

IMPACT OF EMPIRE · VOLUME 18

ROMAN RULE IN GREEK AND LATIN WRITING

Double Vision

Edited by
Jesper Majbom Madsen
and Roger Rees

BRILL

Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing

Impact of Empire

ROMAN EMPIRE, C. 200 BC–AD 476

*Editorial Board of the series Impact of Empire
(= Management Team of Impact of Empire)*

Angelos Chaniotis, Ségolène Demougin,
Olivier Hekster, Gerda de Kleijn, Luuk de Ligt,
Elio Lo Cascio, Bernhard Palme, Michael Peachin,
Christian Witschel and Greg Woolf

Executive Secretariat of the Series and the Network

Lukas de Blois, Olivier Hekster
Gerda de Kleijn and John Rich

*Radboud University of Nijmegen, Erasmusplein 1,
P.O. Box 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

Academic Board of the International Network Impact of Empire

NICOLE BELAYCHE – STEPHANE BENOIST – ANTHONY BIRLEY
LUKAS DE BLOIS – CHRISTER BRUUN – JOHN DRINKWATER
WERNER ECK – PETER FUNKE – ANDREA GIARDINA
FRANÇOISE VAN HAEPEREN – JOHANNES HAHN – ANNE KOLB
FIK MEIJER – ONNO VAN NIJF – MARIE-THERESE RAEPSAET-CHARLIER
JOHN RICH – JOHN RICHARDSON – BERT VAN DER SPEK
RICHARD TALBERT – WILLEM ZWALVE

VOLUME 18

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/imem*

Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing

Double Vision

Edited by

Jesper Majbom Madsen and Roger Rees



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: The Senate House in Rome, taken by Thomas Meloni Rønn.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Roman rule in Greek and Latin writing : double vision / edited by Jesper Majbom Madsen and Roger Rees.
pages cm. — (Impact of Empire; 18)

“This volume has its origins in a conference hosted in April 2009 at the University of Southern Denmark as a collaborative venture between the School of History, University of Southern Denmark and the School of Classics, University of St Andrews.”

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-27738-0 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-27828-8 (e-book)

I. Madsen, Jesper Majbom, editor. II. Rees, Roger, editor.

PA3014.P65R65 2014

880.09358—dc23

2014017109

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities.
For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1572-0500

ISBN 978-90-04-27738-0 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-27828-8 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Acknowledgements vii

Introduction: A Roman Greek 1

Jesper Majbom Madsen and Roger Rees

1 Patriotism and Ambitions: Intellectual Response to Roman Rule
in the High Empire 16

Jesper Majbom Madsen

2 Becoming Wolf, Staying Sheep 39

Ewen Bowie

3 Accommodation, Opposition or Other? *Luke-Acts'* Stance
Towards Rome 79

John Moles

4 Adopting the Emperor: Pliny's Praise-giving as
Cultural Appropriation 105

Roger Rees

5 The Representation of Greek Diplomacy in Tacitus 124

Bruce Gibson

6 Fractured Vision: Josephus and Tacitus on Triumph and
Civil War 144

Rhiannon Ash

7 'Heus tu rhetorisce': Gellius, Cicero, Plutarch, and Roman Study
Abroad 163

Joseph A. Howley

8 Triple Vision: Ulpian of Tyre on the Duties of the Proconsul 193

Jill Harries

9 Greek History in a Roman Context: Arrian's *Anabasis*
of Alexander 210

Jesper Carlsen

10 Herodian on Greek and Roman Failings	224
<i>Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen</i>	
11 Images of Elite Community in Philostratus: Re-Reading the Preface to the <i>Lives of the Sophists</i>	246
<i>Jason König</i>	
Bibliography	271
Index	296

Acknowledgements

This volume has its origins in a conference hosted in April 2009 at the University of Southern Denmark as a collaborative venture between the Department of History, University of Southern Denmark and the School of Classics, University of St Andrews. For their support in funding the conference, we are grateful to both institutions, to the Danish Council of Independent Research (Humanities) and Ingeniør N. M. Knudsens' Fond. Thanks too to Kirsten Dige Larsen and Karen Fog Rasmussen of the Department of History, University of Southern Denmark and to Margaret Goudie of the School of Classics, University of St Andrews for their help with practical and administrative aspects of the conference. Greg Woolf, Tim Whitmarsh, John Rich and Ewen Bowie gave us timely and generous advice as we saw the project through to publication.

Jesper Majbom Madsen and Roger Rees

INTRODUCTION

A Roman Greek

Jesper Majbom Madsen and Roger Rees

On his round trip of the Black Sea the Roman senator and *legatus Augusti* of Cappadocia, L. Flavius Arrianus from Nicomedia in Bithynia, wrote an account of the area to the emperor Hadrian. His *Periplus* is styled as a letter.¹ In it, Arrian describes the physical and human geography of the eastern seaboard of the Black Sea, from the south round to the east, and northwards to Pantikapaion on the Crimea. If Hadrian had commissioned the report and was expecting a reliable account of contemporary affairs in the region, he would have been disappointed. Arrian's *Periplus* draws its inspiration from Xenophon's *Anabasis*, written more than five centuries previously; Xenophon is almost the only reference point in the *Periplus*, and provides the authority and model for Arrian.² Less than a contemporary document, the *Periplus* reads as a work of archaising literature.³ But some exceptions work their way in. Like Xenophon before him, Arrian reached the Black Sea coast at the city of Trapezus (modern Trabzon), where he reported to Hadrian on some recent religious monuments, including two altars.

καὶ οἱ βωμοὶ ἀνεστᾶσιν ἤδη, λίθου μέντοι γε τοῦ τραχέος, καὶ τὰ γράμματα διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εὐδὴλα κεχάρακται, τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐπίγραμμα καὶ ἡμαρτημένως γέγραπται, οἷα δὴ ὑπὸ βαρβάρων γραφέν. ἔγνωκα οὖν τοὺς τε βωμοὺς λίθου λευκοῦ ἀναθεῖναι, καὶ τὰ ἐπιγράμματα ἐγχαραῖν εὐσήμοις τοῖς γράμμασιν.

The altars are already set up, though in rather rough stone, and as such the inscribed letters are not particularly clear; the Greek inscription is also inaccurately carved, such as that written by barbarians. I therefore decided to rebuild the altars in white stone, and to carve the inscriptions in clear letters (Arrian, *Periplus*, 1.1–4.; translation Liddle, adapted)

1 The text opens Ἀυτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Τραϊανῷ Ἀδριανῷ Σεβαστῷ Ἀρριανὸς χαίρειν ('Arrian sends greetings to the Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus'); on Arrian's minor works, see Bosworth (1993); on epistolary formulae, see Gibson and Morrison 2007: 3.

2 See e.g. *Periplus* 1 (*bis*).

3 Arrian even styles himself 'Xenophon' in his *Order of Battle against the Alans*. See Carlsen in chapter nine below.

Arrian's description offers a revealing insight into the thoughts and priorities of a member of the Empire's educated elite. He actively promotes his own commitment to and participation in the machinery of Empire, casting himself as a dedicated governor, keen to represent the Emperor's interests.⁴ But what is perhaps more surprising is Arrian's remark about the inaccurate inscription, where those responsible, the craftsmen of course, but also implicitly the political elite of Trapezus, are effectively characterised as barbaric. The loyal governor Arrian, attentive to the emperor's public image, thus casts himself in opposition to the population of Trapezus, including the elite, and as a well-equipped judge of the differences between civilised and barbarian. The Greek governor writes to a philhellenic Hispanic emperor of Rome about the cultural competence of the elite in an old Milesian colony. The *Periplus* will not yield a tidy distinction between Greek and Roman.

Arrian's commitment to the imperial project is perhaps even more explicitly witnessed in his comments on military matters.

τῇ στρατιᾷ ἔδωκα καὶ τὰ ὄπλα εἶδον καὶ τὸ τεῖχος καὶ τὴν τάφρον καὶ τοὺς κάμνοντας καὶ τοῦ σίτου τὴν παρασκευὴν τὴν ἐνούσαν. ἦντινα δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὴν γνώων ἔσχον, ἐν τοῖς Ῥωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασιν γέγραπται.

I gave the army its pay and inspected its weapons, the walls, the trench, the sick, and the supply of food that was there. My opinion about these is written up in the Latin report (Arrian, *Periplus*, 6.2.)

The Roman army was of course one of the most conspicuous demonstrations of imperial power, and by documenting his own role in the efficient management of its operations in Trapezus, Arrian plainly advertises his loyalty to the Empire.⁵ His commitment to a core institution of Roman imperial ideology finds Greek voice in a combination we might wonder was intended for wider distribution than for the emperor alone: the Latin report seems to have contained Arrian's recommendations to Hadrian on military affairs, but the *Periplus* itself has little in the way of useful information for practical application in the service of the emperor, but much in the way of literary posturing. That it survives, and the Latin report does not, suggests Arrian had a different—or expanded—readership in mind. That readership must have shared Arrian's taste for classicising prose from centuries before. Even if Hadrian

4 On Arrian's career, see Syme (1982a).

5 Bowersock 1965: 69, Swain 1996: 243–4, 415 n.11.

might have enjoyed the archaising style and approach, it is in this context that Arrian's self-portrait as a dedicated governor needs to be seen.⁶ By depicting himself in the role of a *legatus Augusti*, who inspected the army and military facilities in the region, as well as the altars (and Hadrianic statue) in Trapezus, in a text aimed at a Greek audience, Arrian must surely have expected that his appointment in the imperial administration would have caused admiration among his readers.⁷ If, by contrast, his appointment as the emperor's *legatus* could have been expected to compromise Arrian in the eyes of a Greek audience, it is not obvious why someone so deeply devoted to his Greek cultural background would represent himself as a governor loyal to the emperor and Empire.⁸ As a Greek author who openly committed himself to the imperial administration, with all its many features, Arrian demonstrates how a member of the Empire's educated elite could be both a devoted and proud governor, representing all the interests of Rome, and at the same time someone who was passionately rooted in his Greek cultural background; working inside the imperial administration, Arrian could identify himself as a Greek member of Roman society. To be such an insider, members of the Empire's elite did not have to approve of every aspect of Roman rule *per se*, current and previous emperors or governments.⁹ Educated Greeks did not have to accept the conquest of the Greek world or all the political, cultural or administrative changes brought about by Roman rule, just as they did not have to give up their Greek background in order to become part of Roman society. What it meant to be an insider was rather a matter of commitment to Roman rule, even against the interests of fellow heirs of Greek heritage, as well as a readiness, like Arrian's, to state one's political and administrative appointment openly in one's local community or in text aimed at a readership outside Rome's political elite.

A generation or so before, the Roman senator Tacitus ventured his first steps into historical writing when he penned the biography of his father-in-law Agricola. Like Arrian, Agricola found himself the governor of a heavily militarised and hostile region, in his case Britain. Like Arrian, Agricola comes across as a skilled and competent leader, dutifully serving the Empire's interests. Tacitus represents the governor's means and motives in introducing aspects of Roman culture to Britain as cleverly, calculatedly effective.

6 Madsen 2009: 122–3.

7 Cf. Swain 1996: 243–4.

8 Madsen 2009: 126.

9 See Madsen in chapter one below.

namque ut homines dispersi ac rudes eoque in bella faciles quieti et otio per voluptates adsuescerent, hortari privatim, adiuuare publice, ut templa fora domos extruerent, laudando promptos, castigando segnīs: ita honoris aemulatio pro necessitate erat. iam vero principum filios liberalibus artibus erudire, et ingenia Britannorum studiis Gallorum anteferre, ut qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent. inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga; paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balinea et conviviorum elegantiam. Idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset.

For in order that people who were scattered and rough, and similarly adept in battle, might through luxuries grow accustomed to peace and leisure, he encouraged them in private and helped them in public to build temples, fora and houses, by praising the energetic and reprimanding the lazy: thus rivalry for honour took the place of obligation. Now indeed he instructed the sons of chieftans in the liberal arts, and preferred British talent over Gallic training, so that those who were just now rejecting the Roman language were striving for eloquence. From that, honour was accorded to our mode of dress, and the toga was common; and gradually they wandered into the enticements of vice—porticoes and baths and the elegance of dinner parties. Among the uninitiated that was called ‘culture’, although it was part of their enslavement (*Agricola* 21).

Not all the Britons are as easily duped as the young men of Tacitus’ impressionistic account, and one, the Caledonian chief Calgacus, famously denounces Roman practice with his pithy *auferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium, atque ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant* (‘falsely named, their Empire is to steal, butcher, seize; and when they make somewhere desolate, they name it peace’, *Agric.* 30). In the persons of Agricola and Calgacus, mutually opposed, Tacitus eloquently stages an intelligent debate about the advantages and disadvantages of Roman imperialism at a time of geographical expansion. More one-sided than Tacitus’ text is the public letter collection of his senatorial acquaintance Pliny the Younger, featuring his correspondence with the emperor Trajan; once viewed more or less as a documentary archive of a provincial governor, Pliny’s tenth book of letters is now more generally understood as a text of careful self-promotion, in which Pliny himself is characterised as a loyal representative of Roman authority and culture.¹⁰ Various

¹⁰ Woolf 2006: 97; Gibson and Morello 2012.

across the book, written in Latin from the Greek speaking province of Bithynia and Pontus, Pliny parades his efficiency, industry, and conscientiousness, completely committed throughout to the ideological norms of the Empire under Trajan. In many respects, therefore, despite their differences in local and historical contexts, and in their native tongues, Agricola, Pliny and Arrian can all be seen in a similar light; adhering to and promoting Roman political and cultural values in the face of considerable challenges. The Greek Arrian, the latest of the three, can be seen to be attempting to write himself into a tradition of the textbook Roman governor.

But what we might identify as a consistency in the cultural principles underlying the provincial governorships of these men would scarcely have been possible two or three generations earlier. It is a well-known historical detail, again eloquently testified by Tacitus, that until the reign of Claudius (emperor 41–54 CE), Roman senatorial status was reserved for men originating from Italy or from the city of Rome itself. In the pages of Tacitus' *Annals*, it was Claudius himself who had the political vision and nous to extend the status to Gallic aristocrats. In a relatively short but persuasive speech to the Senate, Claudius pointed out the advantages of political flexibility in respect of non-Italians (*Ann.* 11.24); since the times of aggravation and hostility between Rome and Gaul, the province had now become so peaceful, loyal and wealthy that Rome had as much to gain as the Gallic aristocrats from a radical change in policy.¹¹ After Claudius, what it meant to be Roman in the high Empire was no longer a matter of birthplace; senators came to be appointed from other provinces too, and so throughout the imperial period, the overall number of Roman citizens increased steadily. A growing percentage of Romans had never set foot in the capital or even in Italy but were, nonetheless, legally recognised as part of Roman society, with the same rights as their peers in the capital or in one of the Italian towns. Under the Flavian emperors, aristocrats from southern Spain began to enjoy senatorial privileges; under Trajan and Hadrian, the office included more and more Greeks, until, from the mid-2nd century CE, about half of the non-Italian senators originated from the Eastern part of the Empire.¹² And as Arrian did in Cappadocia and the Black Sea area, men of Greek origin could become part of the machinery of imperial administration and represent the Empire even against the interests of fellow Greeks. It is in this context of the changing demographics of Roman citizenship that the attitudes of the educated classes towards Rome bear reconsideration. In Trapezus in the 130s, Arrian could be both Greek and Roman.

11 See also the Lyon tablet, *CIL* 13.1668, *ILS* 212.

12 Devreker 1980: 261–4; Eck 2000: 219.

As we have seen, Arrian's *Periplus* was written in classisizing Greek, in its style and ambit, a respectful nod towards Xenophon. But despite his own insistence in our discussion's opening quotation on what might be thought to be a conventional classical polarisation of 'Greek' and 'barbarian', Arrian of course did not operate in a Hellenic monoculture. Arrian displays his cultural credentials in the very language of his *Periplus* but he was also an active participant in the Latin speaking ranks of the Empire's governance. His reference to the 'Latin report' (ἐν τοῖς Ῥωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασιν γέγραπται) about military provision reminds us that the language of government of the Roman Empire was Latin.¹³ Latin was the principle language of the various instruments of Empire: law, administration, the army.¹⁴ As more lands were annexed in the name of the Roman Empire, more indigenous languages were ignored, threatened and allowed to die. Etruscan, Umbrian, Iberian, Gaulish, Germanic, Moorish, etc.:¹⁵ the catalogue of indigenous languages that Roman imperialism effectively swept aside reads like a war memorial, even if the means of their effective death were not overtly hostile—Augustine observed that Latin secured its cultural foothold *per pacem societatis* ('through society's peace', *City of God* 19.7.18).¹⁶ But Greek was an exception to the general rule that 'Romanisation' and 'Latinisation' went largely hand in hand. Greek was granted a privileged position as the *lingua franca* of government in the East (with the Balkans the effective fulcrum), even if in certain contexts it underwent linguistic interference in the process of translation from Latin.¹⁷ The army was long considered a different case, a context where Latin was formally required, but Jim Adams has recently questioned the definition of the language as 'official';¹⁸ from evidence of Greek being used to conduct various business, Adams concluded that in the case of Latin and Greek in military contexts, although Latin enjoyed a superior status, the predominance of one language over the other within any military unit probably determined its use there.¹⁹ Adams interprets the Abinnaeus archive as an index of this status differentiation in language choice; the archive, named after the military commander at Dionysias in the Fayûm of the 340s, is dominated by Greek items, but two Latin documents feature. Both could reasonably be characterised as 'official' in that they concern appointment to

13 For some recent discussions, see Adams 2003a: 558–60; Rochette 1997; Adams 2011.

14 Adams 2003a: 599–623; 2003b; see Harries in chapter eight below.

15 Adams 2003a, with bibliography.

16 Rochette 2011b.

17 Kaimio 1979.

18 2003a: 599–623.

