s history (48.48.5), voicing the anti-Pompeian message, depicts Sextus as “slightly arrogant if not mildly deranged” in his identification with the god and it even includes charges of human sacrifice (Gowing 1992, 186). Welch 2012, 18: “It is very clear that Pompeius cultivated Neptune’s patronage and also that he took measures to advertise how the natural elements played an active role in his enemies’ discomfiture.” 188: “Two examples from Pompeius’ Sicilian series (of coins) depict Neptune’s face or statue (\textit{RRC} 511.2 Obv; \textit{RRC} 511.3 Rev.).” 295: “It was Pompeius who had first staked a claim to Neptune’s protection, and for eight years it had stuck.”
Despite these attempts by Octavian to control the narrative there still remained obstacles to securing popular favour over Sextus. Whereas the proscribed were on the point of slipping away from Sextus' base in Sicily, the public at Rome had drawn an affinity between *pietas* and success. The populace was drawn to the fortunate leader whose luck was considered to be contingent upon his *pietas*.\(^{503}\) Similarly, we see that Octavian, when faced with reversals was vilified in the city. As a result, Rome was beset by a rioting populace. Sextus, on the other hand, with every victory drew more support.\(^ {504}\) Whereas with every setback, the populace became more agitated against Octavian. This situation meant that Octavian, as curator of Italy, was the recipient of the worst of these sentiments. Nevertheless, history teaches us that the populace was quite ready to finally embrace Augustan *pietas* with the removal of Sextus and his Pompeian counterpoint. The pattern of success as indicator of popular favour is affirmed by the radically different attitude of goodwill towards Octavian after his successes at Mylae and Naulochus in 36 BC that ended Sextus' triumviral resistance.\(^ {505}\) The attitude of the public after these victories proves the power of success in the popular mind.\(^ {506}\) For these reasons, it becomes increasingly difficult to view the same man who convinced all of Italy to swear an oath of allegiance to him in order to legitimize the campaign against

\(^{503}\) Powell 2002, 115: “That *pius* Aeneas suffered much ill-fortune, notably at sea, is the prominent paradox with which Virgil begins the Aeneid; he gives to the muse the task of explaining it.” Powell 1992, 156-9 also draws the comparison between luck and *pietas* in the Roman mindset. This also had implications for allies. Arabio an African chieftain, initially with Sextus, deserted because of the disproportionate ill-fortune of the Pompeians (App. BC 5.7.54).

\(^{504}\) e.g. This occurred after Sextus repelled Salvidienus Rufus, who was commanding Octavian’s fleet from Sicily in 40 BC and after the Pompeian admiral Apollonius defeated Octavian’s commander C. Calvisius Sabinus in 38 BC (Dio 48.48).

\(^{505}\) More correctly, M. Vipsanius Agrippa’s victories.

\(^{506}\) App. BC 5.13.130; 132: Octavian was received as a hero by the Senate and people who conduct him, garlands on their heads, through Rome.
an Egyptian queen, was universally viewed three short years earlier by the Roman populace as Powell’s ‘inferior man.’

The disillusionment the public felt when peace was not brokered after the treaty of Brundisium was compounded by the triumvirs’ intensified conflict with Sextus in addition to a further worsening famine. The pressure brought on by the public disturbances in this period forced the triumvirs to negotiate the Treaty of Misenum with Sextus. These negotiations occurred because the triumvirs were bound by pietas to the people and, likewise, Sextus to his adherents. The treaty stipulated a cessation of raids on the Italian coast and an end to the interruption of the grain supply. For their part, the triumvirs vowed to restore the proscribed to Italy. Such an action damaged Sextus’ designs irreparably. This stipulation concerned Sextus with reason; the unpopular aspect of the proscribed individuals’ status as outlaws and Sextus’ resistance to it was the basis of their mutual bond of pietas. With the departure of large numbers of the proscribed from Sextus’ camp, he lost resources and a key focus of the pietas he had acquired as a defining characteristic of himself.

---

507 i.e. a campaign against the last remaining impediment to Octavian’s monarchy, Antony.

508 An arrangement between Antony and Octavian after the Perusine conflict that saw the triumvirs allot the territories of the Roman world into eastern and western spheres of influence for Antony and Octavian respectively.

509 Dio 48.31.6.4: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι μάλιστα ὀργισθέντων τέ σφων καὶ ἐπὶ τούτω καὶ δεινόν τι πράξειν προσδοκηθέντων, ἡναγκάσθησαν τῷ Σέξτῳ καὶ ἄκοντες ἐπικηρυκεύσασθαι. “chiefly because of this, the people became angered with them both and it was feared that they would even commit some act of violence in consequence, and the two were forced against their will to make overtures to Sextus.” Welch 2012, 238: “The Treaty of Misenum was the political solution Rome needed and Italy longed for. Scholars assume it was a cynical exercise which was always going to be short-lived. Such a view fails to recognize what it meant at the time it was signed….It...provided a foundation for the great compromise of 27…”

510 App. BC 5.8.71; Dio 48.36.3. Appian reports that after acquiescing to the pressure from his supporters to accept the terms of the treaty, Sextus rent his garments and stated that he had been betrayed by those for whom he had fought.
Poetry and Propaganda

40 BC saw Antony and Octavian meet in southern Italy to work out the details of the Treaty of Brundisium. While Octavian departed for the meeting accompanied by a group of poets, Antony was in the company of his military lieutenants. The impact of these poets’ words would prove to be more forceful and lasting than that found at the tip of a sword. The Augustan literary circle headed by Octavian’s friend and deputy Maecenas gives us much of the understanding we have of those times. Through Maecenas’ patronage, the great poetic voices of the era became Octavian’s *clientela*. The Pompeians, too, engaged in a campaign to articulate their own version of events as well as the motivations behind them.

The Pompeian literary message may also be detected by echoes of it which, despite its suppression, still survive. It will be shown that Sextus also enacted his own communications campaigns. Octavian sought to depict Sextus as an *impius* figure just as Sextus sought to appropriate *pietas* to his own purposes. Both Octavian and Sextus showed similar qualities, and both stood the chance of emerging victorious while characterizing the outcome of events in a personally favourable light. Sextus was branded a pirate in his attempt to secure his familial ‘rights,’ yet Octavian’s renegade origins were no more, or no less, legitimate. Sextus gained universal acclaim for harbouring those on the proscription lists, but he also treacherously murdered the prominent Republican admiral Staius Murcus and removed and had murdered the

---

511 Horace *Satires* 1.5. Both Horace and Vergil are mentioned in the satire as accompanying Maecenas to the negotiations.
governor of Sicily, A. Pompeius Bithynicus. These nefarious acts cast doubts on his loyalty to the Republican pietas. Sextus is said to have been cheered on by the crowds, but was also a principal source of the misery of the famine which gripped Italy. Octavian, too, had his share in the agricultural crisis and the famine taking root because of his policy of evictions and colonization. It was to counter the difficulties associated with their roles in the civil conflict that each man engaged in the appropriation of pietas as a marker of legitimacy.

Both men held up pietas to their fathers as justification for their actions, and were respected and yet reviled for doing so. Sextus reached his zenith after bringing the triumvirs unwillingly to negotiations on his own terms at Misenum, although there is enough evidence for us to believe that both sides were forced to negotiate by the masses that supported them. Octavian was compelled to quiet the angry mob at Rome, and Sextus to appease his charges in Sicily. These disaffected masses engaged in rioting in the capital; consequently, they made demands upon the figureheads of the factions. The displeasure of the masses also came to be expressed against Sextus. So great was the consternation at Rome, that the masses’ fury was turned against Caesarian and Pompeian alike. When even this unrest did not alleviate their plight

---

512 Plut. Pomp. Mag. 49.4: The ‘Pompeian’ precedent had been given by his Father in 49 BC. Pompeius Magnus who had previously cut off the grain-supply to Rome to effect his designs. Cicero (ad Att. 9.6.3) states that Pompeius Magnus had intended to starve Caesar and Italy into submission. Millar 2002, 229 has shown that this strategy had been utilized already in the war against Mithridates. Welch 2002, 55: “The plan was impium.”

513 This aristocratic element wished for a return to Rome and a mediated solution. Kloevekern, 24-25 shows that those proscribed consisted mostly of the old aristocracy, while the triumvirs’ supporters were largely non-entities.

514 Powell 2002, 114-6: “Octavian is recorded sending his senior agent, Maecenas, to Rome, to guard against adverse popular reactions to his failures (App. 5.99, 112, cf. 91).”
the people turned their attention to Mucia, Sextus’ mother, and threatened to burn her
along with her house if she did not impress upon her son to agree to an accommodation
with Octavian and the other triumvirs.\textsuperscript{515} In these events, we may see an intense
struggle to obtain and maintain the sympathy of the disparate elements of support in
Roman society and to discredit the adversary with an appeal to \textit{pietas}.

Horace’s fourth \textit{Epode} fits within this tradition.\textsuperscript{516} Horace composed the first
pieces of the propaganda campaign that would be enacted against Sextus. The date of
\textit{Epode} 4 of early 36 BC places it on the eve of the decisive battles of Mylae and
Naulochus.\textsuperscript{517} In this poem we also have the earliest instances of the charges that
Sextus’ ships were manned by pirates and slaves.\textsuperscript{518} This manner of description takes
its precedent from earlier Republican models, notably Cicero’s invective against Mark
Antony.\textsuperscript{519} Sextus’ depiction by Octavian’s poets culminated in the eventual suppression
of his name and the final commemoration with a crafted image of the adversary.\textsuperscript{520}

\textit{Epode} 7 again deals with Sextus where he is the ‘Neptunian leader’ who, though now

\textsuperscript{515} App. \textit{BC} 5.69. Thus the Treaty of Misenum was brokered by popular dissatisfaction on unwilling
fractional leaders, again showing the supporting classes desire for stability. Welch 2012, 240: “Gangs
paraded the streets of Rome, threatening the homes of the major players, including Mucia, Pompeius’
mother if they (the leaders) did not intervene on behalf of the people.”

\textsuperscript{516} Mankin, 99: “The speaker is a ‘natural enemy’ of a man who seems to have been a criminal but now
parades his wealth.” Watson 2002, 214: “…the characterization of the enemy as \textit{latrones et servilis
manus} (‘pirates and a band of slaves’), a striking anticipation of the description of Sextus and his
followers as buccaneers and \textit{fugitivi} (‘runaway slaves’), which later becomes standard.”

\textsuperscript{517} Watson, 2002, 214: Convincing arguments are given for the identification of the language of invective
and the \textit{gravi...pondere} of the ships mentioned \textit{cf}. Dio 48.49 as alluding to Sextus.

\textsuperscript{518} \textit{Epode} 4.19.

\textsuperscript{519} Watson 2002, 215n.10-16 gives an impressive list with citations of instances of this language.

\textsuperscript{520} Aug. \textit{RG} 25.2: \textit{mare pacaui a praedonibus}.

“I cleared the sea of pirates.”
fleeing Octavian’s forces, recently threatened to shackle the city with the fetters he had taken from disloyal slaves:

\[
\begin{align*}
  & ut nuper, actus cum freto Neptunius \\
  & dux fugit ustis navibus \\
  & minatus urbi vincla, quae detraxerat \\
  & servis amicus perfidis.\end{align*}
\]

The issue of fugitive slaves was a key consideration, as the desertions of slaves to Sextus had prompted somewhat of a crisis at Rome. Such consternation arose that the Vestal Virgins gave prayers to stem the flow of slaves out of the city.\(^{522}\) On this point, we know that both Octavian and Sextus employed slaves in their operations with the force of propaganda, eventually finding fault with one and exoneration in the other.\(^{523}\) Later, Vergil in his \textit{Aeneid} would take up Sextus, alluding to him in the list of sinners being punished in the underworld.\(^{524}\) The development from a “pirate” to “\textit{impius}” is a significant step that would not have been ventured without the interceding years of propagandistic preparation. The \textit{pietas} of the Pompeian faction, though diminished, would not allow for an easy acceptance of such notions. Only after a decade of shaping

\(^{521}\) \textit{Epode} 9.9: “As lately, when the Neptunian (Pompey), driven from the sea, Had fled, with his ships destroyed, Having threatened the city with shackles he’d taken From those faithless slaves, his friends.

\(^{522}\) Dio 48.19.4.

\(^{523}\) Octavian’s 20,000 slave-rowers who defeated Sextus’ forces are documented: Suet. \textit{Aug.} 16.1; Dio 48.49.1; Gabba 1971, 153-4.

\(^{524}\) Williams 1972, 497. Vergil \textit{Aeneid} 6.612-3: \textit{quique arma secuta impia} “and who followed \textit{impius arms}” This too is not without allusion to slaves and their desertions vv. 613: \textit{nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras} “not afraid to betray their masters.”
opinion and after the active power of the Pompeii was obsolete could Augustus have Sextus depicted in this way. There are, from the time when the Pompeii still held the capability to do so, positive echoes of their own messages countering the Octavianic ones.

A later, literary expression of aspects of these struggles may be found in Martial’s *Epigram* 5.74, which strikes a sympathetic tone regarding the Pompeii. Martial wonders at the pitiable lot of the Pompeii who, despite their fame, are scattered throughout the world in their resting places:

*Pompeios iuvenes Asia atque Europa, sed ipsum
Terra tegit Libyes, si tamen ulla tegit.
Quid mirum toto si spargitur orbe? lacere
Uno non poterat tanta ruina loco.*

The epigrammatist asserts that a downfall so monumental could not have occurred in but one location; the Pompeii’s fates were of global significance. There is no doubt Sextus held a lingering popularity, underpinned by Pompeian *pietas*. This popularity is

---

525 Martial *Epig.* 5.74:
*“Asian and European earth buries the Pompeian youths, but Pompey himself is buried by Libyan land if any land buries him indeed. What wonder is it that they are dispersed throughout the world? It is not possible that such a ruin should lie in one location.”*

Sextus was buried in Asia, Gnaeus jr. in Europe and Pompey Magnus, if buried at all, in Africa.

526 Welch 2012, 299 writes: “A strategy could be devised for the elder Pompeius, killed by Egyptians and not Romans…. His son, who had so effectively advertised their family similarity, was a greater problem. Eventually, he was separated from the elder Pompeius by a rhetoric of difference which was uniformly adapted by the disciples of Livy.”
made evident by Octavian’s desire to depict Sextus’ death as Antony’s doing. The echoes of sympathetic messages emanating from the Pompeian camp do much to depict a struggle between Octavian and Sextus for the appropriation of pietas.

**The Pompeian Point-of-View**

Sextus had styled himself a pius son who took up his father’s cause. In so doing he stood out prominently as a figurehead for those opposed to the triumvirate and those included in the lists of the proscribed. Sextus accentuated his role as saviour of citizens and as a viable alternative to triumviral rule. Sextus’ messages, primarily ascertained from the imagery of his coinage, depict him as pius towards his father’s memory as well as to his fellow citizens. These associations were fostered by images of Neptune and the Catanaean brothers on his coinage. Neptune was evocative of the naval power his father once wielded, and pointed to Sextus’ filial pietas. The legend of the Catanaean brothers acted as the pius counter-legend to that of Octavian’s/ Augustus’ Aeneas. The brothers combined symbolism of filial pietas with an association with Sicily, the base of Sextus’ activities. Finally, the coinage showing the oak crown served as a potent image of pietas for Sextus to his fellow citizens during the proscriptions.

---

527 Dio 50.1-3. Although he did not lose the opportunity to celebrate Sextus’ death with games in the circus (Dio 49.18.6).

528 Powell 1992, 120; Gowing 1992, 201 n.59 for the pervasive connections between Sextus, the cognomen Pius and his father. Cf. Philippicae 13.13 where Sextus is compared favourably with his father.

529 Crawford no. 511/3.

530 Powell 2002, 126-7: “Seneca juxtaposed the Catanaean brothers with Aeneas (de beneficiis 3.37.1-2, 6.36.1).
The triumvirs also seemingly display a cynical usage of the *corona civica* on their own coinage. This perception, however, is not so straightforward. The imagery carried a number of associations related to monarchical power bearing relation to Romulus and the autocratic expression of *imperium*.\textsuperscript{531} The emergence of a new power at Rome was likewise displayed by this use of the oak crown. Realignments of Republican images such as these are particularly significant aspects of the manner in which *pietas* was also refashioned at this time. Though previous Republican *pietas* had yielded to a factional one, its use as a means of articulating a promise to one’s confederates did not change. These traditional images came to be valued for their symbolic presence and their utility when they were assigned to new partisan ends. In this way the oak crown, a traditional symbol of the preservation of Roman life, came to figure ironically amid the backdrop of the proscriptions. It stands out as an interestingly ambiguous symbol that parallels the appropriation of *pietas*.\textsuperscript{532}

Along with the rise of Octavian’s poetic and propagandistic messages, Sextus, too, employed the imagery of *pietas*. The difficulty that lies with the reconstruction of the Pompeian counter-campaigns is that by-and-large were suppressed. One such instance we have that sought to answer and rebuff the imagery of Aeneas as exemplar of *pietas* and Apollo as tutelary deity, can be found in the Sicilian myth surrounding Catana.\textsuperscript{533} The Catanaean brothers, mentioned in Pausanias, Strabo, Valerius Maximus and in the

\textsuperscript{531} Frazer, 172.

\textsuperscript{532} It would later become part of Augustan imagery (Aug. *RG* 34.3).

\textsuperscript{533} *RRC* 477/1-3: Sextus coinage, exploiting the images of his father and the *pietas* owed to him emerged in 45/44 BC *RRC* 511/3A depicts Neptune, an association inherited from Sextus’ father, and the Catanaean brothers, counter-expressions of *pietas* and divine lineage to those of Aeneas, Venus and Apollo. Powell 2002, 117.
Appendix Vergiliana, provide an alternative to Caesarian *pietas*, as they are used in Sextus’ coinage to point to the moral inferiority of his enemy. The story in the *Aetna* depicts the city of Catana threatened by the erupting Mount Etna. The brothers carried their parents on their shoulders, protected from the flow of lava around them. Language evocative of greed and *impietas* characterizes the other citizens of the city as they hurry about looting in the confusion. The brothers, however, are concerned only with their familial duty. Such imagery clearly fits well with the message regarding the motivations of the Caesarians according to the Pompeians. The self-interested individuals are given to rapacity and opportunism and are punished with death, whereas *pietas* acts as an *aegis* for the brothers. Sextus displayed this iconography on his coinage connecting it to the Pompeian claim to *pietas* as well as depicting the enemies of the *Pompeiani* as rapacious and destined to incur divine punishment. The emphasis on this myth, coupled with the reality of the proscriptions and land expropriations in Italy, provided a considerable political statement with which the *Pompeiani* could identify. The communications campaigns of the Pompeians were effective and we see their vestiges long after the power of the Pompeians had ended. One such instance comes

---

534 Pausanias 10.28.4; Strabo, VI.2.3; Sen. *De Ben.* 3.37.2; Martial 7.24.5; Val. Max. 5.4; Sil. Ital. 14.197.

535 *Cf.* Propertius *Elegiae* 4.1.52: Aeneas walks through the flames of Troy unscathed with his father on his shoulders and Ascanius clinging to his hem. This mirrored imagery shows a contest for the appropriation of *pietas* between Octavian and Sextus. *Cf.* Powell 2002, 126-7.

536 *Aetna* vv. 614: *rapina*; 617: *raptis...crimina*; 621: *avaro*; 629: *avara*.

537 *Aetna* vv. 623; 634; Powell 2002, 123-6.

538 Similarly, both Appian *BC* 4.41 and Dio 48.53.4 mention Oppius, one of the proscribed who was saved by his son Marcus as he carried his aged father to exile in Sicily. The populace was so impressed by this show of *pietas* that they later elected Marcus Oppius as *aedile* and, because of his poverty, bankrolled his time in office.
to us from the elder Pliny (Nat. Hist. 7.178), who describes an episode from the Bellum Siculum of 38-36 BC:

*bello Siculo Gabienus*

*Caesaris classium fortissimus, captus a Sexto Pompeio, iussu eius incisa cervice et vix cohaerente, iacuit in litore toto*

die. deinde, cum advesperavisset, gemitu precibusque con-
gregata multitudine petiit uti Pompeius ad se veniret aut

diquem ex arcanis mitteret; se enim ab inferis remissum

*habere quae nuntiare. misit plures Pompeius ex amicis,*

*quibus Gabienus dixit inferis dis placere Pompei causas et partes pias; proinde eventum futurum quem optaret: hoc

*se nuntiare iussum; argumentum fore veritatis quod peractis

*mandatis protinus expiraturus esset. idque ita evenit.* 539

A certain Gabienus, one of the bravest men in Octavian’s navy, had been captured by Sextus’ forces, and had his throat cut. Gabienus was left on the shore to die. The man begged to see Sextus or one of his personal staff in order that he might relate a message from the underworld. This message stated that the gods below supported the Pompeian cause because they were the *partes pias.* According to the Pompeian propaganda, this was the reason for the contest between the Pompeians and

---

539 “In the Sicilian war the bravest man of Octavian’s fleets, having been captured by Sextus Pompeius by his order had his neck severed so that it barely remained attached and he lay on the shore the entire day. When evening approached and a crowd surrounded him he, with groaning and imprecations, sought that Pompey should come to him or that he send one of his inner-circle; for he announced that he had a message from the underworld. Pompey sent a number of his friends to the man, to whom Gabienus stated that the Pompeian cause, the pious party was supported by the divine shades and, therefore, the outcome which he wished would transpire. This he was ordered to announce; the words would be proven true because with them uttered he would straightaway expire. And thus this came to pass.”
Caesarians to eventually favour Sextus and his faction. The propaganda depicts a struggle contingent upon pietas and the connection between the idea and the eventual success of a political entity.

Anton Powell takes the imagery of Sextus and extrapolates that, as a result of it, he obtained popular favour typified by pietas. Such favour provided a measure of divine protection in the running of great risks. Instead, within these competing versions of pietas, I see distinction that must be made. It was not because of any ‘sympathy’ in the community or on account of any idealistic considerations that the populace displayed its short-lived favour for Sextus, but rather because of pragmatic concerns. Because pietas was marked by obligation, particularly to familial interests and reciprocal duty, both Octavian and Sextus could argue they were compelled by necessity to adopt the courses of action they pursued. Florus is particularly illuminating on this point:

*Populus Romanus...in statum pristinum libertatis videbatur. et redierat,... nisi aut Pompeius liberos aut Caesar heredem reliquisset...*  

Dio summarizes the inevitability of conflict these competing claims to pietas portended as the Treaty of Misenum broke down:

---

540 The connection between the faction, pietas and success causes the tale to bear the indelible stamp of the era that produced it.


542 Powell 2002, 128.

543 Namely starvation, evictions and disorder prompted the disaffected populace to temporarily embrace Sextus.

544 Annius Florus Bellorum Omnium Anorum 2.14.1-4: “If not for the duties of the Caesarian and Pompeian heirs and sons, the Republic would be restored.”
οἷα γὰρ οὐκ ἔθελονται οὐδ' ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἀλλὰ ἀναγκαστοὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν
πεποιημένοι, χρόνον οὐδένα αὐτῇ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐνέμειναν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς τὰς σπονδὰς
λύσαντες διηνέχθησαν. ἐμελλὸν μὲν γὰρ ποι ἂν λους, εἰ καὶ μηδεμίαν σκήψιν
ἐὑρον, πολεμήσειν.545

Around this inevitability, the requisite reasons for war were constructed along lines of an
inescapable obligation to *pietas*. Any pretense of moralistic action overlaid the reality of
a vendetta represented by factional leaders, who held up the obligations of *pietas* to
justify the necessary actions of the civil wars.

Powell turns to a modern analogy in characterizing the attitude of the People to
Sextus and Octavian in their conflict. The Roman People are compared to the French
citizens who cheered allied bombs falling around them during the Second World War.546
While indicative of one aspect of the mindset of some Romans for a short time who
suffered under Sextus' expression of *pietas*, it argues for an unlikely uniformity among
the populace. By way of analogy, I introduce another that I feel completes the picture
and gives scope to the experience of those caught between sides in war. The mentality
of the people of Genoa during the allied bombings of “Operation Grog” is perhaps more
fitting.547 This operation saw a shell launched from the HMS *Malaya* strike Genoa’s *San
Lorenzo* Cathedral and lodge unexploded in its roof. Rather than cheer the English
bombs falling on their city, the Genoese derided the futility of the campaign. To this day,

545 Dio 48.45.4.1-2: “...for since they had made their agreement, not of their own free will or by choice, but
under compulsion, they did not abide by it for any time to speak of, but broke the truce at once and
quarreled. They were bound, of course, to go to war in any case, even if they had found no excuse...”