19 Adams 2003a: 608.

and dismissal from service respectively; but many of the Greek documents can similarly be classified as formal or official too.²⁰ If this acceptability of Greek and Latin as languages of the Roman army was stable over time and space, Arrian's decision to write his military report in Latin rather than his native Greek seems all the more pronounced.

But notwithstanding its use in certain military contexts, albeit in a hierarchy where Latin enjoyed 'super-high' status, Greek seems at times to have been less acceptable in certain other formal situations. Bilingual inscriptions of the *Senatus Consulta* attest that for a certain readership there was a need for translation into Greek of senatorial business, but there is no doubt that Latin was the primary language in the Roman Senate itself.²¹ Most Roman emperors were Latin-Greek bilingual to some extent, but this seems to have served cultural rather than political ends.²² Suetonius comments as follows on the Greek competence of the emperor Tiberius: *sermone Graeco quamquam alioqui promptus et facilis, non tamen usque quaque usus est abstinuitque maxime in senatu* ('although he was equipped and adept in the Greek language, however he didn't use it all the time, and in particular not in the Senate', *Tib.* 71.1). On the other hand, the emperor Claudius seems to have been less reserved about his Greek: *nec minore cura Graeca studia secutus est, amorem praestantiamque linguae occasione omni professus. cuidam barbaro Graece ac Latine disserenti: "cum utroque" inquit, "sermone nostro sis paratus"; et in commendanda patribus conscriptis Achaia, gratam sibi provinciam ait communium studiorum commercio; ac saepe in senatu legatis perpetua oratione respondit* ('with no less concern he pursued Greek studies and on every occasion, professed his love for that language and its pre-eminence. To some barbarian who spoke both Greek and Latin, he said, 'Since you are equipped with each of our languages...'; and in commending Greece to the Senators, he said the province pleased him, with its involvement in common interests; and in the Senate, he often replied to delegates in sustained [Greek] speech', *Claud.* 42.1). Claudius' philhellenism is made manifest by Suetonius, and his use of Greek in the Senate—even in prescribed circumstances—is surely designed within the biographical collection to be in marked contrast with Tiberius. And with his phrase *sermo noster* to the barbarian envoy, whom in the context we must understand him to have been neither a Roman citizen nor an ethnic Greek, Claudius clearly grants to Greek

20 Adams 2003a: 555–8.

21 Adams 2003a: 36–7.

22 Kaimio 1979: 130–43; Rochette 2011a: 13.

a status denied to other languages, presumably including his addressee's native tongue.²³

Yet it seems that this had not always been the case, at least according to a well-known passage from Valerius Maximus, an author of the early imperial period but who speaks here of the Republican past: *magistratus uero prisci quantopere suam populique Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint hinc cognosci potest, quod inter cetera obtinendae grauitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseuerantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi latine responsa darent. quin etiam ipsos linguae uolubilitate, qua plurimum ualent, excussa per interpretem loqui cogeabant non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae uocis honos per omnes gentes uenerabilior diffunderetur.* ('Indeed it can be seen how much magistrates of old conducted themselves to retain their own majesty and that of the Roman people—that amongst other indications of their need to maintain their dignity, with great insistence they would ensure that they never gave answers to Greeks unless in Latin. Indeed they forced the Greeks to abandon their volubility of tongue—which is their greatest strength—and speak through an interpreter, not only in our city [of Rome] but also in Greece and Asia, of course so that the honour of the Latin language be more widely venerated across all nations', *fact. et dict.* 2.2.2).²⁴ The present tense of the parenthetical *qua plurimum ualent* signals an ongoing anti-Greek sentiment in Valerius Maximus, but otherwise the tenor of the passage might characterise this Roman practice in political negotiation as a historical relic, a thing of the distant past. Nonetheless, the same emperor Claudius we have seen as an eloquent advocate for the enfranchisement of Gallic aristocrats, Greek-Latin bilingual at least to some degree, and generally deeply philhellenic, is also presented in the pages of Suetonius as being very unforgiving of a Greek juror for not knowing Latin; *splendidum virum Graeciaeque provinciae principem, verum Latini sermonis ignarum, non modo albo iudicum erasit, sed in peregrinitatem redegit* ('he not only removed from the register of jurors an eminent man, a leader indeed of the Greek province, but ignorant of the Latin language; he even downgraded him to non-citizen status', Suetonius *Claud.* 16.2). To Claudius, it seems, knowledge of Latin was necessary for engagement in Roman politics as a citizen, but knowledge of Greek was highly esteemed, even in the highest political circles. For native Latin speakers, competence in Greek was, or could be, a mark of cultural distinction.²⁵ Quintilian recommended Greek as the first stage in the education of the (wealthy) young Roman,

²³ Torres Guerra 2011: 7.

²⁴ Adams 2003a: 558–9; Rochette 2011a: 14–15.

²⁵ E.g. Horsfall 1979; Dubuisson 1992.

a sermone Graeco puerum incipere malo ('I prefer a boy to begin from the Greek language', *Inst. Orat.* 1.1.12).²⁶ And so the dominant languages of power could look both ways; Latin speakers like Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, Claudius, Aulus Gellius and Fronto could use Greek as part of their social performance; and Greek was granted and denied some privilege as an acceptable language of Roman political authority. Language choice and competence were finely calibrated in cultural and political relations; and would be increasingly complicated in the imperial period, as territorial expansion and demographic changes interacted. It is precisely this nexus of personal preference, cultural norm and change over time that renders characterisation of the relationships between Greeks, Romans and power very difficult.

In this context, because of their origins, even when conducting political business in Latin, provincials might sometimes have been subject to the arrogant snobbery of Italian senators. Pressure would have been most intense in the Senate House itself, where newly enfranchised senators of provincial descent would have to declaim in Latin before an audience consisting largely of Italians. By the turn of the first century CE, the ethnic and cultural demographic in the Roman senate had an unprecedented mix, and when reading out to the Senate a speech by the emperor Trajan in 101, a Spanish born *quaestor* is said to have been jeered for his delivery: *quaesturam gessit Traiano quater et Articuleio consulibus, in qua cum orationem imperatoris in senatu agrestius pronuntians risus esset, usque ad summam peritiam et facundiam Latinis operam dedit* ('He held the quaestorship when the consuls were Trajan for the fourth time and Articuleius; when as *quaestor* he pronounced rather crudely a speech by the emperor, he was ridiculed, and afterwards devoted himself to Latin to a point of utmost skill and eloquence', *Historia Augusta, Hadr.* 3.1).²⁷ Sixteen years later, this Spanish senator became Roman emperor, a position from where he went on to appoint to the governorship of Baetica in Spain, the Nicomedian Greek Arrian (AE 1974.370).²⁸ Hadrian was, according to various testimonies, devoted to Greek culture.²⁹ The *Historia Augusta* author says *imbutusque impensius Graecis studiis, ingenio eius sic ad ea declinante ut a nonnullis Graeculus diceretur* ('rather deeply imbued in Greek studies, his mind so inclined to them that he was known as 'Greekling' by some' *Vita Hadriani* 1.5). This intellectual taste grew to interest and commitment to Greek architecture, fashion, religion and philosophy. (*Vita Hadriani* 13.6, 22.4, 25.10 Cassius Dio 69.16.1.). In the Athenian stadium, he is said to have staged a hunt of a

26 Adams 2003a: 9–14.

27 Adams 2003a: 16–17.

28 Hadrian was born in Rome, *Vita Hadriani* 1.3.

29 Birley 1997: 58–65, 175–88, 215–21.

thousand animals—a conspicuous fusion of Greek and Roman practices (*Vita Hadriani* 19.3); but he is also said not to have neglected Rome (*Vita Hadriani* 19.4–13).

Hadrian, the ‘Greekling’ is a conspicuous example of how an emperor’s attitude towards Greek culture could be an index of his personal and even moral integrity. Three of the emperors ancient Latin biography condemned are demonised in part for their over-indulgence in certain aspects of Greek culture: Nero, Domitian and Commodus. Nero (emperor 54–68), with his sporting, dramatic and musical performances in Greece, neglected his political responsibilities (Suetonius *vita Neronis* 24, 53). The Greek games inaugurated by Domitian (81–96), including athletic and rhetorical competition, are presented as symptomatic of his tyrannical and capricious reign (Suetonius *vita Domitiani* 4.4); and in Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta*, his commitment to the Greek god Hercules characterises Commodus (180–92) as manically self-obsessed (Cassius 72.15.5, 17.4; *Historia Augusta, vita Commodi* 8.5).³⁰ But greater discretion in attitudes towards Greek culture could secure more favourable testimony from Latin writers, and other emperors fared better. A balance between Greek and Latin cultural interests that broadly seems to have won popular approval was that struck by Marcus Aurelius (emperor 161–80). Aurelius’ *Meditations* is an important work of Stoic philosophy, in Greek; but his philosophy did not inform his political strategies of warring against Germans.

But if it was possible for an emperor to embrace aspects of Greek culture without compromising his status and reputation as a suitable leader of the Roman Empire, it is notable that no Greek ever became Roman emperor. Yet after Trajan, the origins of Rome’s emperors were by no means restricted to Italy. The families of Trajan and Hadrian came from Spain; Marcus Aurelius too had Spanish connections; Septimius Severus was born in Leptis Magna, in Africa; his son Caracalla (emperor 198–217) was born in Lyon; Macrinus (218) was born in Caesarea in Algeria; and Alexander Severus (222–235) was born in Arca Caesarea (in Lebanon). The highest political (and religious) office in the Roman world was filled by representatives of various ethnic and cultural identities, but for all the privilege aspects of Greek culture enjoyed in the Empire, no Greek ever took the throne.

The question of how Roman a Greek could be is an established issue among historians. In his *Hellenism and Empire* (1996) Simon Swain argued, ‘It is quite wrong to assume the priority of one area of a man’s life—such as his Roman

30 For rehabilitation of Commodus, especially in respect of his alignment with Hercules, see Hekster 2005: 208–14.

career—without at least asking whether other areas may not have been more important.³¹ A rival for a man's Roman career which Swain entertains would be his Greek cultural heritage. This perception of identity in Roman Greece as a matter of 'either/or' and the view of how a Greek cultural heritage was more important for the shaping of someone's identity than legal, political and social affiliation to Roman society is characteristic of recent approaches to how Greek intellectuals responded to Rome and the Empire. Educated Greeks criticised almost every aspect of Roman society: the level of civilisation, the organisation and effect of Roman rule, the form of government and the way of life. Even if Greeks are generally believed to have accepted the Empire, their criticism of it has been interpreted as an opposition towards Rome or Roman civilisation in general.³²

This opposition has traditionally been divided by scholars between an explicit and implicit criticism of Roman society. Dio of Prusa's critique of Roman education, lifestyle and legislation in his *Orations* 13 and 25 has been presented as an example of direct criticism of Roman culture and an appeal for Greek guidance and education—*paideia*.³³ Dio's criticism of Roman's lack of education is especially stressed in the 13th *oration*, *On Exile*, delivered in Athens in front of an Athenian audience shortly after his recall by Nerva. In the speech, Dio quotes to his fellow Greeks what he has already told the Romans and mentions how he gave advice on how to plan education.

οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπειρώμην διαλέγεσθαι Ῥωμαίοις, ἐπειδὴ με ἐκάλεσαν καὶ λέγειν ἡξίου, οὐ κατὰ δύο καὶ τρεῖς ἀπολαμβάνων ἐν παλαίστραις καὶ περιπάτοις· οὐ γὰρ ἦν δυνατόν οὕτως ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ πόλει συγγίγνεσθαι πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ἀθροίοις εἰς ταῦτ' οὐ συνιοῦσιν, ὅτι δέονται παιδείας κρείττονος καὶ ἐπιμελεστέρας, εἰ μέλλουσιν εὐδαίμονες ἔσσεσθαι τῷ ὄντι κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ μὴ δόξῃ τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥσπερ νῦν, ἥτις αὐτοὺς μεταπίσει καὶ διδάξει [παραλαβὼν] ὅτι τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἀγαθόν, ὑπὲρ ὧν σπουδάζουσι καὶ πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ κτῶνται, καὶ νομίζουσιν, ὅσῳ ἂν πλείω κτήσωνται, τοσούτῳ ἄμεινον βιώσεσθαι καὶ μακαριώτερον·

And so I too tried to talk to the Romans when they summoned me and gave me chance to speak, but I did not take them in twos and threes in wrestling-schools and cloistered walks; for it was not possible to meet them in this way in that city; but when many had crowded together in the

31 Swain 1996: 70.

32 Swain 1996: 70.

33 Salmeri 2000: 87; see also Dio *Oration* 15 on law, and 31 on gladiatorial combat.

same place, I would tell them that they needed a better and more attentive education, if in reality they were ever to be truly happy and not merely in the opinion of the majority, as was now the case; that if anyone should persuade them of this [and take them in charge] and teach them that not one of those things is good with which they busied themselves and which they acquire with complete enthusiasm, thinking that, the more they acquire, the better and more blessed their life will be (Dio *Or.*, 13.31).

It has been argued that in the speech Dio presents himself as the teacher that taught the Romans who possessed military knowledge but lacked broader cultural accomplishment.³⁴ Dio as the philosopher dedicated to educating the Romans is also the authorial characterisation in the kingship orations (*Or.* 1–4), where he writes himself into the tradition of Greek philosophers who serve as advisors to kings—in this case, Trajan—on political and moral matters. And concerning Roman luxury and luxurious lifestyle, Dio also expressed his reservations. Again, in front of the Athenians he insisted:

τότε γάρ, ἔφην, ἔσται ὑμῶν ἡ πόλις μεγάλη καὶ ἰσχυρὰ καὶ ἄρχουσα κατ' ἀλήθειαν· ὥς τό γε νῦν τὸ μέγεθος αὐτῆς ὑποπτον καὶ οὐ πᾶν ἀσφαλές. ὅσα γάρ ἄν, ἔφην, πλείων ἢ τε ἀνδρεία καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη γίγνηται παρ' ὑμῖν, τοσούτῳ ἔλαττον ἔσται τό τε ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὰ ἐλεφάντινα σκεύη καὶ τὰ ἡλέκτρινα καὶ κρύσταλλος καὶ θύον καὶ ἔβενος καὶ ὁ τῶν γυναικῶν κόσμος καὶ τὰ ποικίλματα καὶ αἱ βαφαὶ καὶ ξύμπαντα ἀπλῶς τὰ νῦν ἐν τῇ πόλει τίμια καὶ περιμάχῃτα, ἐλαττόνων αὐτῶν δεήσεσθε·

“For only then” [i.e. after the Romans were willing to listen to their teacher and give up their wealth], I said, “will your city be great and strong and truly powerful, since now its greatness arouses suspicion and is not very safe. For,” I said, “as much as courage, justice, and temperance increase among you, by so much there will be less silver and gold and furniture of ivory and of amber, less of crystal and citron-wood and ebony and female adornments and colourful things and dyes; in short, all the things which are now considered in your city precious and worth fighting for, you will need in smaller quantities” (Dio *Or.* 13.34).