547 February 6-11, 1941. The operation launched from Gibraltar sought to infiltrate the Bay of Genoa and
bomb the city and the strategic harbour of La Spezia.
they display the shell in the south-east corner of the cathedral’s nave with an inscription proclaiming Genoa a city of the Virgin Mary protected by their faith in her. It was indeed considered a type of piety that had spared the Cathedral but, rather than that contested by the adversaries in the conflict, it was that of a people caught between two hostile forces, each of which garnering little sympathy from the populace.\footnote{Genoa was liberated by the partisan forces on April 26, 1945, not the allies who shelled and bombed the city. Fascism had never been a popular political ideology in Genoa, and Nazism even less so.} The recent obituary of the gunner who fired the shell in question apologetically mentions his inexpertice and error in aim.\footnote{Daily Telegraph 4 July, 2010 ‘Henry Hatfield.’} Conversely, the Genoese inscription commemorating the event takes an unambiguous view to the event: “This bomb, launched by the British fleet to destroy the walls of this noted cathedral fell here on the 9th of February 1941. In perennial recognition of this, Genoa, a city of the Virgin Mary, wishes this inscription to commemorate \textit{Tanta Grazia}.” I believe the gulf between popular perception and the attempts of the opposing sides of the conflict to characterize their involvement favourably, bears a similar set of circumstances to those faced by the people of Italy at the time of the \textit{Bellum Siculum}. The exploitation of this gulf resulted in the era being marked by the competing communications of Octavian and Sextus. It is difficult to state that a starving populace under tried and true Pompeian methods,\footnote{Plut. \textit{Pompeius Magnus} 49.4: The elder Pompey’s strategy of starving Rome to impose his will.} faced with a possible invasion from Sextus’ forces in Sicily,\footnote{Dio 48.17.5: Also kept in line under the threat of famine.} could wholeheartedly support Sextus, because he had successfully claimed to be expressing \textit{pietas}. If we take this viewpoint coupled with the many deaths from disease and famine reported at Rome,\footnote{Dio 48.8.} it is
difficult to hold credence in a population lovingly captivated by the instruments of Pompeian *pietas*, but rather one that eventually acquiesced to the Augustan appropriation of it.

Sextus and Octavian mirrored each other in motivation. Both men laid claim to action prompted by *pietas*. Traditional Republican *auctoritas* and *dignitas* gave way to the natural law of *pietas* as the men vied for political supremacy. This contest was marked by invocations of a divinely mandated justification for their actions. Octavian and Sextus sought to appropriate a positive moral perception of their actions by arguing for a motivation of expressions of filial *pietas*.

Sextus enacted a campaign that sought to offer a competing claim to *pietas*, one that would counter Octavian’s and the Caesarians’ appropriation of it. Sextus’ imagery represents an alternate claim to *pietas* and, therefore, legitimacy. The proscriptions provided the context within which Sextus could argue that he was expressing true *pietas* to his fellow citizens. In response, the Octavian’s communications sought to counter the perceptions Sextus fostered.

The Caesarians at this time resorted to the language of *impietas* to depict Sextus’ actions as piracy, his *fides* to those he harboured as disingenuous and as the source of Italy’s misery because of his naval blockade. The murders of A. Pompeius Bithynicus and Staius Murcus were put forth as proof of Sextus’ dangerous character. Finally, the unrest that occurred as a result of the populace being caught between these factions resulted in disturbances at Rome. These disturbances compelled the factional leaders to acquiesce to the demands of the citizens to whom they were obligated. The
consequent Treaty of Misenum eventually led to Sextus’ defeat as the proscribed, the moral basis of Sextus’ challenge to Caesarian pietas, returned to Rome, leaving him depleted of the moral basis of his actions.

Chapter 4: Vergil, Ovid and Augustan Pietas

Following the defeat of Sextus Pompeius, the poetic clients of Octavian came to articulate their own understanding of Octavian’s actions and motivations, making pietas a term of prime importance in the final period of the civil wars and into the Augustan principate. The notion had closely accompanied some of the most difficult moments of Rome’s transition from Republic to Empire.\textsuperscript{553} It is no surprise that the poets turned to an exploration of the significance of the language of pietas and how it might relate to Octavian’s/Augustus’ actions.\textsuperscript{554}

These ideas acknowledge by name a tumultuous set of circumstances leading to the peace ushered in by Augustan pietas. Pias acted as a remedy to the furor of civil war and as a principle that guaranteed Rome’s greatness. The fratricide of civil war (impia arma) would give way to a new age of Augustan pietas:

aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis:

\begin{quote}
cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[553] Powell 2008, 58: Both Appian and Cassius Dio use the term εὐσέβεια and εὐσεβές to describe those who protected others from the proscriptions. The proscribed Verginius, who convinced his slaves not to kill him, stated that they would be known for their pietas because of their actions (δόξης...εὐσεβοῦς). Cassius Dio describes instances of sons protecting their fathers and slaves protecting their masters as, “such...outstanding acts of virtue and pietas” (ἀρετῆς μὲν δὴ καὶ εὐσεβείας τοσαῦτα τότε ἐπιφανῆ ἔργα ἐγένετο).
\item[554] Williams 1972, 172: “The word furor is the element in human behaviour which seems to be responsible for folly and sin, while the quality of pietas is that through which Aeneas seeks to inaugurate a better world order.” Austin 1971, 113 on furor: “impius gives the clue: it is the madness of civil war, when brother is set against brother and the duty and love implicit in pietas have been forgotten (cf. Ovid Met. 1.144ff.: ‘fratrum quoque gratia rara est....uicta iacet pietas’)."
\end{footnotes}
The costs of *pietas* which brought about this age were not glossed over. Instead, they are presented in an honest manner, showing a recognition of the consequences which the pursuit of the obligations representative of Mars *Ultor* created. This literary exposition of the nature of *pietas* candidly presents both the beneficiaries and those harmed by the victorious Octavianic *pietas*.

Vergil was a client of Octavian bound by *pietas* to his patron, and, therefore, personally knowledgeable of its responsibilities, obligations and difficulties. The examinations of *pietas* put forth by Vergil regard the notion from a number of viewpoints. These show both the constructive and destructive nature of *pietas* in an unflinching and, oftentimes, unsettling manner. As I have shown before, *pietas* engendered a double nature wherein an expression of *pietas* to one entity could result in an *impietas* to another. This circumstance is expressed as an inherent difficulty that accompanied

---

555 *Aeneid* 1.291-296:
“Then with wars abandoned, the harsh ages will grow mild:
White haired *fides*, and Vesta, Quirinus with his brother Remus
will make the laws: the gates of War, grim with iron,
and narrowed by bars, will be closed: inside *impius Furor* will roar
frighteningly from blood-stained mouth, seated on savage weapons,
hands tied behind his back, with a hundred knots of bronze.”
Williams 1972, 182: “*Furor impius*: here is personified the quality of mad strife seen especially in civil war, in which *pietas* was especially profaned (Hor. *Epod.* 16.9)…. The picture of *Furor impius* is said by Servius to be based on a painting (by Apelles. Pliny *N.H.* 35.93) that Augustus placed in his own forum.”

556 Amiottii’s *Augusto e il culto di Marte Ultore* discusses the background and manifestation of the cult of Mars *Ultor*. 
Rome’s history from its beginnings to events contemporary with Octavian’s rise to power.

Here is an example of this double nature of *pietas*. Suetonius relates an episode of the propaganda against Octavian from a letter of Antony in which a shameful event is depicted. A banquet is alleged to have been staged during the famine at Rome caused by the *bellum Siculum*. The triumvir and his guests are depicted as feasting in the costume of the twelve Olympian gods while the populace starves.\(^{557}\) This feast is termed a *mensa...impia*:\(^{558}\)

\begin{quote}
*omne frumentum deos comedisse et Caesarem esse plane Apollinem, sed Tortorem quo cognomine is deus quadam in parte urbis colebatur.*\(^{559}\)
\end{quote}

Octavian assumes on the role of Apollo at this feast; the actual gods who view the display are so disgusted by it that one by one they leave.

This may be contrasted with the imagery described by Vergil’s 4th *Eclogue* depicting a reversed set of circumstances to Antony’s accusations. This poem shows a renewed cycle of existence marked by the return of the immortals to Earth:

\begin{quote}
* magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo.*\(^{560}\)
\end{quote}

---

\(^{557}\) The Octavianic response may be seen in the story circulated of Antony’s man Plancus in blue body-paint entertaining at Cleopatra’s court in the guise of Glaucus the Nereid (Vell. Pat. 2.83.2).

\(^{558}\) Suet. *Aug.* 70.1.9: “an *impius* banquet.”

\(^{559}\) *Aug.* 70.2.4: “the gods had eaten all the grain and that Caesar was truly Apollo, but Apollo the Tormentor, a surname under which the god was worshipped in one part of the city.”

\(^{560}\) Vergil *Eclogues* 4.5: “the great order of the ages is born anew.”
The poem, like the slanderous verses above, is contemporary with the consulship of G. Asinius Pollio (40 BC) and the Treaty of Brundisium. This treaty offered hope of a reconciliation between the two triumvirs and a cessation of conflict with Sextus. Vergil describes this era as one marked by a return of Astraea, personification of justice, and last of the immortals to leave the Earth when the golden age had ended:

\[ \textit{iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna...} \] \(^{561}\)

Ovid similarly links Astraea (justice) with \textit{pietas}, both harmed by the recent civil wars:

\[ \textit{victa iacet pietas, et virgo caede madentis} \]

\[ \textit{ultima caelestum terras Astraea reliquit}. \] \(^{562}\)

Her return is accompanied by a new age of Saturn and a subsequent renewal of the \textit{great year} ushering in an age of \textit{pietas}. \(^{563}\) These words acknowledge that Roman society sought relief from the destructions of the civil wars which, to them, must have seemed on par with a cosmic conflagration. This poetry held out the promise of Caesarian \textit{pietas} as the means by which stability and normalcy would return to the world. Suetonius’ story relates the anti-Octavianic messages, whereas Vergil provides, in contrast, the understanding of \textit{pietas} and its effects that his patron held up.

These costs and the eventual benefits of this \textit{pietas} are depicted by Vergil. He was well acquainted with the expenses of the civil wars as he had his own estate in

\(^{561}\) Vergil \textit{Eclogue} 4.6: “now even the virgin (Astraea) returns, heralding a new age of Saturn…” \textit{Cf.} Statius Silvae 1.4.2; Juvenal \textit{Saturae} 6.19.

\(^{562}\) \textit{Met}. 1.149-52: “Piety was dead, and virgin Astraea, last of all the immortals to depart, herself abandoned the blood-drenched earth.”

\(^{563}\) The Stoic notion of a cyclical existence characterized by a destruction (\(\varepsilon\kappa\pi\upsilon\rho\omega\varsigma\iota\varsigma\)) and regeneration (\(\tau\acute{\alpha}λ\lambda\gamma\nu\gamma\epsilon\nu\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\)) of the universe likely entered the Roman mind via Posidonius, whose interest in astrology and cosmology is apparent in his pupil Cicero’s work (\textit{de Nat. Deor}. 2.51.10). Ulansey 1989, 77.
Mantua confiscated in 42 BC, only to have it restored to him via the patronage of Maecenas and his influence with Octavian. This event is alluded to in Vergil’s ninth Eclogue:

Ecl. 9.1-5: O Lycidas, we’ve lived to see the time when a stranger, owner of our land, could say (as we never thought could happen):
'These lands are mine: you old tenants move on.'
Now sad and defeated, since chance overturns all

Vergil, aware of the negative effects on the land and the grain supply of the confiscations of the triumviral period, sought to depict the future as marked by a return to a golden age where the fields would again be fruitful as they had been under Saturn. He takes the connection of *pietas* and this golden age even further, showing its positive bearing on the Roman Empire itself in the *Aeneid*:

Aeneid 8.360-368: Augustus Caesar, diui genus, aurea condet

saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arua

Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos

proferet imperium...

huius in aduentum iam nunc et Caspia regna

---

564 Ecl. 9.1-5: O Lycidas, we’ve lived to see the time when a stranger, owner of our land, could say (as we never thought could happen):
'These lands are mine: you old tenants move on.'
Now sad and defeated, since chance overturns all
cf. Ecl. 1.3-4: nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.
nos patriam fugimus
“We are leaving the sweet fields and the frontiers of our country:
we are fleeing our country”
The return of *pietas* which the *Eclogue* heralded points to its place within the imperial framework of Rome. The issues of dutiful obligation fostered by the Augustans are connected with the success of the state while confronting the troubles of the past in a straightforward and honest manner.

Not surprisingly, Vergil’s *Aeneid* provides a meditation on *pietas*, as it is one of the overriding themes of the Augustan age. *Pietas* is put forth as the principal virtue of the protagonist Aeneas. The second set of words uttered by the hero as he encounters his mother Venus are, “*sum pius Aeneas.*” In this statement, his character is summarized. With this there are a number of traits associated with the hero: responsibility to gods and homeland, familial responsibility and a subordination of individual desire to the greater service of a destiny laid out by the gods. These themes are notably portrayed with a number of historical and political connotations, in book four of the *Aeneid*. This book, which chronicles the greatest threat to Rome’s divinely sanctioned foundation, namely Dido the Carthaginian queen, examines the implications of love and duty.

---

*Aeneid*: 6.792: Augustus Caesar, son of the Deified, who will make a Golden Age again in the fields where Saturn once reigned, and extend the empire beyond the Libyans and the Indians... Even now the Caspian realms, and Maeotian earth, tremble at divine prophecies of his coming, and the restless mouths of the seven-branched Nile are troubled.

*Aeneid* 1.378.
Despite the affinities between Dido and Aeneas, when the individuals are placed under the duress of Aeneas’ divine mandate and its consequences, they are shown to be reverse images of each other. Aeneas is portrayed as pious, whereas Dido is evocative of a number of the most terrifying images possible to the Roman mind as she, unhinged, presents a contrast to some of Aeneas’ most pious actions. This is particularly apparent when she acts as a perverse funeral officiant. This behaviour is opposite to Aeneas’ pietas towards his father and comrades as he buries them.

This examination of duty and obligation touches upon the inherent difficulties that beset the Augustan visualization of Rome. These difficulties stem from the necessary inclusion of Venus, Mars and Aeneas’ relative Rhea Silvia, the parents of Romulus and Remus, as Augustus’ ancestors. On the one hand, claiming ancestry from Venus and Mars as ancestors of the Julian family presents an advantageous link to the mythical past. But this action evoked the story of Romulus and Remus, bringing to the fore the Roman proclivity for internal discord as well as being reminiscent of the civil wars when vengeance was the order of the day. During the period before Augustus’ consolidation of power, a divine lineage that started with Venus and moved through Julius Caesar was beneficial in maintaining the aura of the dead dictator. But as his hold on power...

---

567 Aeneid 4.499-520.

568 Aeneid 3.710 (Anchises’ burial) ; 6.232 (Misenus): at Pius Aeneas...; 11.170: quin ego non alio digner te funere, Palla, quam pius Aeneas...

“Indeed, Pallas, I thought you worthy of no other funeral than this that Pius Aeneas...chose.”

569 O’Gorman, 106.
increased, “the role of Venus was gradually de-emphasized.”

So, too, was the imagery of a vengeful Mars diminished.

As the Augustan regime developed, Apollo was seen as a more appropriate tutelary deity who represented order and civilization. An interesting aspect of these aspects is the inclusion of a statuary group representing the Danaids at the entrance to the temple of Apollo on the Palatine. This group represented the difficult decisions related to *fides* and, even more importantly, *pietas*. Augustan literature touches upon this myth with Horace, Ovid, Propertius and Vergil all treating the subject. The problematic nature of *pietas*, as represented in the myth, is in line with the realistic and frank portrayal of it by the Augustans, who did not attempt to ignore the realities of its effects in their recent history.

The significance of the Danaid myth is that it creates a thematic thread of fraternal discord and the bounds of *pietas* as they functioned under the duress of familial conflict. The father, Lynceus, ordered his fifty daughters to kill their husbands as he feared their father’s (his brother’s) designs on his own kingdom. This episode is an exposition of the double nature of the obligations inherent in *pietas*. I believe that, for this reason, the subject matter figures prominently in the works of the Augustan poets. It

---

570 Though (mostly) completed in 2 BC the temple of Mars *Ultor* was begun to commemorate the victory against Caesar’s assassins at Philippi in 42 BC

571 Edmonson, 304.

572 The 50 daughters of Danaus were ordered by their father to kill their husbands, the sons of their uncle Aegyptus.

573 Ovid *Her.* 14, *Ars Amatoria* 1, *Tristia* 3; Propertius *Elegiae* 2.1, 2.31; Vergil *Aeneid* 10.495-505.
is also why the myth was represented in the temple the Emperor had built adjacent to his home: a grand sign of his affinity with Apollo. It evokes the major, problematic, themes of the Augustan age and seeks to exhibit the movement to a more civilized expression of 

Ovid makes use of the Danaid myth in his *Heroides*, where he examines the Danaid myth from the viewpoint of Hypermnestra, wife of Lynceus, the only Danaid to spare her husband's life. Hypermnestra speaks of punishment stemming from her *pietas*:

\[ clausa domo teneor gravibusque coercita vinclis; \]

\[ est mihi supplicii causa fuisse piam. \]

She then asks:

\[ haec meruit pietas praemia. \]

The ambiguous nature of expressions of *pietas* is seen, as the obedience to the father conflicts with the expression of *pietas* to her husband. This ambiguity characterizes the difficulties inherent in *pietas*, demonstrating the Augustan poets understanding of these difficulties.

Ovid also treats these themes in *Heroides* VII. He once again represents a conflict between competing expressions of *pietas* in the words of Dido towards Aeneas.

\[ Heroides XIV.3-4: \] “I'm held prisoner in this house, confined by heavy chains: that's my punishment because I was virtuous.”

Knox, 6: “the most probable date of composition for at least the majority of the collection of single Heroides ranges between c. 25 and 16 BC.”

\[ Heroides XIV.84: \] Does *pietas* merit these rewards?
Her language is hostile towards Aeneas; she calls into question the underpinnings of his *pietas* and counts his father and *penates* as convenient excuses for a cold-hearted character. The appellation of *perfidus* stands as the opposite to the *fides* on which *pietas* depends:

*ignibus ereptos obruet unda deos?*

*sed neque fers tecum, nec, quae mihi, perfide, iactas,*

*presserunt umeros sacra paterque tuos.*

*omnia mentiris, neque enim tua fallere lingua*

*incipit a nobis, primaque plector ego.*

*si quaeras, ubi sit formosi mater luli –*

*occidit a duro sola relict a viro!*\(^{576}\)

This letter represents her expression of *pietas* as a series of tensions among conflicting loyalties. Both Aeneas and Dido are represented as owing *pietas* to different forces. They are compelled to pay *pietas* to one side, while harming the other. The inability for these characters to reconcile or find any understanding in these conflicting obligations provides the subtext for the prominent aspect of the duplicity of *pietas.*

\(^{576}\) *Heroides VII.78-84*: Shall the waves bury those gods you rescued from the fire? But you did not bring them with you, as you told me, *perfidus,* nor did your sacred father straddle your shoulders. You lied about it all: for your lying tongue did not start with me, nor am I the first one to be punished: if you ask where Creusa is, the lovely mother of Iulus – she died alone, abandoned by a hard-hearted husband!
Vergil’s treatment of the story of Aeneas and Dido represents this same difficulty in the expression of *pietas*. Whereas Aeneas appears less than noble in his actions towards her, Dido’s descent into madness after Mercury’s words to Aeneas heightens the sympathy of the reader.\(^577\) Dido’s frustrated expectations of *pietas* and Aeneas’ conflicting adherence to his own understanding of it doom the queen, ushering in an ambiguity in the appraisal of Aeneas’ character. Aeneas is primarily motivated by a *pietas* to gods and homeland, whereas Dido is motivated by her *fides* towards him, much as Hypermnestra was to Lynceus.

In book one Aeneas stands atop a mountain overlooking Carthage where he marvels at the building activity, the gates of the city, and the rising walls, to which he exclaims:

*O Fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt*\(^578\)

This statement delineates Aeneas’ obligation, expressed as his *pietas*, to act as founder of a great civilization. He looks forward to the time when his own walls will rise. If we view the state of Carthage after Dido is consumed by the “blind fire” (*caeco…igni*) and she has *solvitque pudorem*\(^579\) we then see the cost of any *pietas* expressed internally in their relationship. At 4.86-89 we are made privy to the effects on society of Dido’s and Aeneas’ union – all the building activity Aeneas marveled at has halted.\(^580\)

\(^{577}\) *Aeneid* 4.265.

\(^{578}\) *Aeneid* 1.437: “O fortunate ones, whose walls now rise.”

\(^{579}\) *Aeneid* 4.55: “loosed the bonds of shame.”

\(^{580}\) Austin 1955, 49: “Virgil now shows the cumulative aspect of Dido’s sleepless passion.”
This then sets the stage for the tragic encounter between Aeneas and Dido. The consequences for Dido and Rome of Aeneas’ obligations are shown to be both detrimental and necessary. At the very moment that Dido and Aeneas consummate their relationship, the cosmos show their apprehension, *fulsere ignes* – “fires flashed” and *ulularunt...nymphae* – “the nymphs shriek.” The union is presented as:

*ille dies primus leti primusque malorum causa fuit* \(^581\)

Dido is shown as uncaring of appearances or reputation (*specie famave*). She calls the liaison “marriage” (*coniugium*) and by this appellation hides her “sin” (*culpam*).\(^582\)

The notion of marriage and divergent views of it by the two characters merits examination. While chastising Aeneas for leaving her (rather distastefully in stealth) she entreats him by speaking of their union: *per conubia nostra*, and the undertaken wedding rites *per inceptos hymenaeos*.\(^583\) For Dido, her acceptance of Aeneas represents a compact equivalent to marriage, accordingly her language reflects this. Aeneas on the other hand, replies that he held out no bridegroom’s torch nor did he come to any marital agreement (4.339). Nature and Dido acknowledged this union as a marriage, the former by the portents that accompanied the union and the latter by her words. Aeneas, however, denies on coldly legalistic grounds, that there is a marriage at

---

\(^{581}\) *Aeneid* 4.167-170: “The first day of death and the first cause of evils.”

\(^{582}\) *Aeneid* 4.171.

\(^{583}\) *Aeneid* 4.316.
all. Near the end of her life, Dido characterizes (her own? Aeneas’?) actions as contrary to *pietas*: “*nunc te facta impia tangunt.*”

**Infelix Dido, Nunc Te Facta Impia Tangunt?: Putting Dido in her Political Context**

A poem as complex as Vergil’s *Aeneid* presents a polyphonic expression of important issues from the Augustan age. The private and public voices evident in the poem provide us opportunities to examine the message, dependent upon the perception of the poet’s intent. Thus, “Parry’s ‘two-voices theory’ became, according to which side you were on, banner or target of Vergilian scholarship.” This polyphony, in my opinion, allows for us to view Dido as both a humane and tragic figure, and a necessary counterpoint to Aeneas’ *pietas*.

---

584 *Aeneid* 4.596: – “now *impius* deeds reach you.”

Williams 1972, 385-6: “…the moment of realization and self-reproach for her *facta impia* in breaking her oath to Sychaeus, and perhaps also, as Austin (1955, 175) suggests, in failing in her duties to her people. Some have argued that the reference is to the *facta impia* of Aeneas against her, but this is inappropriate to the context and the meaning of *tangunt.*” Contra Casali 1999.