Another example is to be found in condemnation of Roman generals, emperors or other Roman representatives. Plutarch reminds his readers that the Greeks were no longer truly free and reminds the political elite in the cities that what they struggled against was not to be measured against the deeds and accomplishments of fifth century BCE Greeks who had fought to establish and maintain and dominions.³⁵ In his guide to Greece, Pausanias describes the coming of Rome as a mischance. 'Megalopolis is the most recent not only of the Arcadian cities but of [all] of Greece, with the exception of those whose inhabitants, by the misfortune of the rule of the Romans, have been settlers' (ἡ δὲ Μεγάλη πόλις νεωτάτη πόλεων ἐστὶν οὐ τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλήσιν, πλὴν ὅσων κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων μεταβεβήκασιν οἰκήτορες, 8.27.1). And Philostratus describes the principate as a form of rule, where most of the *principes* up until the accession of Vespasian were tyrants, 'after the first emperor under whom the affairs of Rome were set in order, harsh tyrannies had lasted for fifty years in this way', (μετὰ γὰρ τὸν πρῶτον αὐτοκράτορα, ὅφ' οὗ τὰ Ῥωμαίων διεκοσμήθη, τυραννίδες οὕτω χαλεπαὶ ἴσχυσαν ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα ἔτη, v.A. 5.27).³⁶

Other scholars have pointed out a more implicit form of opposition, where by omitting Roman institutions, history and achievements of various aspects of Roman civilisation, educated Greeks indirectly criticised Rome and the Romans. Aelius Aristides is one such example of a Greek intellectual; some scholars have read his speech *To Rome* as a celebration of the Empire and its economic opportunities, but also as implicit criticism of the city of Rome, Roman people and perhaps more importantly, Roman civilisation. One example of such indirect criticism is said to be the decision not to celebrate the city of Rome or for that matter its history or the achievements of the Romans. Alternatively, the speech has been read as a panegyric not necessarily to be believed by the author himself, which brings the discussion back to the question of hollow flattery and a pragmatic yet dishonest attempt to please the less intelligent and less attentive Romans, who wrongly thought they were being admired.³⁷ Similarly, in the case of ideal rule, Stoic and Cynic inspirations for the definitions of ideal rulership forwarded by Dio of Prusa and Cassius Dio

35 On less prestigious accomplishments of contemporary Greeks and the former glory of the free Greek communities see Plutarch *Moralia* 813. See also Dio Chrys. 38.23–25.

36 On Plutarch's critique of Rome war in Greece see 8.27.1; Swain 1996: 156; for Pausanias' criticism of Roman colonisation and the synoicism of Greek cities, see 5.23.3, 7.18.3–4, 8; 10.38.4 with Habicht 1985: 122–5 and Swain 1996: 347–8. For Philostratus' comments on the tyrannical *principes*, see Swain 1996: 388–9.

37 Swain 1996: 276–280; Pernot 2008: 188–91; Bowie 2009: 224–7.

respectively have been interpreted as indices of culturally motivated scepticism towards Roman forms of government or the political system *per se*.³⁸

The extent of Greek and Roman integration and affiliation is a recurrent question in this volume. In particular, the contributors focus on the intellectuals of their day, across geographical, political and linguistic divides, and how they experienced and represented Roman rule and Roman institutions of power. It gathers chapters on a variety of authors, across several literary prose genres and documentary texts, and through this spectrum, makes possible a comparison of educated Greek and Latin views of Roman power (in various manifestations, including military, religion, law and politics). This comparative model proves valuable to our understanding of the relationships between culture(s) and authority in a diverse imperialist society. What emerges is a more nuanced appreciation of the differences and similarities between educated responses to Roman power across the Empire across the two dominant languages.

The first two papers of the volume offer contrasting pictures of Greek participation in aspects of Roman power over a wide chronological range. Jesper Majbom Madsen compares the attitudes towards Roman governmental institutions in several Greek and Latin historiographical and oratorical texts, from Pliny under Trajan to Philostratos in the third century CE. Madsen argues that his Greek and Latin authors shared similar views of Roman institutions of power and that these educated Greeks saw themselves as operating within and not in opposition to Roman society. Ewen Bowie, on the other hand, collates epigraphic evidence from the early imperial period onwards to conclude that there was a consistent pattern of Greek (non-)involvement in the Roman army, despite the strong archaic Greek tradition for commemorating military activity. John Moles expands the volume's horizons with a consciously historicising discussion of cultural interaction between Greek, Roman and Jewish communities in the sacred texts of Luke and Acts. Roger Rees proposes that against the traditions of Latin texts, the senator Pliny insists on the Roman character of political praise-giving, to the exclusion of Greek influence, in his surviving speech to Trajan; this, Rees suggests, need not be seen as a function of genre, but as a calculated strategy to claim Trajan for a western, Latinate vision of emperorship. Bruce Gibson's principle focus is on Pliny's associate and fellow Senator Tacitus; Gibson uses the Republican historian Polybius and the Augustan Livy as precedents to highlight continuities and changes in the interfaces between eastern and western political embassies in the traditions of classical historiography. Tacitus features too in Rhiannon Ash's consideration

38 Aalders 1986: 296–300; Swain 1996: 194, 197–200; de Blois 1998: 3413–14.

of historiographical versions of the Flavian victory in the civil war of 68–9 CE; when set against Tacitus, Ash argues that orthodox scholarship's characterisation of Josephus as a collaborative insider is in need of revision. Joe Howley considers the phenomenon of Roman 'study abroad' in Athens; his main focus is the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius, but Howley also sets up Cicero and Plutarch as 'foils' for Gellius' experience and representation of the cultural politics of a Roman studying in Athens. Ulpian, the third century jurist from Tyre, is the focal-point of Jill Harries' discussion of the effect of Roman government and law on provincial society: in terms of his own identity, Harries sees Ulpian as having three layers, not all of which could be comfortably accommodated at the same time—a Roman lawyer, professionally engaged with Greeks, and also the native of a 'provincial' city. Jesper Carlsen moves from an analysis of the four *explicit* references to Roman society in Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander* to a consideration that *implicit* commentary on Roman imperial practice can be detected in the historian's account of aspects of protocol in the court of Alexander; Carlsen concludes that Arrian's account was informed by experiences of Roman government. In his analysis of criticism of Greek society in the text of the third century historian Herodian, Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen differentiates between the narrator's voice and character-speeches attributed to emperors; in Herodian, particular Greek and Roman cultural 'failings' are seen to be *stasis* and tyrannicide respectively. Bekker-Nielsen argues that, although deficient in profound political insight, Herodian's tendency for moralising cultural analysis resulted in pointed juxtaposition of Greek and Roman conventions. In the closing chapter, Jason König uses the Greek biographical work, Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, in his analysis of the relationship between Roman emperors and Greek intellectuals, in the third century. König argues that Philostratus resists tidy accommodation within landscape of consistent and cooperative elite Greco-Roman relations; rather, Philostratus is seen to be a provocative but subtle commentator on relations between Greek and Roman traditions. Across these eleven papers, the visions of imperial government and culture that Greek- and Latin-speaking writers from the late first to mid third centuries command are seen to be resistant to tidy linguistic compartmentalisation. Across the two dominant languages, law, oratory, historiography, biography, military service, philosophy, education and religion all feature as contentious grounds for views of a society in major flux.

Patriotism and Ambitions: Intellectual Response to Roman Rule in the High Empire

Jesper Majbom Madsen

“Οτε φεύγειν συνέβη με φιλίας ἔνεκεν λεγομένης ἀνδρὸς οὐ πονηροῦ, . . . ὡς δὴ τάνδρῃ φίλον ὄντα καὶ σύμβουλον· ἔθος γάρ τι τοῦτό ἐστι τῶν τυράννων, ὥσπερ ἐν Σκύθαις τοῖς βασιλεῦσι συνθάπτειν οἰνοχόους καὶ μαγείρους καὶ παλλακάς, οὕτως τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἑτέρους προστιθέναι πλείους ἀπ’ οὐδεμιᾶς αἰτίας. . .

When it happened to me to be exiled for my alleged friendship with a man of good character the charge against me that I was friend and advisor to that man. For, it is the nature of tyrants, just as to bury wine-bearers and cooks and concubines with Scythian kings, so to add for no reason several others to those who are being executed by them. . . (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 13.1).

In this speech to the Athenians, Dio Chrysostom criticises Domitian for killing good men and for punishing their friends and advisors merely for their acquaintance with those whom the emperor had sentenced to death, presumably for an attempt on the throne in 82 CE (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 13.1). Later in another speech, this time held in his hometown of Prusa, Dio carries on the attack against Domitian by describing him as an evil despot whom Greeks and barbarians alike styled as ‘master and god’, δεσπότην . . . καὶ θεόν and by whom he was exiled for being the only one courageous enough to challenge the tyrant openly (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 45.1). And so Dio offers two versions as to why he was exiled.¹ But what is essential here is how he addresses several fundamental issues of what Romans traditionally considered good governmental practice: the right to speak freely, the right to protection by the law and the moderate conduct of the ruling authorities.²

1 For further discussion Dio’s as literary topos or historical event see Whitmarsh 2001: 159–61; Madsen 2009: 110–1.

2 For the second century debate on *libertas* by Tacitus and Pliny the Younger, see Morford 1991: 3436–7.

From the writing of other Greek intellectuals between late first and early third century CE it is evident that Dio's reservations about Roman rule were not unique. Plutarch reminds members of the Greek civic elite that Greece was no longer free but under foreign domination and emphasises in his essays on Greek and Roman questions the significant differences between the two cultures.³ In his *Description of Greece*, Pausanias criticises the foundation of Nicopolis and re-colonisation of Patrai and Corinth and refers to Roman domination as a misfortune for Greece (7.6.1).⁴ And Philostratus questions the emperor as an institution with the claim that all predecessors of Vespasian except Augustus, and perhaps Claudius, had ruled as tyrants (VA. 5.27).⁵ This scepticism towards Roman rule, together with a general criticism of Roman luxury, lack of education, brutal laws and barbaric forms of entertainment, has been seen as a culturally motivated attempt by which educated Greeks tried to distance themselves and the Greek World from the Roman imperial community.

One of the most influential studies of Greek reluctance towards the Roman world is Simon Swain's *Hellenism and Empire* from 1996. Here, Greek criticism of Roman rule and the institutions involved are seen as ways by which educated Greeks drew a line between the Greek and the Roman worlds. As pointed out by Swain, members of the Greek elite were often legally Romans and deeply engaged in Roman politics and administration, but in contrast to what is believed of their peers in the western provinces, did not perceive themselves as belonging to a Roman collectivity. Instead, a distinction is drawn between being Greek and being Roman, and it is argued that Greeks, who are seen as 'under foreign domination', were forced to make a choice between a Greek or Roman identity, which more often than not caused intellectuals, including those involved in Roman government, to put their Greek identity before their Roman affiliation.⁶ Greek intellectuals criticised aspects of Roman rule and *mores*. Emperors such as Caligula, Nero, Domitian and Commodus were generally exposed to substantially negative press for their tyrannical conduct; and the imperial cult and, in particular, the worship of living emperors

3 Plut. *Political Advice* 813c–e; Preston 2001: 90–1, 97, 100.

4 For more critique of Roman urbanisation in Greece see Paus. 5.23.3; 7.18.8; 8.24.11; 8.27.1; 10.38.4.

5 See Flaig 2010: 276–9 on the general legitimacy of the principate as opposed to the acceptance of the individual emperor. Philostratus' general critique of almost every emperor testifies to a more profound scepticism towards the institutions and not just the individual emperor.

6 Swain 1996: 70–1, Woolf 1994: 127–30.

was frequently condemned.⁷ This criticism was no doubt genuine enough but the question to be treated in this chapter is, was it for the larger part culturally motivated? One way to test this is to compare how Greek intellectuals perceived the Empire and its politics of power with how intellectuals from the western part of the Empire, whose affiliation to the Roman world we take for granted, viewed the same questions.

The Perfect *Princeps*

In the High Empire, the emperor was the most important institution in the Roman government. His position as the undisputed commander of the armed forces, his control of the political process, administration and the legal system meant that the emperor was the personification of Roman rule both in the provincial communities and in the city of Rome.⁸ Consequently, political commentators from across the Empire devoted much of their attention to how various emperors managed this almost unlimited power. Two intellectuals to address the question of the ideal ruler were Pliny the Younger and Dio Chrysostom. Both chose the genre of oratory as their medium and both addressed Trajan on his return to Rome around the year 100 CE, for the first time as *princeps*.⁹

In his panegyric, Pliny presents Trajan's first years in power as the antithesis of the reign of Domitian, who ruled without consulting the senators, who were instead exposed to unlawful prosecution and disrespectful treatment, such as when requested to style the emperor as *dominus* and *deus*.¹⁰ Trajan's determination to include the Senate in the government is emphasised in the following way: *illuxerat primus consulatus tui dies, quo tu curiam ingressus, nunc singulos, nunc universos adhortatus es resumere libertatem, capessere quasi communis imperii curas, invigilare publicis utilitatibus et insurgere* ("The first day of your consulship had dawned when you came into the Senate-house and exhorted individuals and everyone together, to resume freedom, to take up the

7 See Cassius Dio on Caligula's demand to be worshipped in the Milesians' temple to Apollo (59.28.1); on Commodus' murder of senators 73.10.2, and on his criticism of Caracalla for killing out of envy 78.1.1–2.

8 For the emperor as a unifying symbol particularly in the western part of the Empire see Noreña 2011b: 1, 3, 13.

9 Moles 1990: 333.

10 On Domitian's exclusion of senators *Pan.* 66; on unlawful prosecution *Pan.* 48; on confiscation of property *Pan.* 50.1–2; on the elevated status *Pan.* 2.3.

responsibilities of power as if they were communal, to watch over the interests of the people, and to rise to it', Pliny *Pan.* 66.2). Throughout the speech, Pliny is eager to show how the situation had changed for the better, how Trajan encouraged senators to share the responsibility of the government for the benefit of the people, and how the new political situation had enabled senators to express themselves openly and without fear. (Pliny *Pan.* 66, 93.1–3).¹¹ *iubes esse liberos; erimus. iubes, quae sentimus, promere in medium: proferemus. neque enim adhuc ignavia quadam et insito torpore cessavimus: terror et metus, et misera illa ex periculis facta prudentia monebat, ut a republica (erat autem omnino respublica?) oculos, aures, animos averteremus.* ('You bid us be free; and we shall be free. You bid us bring into the open our thoughts: we shall bring them. For we did not linger still for some cowardice or natural inertia: fear and apprehension, and that lamentable caution born of our perils bade us turn our eyes and ears and minds from our state, (but was it a state at all?),' *Pan.* 66.4). Pliny repeatedly returns to the relationship between *princeps* and Senate showing how Trajan set the Romans free by respecting the traditional virtues of *libertas*—the constitutional right to participate in the affairs of the state.¹² Apart from the encouragement to speak freely and participate in government, Trajan is honoured for his modest reluctance to accept both the title *pater patriae* and the third consulship and his respect for the single magistracies is emphasised by the account of how Trajan took the same oath as other senators before entering the consular office.¹³

Another sensitive matter for Pliny was the imperial cult. Here, Pliny emphasises the emperor's mortality by claiming that one of the reasons why he is a good *princeps* was because he knew he was mortal (Pliny *Pan.* 2.3). Pliny moves on to describe how Trajan enters the temples to offer his own prayers to the gods and praises the fact that he did not allow sacrifices or sanctuaries to be set up or carried out in his honour. This hesitation to allow any sort of ruler cult—in Rome that is—is further exemplified by how Trajan denied thanksgivings to his goodness, *bonitas*, or his *genius* and hints to other emperors' or one specific emperor's divine aspirations: *horum unum si praestitisset alius, illi iam dudum radiatum caput, et media inter deos sedes auro staret aut ebore, augustioribusque aris et grandioribus victimis invocaretur. tu delubra non nisi adoraturus intras* ('had someone else claimed a single one of these achievements, his head would have long since worn a nimbus, his seat with gold or ivory would have

11 Morford 1992: 584–6.

12 Durry 1938: 21–4; Syme 1938: 223; Morford 1992: 585.

13 Morford 1992: 587–9. For Trajan's reluctance to assume titles and magistracies, *Pan.* 21; the consulship *Pan.* 56.3–58.

been among the gods, and he would have been invoked at more august altars and grander sacrificial victims. You did not enter sanctuaries unless to offer prayers', Pliny *Pan.* 52.1). Once again, the contrast with Domitian and his desire to be styled as *deus* must have been apparent to most, but the criticism extends to a general disapproval of the imperial cult.

Pliny's approval was by no means unconditional but depended on whether Trajan continued to rule as a citizen, who, as a first among equals, made his decision in consultation with the Senate. The explicit intention to revise and expand the speech for a published version could have been a strategy to keep Trajan on this promising path and to inspire future emperors to follow his example (4.1).¹⁴ The *Panegyricus* should thereby be seen as more than a 'vote of thanks' for a consular appointment but as a contribution to a political and constitutional debate, which took off in the years after the fall of Domitian, where both the *principate* and the role of the *princeps* were open for discussion.

In contrast to how Pliny explicitly compared the reign of Domitian and Trajan in order to illustrate the difference between the tyrannical and perfect ruler, Dio Chrysostom offers a more generalised and theoretical approach to what constituted the question of ideal rule. These differences in approach have divided modern scholars between those who see Dio's speech as flattery of Trajan, and those who see it as an attempt to improve the *princeps* morally.¹⁵ Like Pliny, Dio's ideal king was god-fearing and recognised the divine king, Zeus, as his superior by offering prayers in his honour (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.39, 1.44–46 & 3.51).¹⁶ Dio's king should not be arrogant, depraved, ignorant, temperamental or paranoid, but modest and a law-abiding shepherd of his people who shared their hardships (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.12–13). First then could he call the soldiers 'fellow-soldiers' and his associates 'friends' and rightfully use the title 'father of his people and subjects', πατέρα δὲ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.22);¹⁷ and like Pliny, Dio also describes how the good king was not feared but respected by his subjects (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.25).¹⁸

14 *Ep.* 1.20, 3.13, 3.18.1; Durry 1938: 21–4; Radice 1968: 168; Morton Braund 1998: 58–68; Roche 2011b: 4–5; Rees 2011a: 175.