585 The “pessimistic” Harvard school, first identified with A. Parry, who in 1963 argued for the “Two Voices of Vergil’s *Aeneid*”, among others (O. Lyne, R. Johnson, R. Thomas) who have “championed a darker, less optimistic assessment of the epic’s message.” (Schmidt, 149 n. 24) Contra A. Wlosok, K. Galinsky, J. Griffin, R. Glei, S.J. Harrison and M.C.J. Putnam 1995, who writes: “The historicist view, espoused most recently by Hardie and Cairns, but stemming from a long tradition in Vergilian scholarship whose most acknowledged exponent since the Second World War is Pöschl, sees the *Aeneid* as a grandly imaginative reinforcement of Augustan ideology and power structures.” This may be contrasted with Parry, who quotes from an introduction to a translation, 111: “The ancient Romans did not read this episode (sc. that of Dido) as tearfully as we do…. From the Roman point of view, Dido was the aggressor in her marriage with Aeneas, an intolerable assumption of a male prerogative” before asserting his own objection against “orthodox interpretations of the *Aeneid.*” 110: Parry then puts forth the notions of an “explicit message” and a “panegyric,” counteracted by the “characteristic Virgilian note of melancholy and nostalgia, a note produced by the personal accents of sorrow over human and heroic values lost.” His acknowledgment and inclusion of the “orthodox interpretation” in addition to the other allows Parry to put forth his “two voices” in the poem. 121: “We hear two distinct voices in the *Aeneid*, a public voice of triumph, and a private voice of regret.”

586 Schmidt, 147.
Responsibility to the gods and (future) homeland, familial obligation and subordination of individual desire to the greater service of a divinely sanctioned destiny are placed in a problematic relationship with personal desire and the will of the individual in book four of the *Aeneid*. This tension can be seen as evocative of a greater tension in Augustan Rome, where the obligations and desires of private individuals were brought into contact with the realities of the demands of loyalty in the Augustan period following the civil wars. These themes are visibly portrayed, while evincing a number of historical and political overtones in book four of the *Aeneid*. This book, which chronicles the greatest threat to Rome’s divinely sanctioned foundation, namely Dido the Carthaginian queen, examines the implications of love and duty when faced with necessity. In the person of Dido, we see “the classical idea of passion overcoming reason, of the personal taking precedence over the public” and a foil to Aeneas’ character.\(^{587}\) In this regard, Aeneas is already placed by his stated adherence to *pietas* on a footing which preordains that their relationship will be problematic.

This examination of duty and obligation will touch upon the inherent difficulties that beset the Augustan visualization of Rome. Vergil’s treatment of the story of Aeneas and Dido represents these tensions and is not without its problems. From a modern standpoint, Aeneas appears less than noble, perhaps even *impius*, in the face of his reaction to Dido’s hospitality, whereas her pitiable desperation only heightens the sympathy of the reader. As a result the reader experiences an ambiguous valuation of Aeneas as a hero marked by noble characteristics.

---

\(^{587}\) Covi p.59. Important notions in this discussion which bear relevance to the relationship, governed by *pietas*, between figures of authority and the individual.
From the very first lines of book 4 of the *Aeneid*, we are afforded a view of *amor* that is unsettling and, ironically, fatally romantic, in the modern sense. Dido is represented as wounded and seized by a *caeco...igni*, a blind fire.\(^{588}\) This imagery of burning and the erotic is immediately connected with familial strife when, eighteen lines later the murder of Sychaeus, Dido’s husband, is again mentioned. Seen earlier, Sychaeus’ fate occurs in book 1.335-368: Venus recounts the story to Aeneas of Dido’s brother Pygmalion and his lust for wealth – *auri caecus amore*, coupled with his *impietas*.\(^{589}\) This similar language is obvious. This murder sets in motion a chain of events that culminates in Dido’s escape from Tyre, and subsequent foundation of Carthage. A parallel analogy may be drawn here between the foundation of Rome after the murder of Remus and the future foundation of Carthage, both defined by familial murder. By establishing these affinities between Rome and Carthage, we begin to see the placement of Aeneas and Dido as mirroring each other. Both flee their homelands, forced by necessity, but they establish societies inevitably destined by forces outside of themselves, so as to enter into an everlasting enmity. The distinction between the two is delineated by the stimuli that motivate them: Aeneas is primarily motivated by the constructive *pietas*, whereas Dido is ensnared by destructive *amor*.\(^{590}\)

Another aspect of the characterizations of Dido and Aeneas reaches back into the historical past to evoke the propaganda used against Mark Antony before Actium.

\(^{588}\) *Aeneid* 4.2. Austin 1955, 26: “*Carpere* well expresses the gradualness and inexorability of her passion; it implies the action of taking the part from a whole, and so the completion of something by successive stages...little by little the fire will wear her down to nothingness.”

\(^{589}\) *Aeneid* 1.349: “blind with the love of gold.”

\(^{590}\) Cf. *Aeneid* 6.801 where Augustus represents the epitome of imperial industriousness in a geographical description of his exploits which outstrip even those of Dionysus and Hercules - both important associations fostered by Antony.
The imagery employed was of eastern luxury and depravity, placed in opposition to Roman *pietas* and moral rectitude. In book four, Dido’s appearance is decadent; she is clad in gold *auro...in aurum...aurea*, and dressed in purple.\(^{591}\) Immediately following this, Aeneas is described with not worldly luxury, but with the religious imagery of Apollo.\(^{592}\) This juxtaposition is striking, for it comes immediately prior to the union of the two lovers. After this point, the character of both parties is plainly visible. Aeneas is equated with Rome’s future hopes and Dido with a soul captivated by the destructive force of blind *amor*. The catalyzing nature of this dichotomy leads to a number of events to define Aeneas, his *pietas* and the inescapable consequences of the will of the gods as it plays out in human affairs.

After a period of vacillation at Carthage, Aeneas is reminded by Mercury acting as herald for Jupiter, that his destiny does not lie on Libyan shores but in the future of Rome.\(^{593}\) At this point, it bears mention that Aeneas, too, until warned and redirected by the gods, is wholly ensnared by the comfort and pleasant life of ease with Dido at Carthage. Aeneas is abdicating the responsibilities of *pietas*, while assimilating the luxuriousness previously attributed to Dido. Aeneas is now clad in eastern garb:

*Tyrioque…murice laena demissa ex umeris,*\(^{594}\)

He now lays the foundations of Carthage, unmindful of his responsibility to the destiny of Rome and to the demands of paternal *pietas*. This is pointed out to Aeneas

\(^{591}\) *Aeneid* 4.138-139.

\(^{592}\) *Aeneid* 4.144. An association between Apollo and Augustus was fostered by physical monuments and literary emissions. Cf. Miller, J.F. 2011: recalls Aeneas’ own travels – like Apollo, he has been voyaging west from Asia Minor; at the god’s “maternal Delos” (4.144).

\(^{593}\) *Aeneid* 4.270: *quid struis?*

\(^{594}\) *Aeneid* 4.263: “With purple Tyrian cloak hanging from his shoulders.”
by Mercury himself, who asks if Aeneas builds up Carthage to the detriment of his own destiny and obligations. It is this very responsibility, this *pietas* to his own son Ascanius/Iulus, that is placed as the chief reason given to Aeneas to fulfill his duty as ordained by the gods:

...*Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli*

*respice, cui regnum Italicae Romanaque tellus*

*debentur.*

It is of the utmost significance that this warning stands as the principal motivator for Aeneas to leave Carthage. A choice of *pietas*, and *labor* in favour of *otium* sets in motion the chain of events which lead to Dido’s death and the enmity that Rome and Carthage shared. Dido, in her final manic furor calls down a curse on Aeneas and Rome. She calls for a never-ending enmity between the nations, invoking an avenger to arise from her bones. Thus the mythical underpinning for Rome’s problematic relationship with Carthage is provided.

The reactions of the characters to the stimuli of the gods are excellent indicators of the interplay between destiny and the double-edged sword presented in fulfilling one’s *pietas*. Both characters are described as stricken with terror at some point in the book. Dido is struck by *amor*, in fact, she is *exterrita* by it (4.457), whereas Aeneas is

595 *Aeneid* 4.274-6 “…have regard for the growing Ascanius, the promise of Iulus your heir, to whom the kingdom of Italy and the Roman land are due.”

596 *Aeneid* 4.271: Mercury asks, “*qua spe Libycis teris otia terris?*”

“With what expectation do you idly waste your time on Libyan shores?”

597 *Aeneid* 4.625 *exoriare alicuis nostris ex ossibus ультor*.

“a certain avenger will arise from my bones.”

Williams 1972, 388: “The appeal to the Carthaginians is general, extending through all future time; but the specific *alicuis ультor* must have brought to Roman minds the thought of Hannibal.”
terrified by the words of Mercury warning him to observe *pietas*. This point is the pivotal moment at which the true characteristics of the individuals are presented by Vergil. After line 280 and Mercury’s warning, Aeneas irrevocably follows the path of his destiny, whereas Dido descends further into madness. The catalyzing moment of Mercury’s warning to Aeneas from Jupiter and his message of paternal responsibility infused with *pietas*, serve as the point at which the *Romanitas* of Aeneas is juxtaposed by Dido’s reckless passion and lack of reason. In contrast to her mounting frenzy, Aeneas’ response to Dido’s entreaties are cold and legalistic. The necessity of Aeneas’ *pietas* places the hero at odds with his own desire and any noble semblance of action from a modern viewpoint, but one in line with Augustan orthodoxy, when he chooses his duty. This rejection of *amor* and the associated ideas of desire (*cupiditas*) and potential happiness affirms his destiny as the founder of the Roman civilization. It establishes his place as an Augustan exemplar at this point.

Conversely, Dido is destroyed by this *pietas*. Thus, at the point at which Aeneas rejects the greatest threat to his destiny and should, therefore, be at his most heroic, he may be seen blameworthy and unappealing to our eyes. The lesson of recent Roman history had taught that *pietas* required a subordination or exclusion of a number of desires important to the individual, in favour of a problematic embrace of duty to the gods and homeland. The tragic aspect of this reality is heightened by Dido’s inability to comprehend Aeneas’ explanation of his own predicament. He attempts to convey that if he were to do as he pleased, free from considerations of *pietas*, he would remain. At

---

598 *Aeneid* 4.279-81. Now Aeneas, prompted by *pietas*, burns (*ardet*) to leave in contrast to Dido, who is consumed by the burning aspect of love itself.

599 Or placid, dependent on which of the “two voices” one espouses.
line 356, Aeneas tries in vain to convince Dido he was specifically told by the gods his
duty lay elsewhere. After this, again, Aeneas reaffirms he does not enact these things of
his own volition.\textsuperscript{600} The tragic aspect of Aeneas’ action, being both necessary and
destructive, is heightened by the fundamental disconnection between his own appraisal
of his duty and the \textit{mandata}\textsuperscript{601} of the gods, as well as Dido’s own valuation of these
considerations. Her response of disbelief or, even more accurately, of inability to
comprehend Aeneas’ motivations, is telling of her lack of understanding of Aeneas’
steely denial of the bonds of \textit{pietas} that she sees as binding them. At this point, she
replies in fury, completely uncontrollable in her invective against Aeneas. In so doing,
she questions his loyalty calling him \textit{perfide}.\textsuperscript{602} For Dido, Aeneas’ \textit{pietas} stands in direct
opposition to \textit{fides}.\textsuperscript{603} Again, the queen uses language evocative of marriage and union.
However her idea of these things is shaken to the core. The cosmos are overturned;
nowhere is faith secure:

\textit{nusquam tuta fides}.\textsuperscript{604}

The attempt to gain the benefits of \textit{pietas} will be shown to be a concern to Dido.
Furthermore, we see that Dido cannot comprehend the son of Venus, so blind to love:

\textit{nec tibi diva parens…sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens Caucasus}\textsuperscript{605}

\textsuperscript{600} \textit{Aeneid} 4.361: “\textit{Italiam non sponte sequor.”}

“I do not make for Italy by my own desire.”

\textsuperscript{601} \textit{Aeneid} 4.357.

\textsuperscript{602} \textit{Aeneid} 4.366.

\textsuperscript{603} Ironically, a prime component of the idea.

\textsuperscript{604} \textit{Aeneid} 4.373: “nowhere is loyalty assured.”

\textsuperscript{605} \textit{Aeneid} 4.366-367: “there was no divine parent of yours…but the craggy Caucasus bore you on hard
stones.”
Finally, at line 376, we have Dido’s summation of her state, as she struggles, unsuccessfully, to make some sense of this impossible situation,

_Heu furiis incensa fero!_

The theme of being driven by the Furies will have important implications to be analyzed further on. This heightened, tragic inability to comprehend each other is made explicitly clear in Dido’s characterization of Aeneas’ divinely ordained _mandata_. For her, these are horrible commands (_horrida iussa_). The fundamental inability to reconcile Dido’s heroic personality with the demands of Aeneas’ _pietas_ affirms there is no hope for a reconciliation of the ideas at opposition here.