15 Moles 1990: 301–3; Rostovtzeff 1957: 120; Fears 1977: 154–8; Jones 1978: 117–20; Desideri 1978: 350 n.1.

16 Pliny on Trajan's prayers to the gods *Pan.* 52.2.

17 Pliny on Trajan's share of hardship with the soldiers Pliny *Pan.* 19; see Campbell 1984: 32–59.

18 For Pliny on how Trajan ended *maiestas* trials and on how the senators enjoy the emperor's company *Pan.* 42; 48.

The question of the constitution is discussed in the third oration, where the definition of ideal rule is based on the thoughts of Homer and Aristotle on government. Good government is defined as the oversight of men in accordance with the law, while monarchy and tyranny are defined as ways of ruling, where the will of the king was either the law or the arbitrary and lawless treatment of the subjects (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 3.43–6).¹⁹ From here, Dio moves on to compare aristocracy, oligarchy and democracy and concludes, with a reference to Homer, that ideal rule is a form of government where a city, a number of people or the whole world was organised under the judgement and virtue of one good man, which, Dio says, was the situation at present.²⁰

τούτων μὲν οὖν ὁ λόγος ἄλλως ἐπεμνήσθη, πολλὰ παθήματα καὶ συμφορὰς ἐκάστης αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πρότερον χρόνου δεῖξαι δυνάμενος· περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐδαίμονός τε καὶ θείας καταστάσεως τῆς νῦν ἐπικρατοῦσης χρή διελθεῖν ἐπιμελέστερον.

Mention of these has not been made for nothing, when I could point to many sufferings and disasters that each of them has experienced in the past, but I must go through more carefully the blessed and god-given constitution presently in force (Dio *Or.* 3.49–50).

It has been suggested that Dio's words should be interpreted as if he were referring to a 'divine system now in power' indicating a reference to the kingdom of Zeus.²¹ The choice of words is surely ambiguous. Yet, there are elements in the context suggesting that Dio was thinking of an earthly regime. The reference to a system now (νῦν) in place, suggests that Dio was referring to a reign recently inaugurated or at least to a regime which had replaced a less fortunate one, which in neither case suggests that Dio was referring to the kingdom of Zeus (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 3.50). Dio's words are essential as it shows that he describes the government under Trajan as the best form of rule, even if less explicitly than Pliny.²²

There are of course differences in the circumstances between Pliny and Dio, which determined their approach to Trajan.²³ As a newly elected consul with a weight of generic expectation on his shoulders, Pliny spoke in front of

19 Aristotle *Pol.* 7.2.7.

20 Homer *Il.* 2.190f; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1406a23.

21 Swain 1996: 195.

22 Pliny *Pan.* 45. Moles 1990: 355–6.

23 Gibson 2011: 113–16.

the emperor with the senators as his audience. Perhaps already in the Senate but certainly in expanded version, Pliny used the opportunity to display his thoughts on ideal rule to influence Trajan and assure the senators, as well as later readers, that he had not sympathised with Domitian even if he did enjoy the emperor's personal favour as *quaestor imperatoris*.²⁴

The performance context for Dio's orations is less clear, although they were not delivered *ex officio*. No doubt a certain amount of courtesy and approval could have smoothed the way for Dio's ambitions for Prusa, but without the need that Pliny felt for personal apologetics concerning his experience under Domitian, Dio was at greater liberty to speak freely. A reference to a speech held in front of the emperor (αὐτοκράτωρ) in *Or.* 57.11 suggests that later versions of the speech may have been delivered at other occasions.²⁵ As such, any sign of Dio's approval of Trajan and the principate that survived in the published version should be considered as the opinion with which Dio wished to be associated—for, away from the circumstantial pressure of Trajan's presence, he would have been free to cast his kingship theories in whatever way he chose. Now, where Pliny and Dio may have shared their views on ideal rule, their approaches were different. Where Pliny had to use the current *princeps* as the example of what constituted ideal rule, Dio was free to turn the matter around by defining ideal rule from a more theoretical or philosophical angle, letting his audience and later readers decide whether Trajan or other rulers met the definition or not. On the other hand, that Dio cast himself as someone holding the wisdom Trajan needed in order to become a good king implies that he was to advise Trajan privately, which he implies Trajan acknowledged.²⁶

Yet, by framing Trajan's reign so that it would fit with what seems to have been contemporary ideals of ideal rule, Pliny sets Trajan in a position where the latter would have to choose whether to rule in accordance with the law, *mores* and virtues of the Roman people or as a tyrant like his predecessor. Pliny's move was bold. If the characterisation of Trajan were too obviously off target, it would easily come across as an attempt to either criticise or ridicule the *princeps*. It could be done only because Trajan was at an early stage of his reign and nobody, not even Trajan self, would know what sort of ruler he would turn out to be.²⁷ To a large extent, Pliny and Dio shared the same ambition although with different prospects in mind. Where Pliny argued for collaboration between the *princeps* and the Senate, Dio's intention was to show both his

24 Birley 2000: 6–8; Noreña 2011a: 38–9.

25 Dio Chrys. 57.11.

26 Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.6–9; *Or.* 57.10; Moles 1990: 307–8.

27 Moles 1990: 313–15 for a similar strategy in Dio's first oration.

own importance at Trajan's court as well as the need for the emperors in general to benefit from the wisdom available from the Empire's educated Greeks. The focus on Greek cultural superiority by educated Greeks is often interpreted as way of establishing distance from the culturally inferior Roman world. But Dio's display of his mutually respectful relationship with the emperor, whom he calls his friend and whose advisor he claims to have been, argues for his inclusion in a Roman collectivity.

Dio's main audience is likely to have been members of the Greek civic elite in Asia and on mainland Greece. If Dio had wanted to come across as someone who argued to maintain a distance to the Roman world, he would have needed to be a lot more specific. Dio criticised Domitian and did not like all aspects of provincial administration. Yet, criticism of Domitian was already a part of the new regime's ideology, but Dio would have needed to distance himself from Trajan as well. One can hardly say he did. Instead he chose to appear in the role of the emperor's friend and advisor.

Sharing of Absolute Powers

Since 23 BCE when Augustus laid down his successive consular appointments and received the powers of the tribune with *imperium pro consule* in return, free competition for magistracies and commands had been a thing of the past.²⁸ The Senate continued to debate political matters, and senators still received envoys and delegations from provinces and foreign states, and their decisions, the *senatus consulta*, were quoted as the source of law by jurists later on.²⁹ Still, the emperor's political and military control, his extensive travel, long military campaigns and increased reliance on praetorian prefects, freedmen and even ambitious mothers, meant that most major decisions were made outside senatorial meetings.³⁰ How various emperors administered their power was therefore a fundamental question for members of the political elite and commentators.

The third century senator and historian Cassius Dio is one example of a Greek intellectual to discuss the institution of the principate and the reign of different emperors. His approach to ideal rule comes across in a scene where Augustus receives advice on how to rule from Agrippa and Maecenas. After

28 For *imperium pro consule* see Richardson 2012: 101.

29 Millar 1977: 344–5.

30 Oakley 2009: 184–5. Cass. Dio 53.19; Millar 1964: 37–8 for regret that most politics was conducted outside the Senate chamber and therefore less transparent.

Agrippa has pleaded for a return to the republican way of rule, Maecenas describes how to organise a righteous form of one-man-rule. The monarch should enact all new laws in consultation with the best men without influence from the masses

ἐκεῖνα δὲ δὴ καὶ καλὰ καὶ χρήσιμα καὶ σοὶ καὶ τῇ πόλει γένοιτο ἄν, τό τε πάντα
τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτόν σε μετὰ τῶν ἀρίστων ἀνδρῶν νομοθετεῖν, μηδενὸς τῶν
πολλῶν μήτ' ἀντιλέγοντος αὐτοῖς μήτ' ἐναντιουμένου,

That would be both honourable and useful both for you and for the city—
You yourself should, with the best men, lay down all the fitting laws, with
nobody from the masses disagreeing with them or opposing them (Cass.
Dio 52.15.1).

Similarly, decisions on war and the selection of commanders should rest with Augustus and his advisors as this, Maecenas predicts, would avoid competition and ensure the selection of the most competent men (52.15.2–3). Augustus is encouraged to re-compose the Senate by selecting men from all over the Empire and select magistracies and commands without interference from the Senate (52.19.1–3). Praetorships and consulships should be prestigious but should lose their traditional powers, and senators should not be given commands immediately after holding office (52.20.2–3). The Senate should enact laws, meet envoys from foreign states and rule in cases against senators, where the punishment was either exile or death; *maiestas* trials should be entirely avoided (52.31.1–3). For provincial communities, Maecenas suggests that the assemblies in the towns should be abolished, as in Rome, and expenses on festivals, games and extravagant public buildings should be prohibited, just as the right to mint coins should be taken away (52.30.2–3).

If the words attributed to Maecenas represent Dio's view of the ideal form of rule he is arguing for a strong and centralised government, where the monarch enacts the laws in consultation with the senators, whom he selects in the first place.³¹ Dio's ideal government is thereby divided between monarch and the Senate, where the latter is responsible for the assisting the emperors in the enactment of law, conducting trials, preventing conspiracies and receiving envoys.³² According to Dio, senators thus should be allowed substantial influence over the government.

31 Reinhold 1988: 165.

32 Bleicken 1962: 454–6; de Blois 1998: 3409.

As in the case of both Pliny and Dio Chrysostom, government in accordance with the law and the Senate's right to participate in political affairs were essential issues throughout Cassius Dio's account of the imperial period. Some of his strongest criticism is directed at emperors who were responsible for the killing and unlawful prosecution of members of the Empire's elite. Caligula, Nero, and Dio's contemporary emperors Commodus and Caracalla are used as examples of cruel and unpredictable despots responsible for the death of innocent men, for terrorising or treating Rome's political elite disrespectfully or for associating themselves in one way or the other with the divine realm.³³

To illustrate the ideal form of government, Cassius Dio emphasises the success of emperors who ruled in accordance with the law and in respectful cooperation with the political elite. One such example is Vespasian who is praised for having annulled his predecessors' *maiestas* trials and for including the Senate in his decisions by asking its members for advice on all matters. ἐς τε τὸ συνέδριον διὰ παντὸς ἐφοίτα, καὶ περὶ πάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπεχοῖνου, καὶ τῇ ἀγορᾷ πολλάκις ἐδίκαζεν ('On all matters, he used to attend the Senate, and he communicated with them on everything', Cass. Dio 66.10.4–5). Nerva is emphasised for ending *maiestas* trials, recalling exiles and abstaining from killing members of the Senate (65.9.1–2; 68.1.2; 68.3.1–3). And Trajan is described as an emperor with a dignified relationship with the Senate who never carried through any unjust prosecutions or laid hands on the property of others, and is praised as someone who did not fear or envy anyone, but honoured good men without exception (67.6.2–67.7.3).

Interestingly though, Cassius Dio's attitude towards emperors who had prosecuted senators and other members of the elite is not black and white. In his account of Hadrian, Dio criticises the accession to power and how he was hated for killing many good men, either to end opposition, because he desired their property, or envied their reputation—traits Dio readily criticises elsewhere (69.2.4–5). Without dismissing these accusations or justifying Hadrian's acts, Dio emphasises his many qualities as a *princeps*—he governed efficiently by maintaining strict discipline in the army and he assisted the provincial communities by improving urban infrastructure (69.5.2–3).

Cassius Dio's views on Hadrian may be influenced by the emperor's concern for Athens, where substantial sums were invested to improve the city's architecture and infrastructure, but also for his assistance to Bithynian cities after the earthquake in 120 CE.³⁴ Yet, his otherwise favourable assessment of

33 For similar characteristics of other emperors see Cass. Dio 69.10.7–8 and 69.22.3–4 on Caligula; 73.6.3 on Commodus; 78.1.1–2 on Caracalla.

34 On the completion of the Olympeion see 69.16.1.

Hadrian may be explained by the terms of the speech attributed to Maecenas, where the violent acts of the emperor, unfortunate as they always are, may be accepted if he rules in an otherwise excellent manner. Octavian's path to power is an example of a brutal accession followed by stable and competent rule, which Dio acknowledges for having provided a new form of constitution, which ended more than a century of civil war and political unrest.

εἰ γὰρ τινες καὶ τῶν προτέρων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐμφυλίοις πολέμοις γενομένων ἐμνημόνευσον, ἐκεῖνα μὲν τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνάγκῃ ἀνετίθεσαν, τὴν δὲ δὴ γνῶμην αὐτοῦ ἐξ οὗ τὸ κράτος ἀναμφίλογον ἔσχεν ἐξετάζειν ἡξίου· πλείστον γὰρ δὴ τὸ διάφορον ὡς ἄλλῃθῳ παρέσχετο

If people recalled the previous deeds in the civil wars, they attributed them to the demands of the circumstances, and they thought it right to consider his attitude from when he held undisputed power; for in truth this presented a very big difference (56.44.1).³⁵

Ideal rule is thereby defined as strong leadership, in cooperation with the Senate, in which the *princeps*, in accordance with the law, took it upon himself to secure and maintain peace and political stability. Prosecutions of political opponents to ensure stability were acceptable, as in the case of the triumvirate, Vespasian's removal of Helvidius or Trajan's punishment of Aelianus and the praetorians who had tried to overthrow Nerva. Hadrian's killings, on the other hand, were for all the wrong reasons.³⁶

Similar thoughts about ideal rule and criticism of imperial maladministration are readily found in the writing of authors from the western part of the Empire, where Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny, at the turn of first century, debated both the principate and the role of the emperor. As for Dio Chrysostom and Cassius Dio, security and governance in accordance with the law were indispensable for authors from the western part of the Empire. In addition to Pliny's portrait of Domitian as the antithesis to the good ruler (see above), Tacitus more than suggests that out of envy, Domitian commissioned the death of Agricola and describes how he himself as a senator witnessed the killing and

35 For Cassius Dio's approval of Augustus' rule and the explanation of Octavian's role in the proscriptions see 56.43.4–56.44.3.

36 For Helvidius Cass. Dio 65.13.3; For Aelianus Cass. Dio 68.5.4.

unjustified conviction of both consuls and senators.³⁷ A similar attitude can be seen in Suetonius whose impression of a cruel and unpredictable tyrant in Domitian includes the death sentences he passed on senators for making jokes, for celebrating the birthday of Otho, for having a birthmark shaped as the Empire or for other, unjustifiable reasons.³⁸

Also, western writers set the standards of good governmental practice from the examples of emperors who governed in accordance with law. Once again, Vespasian and Trajan are singled out in praise for having abstained from *maiestas* trials, practices which Pliny describes as *singulare et unicum crimen eorum, qui crimine vacarent*, 'the singular and only way of incriminating those who were free of crime', (Pliny *Pan.* 42.1). Suetonius honours Vespasian for his *clementia* and how he forgave highly placed senators for insulting him in public and, in what must have been a problematic argument to make, for how it was difficult to prove that Vespasian was involved, at least not directly, in the death of any innocent men.³⁹ Closely tied to the question of safety and emperors' respect for the law was the right of free speech. The fall of Domitian is again a natural point of reference for Pliny who describes the rule of Trajan as a new era, when everyone not only could speak their mind but were encouraged to do so (Pliny *Pan.* 2.3).⁴⁰ And Tacitus offers a similar link between freedom and the right to speak freely by characterising the rule of the divine Nerva and the reign of Trajan as rare times of happiness where one was allowed to think what one wanted and say what one thought (Tac. *Hist.* 1.2).⁴¹ Senators' right to speak their mind and so influence political process is also the issue in the positive assessment of the first half of Tiberius' reign, where the cooperation between *princeps* and Senate on both public and private matters and the respectful treatment of the senators are used to illustrate the difference between lawful government, where the *princeps* bases his decision on the wisdom of his peers, and tyrannical rule. Tacitus describes the first phase of Tiberius' rule accordingly: *iam primum publica negotia et privatorum maxima apud patres tractabantur, dabaturque primoribus disserere et in adulationem lapsos cohibebat ipse* ('now first, the most important public and private affairs were conducted

37 For the death of Agricola see Tacitus *Agr.* 42–3; for the killing of consuls and senators see Tac. *Agr.* 45.

38 For killing of senators see Suet. *Dom.* 10. See also Pliny *Pan.* 48.

39 On Vespasian Cass. Dio 65.9.1–2; Suet. *Vesp.* 14–15. For a similar characteristic of Titus see Cass. Dio 66.19.1.

40 Bartsch 1994: 149–50.

41 For the matter of speaking freely see Crook 1955: 54 on the Acts of Hermaiscus *P. Oxy.* 1242.

among the Senate, and its leaders were granted the right to speak freely and if they lapsed into adulation, he checked them' Tac. *Ann.* 4.6). By the fall of Domitian, the debate about what constituted the ideal form of government was reopened. *Libertas* remained a key issue. It has been argued that *libertas* in the imperial period meant little more than the right to a prestigious social position and freedom from unlawful prosecution; a conclusion based on the political reality that emperors held absolute military and political power in the state and did not need the senators' approval for other than symbolic reasons.⁴² There is no doubt that the Senate, from Augustus onwards, was left with little influence on the bigger issues and the focus on *maistas* trials, prosecutions or unregulated killings confirm that the question of security from politically motivated assaults was a fundamental issue for members of the political elite. Yet, the writings of Pliny and Tacitus suggest that commentators, at the turn of the first century may have had higher hopes on behalf of their fellow senators. Like Pliny, Tacitus also recognised the need for one-man-rule and acknowledged the emperor's right to make the final decision, but emphasised, again like Pliny, that liberty and the right to speak freely were inseparable. In order to govern a free state the emperor, i.e. Nerva and Trajan, would have to grant the Senate political participation, not by allowing free competition or unregulated opposition, but by involving the senators in the administration of both private and public affairs and by listening carefully to their advice, as Tiberius did before he turned his back on the Senate and ruled as despot.⁴³

A century later, under the rule of Commodus and later the Severan emperors, it was the same question that occupied Cassius Dio, who would have looked in vain for any real influence on the affairs of the state. Septimius Severus is presented as someone who did let members of his *concilium* speak freely but is elsewhere described as an emperor who based his power not on his associates but on the support of the army (Dio Cass. 75.2.3). Still, the ideals were the same—that good rule depended on a respectful relationship between emperor and Senate, which both parties were equally responsible for upholding, and the good emperor was one who did not kill senators—or, even better, someone like Vespasian who asked the Senate for advice.

42 Wirszubski 1950: 167 followed by Millar 1964: 75.

43 Morford 1991: 3427 for the relation between *libertas* and free speech. See also Tac. *Dial.* 38.2; 40.2 and 41.4. For a senator's right to participate in the business the state see Morford 1991: 3431.

The Divine Emperor

The imperial cult was an institution with theological issues and the potential to further enhance the social difference between emperor and the Empire's elite communities and was therefore bound to attract the attention of intellectuals across both cultural and social divides. Domitian's alleged request to be addressed as 'master and god' was strongly condemned, as was Caligula's divine aspiration and decision to build temples to himself in Rome, where exotic birds were sacrificed in his honour (Suet. *Calig.* 22). To the political elite in Rome, the emperors' desire to be worshipped was unacceptable as it disrupted the balance between *princeps* and Senate. The humiliation of having to honour emperors who were often of limited political, military and administrative experience was bad enough, but the request for worship reduced the senators' status from partners and equals to mere subjects.

In his third speech on kingship Dio Chrysostom explicitly addresses the deification of mortals and draws the conclusion that mortals could enter the sphere of the divine if they had lived a good and righteous life; but never when still alive.⁴⁴ A more critical view of the cult to living emperors is found in the history of Cassius Dio. His disquiet is particularly apparent in the speech of Maecenas in book 52, where Augustus is warned against the introduction of cults in his honour, which, according to Dio's Maecenas, could only be realised with the emperor's consent, something which would make him an accomplice in his own deification—and for that, Augustus would face ridicule.⁴⁵ Dio's bias towards a cult in which Roman citizens worshipped the living emperor may well have been a product of his own age, in which emperors such as Commodus and Elagabalus time and time again crossed the line between the mortal and the divine. To Dio, such behaviour was unacceptable and his criticism of emperors who commissioned their own worship may very well have been a way to either underline his own position on the matter or an attempt to influence contemporary opinion.

Similar reservations about worship of living emperors are readily found in Latin literature. Pliny remarks how Trajan entered temples as a mortal and how he carefully saw to it that his own statues were set outside and not within the temple's sacred area; a distinction that identifies the emperor not as a god but as a guardian of religion (Pliny *Pan.* 52). The same line of thought seems to

44 Swain 1996: 195–7.

45 Cass. Dio 52.35.5 critical attitude towards cult to the living emperor see Swain 1996: 407; Reinhold 1988: 207–8.

be behind Suetonius' account, who deftly avoids the question of the imperial cult in Italy, and stresses that Augustus refused cult within the city of Rome and only granted such worship where this was the custom even for proconsuls and even then only together with Dea Roma (Suet. *Aug.* 52).⁴⁶ Tacitus, on the other hand, directly criticised Augustus for having divine ambition: *nihil deorum honoribus relictum, cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet*, ('Nothing remained for the honour of the gods, since he wished to be worshipped in temples and with divine statuary, through *flamines* and priests', Tac. *Ann.* 1.10). Tacitus and Suetonius therefore differ on whether Augustus desired worship or, for strategic reasons, modestly received worship; but they concur, along with Pliny, Dio Chrysostom and Cassius Dio, that the living emperor was mortal even if he was worshipped in both Italy and the provinces.

The third form of emperor worship is the cult inaugurated to deceased emperors, known as the *divi augusti* cult. By the high Empire, deification of deceased emperors had evolved into a formalised procedure. Since Claudius, every emperor until Marcus Aurelius, except for Nero and Domitian, had been deified. The power to deify the deceased emperors was in the hands of the Senate, but despite its official status of the cult, the question of a deceased emperor's divinity was still challenged by intellectuals who saw the deification as a politically motivated ritual to secure the position of the dynasty. Seneca delivered the bluntest attack on deification of deceased emperors in the satire on Claudius' death when he points out the paradox that the Romans could worship an emperor without knowing whether the Olympic gods had accepted him themselves.⁴⁷ The political motives behind the worship of deceased emperors is also pointed out by Pliny, who, after mentioning how Trajan deified Nerva by building a temple in his honour, describes how previous emperors had been deified for political reasons. Pliny insists that Trajan deified Nerva out of pure intentions: *tu sideribus patrem intulisti, non ad metum civium, non in contumeliam numinum, non in honorem tuum, sed quia deum credis*, ('you elevated your father to the stars, not to terrify the citizens, not out of contempt for the gods, not for your own honour, but because you believe him to be a god', Pliny *Pan.* 11.2). Still, the comment reveals strong reservations about the *divi augusti* cult—strong enough to comment on in a speech to an emperor who had just deified both his biological and adoptive fathers.

46 For a similar example see Cassius Dio's description of how Augustus declined Agrippa's offer of dedicating his Pantheon and set up an image of Augustus in the temple. Instead it was decided to set up a statue of Augustus in the ante-room 53.27.2–3.

47 *Apocol.* 11–2.

The debate about the emperors' divinity, dead or alive, shows that the Empire's educated elite rejected the divinity of living emperors no matter whether the initiative came from the emperor himself, or from Italian cities or from provincial communities. Scepticism towards the deification of both living and deceased emperors united writers across cultural, political and social divides. Some, such as Suetonius and Cassius Dio, acknowledged worship of *divi Augusti*, but it is telling that none of them spoke persuasively in favour of the cult, which may have to do with the political momentum available to the sons of deceased emperors who could now add *divi filius* to their name.

The Provincial Perspective

Writers in provincial communities were just as concerned with Roman power as their peers in the political establishment in Rome but not surprisingly, were more concerned with how Roman rule influenced their everyday lives or the Greek world as a whole than the level of cooperation between the emperor and the political elite in the capital.

One Greek to consider Roman power from a provincial point of view was Plutarch. As a man firmly rooted in Greek culture, engaged in both local politics and as a priest of Apollo in the Delphic cult, Plutarch was sceptical towards influence from Rome and how Roman rule would affect Greek civic communities. Rome's rule over Greece is acknowledged as divine interference to end the struggle between Greeks, and Plutarch describes the beginning of the second century as a time when men revelled in states with no tyranny, war or blockade (οἱ νῦν τρυφῶντες ἐν πολιτείαις, μὴ τυραννίδα μὴ πόλεμόν τινα μὴ πολιορκίαν ἐχούσαις, *An seni* 784f) but nonetheless warns the Greek civic elite against becoming too involved in Roman politics and administration.⁴⁸ Greeks who pursued careers in the imperial administration are deemed by Plutarch to be greedy and restless souls whose ambitions are never to be fulfilled; Plutarch reminds the Greek civic elite that they are under foreign domination.⁴⁹

One reason for Plutarch's double view of Roman rule lay in the paradox between a need for stability and law on the one hand, and on the other, a fear that the influence from Roman rule, with its political, social and cultural values, would change civic communities and thereby alter the world he cherished. One of Plutarch's objectives was to maintain undisturbed Greek culture and its heritage; this would oblige members of the Greek civic elite to take on cultural,

48 Swain 1996: 158.

49 Plut. *De tranq. anim.* 470 B–C; *Prae. ger. reip.* 813E–814D. Madsen 2006: 65–6.

administrative and political obligations in their hometowns such as magistracies, obligations in relation to emperor worship or the responsibility of representing the city for instance at the court. It is difficult to separate Plutarch's cultural agenda from his political motives and there is little reason to doubt that Plutarch saw Greek civilisation as superior or that he objected to extensive use of force by Roman authorities and the rule of tyrannical emperors.⁵⁰ But the description of what little there was to be gained from leaving the Greek civic world for a career in imperial administration is also a politically motivated attempt to reach his own ends by convincing the Greek elite to prioritise their hometowns and their own cultural heritage.

Another patriotic Greek intellectual to criticise Roman rule for its brutality and negative impact on Greek culture is Pausanias. In his *Description of Greece*, the looting and destruction of Greek cities such as Corinth and Athens in the middle and later republic is, together with the re-colonisation and new foundations of cities under Caesar and Augustus, condemned just as Roman rule is described as a loss of freedom and as a misfortune for Greece.⁵¹ Pausanias' main focus was a historical Greece when Greek civilisation was at its prime; he was no admirer of Roman rule, even if he refers to the dignity of Augustus' principate (3.11.4).⁵² But as is the case with other intellectuals from the period, Roman rule is acknowledged and there appear favourable references to the emperors from Pausanias' lifetime. Hadrian is held to be the best emperor, praised for his support and general interests in Greece, for contributing to the happiness of his subjects, for honouring the gods with great care and for never having started a war (1.3.2; 1.5.5). And Pius receives honours for his religious belief, for having bestowed freedom and liberty on the city of Pallantium, for his assistance to the cities after the earthquake in the early 140s, for enabling Greek sons to inherit from their fathers, and for defending the Empire against attacks from barbarian tribes (8.43.1–6).

⁵⁰ *Phil.* 17.2; *Flam.* 12.10.

⁵¹ On looting of art by Caligula and Nero, see Paus. 9.27.3–4, 9.33.6; on Sulla's behaviour in Athens 1.20.7; on Vespasian's reversal of Nero's grant of freedom, 7.18.3–4; on Roman urbanisation strategies 5.23.3; 7.18.8; 8.24.11; 10.38.4; on Roman rule as a misfortune for Greece 8.27.1. For Pausanias' reluctant view towards Roman rule, see Swain 1996: 347–8; Habicht 1985: 122–5. For Pausanias as largely favourable towards Roman rule see Arafat 1996: 214–15. For Pausanias' balanced view on Roman rule see Hutton 2005: 47; and also Hutton 2008: 624 who argues that Pausanias did talk about the disaster of Roman rule, but that he does not hold a general anti-Roman view. For a neutral reading of Pausanias description of Roman synoecisms see also Isager 2009: 203–6.

⁵² Arafat 1996: 131.

Like Plutarch, Pausanias held Greek culture to be superior and was committed to showing his audience the greatness of its past. The *Description of Greece* may justifiably be seen as a localised response to the influence of the Empire and thereby as an attempt to mark out what it meant to be Greek through the invention of what has been described as a 'repertoire of cultural traditions'.⁵³ Rome definitively put an end to Greek independence and changed both the rural and civic landscape, which for someone seeking the 'authentic' Greece were reprehensible acts.⁵⁴ On the other hand, the favourable remarks on how contemporary emperors ruled in admiration of Greek culture may equally be seen as an attempt to show how Greek culture, in his time, was highly appreciated by the ruling establishment and was an integral part of the Empire.

Aelius Aristides is another educated Greek dedicated to his Greek cultural heritage. But unlike Plutarch and Pausanias, Aristides held a predominantly positive view of the Empire and its administration. Roman rule is described in favourable terms for its provincial administration and for having introduced a legal system offering equal rights to the provincial elite across the Empire.⁵⁵ It has been argued that Aristides' criticism of Hadrian's extensive travelling by the remark that Pius ruled through letters and Aristides' celebration of the Roman Empire should not be held as genuine but seen as the words expected by the imperial family.⁵⁶ However, Aristides' alleged criticism of Hadrian should not be exaggerated, as Hadrian is the likely emperor referred to as the best up to now, elsewhere in Aristides' works.⁵⁷ In his discussions of *homonoia*, Aristides advises his fellow Greeks to put their differences aside, not least because it was a priority for Rome and he praises various emperors for their generosity towards the Greek cities and encourages other Greeks to do the same.⁵⁸

Philostratus from Lemnos is a further Greek writer to address the question of Roman power and ideal rule. Apart from his traits as a sophist, Philostratus served as a civic magistrate in Athens. He was of excellent family, married a woman of senatorial descent and one of their sons was later appointed to the Senate as well. In the beginning of the third century, Philostratus joined

53 Goldhill 2010: 67.

54 Habicht 1985: 104; Pretzler 2007: 28; Alcock 1993: 16 & 20.

55 Oliver 1953: 929; Fontanella 2008: 212–16.

56 Swain 1996: 280–1. For Aristides' ambiguous attitude to the Roman Empire, see Pernot 2008: 195–7.

57 Aristid. *To Rome* 33; Oliver 1953: 919.

58 For the help for Smyrna, Aristid. *Or.* 20.5–8; for his general approval of emperors' support of the Asian cities, Aristid. *Or.* 27.40; Swain 1996: 287.

the Severan court and the group of intellectuals with whom Julia Domna associated.⁵⁹ In his extensive literary production, including *Lives of the Sophists* and *Apollonius of Tyana*, Philostratus delivered a severe criticism of various emperors for their brutality and tyrannical traits and questioned the principate as the ideal form of rule with the claim that most emperors were tyrants.⁶⁰

Despite the critique of the principate, Philostratus' thoughts on ideal rule were not different from the views found in other writers, in both Greek and Latin. In the dialogue between Apollonius and Vespasian, where the latter seeks advice on how to rule in a competent manner, Apollonius advises the aspiring *princeps* that he should always honour the gods, never punish wrong advice, rule in accordance with the law, not transfer his power to his sons unless they were morally ready, abstain from collecting wealth but assist the needy and protect the property of the rich (VA. 5.36.1–3).⁶¹

Philostratus has been seen as someone who may have accepted Roman rule but at the same was committed to an exclusive model of Hellenic culture. His criticism of Roman authority and influence has recently been described as a cultural-ideological attempt to purify Greek civilisation and present it as superior and as the natural choice for the educated Greek elite.⁶² Similarly, the dialogue between Vespasian and his Greek advisors, together with the examples from the *Lives of the Sophists*—where emperors are advised or impressed by Greeks sophists—is often interpreted as the author's attempt to illustrate Greek cultural superiority.⁶³ There is little reason to doubt that Philostratus saw Greek civilisation as superior or that the dialogue between Vespasian and his Greek advisors was anything but an attempt to illustrate the emperor's need for Greek wisdom. But what may give pause for thought is whether Philostratus' manifestation of Greek cultural superiority need be understood as an attempt to differentiate Greek civilisation from the imperial collectivity; for, another possibility is to see Philostratus' focus on Greek cultural superiority and the emperors' need for advice from educated Greeks as a way to show his readers how Greek civilisation was highly valued by the civilised emperors

59 Bowersock 1969: 103–4; Anderson 1986: 4–6; Swain 1996, 380; Bowie 2009: 20.

60 Philostr. vs. 623. For further on Philostratus' criticism of Roman rulers see Bowie 2009: 227–230; Swain 1996: 387–8.

61 de Blois 1998: 3426.

62 Swain 1996: 399–400; 2009: 34; On Roman names, Philostr. VA. 4.5; *Letters* 71–72. Swain 1996: 387–8; on Nero, Philostr. VA. 4.38; 5.7; 5.10; on Domitian Philostr. VA. 5.3–5.

63 de Blois 1998: 3424, Swain 1996: 388–391, 396–400. For emperors impressed by their Greek advisors see vs. 488 for Trajan's gratitude to Dio; Philostr. VA. 534 for Pius' admiration of Polemo; Philostr. VA. 583 for Marcus' appreciation of Aristides.

either for the sophists' reputations as men of letters, to whom the emperors listen with great pleasure, or in their more formal attachment to the court as advisors, *ab epistulis Graecis* or tutors of the young princes.⁶⁴ When Apollonius guides Vespasian to success or when emperors such as Trajan, Pius and Marcus receive favourable notice, it illustrates the influential position educated Greeks and Greek civilisation as a whole had assumed at the court and in the Empire in general.