The resolution of Dido’s speech portends that Aeneas’ actions will be avenged throughout the ages, and that Rome and Carthage will ever be at odds. All of this is tied to the implications of Aeneas’ _pietas_. The exclusion of certain aspects in favour of obligation presents a problematic yet inevitable _terminus ad quem_ of Rome’s greatness. In Aeneas’ sacrifice of potential happiness to the greater good of the future Roman State, we see the nature of _pietas_ crystallized to be a series of tensions.

Aeneas is at his most frustratingly heroic when he states:

_Hic amor, haec patria est._

---

606 _Aeneid_ 4.376: “alas on fire I am borne by the Furies.”

Williams 1972, 367: “Dido is not prepared to believe that anyone should sacrifice his personal life to requirements supposed to be imposed by the gods. It is a conflict of belief in a man-centred universe and belief in a divinely controlled world.”

607 _Cf. Georgics_ 3.41, Maecenas’ “_haud mollia iussa_” = “not soft commands” to Vergil that he expand the scope of his literary activity to include themes appropriate to Octavian’s greatness. In this congruity, I see Aeneas and Vergil both bound to the _iussa_ and by _pietas_ to their masters.

608 _Aeneid_ 4.347: “Here is love, this my homeland.”
Following the heightened tension of the exchange between Aeneas and Dido, the poem recommences with the words *pius Aeneas*. This is the first time Aeneas is granted this epithet since uttering it of himself in the exchange with his mother at 1.378. It is significant that he receives this appellation at this point. In his summation of the discussion of the epithet, Williams characterizes it as a, “complex word, a sensitive symbol of adherence to a personal ideal of devotion, which may nevertheless bring pain and sorrow…it means that he (Aeneas) has been true to himself and done his duty at a dreadful cost; the path of desire would have been so much easier and so much more comforting.” By this statement, we see that the appellation of *pius Aeneas* at line 393 may be characterized as anything but placid; rather it is a statement loaded with *pathos*. It is “eloquent of struggle and bewilderment and submission.”

The remainder of the book documents Dido’s descent into terrified *furor* and her final act of suicide. The language that Dido employs remains hostile to Aeneas and his descendants. The pity we feel for Dido is brought into focus as we see that she, for all her enterprise and royalty, is but a passive entity, as is Aeneas, in the greater machinations of the gods, the fates and destiny. It was her adherence to *amor* with a man, whom after he conspicuously displayed his *pietas*, she can only see as unbending and cruel that undoes her. Her inability to comprehend the nature of her lover’s duty brings the tension between *amor* and *pietas* to the fore. Dido’s inability to come to terms

---

609 *Aeneas* 4.393.

610 Austin 1955, 121: “...the words mark the crisis of the whole book: they are of deep significance, and distinct with emotion.” Cf. Page, xix: “Vergil seems unmoved by his own genius, and begins the next paragraph quite placidly at *pius Aeneas*.”

611 Williams 1972, 122.

612 Austin 1955, 123.
with Aeneas’ *pietas* is the tragic flaw that dooms her. It is in this inescapable reality that duty and subordination of individual desire to the greater good of the community clash with personal desire. We may sympathize with Dido’s plight, to the detriment of Aeneas’ heroic standing but, nevertheless, we must acknowledge his dedication to *pietas*. Despite this dedication to Roman ideals, we are hard-pressed to set-aside our own negative sentiments regarding Aeneas’ *pietas* and the destructiveness of it when it meets with Dido’s *amor*. We are afforded a greater picture of things than either Aeneas or Dido and, yet, we still struggle with the repercussions of the universe that Vergil presents.

With its considerations of obligation arrayed against personal will and desire, the Dido-Aeneas episode has long captivated its audiences with its humane and moving depiction of a seemingly ideal love, shattered by fate and destiny. These events have prompted modern interpreters to examine the moral responsibility Aeneas bore towards Dido, with the conclusion often being drawn that Aeneas had acted in an unheroic manner by betraying Dido’s hospitality. Because of this, it is argued that Vergil makes Aeneas culpable in the enmity that arose between the Roman and Carthaginian peoples.

Despite any tendency to take the opposite view, Vergil furnished us with many indicators of the danger of subversion to the Roman destiny Dido represents. Vergil depicts a threat to the dynastic succession to Ascanius, embodied by Dido as she vies

---

613 Williams 1972, 368 states of Vergil’s *pius Aeneas*: “the only possible defense for Aeneas’ actions is his *pietas*; in any other capacity than as man of destiny he should have stayed – *pietas* is why he must leave, and Vergil wants us to remember this. It may be that many would wish that *pietas* had not prevailed, but it is utterly wrong to object to being told that it has done so.”

614 Farron, 1980; Stahl, 1981 gives a good summary of the academic tendencies surrounding such valuations.
to insinuate herself into the Trojan blood line. The importance of this dynastic concern of Dido’s is that she functions outside of *pietas*. She was able to lay no claim to Aeneas’ *pietas* without the fusion of Trojan and Punic blood, and actively worked towards this end. The depiction of Dido displays ambition in the face of necessity and her fundamental misunderstanding of Aeneas’ mission and its significance for the Roman destiny. Sacrifice and obligation, particularly in intergenerational family relationships are presented as the basis of moral action in the Augustan mindset. Dido is depicted as the antithesis of such a world view. In true heroic fashion, she finds herself unable to comprehend, reconcile herself to, or live in a world marked by these same characteristics.

When Dido first describes Aeneas in book 4, she is awestruck by his physical appearance and, most importantly, his *armis* (4.11). This is the first instance in a discernible pattern that portrays Dido to be compelled by necessity to affect a union with Aeneas. In conversation with her sister Anna, Dido uses the language of empire and the evasion of conquest as a dominant theme. She urges Dido to hope for more than the status quo and to achieve her aims by love. Dido is portrayed as conscious of her precarious situation; Aeneas will be depicted as an ideal candidate to stabilize it. Dido, princess of the royal house of Tyre, married Sychaeus who was murdered for his wealth by her brother Pygmalion. Because of these events, Dido left Tyre and founded Carthage. This settlement was not without its problems, however, as surrounding tribes, particularly Iarbas and his Gaetulians, were hostile to Dido and her people. Dido had rejected Iarbas finding herself surrounded by enemies and isolated.
Dido was, despite some outward appearances including Carthaginian growth marked by her rising walls the *moenia surgunt*, which so delighted Aeneas, in dire straits. 1.661 has Venus fearing Dido’s *ambiguam...domum*. The notion of the precarious nature of Dido’s house is again mentioned by hers at the point where she begs the departing Aeneas to “pity a falling house” (*miserere domum labentis*). This understanding by Dido reveals the underlying knowledge that prompted her sister Anna to urge her towards a union with Aeneas. The reason given is *amor*, but even in this appraisal there is the element of empire and the Roman concern of ceding it to *others* who did not have a share in Rome’s imperial destiny. This preoccupation is shown when Anna replies to Dido’s initial protestations against a love that was already consuming her. She asks, “Will you not know sweet children or the *praemia* of *amor*?” Anna’s advice gives us the connection of offspring and the obligations of *pietas*, all framed within the context of the building and preservation of Carthage. The use of *praemia* invokes the context of empire, often associated with the rewards of military conquests and booty or plunder. The theme of empire is now firmly established in Dido’s relationship with Aeneas. A few lines later, when Anna questions the wisdom of spurning everything that love could provide for the ashes and buried shades of Sychaeus, she mentions the African lands rich in triumphs (4.37) and asks “Will you fight (*pugnabis*) against a pleasing (*placito*) love?” (4.38). Dido also reminds us of the precarious

---

615 A very early indicator of her uncertain state.

616 *Aeneid* 4.318.

617 *Aeneid* 4.33.

618 The imagery of love as a battleground occurs frequently. *Cf.* Propertius 2.1.45: *angusto versamus proelia lecto* – “rolling battles in the narrow confines of the bed.”

619 “*triumphis.*”
position that we have already seen by listing her enemies: the Gaetulian cities, the Numidians, the Barcaeans, and the Tyrians. In response to these threats, Anna sees an opportunity, stating that Teucrian arms will bring Punic glory and a glorious city, but not Rome:

quot tu urbem, soror, hanc cernes, quae surgere regna
coniugio tali! Teucrum comitantibus armis
Punica se quantis attollet gloria rebus

This strategy projects worrying implications within the context of an Augustan message on pietas, centred on a more constructive focus on a divinely sanctioned homeland organized in a familial structure. Anna’s counsels on these subjects are said to further inflame Dido and give her hope for a fusion of Trojan and Punic bloodlines as well as Trojan arms employed at the defense of Carthage.

Dido is excluded from the Augustan system of familial and patriotic pietas. It is pietas, and its obligation to his destiny laid out by the gods that is the reason for Aeneas’ departure from Carthage. Dido directs her anger and invective against Aeneas’ expression of the virtue when her hopes and expectations are frustrated:

nunc augur Apollo,
nunc Lyciae sortes, nunc et loue missus ab ipso

620 Aeneid 4.321.
621 Aeneid 4.47-9: “What a city you will see rise here, sister, what a realm, by reason of such a marriage! With Teucrian arms beside us, to what heights will Punic glory soar?”
622 Aeneid 4.55: spemque dedit dubiae menti.
Pietas functions within an orthodox view of the gods’ place in the cosmos. This is combined with elements of duty, obligation and ancestor worship. Furthermore, it is a social construct recognized in the relationships between blood relatives. Dido, without a child from Aeneas, could claim no share of Aeneas’ pietas. Their child would have secured pietas for Dido. As one who stands outside of pietas and the divinely mandated guidance and destiny associated with it, Dido must insinuate herself into the Trojan bloodline or face the sternness of fortune’s whim. Dido is seen as caught in difficult circumstances with the only hope of survival coming from a union of the Trojan and Punic peoples.

Augustan thought regarding the themes of necessity and fortune can be found in Horace’s Odes 1.35:

*te semper anteit saeva Necessitas*

This poem finds parallels in Vergil’s treatment of Dido. Both poets present fortune as a fickle tutelary deity, presenting it and hard necessity as always connected. At 1.563 Dido explains the rough reception the Trojans received when they approached the African coast:

*res dura et regni novitas talia cogunt moliri*

---

623 Aeneid 4.376: “now the prophet Apollo,
   now the oracles at Lycia,
   and now the messenger of the gods,
   sent by Jupiter himself, brings the horrid orders in the air.”

624 Horace Carm. 1.35.17: “before you (Fortuna) ever stalks necessity.”

625 Aeneid 1.563: “...stern necessity and the new state of my kingdom force me to do such things.”
The *res dura* echoes Horace’s *saeva necessitas*. So then, Dido finds herself compelled by hard necessity.626 This governance by fortune is contrasted with Aeneas’ governance by *pietas* and the divine will. This is the clash of motivations represented by Dido and Aeneas. Dido, like fortune’s adherent in the poem of Horace, is ever stalked by the fury-like characteristics of *saeva necessitas*:

\[
\begin{align*}
& te \ semper \ anteit \ saeva \ Necessitas, \\
& clavos \ trabalis \ et \ cuneos \ manu \\
& gestans \ aea \ nec \ severus \\
& uncus \ abest \ liquidumque \ plumbum627
\end{align*}
\]

Dido dreams of herself driven along by a fury, after Aeneas confirms his adherence to the principle of *pietas*. Finally, she internalizes this imagery and becomes herself an instrument of vengeance:

\[
\begin{align*}
& sequar \ atris \ ignibus \ absens \\
& et, \ cum \ frigida \ mors \ anima \ seduxerit \ artus, \\
& omnibus \ umbra \ locis \ adero. \ 628
\end{align*}
\]

She reacts violently to the frustrated ambitions that Mercury’s words signify for her.629 The context of these words is one of responsibility and duty. Dido moves further towards a manic and frightening expression of one dictated by passions fed by false hope and a misunderstanding of the fabric of Aeneas’ character. Dido resorts to seeking

626 Pease: “As one of the Epicurean type Dido Is controlled by Fortuna. (4.434; 4.653; 4.696).”

627 Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.16-20: “Before thee ever stalks Necessity, grim goddess, with spikes and wedges in her brazen hand; the stern hook and molten lead are also not far.”