It has been pointed out that the success members of the Greek elite enjoyed at the court or in the political establishment was not by any means a privilege reserved for the sophists. When sophists were involved in political matters which required contact with the emperor or were acting as magistrates or servants at the court, it had more to do with their belonging to the Greek civic elite in general than their traits as sophists.⁶⁵ Similarly, what Philostratus shows in the *Lives of the Sophists* is an often strained relationship between the emperor and the learned Greek, where the latter often ends up being either punished or disillusioned, and it has been noted that Philostratus saw *paideia* and political power as two separate features warning his readers not to cross the line.⁶⁶

This is surely accurate but it is precisely in the cases where sophists and other educated Greeks are treated unfairly or disrespectfully that Philostratus illustrates the differences between the good ruler, who like Trajan loves Dio, and Caracalla who took away immunity from financial obligation from Philiscus, the professor of rhetoric in Athens, as part of a personal vendetta.⁶⁷ Philostratus' perception of the Roman world and Greek identity is complex, stretching from the view that Greek civilisation is superior, and therefore the natural culture for the elite community in the cities of the east, to a notion that this cultural superiority has given Greek civilisation an integral place and function in the Empire. Philostratus criticises emperors who did not choose to benefit from the advice given by educated Greeks and condemns the eviction of philosophers—actions that would weaken their influence over Rome's political establishment. But he also criticises Greeks who went too far in their criticism or approached the emperor in too pretentious a style and thereby exposed themselves to the emperor's rage or frustration, thus jeopardising

64 Bowersock 1969: 52–3; 58; Millar 1977: 226–8; Mennen 2011: 150–1. For example, see Antipater of Hierapolis who served as *ad epistulis Graecis*, consul and *legatus Augusti* in Pontus et Bithynia and as the teacher of Caracalla and Geta; see Philostr. *vs* 607.

65 Anderson 1989: 150–52; Bowie 1982: 32, 39, 53–4.

66 Flintermann 1995: 38–40, 45.

67 Philostr. *vs*. 488; 622.

their own position and the favourable attention Greek intellectuals and Greek civilisation on the whole enjoyed. By addressing the question of political and cultural interaction between the educated Greeks—mostly sophists, his main focus—and the emperor, Philostratus may well have tried to show how he thought Greek civilisation would acquire the strongest possible position in the Empire.

Conclusion

Greek and Latin authors had different views of the Roman Empire both within and across political, social and cultural divides. Members or associates of the political elite in Rome criticised aspects of Roman rule, the imperial organisation and inadequate emperors, but approved of the Empire by stating their support for the principate. Where the political elite in Rome worried about closing the social and political gap between the emperor and themselves, provincial authors often pursued more local priorities when considering Roman government. Plutarch worried that the influence from Rome drained the cities of their political elite, who would leave home for a career in provincial administration. Dio Chrysostom who was associated with political circles in Rome before his exile in 82 CE, criticised both the rule of Domitian and Roman government in more general terms; but nonetheless, he also confirmed his approval of the principate under the reign of Trajan.

Other provincial intellectuals, such as Aristides, argued on several occasions that Asian cities had benefited from imperial administration and would do so in the future by cooperating with Roman officials. At the time Aristides addressed the question of imperial rule, the cultural composition of the Senate had changed so that half of the non-Italian senators were now Greek.⁶⁸ And so, being a representative of Roman government was no longer determined by ethnicity or culture, but depended on a combination of legal, political and social factors. Pausanias' disapproval of imperial government and its influence on Greek cities illustrates how differently Greek intellectuals experienced Roman power. But like Aristides, Pausanias also draws his readers' attention to how the Greek world, having suffered from wars, annexations and unpredictable emperors, now enjoyed respect and positive attention from the emperors of their own time.

68 Devreker 1980: 261–4; Eck 2000: 219.

The complexity in how Roman rule was perceived is illustrated in the diversity of how these writers saw Roman institutions of power and government. Where Plutarch argues for Greek independence and a strong local government, Cassius Dio suggests that assemblies in provincial cities and the right to mint their own coins should be abolished and wants to restrict the construction of public buildings and expensive festivals and games in the provinces. Similar differences are apparent in assessment of the various emperors. Cassius Dio praises Vespasian for his clemency towards the senators and celebrates how the Senate was included in the government (65.10.4–5), while Pausanias sees Vespasian as the emperor who re-enslaved Greece when reversing Nero's grant of freedom to Achaëa (1.17.4). A similar example is seen in the case of Hadrian, where Pausanias offers a positive portrait of a philhellenic emperor for honouring the gods and investing in the well-being of Greece, Cassius Dio criticises Hadrian's path to power and his murder of senators and other excellent men.⁶⁹ The diversity in how Greek writers saw Roman rule and how a given opinion depends on personal interests and priorities, illustrates that the question of whether educated Greeks were either favourably or unfavourably disposed towards Roman rule is too simplistic. Opposition to Roman rule by Greeks should thereby not be seen too readily as culturally motivated criticism of Rome intended to distance themselves and the Greek World from Roman rule or to inspire others to do the same. The criticism of Roman rule forwarded by Greeks resembled to a very large degree the reservations held by authors writing in Latin. Tacitus for instance offered one of the most direct critiques of cult to the living emperor, attacking Augustus for introducing cult in his own honour (*Ann.* 1.10). Pliny the Younger criticised how most emperors, up until the accession of Trajan, had abused their powers by excluding the Senate from the decision making process and questioned even the divinity of Augustus and criticises, in overall terms, the practice of deification for its political connotations (Pliny *Pan.* 2, 11, 52). Despite their linguistic divide, in their attitude to imperial power, Pliny in Latin and Dio Chrysostom in Greek had more in common than did Dio Chrysostom and Pausanias, where the latter's overall scepticism towards Rome is not shared by the former; or in the case of Cassius Dio and Philostratus, where the former's enthusiasm for monarchy was not shared by the latter.

Most authors, including men of Greek cultural descent, not only accepted Roman rule but even held the principate to be a suitable form of constitution, providing the *princeps* ruled in accordance with the political elite or

69 Pausanias on Hadrian as the best emperor 1.5.5; 2.17.6; Cass. Dio 69.2.3–4.

accommodated the views of educated Greeks and Greek civilisation as a whole. More often than not, imperial authors, across cultural divides, were members of the Roman establishment, either in Rome or in provincial communities, and thereby insiders who to the best of their abilities tried to influence public opinion and change the course of government to suit their specific preferences and priorities in the best way possible.

Becoming Wolf, Staying Sheep

Ewen Bowie

From its earliest historical period, illuminated from various angles by hexameter epic poetry, hortatory and commemorative elegiac poetry, and some melic poetry, by funerary and dedicatory epigram, by vase-painting, sculpture and later attestations of wall-painting, Greek *polis*-society set a very high value on displays by its male citizens, above all by its νέοι, of valour and military excellence—both concepts covered, significantly, by the same term that also designated non-military excellence, ἀρετή. That high value continued to be accorded at least down to the time of Polybius, and Greek cities continued to be involved in land and particularly naval campaigns—the clearest case is that of Rhodes—down to the Roman civil wars of the first century BC. The *pax Augusta* eliminated the opportunity, if not the motive, for cities and peoples within the empire to go to war with each other. But neither the reign of Augustus nor that of any of his successors succeeded in halting recurrent wars on the empire's frontiers, and most Greeks who thought about the matter are surely likely to have shared some form of the view that Aelius Aristides put forward in his εἰς Ῥώμην, that one of the empire's great benefits to the civilized Mediterranean world was the ring of legionary steel with which it protected its boundaries.¹

In this situation one might have expected a substantial number of Greek νέοι to have grasped the opportunity for a military career, whether in the *auxilia* or the legions—the latter option must have become increasingly open as *civitas Romana* spread in the Greek cities of the East and as the restriction of legionary recruitment to those who were already citizens was relaxed. But so far as we can tell from our evidence, primarily epigraphic, that is not the case. There are a few Greeks from city elites who undertake one of the three equestrian *militiae*, but at that point more men move into a procuratorial career or have no further documented post than enter a long military career. There are also a few, but very few, whose paths into or through a senatorial *cursus* involved more than one military post. Thus so far as concerns members of Greek elites, the number of *equites* and senators who seem to evade any military involvement is much greater than of those who have one or more military

¹ Aristid. *or.* 26 Keil, esp. 81–4.

posts. So too there are few Greek legionaries at centurion level, and the numbers at the level of an ordinary legionary are very small indeed by comparison with recruitment from veteran colonies in the Eastern empire or from more recently acquired provinces like Thrace, to say nothing of recruitment from the western provinces. The Greeks' vision of the Roman empire seems to have been very different from that of Romans or other westerners.

I shall examine some of the evidence for this situation, beginning with enrolment in legions.

Legionaries

The overall picture we can reconstruct seems to have changed remarkably little during the seventy years between Parker (1928), Forni (1953 and 1974), Mann (1983) and Le Bohec (2000). A list of the relevant cases is printed below as Appendix 1. It is clear from that list that very few Greeks come from the great urban centres of western Asia Minor. This has its corollary in the *cognomina* of legionaries. In 5700 cases which were analysed in 1916 by Dean there were 56 Latin names each found twenty times or more.² The second most frequent category was Greek, but it revealed only 192 names spread over 328 men. Apart from Celtic names (80) the rest was made up of negligible numbers (Thracian, Phoenician, other Semitic names). In short, the onomastics of the legionaries reveal that the army belonged to the Latin-speaking Roman world.³

Perhaps this picture is not surprising: the rewards for fighting bravely for one's *polis* (and the penalties for military incompetence or for cowardice in battle) were much more up-front in an archaic, classical or even Hellenistic *polis*. The pattern of occasional fighting by a citizen of a classical *polis* who returned (if he did return) to the same station in his society that he had left was very different from what was entailed by joining a professional Roman army for a period of twenty or twenty-five years and service far from one's πατρίς. Perhaps the surprise should be that any men from Greek cities opted for a military career at all. Some *did*, but men from Italy, the western provinces and Africa, facing similar choices, did so in vastly greater numbers. What explains this disparity?

Two preliminary points may be made. First, if one seeks an answer within the framework of the formulation in Woolf 1994, one might say that becoming a member of the Roman military machine could be seen as adopting a part of

² Dean 1916.

³ Le Bohec 2000.

Roman social and material culture (like gladiatorial shows, aspects of urban architecture, bath-complexes and villas) but a part that, unlike those others, the Greeks on the whole simply chose not to accept. But then why did they make that 'choice'? It is hard to see the choice as based largely on a belief that becoming a member of the Roman military machine would in some way diminish Greekness. Language may indeed have been a factor: recruits from Thrace to a cohort of Thracians would perhaps not be put off by the thought they would have to become competent users of middlebrow Latin—and Thracians might be encouraged by the thought that if they were lots of Thracians together they could speak Thracian in the locker-room. A related possibility is that a Greek would be unlikely to feel that enough *other* Greeks were to be found in the Roman military system to offer a prospect of Hellenic camaraderie.

That a requirement for a knowledge of Latin did not constitute a bar to Greeks entering some sort of 'Roman' career is of course clear from the numbers—admittedly still not huge—who took up procuratorial careers, among them the post *ab epistulis graecis* which assuredly involved a knowledge of Latin—and (from a certain date) the study of Roman law.

Second, the negative attitudes initially of Italian and later of other Western 'Romans' to Greeks might communicate counter-indications at various levels.⁴ Popular versions of the Vergilian dichotomy *tu regere imperio populos Romane memento...describant alii...* (*Aen.* 6.851–853) could have suggested both to 'Greeks' and to 'Romans' that the Roman army did not need 'Greeks', or even would be better without Greeks, even if they already held Roman citizenship.

It might be argued we should not expect Greeks at the social level at which the discourse of ἀρετή can be documented for the classical period to be attracted by recruitment into legions and *auxilia*. This level is that of the elites who were typically the producers and certainly the chief consumers of such martial hortatory poetry as that of Tyrtaeus and Callinus, of such accounts of military exploits as those of Simonides, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, of funeral orations real or imaginary, or of such explorations of the idea of 'courage' as Plato's dialogue *Laches*. But both the pre-battle speeches in these historians and the funerary epigrams of men who (in an Athenian context) seem to belong to the hoplite/*zeugites* class demonstrate that military excellence was also presented, if not always accepted, as an ideal well down the spectrum of free citizen society—low enough to be relevant for men who in other parts of the Empire might aspire to become centurions.

More of an impact on the overall picture very probably resulted from the fact that *auxilia* were recruited regionally and *en bloc*. For reasons more to do

4 See Sherwin-White 1967, Petrocheilos 1974, Balsdon 1979.

with Roman recruitment policy than with Greek keenness to enlist, only rarely was an attempt made to raise auxiliary cohorts or *alae* in Greece or western Asia Minor. Accordingly for a Greek in a city of the provinces Achaia or Asia joining the *auxilia* was almost never an option.

The few known exceptions to the above generalisations help to sharpen their implications.

(1) At the beginning of the campaigns of Lucius Verus against the Parthians Sparta was asked to provide *auxilia*, which either included or consisted entirely of cavalry.⁵ Spawforth argued plausibly that Verus' request should be seen, like the later recruitment of Spartans and Macedonians by Caracalla, as an 'antiquarian gesture from an emperor attuned to Greek attitudes', with the Parthians perceived as the old enemy, the 'Persians'. That may be so, but it does not imply that Lucius Verus had no need for troops, and it does suggest that he had confidence in the Spartans' military capacities in the context of fighting by Roman legions and *auxilia*. And although Spawforth may have been right to suggest that in 162 CE 'no other Greek city is known to have provided Rome with troops', at least one other case is well documented for the years between the death of Lucius Verus (168/9 CE) and 172 CE.⁶

(2) That case is Thespieae, where an inscription records and commemorates the despatch of a contingent to assist the emperor Marcus.⁷ It documents a decision that a list of the men sent ἐπὶ τὴν στρατείαν should be inscribed, and that the privileges of councillors (βουλευταί) should be given to the young men (νέοι) setting off 'for the most felicitous and pious campaign' (ἐπὶ τὴν εὐτυχεστάτην καὶ εὐσεβεστάτην στρατείαν). The list of 'the young men who have shown enthusiasm on behalf of their country' (τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος προθυμηθέντων νέων) is to be inscribed in the *agora* of Thespieae. That list we have, with the names of eighty combatants and a doctor (ιατρός). Its first

5 See Cartledge-Spawforth 2002: 115, noting that the description of one of those who went off to the Parthian frontier as a δεκατάρχης, equivalent to Latin *decurio*, shows that he belonged to a mounted unit. The relevant inscriptions are *IG* v 1.116.17–18, concerning a public slave, presumably a batman to a Spartan, who 'twice went on campaign against Persians' (Νεικοκλής νέος δημόσιος ἐστράτε<υ>μένο<ς> δις κατὰ Περσ<ῶ>ν), *IG* v 1.44 (= SEG 11.486.4–6), *IG* v 1.816 Διοσκορά | χαίρει, ξτη βιώ|σας εἵκοσι|καὶ ἑξ·| ἀπελθὼν δὲ | εἰς τὴν εὐτυχες|στάτην συ|νμαχίαν τὴν | κατὰ Πελοπόν| καὶ ἐπανελχόμε|νος ἐν Ἱερὰπόλιν|ἐτελεύτησεν·| προσδεξαμένου ||τὸ ἀνά(λωμα) τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ|———ονίκου| [τοῦ———]; and, with the term δεκατάρχης, *IG* v 1.818: [———]]|[———ξτη] κβ', [ἀποβι]|[ώ]σας ἐν Σαμ[οσάτοις] | [στ]ρατευόμεν[ος] | [ἐ]πὶ τοὺς Πέρσας[ς] | [δ]εκατάρχης.

6 The *terminus ante quem* is supplied by the absence of the name Germanicus from the titulare of Marcus.

7 Jones 1971, discussing Plassart 1932.

editor, Plassart, related the contingent to the incursion of the Costoboci in 170 CE that caught the Roman military machine by surprise and was resisted in the north of Greece by the Olympic victor Mnesibulus of Elatea and a group of volunteers.⁸ Whether that date or the slightly earlier one proposed by Jones is correct, we have a clear case of a group of Thespian citizens numerous enough to fight as a unit and to function as a small Greek community while doing so. That they were in every sense ‘volunteers’ (as suggested by Plassart and followed by Jones) is less clear: it does not follow inevitably from their descriptions as τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος προθυμηθέντων νέων, and at the very least the promise that they (and their parents during their absence) would enjoy ‘the honours of councillors’ (βουλευτικά τιμαί) shows that considerable incentives were needed to persuade eighty Thespians to go off to fight for Rome.

(3) Other units were recruited from the Greek world as Marcus’ Danubian wars took their toll. The *Historia Augusta* refers to extreme measures taken by Marcus to raise troops after the plague,⁹ and in the years 172–5 CE a member of the Termessus elite (a man who was life-priest of Dionysus and also twice *archiereus*, i.e. in charge of the imperial cult), is honoured with reference to his having been the leader of ‘allies sent to fight with the Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Armeniacus Parthicus Medicus Dacicus Germanicus’.¹⁰

(4) Under Caracalla Macedonians and (once again) Spartans were recruited in 214 CE for his campaign against the Parthians. While according to Herodian the Macedonians were armed in the way a phalanx of Alexander’s army had been equipped, the 500 Spartans were organised into a ‘Laconian and Pitanate *lochos*’, alluding to the criticism made by Thucydides of a predecessor’s reference to a ‘Pitanate *lochos*’,¹¹ and perhaps in its number replicating the size of a *lochos* in the classical Spartan army. The representation on M. Aurelius

8 Paus. 10.34.5, *Syll*³ 871 = *IG* ix 1.146.

9 *armavit et diognitas*, *SHA Marcus* 21.6–9, supported by an inscribed text from Aezani (*IGR* iv 580).

10 ἡγεμ[ό]να τῶν ἐκπεμφθ[έν]των συμ<μ>άχων|τῷ μεγίστῳ Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Μ[άρ]κῳ Αὐρηλίῳ Ἀντωνεῖνῳ, Ἀρμενιᾶκῳ, Παρθικῳ, Μηδικῳ, Δακικῳ, Γερμανικῳ, *IGR* iii 449. Although the inscription’s language is Greek the name of the honorand, Hoples son of Obrimotos, like the name of most of those honouring him, is Lycian, and he cannot be classified simply as ‘Greek’.

11 Th. 1.20, perhaps criticizing Hdt. 9.603. For the contingents see Hdn. 4.8.3 ἀπό τε Σπάρτης μεταπεμψάμενος νεανίας Λακωνικὸν καὶ Πιτανάτην ἐκάλει λόχον and 4.9.4 πᾶσαν τὴν νεολαίαν ἔς τι πεδῖον κελεύει συνελθεῖν, φήσας ἐς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τιμὴν φάλαγγα βούλεσθαι συστήσασθαι, ὥσπερ Μακεδονικὴν καὶ Σπαρτιατίν, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ ἥρωος ἐπωνύμους; *IG* v 1.130 (= *SEG* 11 603) Μ(άρκος) Αὐρ(ήλιος) Κλεάρε[τος]| Τειμοκλέο[υς—————]|συ{ν}μαχήσας{συμμαχήσας}| Αὐτοκράτορι Ἀντωνεῖνῳ and *IG* v 1.817, cited in the following note.

Alexys' tombstone of a lightly armed soldier 'wearing a cap resembling the old Laconian cap or *pilos* and armed with a wooden club'¹² does little to help us know how this contingent was really armed—but the club may evoke Heracles, the ancestor of the Spartan royal houses, and the description of the enemy as 'Persians' recalls Chaereas' plan in Chariton's first-century CE novel *Callirhoe* to assemble 300 Greeks (whom he explicitly compares to the 300 who fought with Leonidas at Thermopylae) as a special force that he will lead against the Persian king, initially storming Tyre.¹³

These special cases show that at least by the reigns of Marcus and Caracalla the idea of recruiting contingents of Greeks was acceptable both to Rome and to some Greek communities. But it required special situations, and perhaps the passage of 200 years since Actium was also relevant: despite the philhellenism of Nero and Hadrian we have as yet neither literary nor epigraphic evidence for anything like this happening in their reigns.

So far my focus has been on recruitment at middle or lower levels of society. But it could be argued that if we expect any response to the age-old traditions of military ἀρετή, it is especially among the elite we should look. I shall first examine the evidence for Greeks in the equestrian *militia*, then for careers of Greek senators with military involvement.

Military Equestrians

One index of imperial Greeks' apparent lack of enthusiasm for pursuing military distinction is their very low representation in the equestrian *militiae*. That low representation can be asserted with confidence, even though there are many uncertainties even concerning the individual cases we know, almost all from epigraphy. So far as I am aware no thorough analysis has been conducted that takes into account the evidence from Macedonia, Achaia, Crete and Cyrene, and in what follows I am heavily dependent on studies by Eric Birley and by Devijver who examined the evidence for those whom they termed 'Easterners' in equestrian military service, i.e. *praefecti cohortis*, *tribuni militum angusticlavii* and *praefecti alae* from provinces East of the Aegean. As

12 IG v.1.817 Μάρκος | Αὐρήλιος | Ἄλεξυς Θέωνος | στρατευσά|μενος | κατὰ Περσῶν,| ἔτη βιώσας | λ', cf. Cartledge and Spawforth 2002: 118. The numeral λ' marks Alexys' age at death as thirty, not (as Cartledge and Spawforth) forty.

13 Chariton 7.3. Similar conclusions about recruitment from the Greek cities of Asia Minor were reached by Mitchell 1994.

Devijver correctly stressed,¹⁴ it is often hard to establish whether a man is from a family of Italian settlers or from the local elite, and in the context of my discussion it would be desirable, but in fact quite impossible, to draw distinctions between local elite families which had been, or believed they had been, 'Greek' for many centuries (as must very many in *provincia Asia*), and others in Syria or Egypt whose hellenisation was recent and perhaps partial and who perceived themselves not simply as Greek but as Greek *and* Syro-Phoenician, or Greek *and* Egyptian.

Setting aside these complexities, we must also register the smallness of the sample that our epigraphic evidence offers. Devijver estimated that roughly 50,000 equestrian officers were engaged in *militiae* between Augustus and Gallienus, but that only 2000, ca. 4%, were known at the time he was writing. Of these some 200 were from 'Eastern' provinces: Asia and Aegean islands, Bithynia-Pontus, Lycia-Pamphylia, Cilicia, Galatia, Syria, Judaea, Arabia and Egypt.¹⁵ This is a strikingly low figure given the proportion of the empire's population in these provinces, and the numbers become even more striking when we factor in those individuals who are certainly from Roman *coloniae* or very probably from families of Italian settlers. In the following discussion, necessarily a rapid overview of voluminous and complex data, I pick out the long-Hellenised provinces of Asia and Bithynia-Pontus from Devijver's wider conspectus, and add Macedonia and Achaia. I do this not because the other provinces have nothing to contribute to the question, but because in each of them other local, ethnic traditions could be a distorting factor.

Provincia Asia

The evidence from *provincia Asia* is most substantial, with 85 men in Devijver's *prosopographia*.¹⁶ By far the largest number, 23,¹⁷ is from Ephesus, the seat of the Roman governor and the city that seems to have had the largest number of Italian families, many probably the descendants of republican *negotiatores*. In some other cities too it seems probable that the *equites* are men of Italian descent and not from local elite families which have received the

14 1986: 156–8. For a more recent analysis of *equites* from Anatolian provinces see Demougin 1999, including an appendix with 280 names of Anatolian *equites*.

15 1986: 114–5. Cappadocia, Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia and Cyprus are not documented as the home provinces of any equestrian officer.

16 1986: 117–29.

17 23, Devijver 1986: 131; 24, *ibid.* 142. For the predominance of families of Italian descent in Ephesus in the first two centuries CE (by contrast with Pergamum) see Halfmann 2001, and for an exhaustive account of the Ephesian elite, Kirbihler 2003.

civitas Romana. That may be the case for Pergamum, which follows Ephesus *longo intervallo* with 7. Most or all of the 6 from Alexandria Troas, however, an Augustan *colonia*, are themselves veteran *coloni* or their descendants. Within these broad figures there are temporal divisions: all the military *equites* from Alexandria Troas are in the period between Augustus and Vespasian—the sons and grandsons of veterans and presumably still conscious of their origins. In Pergamum and Ephesus immigrants are somewhat more numerous in the first century: presumably the two Augustan Aufidii from Pergamum,¹⁸ a Q. Pinarius and M. Aemilius Pius from Ephesus,¹⁹ and almost certainly the Ephesian T. Camurius Iustus, explicitly acting on behalf of the *conventus civium Romanorum*.²⁰ L. Malius Reginus from Miletus may well also be of immigrant stock;²¹ then in the Flavian period C. Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus.²² Of these only the last, Salutaris, seems to have held two levels of equestrian military post, *praefectus cohortis* (in Mauretania) and *tribunus legionis* of the *legio XXII Primigeniae piae fidelis* (in Germania Superior).

Already in the first century, however, some Greeks who had received the citizenship from an emperor are found in the *militia equestris*: from Ephesus Ti. Claudius Balbillus, from Ephesus and Sardis Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus, from Magnesia Ti. Claudius Democrates, from Laodicea L. Antonius Zeno, from Eumeneia and Acmonia C. Iulius Epigoni filius Cleon, and from Cos the brothers Q. Stertinius and C. Stertinius Xenophon. However even a very brief review of these men's accomplishments and careers demonstrates how diverse they are, and how little they encourage generalisation.

The military involvement of Ti. Claudius Balbillus—assuming the identity of the man attested at Ephesus with the Claudian administrator—was marginal.²³ He was *praefectus fabrum* to the emperor Claudius and held the rank of *tribunus legionis* during the British invasion of 43 CE, but his other posts show he was valued as a man of learning and administrative skills—*ad legationes et responsa Graeca*, then in charge of the Alexandrian Museum and Library, and finally the plum job of *praefectus Aegypti*.²⁴ It is unclear whether the posts of *praefectus fabrum* and *tribunus legionis* indicate an early interest in a military career which was then superseded by administrative promotions,

18 CIL iii 399, Devijver 1986: 118 nos 10 and 11 = *PME* A 196 and 199.

19 Devijver 1986: 125 no. 64 = *ILS* 8862, and *PME* P 33, *ibid.* 117 no. 6 = *ILS* 9499 and *PME* A 85.

20 Devijver 1986: 119 no. 21, cf. *IEph* 3019 and 888.

21 So Devijver 1986: 125 no. 60, cf. *IDidyma* 343.

22 Devijver 1986: 128 no. 77. Cf. Rogers 1991.

23 For Balbillus' identity see succinctly Syme 1958: 508 n.9.

24 *PIR*² C 813, *PME* C 124.

or whether they were never more than a device for securing his presence in Claudius' entourage.²⁵

A quite similar career was enjoyed by Xenophon of Cos, who seems to have acquired citizenship through the consul of 23 CE, C. Stertinius Maximus: ἀρχίατρος to Tiberius, Gaius and Claudius, Xenophon accompanied the last on his *expeditio Britannica* of 43 CE as *tribunus militum* and was then given the office of *praefectus fabrum*; he too was appointed *ad responsa Graeca*.²⁶

Very different, it would seem, were the cases of Ti. Claudius Democrates from Magnesia, L. Antonius Zeno from Laodicea and C. Iulius Epigoni filius Cleon from Eumeiea and Acmonieia. All were ἀρχιερεῖς τῆς Ἀσίας, and all held only one military post, *tribunus legionis*, Cleon in the *VI Ferrata* and Democrates in the *XII Fulminata*, both in Syria. All three seem to be from the local elite—Zeno's family prominent enough to have acquired the citizenship in the triumviral period, and later to produce senators²⁷—and the pattern they exemplify of holding only one military post is repeated frequently in later years and in other provinces, as is the fact that this one post is held in an Eastern province. Given the lack of literary or indeed any other supplementary evidence we can only conjecture how the phenomenon should be explained. Are all or some such men thinking seriously about a military career, and deterred by their experience in their first post? That seems unlikely, since for a *vir militaris* the first post should be *praefectus cohortis*. More probably, then, a member of a local elite is using his connections with the imperial family or with a senator to have himself appointed for a brief tour of duty as *tribunus legionis* but with no intention of going further. The appointment will have been calculated to enhance his standing in his πόλις and in the *provincia*, just as other competitors for local eminence performed acts of euergetism, served on embassies or acquired rhetorical skills on a professional level.²⁸

Another possible outcome of service as a *tribunus legionis* is illustrated by the career of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus. A perhaps fortuitous presence in Alexandria in 69 CE as *tribunus legionis* of *legio III Cyrenaica* seems to have brought him to the attention of Vespasian, who adlected him *inter aedilicios*, not later than 74 CE. Thereafter he had a senatorial career in which the posts

25 An early example of the use of the post of *praefectus fabrum* to give a formal role to a Greek whose various services were of use to a Roman commander is found in the case of Theophanes of Mytilene, cf. Bowie 2011.

26 *Syll.*³ 804, Syme 1958: 508 with notes 8 and 10; Devijver 1986: 126 no. 62, *PME* S 79.

27 See Bowersock 1965: 143–4.

28 For the place of rhetorical expertise and performance in competition within the elite see Schmitz 1997.

between his praetorship and consulate (in 92 CE) were all held in Eastern provinces, and, like his later positions in the city of Rome, were administrative rather than military, with the exception of the post of *legatus legionis IV Scythicae* in Syria.²⁹ His Roman career culminated in his tenure as proconsul of his own province Asia in 106/7 CE.³⁰ Devijver's description of him as 'the scion of a wealthy sacerdotal family of Sardes' on the basis of his position there as ἱερεὺς τῆς Πώμης is probably correct, as is the conclusion from his *nomen* that the family acquired citizenship from Tiberius, but we cannot be certain that he had no family connections with Italian settlers.

In the Flavian and Antonine period military careers involving two and very occasionally three *militiae* are documented both for men who look like immigrants or their descendants and for men whose imperial *nomina* point rather to their belonging to a local elite. T. Flavius Varus Hermocrates of Phocaea is in the latter group: twice *praefectus fabrum* in Rome, then *praefectus cohortis* and *tribunus militum* in Cappadocia. Several local offices and that of ἀρχιερεὺς for the temple at Ephesus indicate epichoric distinction, as does his descendants' marriage into the family of the great sophist M. Antonius Polemo.³¹ From Ephesus the local elite seems to have supplied Ti. Claudius Priscus, grandson of a Dionysius, *praefectus cohortis* in Germania Superior and *tribunus legionis* in Judaea;³² and Cn. Pompeius Hermippus, ἀρχιερεὺς of the two temples at Ephesus c. 150 CE and *tribunus legionis*.³³ From later first-century Ephesus and Sardes we have Ti. Iulius Alexander Capito, a relative of Polemaeanus, who was *tribunus legionis* and *praefectus alae*, then successively procurator in Achaia, Asia and Egypt over the reigns of Nerva and Trajan;³⁴ and from Miletus we have Claudius Chionis, son of Claudius Philostratus, whose career included positions as *praefectus fabrum* in Rome and *tribunus militum* in Alexandria, as well as those of προφήτης and ἀρχιπρύτανις at Miletus and συν[έ]χδημος (*comes*) of the proconsul of Asia Valerius Messalla—his several functions on Messalla's behalf equipped him well for service on many embassies to Rome.³⁵ Some

29 But that too was essentially administrative, cf. Birley 1969.

30 For the evidence see *PIR*² C 260, *PME* I 42, Devijver 1986: 123 no. 51, 131–2.

31 Devijver 1986: 122 no. 42, *PME* F 82, cf. the man honoured as a philosopher at Phocaea in IGR iv 1323–4, 1326, whom Stein in *PIR*² F 285 took to be the same, *contra* Devijver 1986: 122. On the identity of the different men with the name Flavius Hermocrates see Campanile 1994: no. 34a, Puech 2002: 300–303, 527–9 (with a stemma 530).

32 Devijver 1986: 121 no. 34, *PME* C 173.

33 Devijver 1986: 125 no. 65, *PME* P 59.

34 Devijver 1986: 123 no. 50, *PME* I 17.

35 Devijver 1986: 120 no. 25, *PME* C 130.

contribution to his upward mobility was doubtless made by all these *militiae equestres*, but it is not clear what.