628 *Aeneid* 4.384-6: “Though far away, I will chase you with murky brands and, when chill death has severed soul and body, everywhere my shade shall haunt you.”

629 *Aeneid* 4.271-6.
pity from Aeneas for her falling house, reminding him of her enemies encircling her.\footnote{Aeneid 4.320-22. Austin 1955, 102: “It is plain that she had previously been unafraid of the enemies that surrounded Carthage, but now she cannot face them without him.”}

She states that it is because of Aeneas she faces hostile neighbours; in fact, she states she she would not be \textit{omnino capta} if only she had a son by Aeneas:

\begin{quote}
\textit{si quis mihi paruulus aula luderet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret, non equidem omnino capta ac deserta uiderer.}\footnote{Aeneid 4.330: “If I’d at least conceived a child of yours before you fled, if a little Aeneas were playing about my halls, whose face might still recall yours, I’d not feel myself so utterly deceived and forsaken.”}
\end{quote}

This son would have had a counterclaim to the \textit{pietas} owed to Ascanius. The complaint that she would not be \textit{capta} echoes the fear that without Aeneas Dido would be lead \textit{captam} by Iarbas or would have to suffer her brother’s destruction of her city walls:

\begin{quote}
\textit{an mea Pygmalion dum moenia frater destruat aut captam ducat Gaetulus Iarbas?}\footnote{Eldinow, 260: Virgil emphasizes Iulus’ position and reinforces the contrast between him and the child by Aeneas that Dido wants but does not have.}
\end{quote}

The connection is now established that Dido’s political aim, namely a unification of Trojan and Punic peoples in the interest of defense, runs contrary to the divinely foretold destiny of the Roman people in Italy. Her plans are a threat to the dynastic succession of Iulus. This danger to Aeneas’ succession is the central point in the censure that he

\footnote{Aeneid 4.326: “Will my brother Pygmalion destroy my walls, or Gaetulian Iarbas lead me captive?”}
incurs in Jupiter’s message from Mercury (4.271-3). When Dido sees Aeneas cannot be swayed from his dutiful adherence to familial and divine *pietas*, she becomes a metaphorical fury.

Another aspect merits mention in the discussion of family, civilization and empire centred in Dido. When the queen lay dying by her own hand, Anna is described thus:

*unguibus ora...foedans et pectora pugnis.*

These same words are used two more times in the *Aeneid*.

Acoetes, Pallas’ tutor, does the same mourning over him at his funeral. This scene reminds us that Aeneas’ obligations to the mutual bonds he shares with Pallas’ father Evander, have drawn the hero into a morally ambiguous conflict with Turnus. Aeneas had sworn to Evander he would protect his son. When Turnus kills Pallas, it creates a vengeful obligation for Aeneas. Turnus’ words after killing Pallas, however, are also those of *pietas*:

‘Arcades, haec’ inquit ‘memores mea dicta referte

*Euandro: qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto.*

---

633 *Aeneid* 4.673: “tearing her face with her nails, and beating her breast with her fists.”

Williams “This line is repeated (of Turnus’ sister) in 12.871; cf. also 11.86.”

634 *Aeneid* 11.86: *pectora nunc foedans pugnis, nunc unguibus ora.*

635 *Aeneid* 10.491: “Take these memories back with you to Evander, Arcadians, from my words: I return Pallas with him having got what he merited.”

Fratantuono, 304: “For Turnus, Pallas is a traitor, a native Italian who fought on the wrong side.”

*Cf.* above 52, 62, 146 Cicero’s words on *meritus* vel sim.: and loyalty to the Roman state; on the obligations of *amicitia*; and as a paternal exhortation towards Plancus at a pivotal moment for the Republic.
The duplicity of \textit{pietas} is again evident, as Turnus’ \textit{pietas} to his homeland clashes with Aeneas’ obligation to Evander.\textsuperscript{636} The memory of the recent consequences for Roman society of competing expressions of \textit{pietas} finds a poetic equivalent here. This episode heralded the end of the Latins’ support of the Rutulian chieftain and leads to the single combat between the two heroes.

The context of all three instances is that of the fall of a civilization: Anna tears at herself with her nails as the fortunes of the Phoenicians fall; Acoetes does the same when Pallas’ death signifies Aeneas’ fatal obligation to exact vengeance from Turnus; and, finally, Iuturna acts as a doublet to Anna and Dido. This final instance using the words that portend a faltering civilization occurs in book twelve. The same words are used describing Iuturna who is characterized as \textit{infelix} as she laments that Jupiter has granted that Turnus meet his fate.\textsuperscript{637} An identifiable allusion to Dido in theme, appearance, and in the epithet \textit{infelix} is evident. Once again, these words signify a fundamental change for a civilization. Shortly afterwards, the idea of Rome is born with Jupiter’s assent to a mixing of Trojan and Italian blood (12.838). Dido, who is alluded to at such key moments of the \textit{Aeneid}, also sees her civilization undone by this birth. The circumstances of her death and of Carthage’s destiny are associated with Aeneas’ \textit{pietas}. Such an association creates a humane and tragic figure showing the human costs of Roman greatness.

\textsuperscript{636} \textit{Aeneid} 8.142: In his first encounter with Evander, Aeneas expounds for ten lines on the familial relationships shared by the two men: \textit{“sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.”} \textit{“So both our races branch from a single blood.”} Aeneas’ obligation is predicated by familial considerations, guest-friendship, and military alliance.

\textsuperscript{637} \textit{Aeneid} 12.871: \textit{unguibus ora...foedans et pectora pugnis}
Dido and the Political Context

Having heard the one voice that depicts Dido as a sympathetic character, I now turn to the other voice, one meant for the public reading of the work. This reading presents her as representative of a danger to the Augustan focus on familial and patriotic *pietas*.\(^{638}\) When, in book 6, Aeneas finally encounters his father, Anchises, worried that some harm may have come to his son from Punic shores,\(^{639}\) Anchises’ fear is very nearly realized in the time Aeneas spends with Dido at Carthage.\(^{640}\) Dido’s reaction to Aeneas’ *pietas* is stark, as she questions whether Aeneas did not owe herself a debt of gratitude for not killing him as he approached her shores:

\[
\text{non potui abreptum diuellere corpus et undis}
\]
\[
\text{spargere? non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro}
\]

---

\(^{638}\) Parry’s “personal accents of sorrow over human and heroic values lost” versus Pöschl’s, “grandly imaginative reinforcement of Augustan ideology and power structures.”

\(^{639}\) *Aeneid* 6.692.

\(^{640}\) McLeish, 247: “The oldest, simplest view of Dido seems to be the best: poetry apart, she is in the Aeneid principally to emphasize Aeneas’ *pietas*. Books iv, v, and vi deal with different aspects of *pietas*, which is closely linked every time it appears with Aeneas’ destiny, and the progression through Roman history to Augustus himself. The *pietas* in Books v and vi is easy to see; but in Book iv it is obscured—some say obliterated—by the character of Dido….To us Dido is a three-dimensional character, a real person whose emotions and actions have a roundness, a wholeness, that often seems missing in Aeneas himself. But we are post-Romantics: our view of Dido is filtered through Purcell, Dryden, Berlioz, and a hundred other interpreters. To a Roman of Virgil’s day she was probably nothing more than an unbalanced barbarian queen, a definite encumbrance in Aeneas’ way. Virgil’s avowed purpose in undertaking the Aeneid was to present Aeneas as the founder of the Roman race and precursor of Augustus. He is far more important than any of the obstacles placed in his path. In such a context (and again, leaving poetry aside) Dido might seem to have no larger a part to play than Scylla, Charybdis, or Polyphemus himself.
The danger to Aeneas’ stock is made clear a few lines later, at 4.604, when Dido states:

faces in castra tulissem

implessemque foros flammis natumque patremque

cum genere extinxem, memet super ipsa dedissem.  

In this statement, Dido is explicitly depicted as a threat to Aeneas’ heir: the succession marked by pietas and its system of familial obligation and reciprocation mandated by the gods.

Cassius Dio’s history contains parallel elements of the propaganda campaign against Antony. Dio 50.5 has Octavian making his case against Cleopatra in the Senate after the infamous triumph of Alexandria. Among his arguments he states that Antony has become enslaved by Cleopatra to the extent he called her Queen and δέσποινα and that he had furnished her with a bodyguard of Roman soldiers. To make matters worse, the troops had her name inscribed on their shields. This scene is reminiscent of Vergil’s depiction of Aeneas’ Phrygian cohort being assimilated into Dido’s ranks. This portrays Aeneas temporarily abdicating his pietas, thus leading to a detrimental assimilation:

nec non et Phrygii comites...incidunt.

---

641 *Aeneid* 4.600-2: “was I not able to tear his body limb from limb and scatter the pieces on the waves...could I not have served Ascanius himself to his father at his table?” Vergil here evokes in one phrase a collection of fearful mythical precedents to this unhinged behaviour: Medea, Tantalus and Pelops, and Atreus’ serving of Thyestes’ children to their father.

642 *Aeneid* 4.604: “I should have carried fire into his camp, filled his decks with flame, blotted out father and son together with the whole race, and immolated myself on top of it all.”

Williams 1972, 386: “The horror and barbarity of Dido’s thoughts reveal the depth of tragic madness to which she has come.”

643 *Aeneid* 4.140-3: With her pace a Phrygian train....Aeneas...advances to join her and unites his band with hers.
Aspects of the propaganda of this time evidence the ensnarement of Antony by Cleopatra, his adoption of eastern dress, religious symbols and political institutions.\textsuperscript{644} This assimilation would have led to an immersion in cultural practices that run opposite to orthodox Roman expectations. Antony is depicted as calling his headquarters the \(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\), carrying the \(\acute{\alpha}k\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}k\eta\),\textsuperscript{645} setting aside his Roman dress and insignia, and being enchanted by all things non-Roman.\textsuperscript{646}

A parallel to this ensnarement may be found in book 4 where, after Dido’s and Aeneas’ liaison, Aeneas is discovered by Mercury to be in a shameful state from the Roman point of view: line 260 has Aeneas working to build Carthage’s towers and building homes. He is actively moving away from the will of the gods and losing sight of his destiny on Italy’s shores. Aeneas is depicted as dressed in Tyrian purple, armed with a sword studded with jasper, a stone identified with the East.\textsuperscript{647} Likewise, Antony was depicted by Dio at Alexandria affecting Oriental dress and wearing an Eastern sword in place of a Roman one.\textsuperscript{648} This may be compared to Dio 48.30.2, which has Octavian and Antony differentiated by their appearance along lines of Roman versus Eastern dress.\textsuperscript{649}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{644} Scott, 52.
\textsuperscript{645} An oriental sword.
\textsuperscript{646} Cassius Dio 50.5.2-50.5.3.4.
\textsuperscript{647} Austin 1955, 89.
\textsuperscript{648} Cassius Dio 50.5.2.
\textsuperscript{649} This takes place at the negotiations preceding the Peace of Brundisium in 40 BC. It is evident from their inclusion in the histories that such distinctions were being drawn by the faction of Octavian at this early stage in the struggles between the two.
\end{footnotes}
Aeneas may be seen as suffering from a similar set of circumstances to those Antony experienced at this point. I believe what we have here is an explicit statement of the danger faced by Aeneas and Rome at this point, in its reiteration of the dangers faced by Rome in the person of Cleopatra. Aeneas is now at his least heroic wavering in his *pietas* and busily doing the work of building Carthage, the city of the people whom Jupiter refers to as *inimica* (4.235). The message after Actium had been and continued to be that the expression of *pietas* by Octavian had saved Rome from a disastrous fate. Antony had fallen under the spell of Cleopatra’s spell. Aeneas finds himself likewise faltering until he is reminded by the gods themselves of his obligations and the demands of *pietas*.

The danger inherent in not observing *pietas* is both connected to homeland and family. Line 223 has Jupiter instruct Mercury to remind Aeneas of his duty. He states that Aeneas is unmindful of the fates’ role for him in Rome’s foundation:

*Tyrias Karthagine...expectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes.*

650

The foundation of a great civilization is the responsibility Aeneas must bear. The dynamic of heirship and the reciprocal obligations between generations is added to this by Jupiter in line 234:

*Ascanioque pater Romanas invidet arces?*

651

By remaining with Dido at Carthage, Aeneas is denying his offspring its rightful inheritance. In this concern we see the emergence of an empire with familial foundations underpinned by ethnicity, religion and dutiful obligation. The inheritance of the future greatness of Rome was a result of its *pietas*. The threat of Dido to the entire

650 “looks forward to Tyrian cities, unmindful of those granted by the fates.”

651 *Aeneid* 4.234: “does the father begrudge Ascanius the towers of Rome?”
Roman civilization is stated in Jupiter’s words that lay out the consequences for Aeneas’ offspring of his continued stay at Carthage.

At this point, it is the Roman destiny, contingent upon the gods’ goodwill reciprocated for pietas towards them, that is at stake. It takes a divine warning demanding intergenerational pietas to break Dido’s spell on Aeneas. Implicit in this line of thought is that the prized concept of Octavian’s communications, pietas, had saved Aeneas from shameful subservience. So, too, had Augustus saved the world under the banner of pietas from Cleopatra and the captivated Antony. Both were willing to allow the Roman res slip from the grasp of the People and into foreign hands. These polarities are most evident in the ekphrasis of book 8, the depiction of Aeneas’ shield.

Book 8 Line 678:

\[ hinc \ Augustus \ agens \ Italos \ in \ proelia \ Caesar \]
\[ cum \ patribus \ populoque, \ penatibus \ et \ magnis \ dis, \]
\[ stans \ celsa \ in \ puppi, \ geminas \ cui \ tempora \ flammas \]
\[ laeta \ uomunt \ patriumque \ aperitur \ uertice \ sidus. \]

The other side is depicted with barbaric wealth ope barbarica (8.685) and ‘strange-gods’. A reference to Caesar’s star (8.681) reminds us of Octavian’s extensive use of his father’s name. The pietas he exercised was justification for the policies he enacted throughout the civil wars. Additionally, Antony is followed by his (nefas) Aegyptia coniunx (8.688). The message is that Augustus and his adherence to pietas had

\[ ^{652} \text{“Barking Anubis, and monstrous gods of every kind}
\text{brandish weapons against Neptune, Venus,}
\text{and Minerva. Mars rages in the centre of the contest,}
\text{engraved in steel, and the grim Furies in the sky,}
\text{and Discord in a torn robe strides joyously, while}
\text{Bellona follows with her blood-drenched whip.”} \]
successfully fought back the foreign threat. The *monstra* of the gods of the east are pitted against Neptune, Venus and Minerva:

\[
\textit{omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis}
\]
\[
\textit{contra Neptunum et Venerem contraque Mineruam}
\]
\[
\textit{tela tenent. saeuit medio in certamine Mauors}
\]
\[
\textit{caelatus ferro, tristesque ex aethere Dirae,}
\]
\[
\textit{et scissa gaudens uadit Discordia palla,}
\]
\[
\textit{quam cum sanguineo sequitur Bellona flagello.}^{653}
\]

The madness of civil war is on display at its most monstrous, until Actian Apollo imposes the peace that destroys Cleopatra:

\[
\textit{Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo}
\]
\[
\textit{desuper.}^{654}
\]

Dido is again not far from this: just as Cleopatra is pale at the coming death – *pallentem morte futura* (8.709) – so too is Dido, in the moments before her death, also *pallida morte futura* (4.644).

The evils of civil war, associated with Octavian’s obligation to vengeance ordained by Mars (*saeuit medio in certamine Mauors*) and Antony’s foreign queen, are pacified by Apollo. It is not an Actian Mars embroiled in the war who imposes peace on a world engulfed by madness, but an Actian Apollo who bears the Augustan post civil-war message of an obligation to the gods, the homeland and the family.

We now see how the Augustan message regarding empire, family and dynastic succession have reverted to an earlier, idealized understanding of the obligations and

---

653 *Aeneid*

654 *Aeneid*, 8.704: “Apollo of Actium sees from above and bends his bow.”
responsibilities attendant to pietas. As the consequences of these duties are presented in relation to Dido, so too are they in relation to Cleopatra. For her part, Dido is infelix, because she is pitted against the gods’ vision of the world, such that, when she asks, ‘if the impia facta now touch her’ we see that, driven by circumstance, she is at odds with Augustan pietas, that is the irresistible will of the gods and the machinations of the fates.655 Dido cuts a sympathetic yet terrifying figure, as Cleopatra cuts a noble but dangerous one:

\[\text{quae generosius}\]
\[\text{perire quaerens nec muliebriter}\]
\[\text{expavit ensem nec latentis}\]
\[\text{classe cita reparavit oras,}\]
\[\text{ausa et iacentem visere regiam}\]
\[\text{voltu sereno, fortis et asperas}\]
\[\text{tractare serpentes, ut atrum}\]
\[\text{corpore conbiberet venenum,}\]
\[\text{deliberata morte ferocior:}\]
\[\text{saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens}\]
\[\text{privata deduci superbo}\]

---

655 *Aeneid* 4.595: “Ill-starred Dido, now do your impious deeds touch you?”

*cf. Aeneid* 1.750; 4.68; 4.450; 4.529; 6.456.

Austin 1955: “By impia facta she means her lack of pietas to Sychaeus, and perhaps also her failure in her duty to her own people.”
This message regarding Roman religious and cultural institutions portrayed Augustus as an exemplar who greatly outperformed his rivals in *pietas* during the civil conflict. In fact, Augustus even outpaced Aeneas, at times, in his adherence to the dictates of *pietas*.

---

656 Horace *Odes* 1.37: “But she, intending to perish more nobly, showed no sign of womanish fear at the sword, nor did she even attempt to win with her speedy ships to some hidden shore. And she dared to gaze at her fallen kingdom with a calm face, and touch the poisonous asps with courage, so that she might drink down their dark venom, to the depths of her heart, growing fiercer still, and resolving to die: scorning to be taken by hostile galleys, and, no ordinary woman, yet queen no longer, be led along in proud triumph.”
Conclusions

When I first embarked upon this study, I did so with a mandate of examining the development of the Roman ideal of *pietas*. In so doing I have come to a clearer understanding of the term’s meaning to Romans by charting its development from a familial notion, as understood by Romans themselves, to its ultimate presentation as a defining characteristic of the Augustan age. I sought to accomplish this without any preconceived notions and with the expectation that this study would yield a more sophisticated view of the idea than the traditional platitude of dutiful responsibility to homeland and the gods. The term’s origins and understanding by rank and file Romans stood outside of this simple definition. This analysis has provided a view of the deeply pragmatic nature of even ideals for the Roman people. *Pietas* is no abstract concept, instead, it is one with a deeply utilitarian functionality.

The opening chapters demonstrate that *pietas* marked familial discourse and came to help define the power structure of the Roman family. Such a power structure was later assumed, although in a particularly focused and useful manner, by the Emperor Augustus. These ideas came to be shaped by the communications apparatus of the era, and bear the indelible mark of the Augustans’ desire to depict Roman society as an extension of the Roman family. The face of this relationship was not contingent upon notions of affection but, rather, upon ideas ranging from expectations and mutual responsibility to deeply pragmatic concerns reflective of historical realities.

This, in turn, bore consequences for our understanding of the emotional climate of the Roman family and, by extension, the relationship of the family to the
Most strikingly, it became clear that the valuation of the individual, both in the state and in the family, was contingent upon utility and that this utility was reciprocated by those affected by it. This pattern of reciprocal behavior then comes to significantly characterize the function of *pietas*.

The movement from the familial aspects of *pietas* towards the political and social aspects of it at the end of the late republic shows that the term, though functioning in many diverse roles, still adhered to its core understanding, regardless of the focus of its expression. The philosophical background of the ideal, when set against the realities of political strife and an expansionist imperial policy, opened the door to an understanding of *pietas* as a premier means of justification, after the fact, and a stimulus, beforehand, for many of the occurrences in the shifts of Roman political life at the end of the Republic.

Cicero proved an invaluable source for the understanding of the philosophical, political, and personal underpinnings of *pietas*. His use of it in the legal arena gave the first inklings that this term was one that would come to be appropriated by those who employed it to political ends. These ends, though functioning on an individual level, came to have reverberations felt throughout the State. By dint of Rome’s status as an imperial power, it came to have consequences well outside of any previous notions of comportment within the family or between and among friends.

Gratitude, then, emerged as an important basis for the expression of *pietas*. This emotion guaranteed reciprocal obligation, lest the receiver of any *beneficium* be viewed as *ingratum*. The appearance of ingratitude stands as one of the most stigmatized
accusations in ancient Roman society. This gratitude holds ramifications for events far beyond simple personal matters; the events surrounding the punishment of the Catilinarians, for instance, embodied repercussions for the relationship between Cicero and Pompeius Magnus which, in turn, influenced relations to the traditional oligarchic familial networks at Rome. This radiating nature of benefaction, gratitude and reciprocity – all sesquipedalian expressions surrounding the singular term *pietas* – starkly depict the importance of the term in its expression within the function of Roman society.

By way of justification – another key development in the function of *pietas* – we see it held up as the reason for Roman greatness and as an expression of *humanitas*. This aspect creates an important connection to the Roman preoccupation with justice both inwardly and externally. These notions, underpinned by Greek philosophical ideals transmitted via Cicero, began to align the language between the Greek and Roman expression of the function of *pietas* and its constituent parts. This, later, would prove important as the Greek histories of Rome replace Cicero for our key sources of an age in which *pietas* came to the fore as a political force and indicator of many of the central ethical ideas at the end of the Roman Republic.

The state of affairs before the battles of Pharsalus and Munda, and the subsequent reorganization of the Roman *res* afterwards, once again showcases the significant place of *pietas* in the events of the late Republic. The emergence of individuals, who could draw from considerations of gratitude and reciprocity more forcefully and to more effect than the State itself, stand as clear proof of the doomed nature of the Roman Republic when faced with the realities of the societal hallmarks
that defined it. With the emergence of Caesar’s domination, the demands of *pietas* are brought into even clearer focus, and the stage came to be set for the Augustan poets’ examination of its legacy and ramifications. A debate concerning the relationship between pragmatic necessity and the ideals that *pietas* represented were reconciled at this point. And so the way for the Augustan principate’s appropriation of *pietas* was paved.

The period after Caesar’s assassination presented an even clearer view in the direction of Roman society. Those who continued on in his legacy and who rushed to fill the power vacuum left by his demise, concentrated on notions related to *pietas*. These efforts were directed towards harnessing the resources present in the *populus* and in a nobility now drawn away from the earlier Republican networks. The invaluable tool had now become a premier means of articulation transcending social class and connected to success for those who could most effectively wield it.

The triumviral period saw *pietas* expressed in its most tangible manner, as those who underpinned power were incentivized by benefactions with the implicit understanding of *pietas*’ reciprocal obligations. The emergence of Octavian and Antony as the figureheads in this new reality reveal the continued momentum of Caesar’s earlier appropriation of Roman societal expectations. The eventual conflicts between the two dynasts also came to take on a dimension of gratitude and reciprocity, as both vied to align their actions with the ancient obligation of vengeance. Octavian’s embrace of the work of acting as *ультор* found its greatest obstacle in the personage of Sextus
Pompeius and his own claims to filial _pietas_. These competing claims, once again, affirmed the importance of _pietas_ in the vacuum of the failed Republic.

Finally, the civil wars had proven themselves to be utterly exhausting and destructive in their effect on Roman society. The rationale and rallying cry of these wars was _pietas_. This association created difficulties for the victor. As a result, the client poets communicated both the costs and benefits of _pietas_. They would eventually put forth the idea that _pietas_ bore human costs, but that it guaranteed the Empire’s greatness. This honest appraisal represented a major aspect of the consequences of the rise of Augustan _pietas_. _Pietas_ came to be figured as the justification for Octavian’s actions. These actions had been problematic indeed and had caused much pain and hardship, but they were an inevitable effect of the demands of _pietas_. The Augustan appropriation of _pietas_ still had to function on a basis of these inescapable obligations. But it now returned to a simpler focus. Holding true to the transactional nature of _pietas_, Roman society again became focused on the traditional entities of family and the gods as the basis of the State. With the rise of the principate, _pietas_ was to become expressed through the State family headed by a paternal _princeps_. This acceptance of the principate was evoked in the stability of Rome’s new age of _pietas_.
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