Two similar if less distinguished cases are found in Hadrianic Magnesia: Ti. Claudius Charidemus Philometor and Ti. Claudius Tuendianus Magnus, both new citizens enrolled in the tribe Quirina, from prominent local families, and the latter apparently one of few who held all three *militiae*.³⁶ Another who held all three was a Flavianus of unknown *nomen* from Samos, son of a Timocrates,³⁷ supposed by Devijver to have been from the local elite. Devijver also conjectures such an origin for an unknown man honoured at Ephesus as having performed all the equestrian *militiae*, then having risen to the post of procurator *ducenarius*, but also honoured as asiarch and as the father of high local office-holders. Without knowledge of his *nomen* an argument from his profile alone is risky.³⁸

Many more men, however, who hold two or more *militiae* seem likely to be of Italian families. Thus L. Cusinius Messalinus from Ephesus, who followed the post of *tribunus legionis* in Syria with a procuratorship;³⁹ P. Vedius Antoninus, πρύτανις at Ephesus c. 96–99 CE, then γραμματεὺς 117–8 CE, also *praefectus cohortis* (location unknown) and (in Moesia Superior) *tribunus militum*;⁴⁰ P. Gavius Balbus whose *tres militiae* were part of a long equestrian career and who seems likely to have settled, though not necessarily to have originated, in Ephesus;⁴¹ L. Egnatius Quartus from (probably) second-century Acmonia and Temenothyrae, with a career in which he was successively *praefectus cohortis* with the *cura* of another cohort, both in Cappadocia, then *tribunus legionis* in Germania Superior, finally *praefectus alae*, perhaps in Britain or Syria.⁴²

Two colonial clusters should be considered and compared. First, some equestrians from Alexandria Troas are already completing three *militiae* in the early first century CE, another holds four posts and one five.⁴³ Secondly, in the first half of the second century CE two families from Heraclea ad Salbacum in Caria stand out, Aburnii and Statilii. Least interesting is L. Aburnius Severus, known simply as *praefectus alae* in Pannonia Superior in 146 CE, presumably

36 Devijver 1986: 119 no. 24, *PME* C 129 and *ibid.* 121 no. 25, *PME* C 189bis.

37 Devijver 1986: 123 no. 44, *PME* F 109.

38 Devijver 1986: 129 no. 83, *PME* inc. 25.

39 Devijver 1986: 121–2 no. 37, *PME* C 262.

40 Devijver 1986: 127 no. 74, *PME* V 60; Halfmann 1979: 168–70.

41 Devijver 1986: 123 no. 46, *PME* G 7.

42 Devijver 1986: 122 no. 40, *PME* E 3.

43 Devijver 1986: 129–30.

(at least) his third *militia*.⁴⁴ A slightly older relative, L. Aburnius Torquatus, was successively *praefectus cohortis*, *tribunus legionis* and *praefectus alae* in Mauretania Tingitana, Cappadocia and perhaps Pannonia Inferior or Dacia.⁴⁵ But the hard-core *vir militaris* is this man's father, L. Aburnius Tuscianus, with a long army career: *praefectus fabrum* in Rome, *praefectus* successively of the *cohors III Aug. Thracum equitata* and *cohors III Thracum Syriaca equitata*, then *curator cohortis I Ulpiae Petraeorum*; then *curator annonae bello Parthico* on the Euphrates; between his last two posts, *tribunus legionis VI Ferratae* and *praefectus alae I Ulpiae singularium* his achievements were rewarded by *dona* from the emperor Trajan.⁴⁶ It seems unlikely that this family with the rare name Aburnius are local worthies who had acquired Roman citizenship. I suspect that when Heraclea acquired the status of *colonia Ulpia* from Trajan the city's claims to this advancement were reinforced by some veteran settlement.⁴⁷ As to why Trajan's attention might have been drawn to this small community in Caria, another local family, the Statilii, offers a clue. Two of them, T. Statilius Crito and T. Statilius Attalus, were doctors to Trajan, Pius and Marcus.⁴⁸ That may explain the three Statilii documented as equestrian officers. T. Statilius Apollinarius followed the route of *tribunus legionis* and *praefectus alae* to become procurator of Lycia, Pamphylia and Cyprus;⁴⁹ a son, T. Statilius Solon, less ambitious or less effective, was *primipilaris* and *praefectus castrorum*.⁵⁰ A relative (presumably) T. Statilius Frontonianus, who made a dedication at Heraclea in 125–6 CE, was *praefectus* of a cohort found thirteen years later in Syria Palaestina and then *tribunus legionis* of the *VI Ferrata*.⁵¹ The medical expertise of one branch of the family, with one member called Crito, and Apollinarius' decision to name his son Solon, virtually guarantee that this is a local Greek or Hellenised family. So we do indeed seem to have evidence of a 'Greek' family providing men for the *militiae equestres*, but two factors particular to their case, the medical expertise of two Statilii and the roughly contemporary participation of the Aburnii, make this example far from typical.

I have reviewed only a selection of the 85 equestrian officers known for *provincia Asia*, but enough to show that in our evidence, at least, there is only

44 CIL xvi 178, cf. Devijver 1986: 117 no. 1, *PME* A 3.

45 Devijver 1986: 117 no. 2, *PME* A 4.

46 ILS 9471, Devijver 1986: 117 no. 3, *PME* A 5, *PIR*² A 20.

47 For the *colonia* see Robert & Robert 1954: 211.

48 Pflaum 1960: 299–300.

49 Devijver 1986: 126 no. 69, *PME* S 63.

50 Dobson 1978: 258 n.139.

51 SEG 30.1264, cf. Devijver 1986: 126 no. 70, *PME* S 65.

a scattering of men of Greek origin who take up more than one of the *tres militiae*, and that more *virī militares* come from *coloni* or other Italian families.

Bithynia-Pontus

The phenomenon of more than one member of the same family taking up an equestrian military career is also found in Bithynia-Pontus, a province much less rich in evidence (only thirteen individuals are known). The Domitii from Prusias ad Hypium provided two men in the second and early third century: L. Domitius Proculus, whose two posts as *praefectus cohortis* and two as *tribunus legionis* took him to Raetia, Britain and Spain;⁵² and a Domitius Honoratus, attested as *tribunus cohortis* at Birdoswald on Hadrian's wall, and perhaps the same as the L. Domitius Honoratus who was *praefectus Aegypti* in 222 CE.⁵³ Devijver was rightly agnostic on whether the Domitii were 'descendants of new citizens or of *negotiatores*'.⁵⁴ That they were from Greek families who had received the citizenship would undermine his suggestion that the 'Hellenistic tradition of the Greek *poleis*, dreaming of autonomy and always in rivalry with one another' (he cites that between Nicaea and Nicomedia) 'caused a de facto stagnation of the Romanisation process'.⁵⁵ He was right, however, to flag the origins of the first documented equestrian officer as (again) a *colonia*: [—]tilius P.f. Clustumina Longus, *tribunus legionis IV Scythicae beneficio divi Claudii* and *praefectus cohortis III sagittariorum*, then adlected *inter praetorios* by Vespasian, seems to be from the *colonia* Apamea by which he was honoured as their *patronus*.⁵⁶

Macedonia and Achaia

From Achaia our best documented instance is that of C. Iulius Spartiacus, a man whose name, like that of his father Laco, emphasized his Spartan origins (he claimed descent through thirty-five generations from the Dioscuri).

52 Devijver 1986: 154 no. 3, *PME* D 29.

53 *PME* D 22bis, Birdoswald, Tomlin 1991: 309 n.95, suggesting identification with the L. Domitius Honoratus who was prefect of Egypt in AD 222, *PIR*² D 151. For Domitii at Prusias ad Hypium cf. P. Domitius Iulianus, *SEG* 20.25; from elsewhere in Bithynia. M. Domitius Iulianus, Dörner 1952, 19 no. 18 and (from Nicomedia) T. Dom[i]tius Heron, *RIB* 917=CIL vii 317, Penrith, Devijver 1986, 154 no. 21, *PME* D 22.

54 Devijver 1986: 157.

55 Devijver 1986: 157. As is clear from epigraphy, Aristides and Philostratus, the rivalry between cities in Asia was little different from that in Bithynia.

56 Devijver 1986: 154 no.5, *PME* L50bis = L49, Halfmann 1979: 115 no. 18, suggesting attractively that L. Catilius Severus Iulianus Claudius Reginus, *cos. II ordinarius* in AD 120 (cf. *ibid.* 133–5 no. 38, *PIR*² M 468) is a descendant.

Spartiaticus' career included repeated office-holding in Corinth and Athens as well as a position as procurator. His grandfather C. Iulius Eurycles had been allowed by Augustus to rule Sparta until enemies' accusations of malfeasance and attempts to extend his power brought about his exile.⁵⁷ His more cautious father Laco seems to have been content to exercise his power in Sparta as a procurator.⁵⁸ In this Laco seems to have been followed by Spartiaticus,⁵⁹ though he too was exiled by Nero. That Spartiaticus was *tribunus militum* is hard to interpret,⁶⁰ but it certainly did not lead to a military career: compare his nephew Herculanus, who seems to have treated the post of *legatus legionis* as his highest goal.⁶¹

A rather lower profile is offered by Plutarch's friend Cn. Cornelius Pulcher. In a career that combined high offices in Achaia, the procuratorship of Epirus under Trajan and *iuridicus* of Egypt under Hadrian Pulcher was also *tribunus militum* of the *IV Scythica*. But here too no other military post followed; and in any case his name and his office at Corinth of *duovir quinquennalis* might suggest that he was descended from one of the original *coloni*. Another man whom Plutarch may have known is P. Memmius Theocles, son of Critolaus, citizen both of Delphi and Nicopolis.⁶² Theocles was *tribunus legionis* in Germany c. 79 CE.

Another *eques* with Corinthian connections is the Daphnis whom Arrian records as commanding the *cohors IV Raetorum equitata* in his ἑκταξίς κατὰ Ἀλανῶν 1. The ὄνομα alone does not allow safe inference about Daphnis' ethnic credentials.⁶³ The next officer Arrian mentions (ibid. 3) is a Pulcher, commanding both the *cohors I Italica civium Romanorum* and a *vexillatio* from the

57 *PIR*² I 301, with a stemma.

58 *PIR*² I 372.

59 Pflaum 1960–1961: 36 and no. 24bis, Devijver 1986: 154 no I 29a, *PIR*² I 587.

60 *AE* 1927: 2 = *Corinth Lat. Inscr.* 68.

61 *PME* H29, cf. for Herculanus' career. *IG* v.1 1172, from Gytheion: [Γ(άϊον) Ἰούλι]ον Εὐ[ρ]υκλέα | [Ἡρακλ]αγόν, Γ(αῖου) Ἰ[ο]υλίου |[Λάκω]γος υἱόν, ἔκγονο[ν] |[Εὐρυκ]λέους, λς' ἀπὸ | [Διοσκ]ούρων, [ε]ρέα κ[αί] | [ἀρχι]ερέα τοῦ τῶν [Σ]εβαστῶν | [οἴκου δι]᾽ βίου, ταμ[ί]αν καὶ | [ἀντιστ]ρατήγον τ[ῆ]ς Ἀχαΐα[ς],|[δῆ]μου Ῥ[ω]μαίων δῆμαρχο[ν] | [καὶ στρα]τηγόν, πρ[ε]σβευτῆ[ν] | [ἐπαρχ]εΐα[ς] Ἰσπανί[α]ς Βαιτυκῆ[ς],|[πρ]εσβευτὴν το[ῦ] Σεβαστο[ῦ] | λεγιῶνος γ'. *FdD* iii (1976) nos. 504–505, *PME* M 40. Presumably Theocles obtained Roman citizenship through P. Memmius Regulus, legate of Achaia, Macedonia and Moesia in 35–44 CE, cf. *PIR*² M 468: Regulus is much honoured at Delphi.

63 *PME* D 28, *PIR*² D 7. The manuscript form Δάφνης was corrected to Δάφνις by Hercher in 1854, but Jacoby in *FGrH* 156 F 12 and the Roos-Wirth Teubner (1968) retain it: the evidence now presented in *LGPn* shows that Δάφνης would be anomalous, whereas Δάφνις is quite well attested.

cohors III Augusta Cyrenaica sagittariorum equitata. One may suspect that this is a relative of Plutarch's Pulcher, but it can be no more than a guess.

Our single instance from Macedonia resonates only distantly with the phalanx reconstituted by Caracalla. From Cassius Dio we know of an Antigonus who was *adlectus inter praetorios* by Caracalla and became *cos.suff.* c. 225 CE.⁶⁴ That he remained conscious of his educated Greek origins seems to emerge from the four-line elegiac epigram he erected for his father Philippus at Suessa Aurunca in the Liris valley in northern Campania:

τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς εἰδήμονα φῶτα Φιλίππον
 πρέσβυν Εἰαονίης ἐμπέραμον σοφίης,
 Αὐσονίων ὑπάτου πατέρα κλυτὸν Ἀντιγόνοιο
 θρέψε Μακεδονίη, δέξατο δ' Ἰταλίη.⁶⁵

The man knowledgeable in all excellence, Philippus,
 Who carried his skill in Ionian wisdom into old age,
 Famous father of the consul of the Romans, Antigonus,
 Was nurtured by Macedon, but laid to rest in Italy.

This text also shows that the family, albeit of Macedonian origin, had not stayed there. Philippus had come to Italy (presumably Rome, but perhaps Naples) to communicate Greek σοφία, probably as a teacher of language or rhetoric.⁶⁶ His Italian location may have contributed to his son's entering an army career and being rewarded by Caracalla.⁶⁷

The evidence from Macedonia and Achaia corroborates, so far as a very small sample can, the picture that has emerged so far: only a few members of Greek elites have an equestrian military career, more take up only one post, and often special circumstances can be discerned.

64 *PME* D 16, A 736. D.C. *exc.* 77.8.1–2: it is not clear from this abbreviated account whether Antigonus was in the entirely Macedonian 'phalanx' raised by Caracalla, claimed by D.C. *exc.* 77.7.1 to number 16,000.

65 *IGR* i 407 = *IG* xiv 888, from Suessa Aurunca. The name Antigonus still appealed in Macedon: cf. the ephebach from Beroea, Statius Antigonus, *SEG* 30.378.

66 The sophist Apollonius of Naucratis taught privately in Macedonia c. 200 CE, Philostr. *vs* 2.19.599–600; Philiscus of Thessaly had maternal family in Macedon, *ibid.* 2.30.622.

67 If this man's *gentilicium* is Domitius, then perhaps he is related to Domitius Philippus ὁ λαμπρότατος στρατηλάτης in Egypt, 240/241 CE, *PIR*² D 157, cf. Pflaum 1982: 249A, 64–66.

Eastern Senators and Military Posts

My discussion of Greeks' possible perceptions of involvement with the Roman army in the course of a senatorial career will be briefer and more impressionistic. The entry of men from the Eastern provinces to the Roman senate has been much discussed for at least 80 years,⁶⁸ and this is no place for a wide-ranging review. Moreover in several ways the issue is different from that of military equestrians. For some men becoming and being able to term oneself a senator seems to have been the only goal—there was no question of a 'career'. For those who did choose to have a career the key elements in that were civil offices in Rome and the provinces, with the crowning glory a suffect consulate, and, for a very few, becoming *consul ordinarius*, followed in some cases by the proconsulate of one of the top two provinces where the *proconsul* had no military responsibilities, Asia and Africa. There was nothing that corresponded to the *tres militiae* that might be chosen by equestrians. On the other hand some men's path to the consulate and beyond was strongly marked by military posts, encouraging modern historians to exploit Tacitus' phrase *virī militares*. In this section of my discussion I offer some observations on what is known of the careers of some Eastern senators, presented schematically and (necessarily) with considerable abbreviation in Appendix 2, which is based on data assembled and discussed by Halfmann,⁶⁹ with some additions of more recently discovered information, and does not carry the story beyond c. 150 CE.⁷⁰ As with equestrians, it is often difficult to be sure whether we are dealing with a man descended from western immigrants or from a family that has been local and has perceived itself as Greek for many generations.

Despite this difficulty, however, some generalisations can be made. Among the first generations of senators from the Eastern provinces a significant group is formed by men from Caesarian and Augustan *coloniae*, i.e. men of Italian and indeed legionary descent (Halfmann nos 3, 4, 6, 9, 13, 18, 20, 32–35a, 40, 49, 60). Second, there is a sprinkling of men of royal descent—C. Iulius Alexander (25), C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus (26), C. Iulius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus (36), Sex. Iulius Maior Pythodorus (54). For those men whose origins are indeed Greek cities in Bithynia, Asia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, or Syria the problem of possible Italian descent is a recurrent obstacle for this investigation. Each

68 Walton 1929, Hammond 1957, Syme 1958: 504–519. Halfmann 1979, Devreker 1982, Syme 1982b, 1987, Rémy 1988.

69 Halfmann 1979, 1982.

70 Some changes of detail might have been added from Rémy 1988, but the picture would not be significantly different.

needs individual consideration. But overall those senators who have Greek civic ancestry have remarkably few military posts in their *cursus*.

The complexities are illustrated by Q. Pompeius Macer (Halfmann no. 1). Although his grandfather, Theophanes of Mytilene, held an apparently titular post as *praefectus fabrum* when advising Pompey in the civil wars, his father Cn. Pompeius Macer held civil posts organising the imperial libraries in Rome and was then a procurator in *provincia Asia*,⁷¹ and our scanty evidence on the career of Quintus does not disclose whether he held any military post before his suicide in 33 CE.

The next senator admitted by Halfmann (no. 2) is M. Calpurnius Rufus from Attaleia in Pamphylia.⁷² If, as Groag (in *PIR*²) thought, he was the same as a homonym honoured at Ephesus, he had a career that seems quite unmilitary and conducted entirely in Greek provinces, including the post of *legatus* in his own province, Lycia and Pamphylia, soon after its creation in 43 CE. His own nomenclature and the fact that his mother, Caecilia Tertulla, was priestess of Iulia Augusta (i.e. Livia) and of Roma⁷³ makes it virtually certain that he was a *civis Romanus* from the west settled in Attaleia.⁷⁴ That is even clearer for some men from Antioch *ad Pisidiam*, Sergii Pauli and their kinsman Caristanius Fronto, *cos. suff.* 90 CE, whose long and slow career included three military posts; and very probable for Servenius Cornutus from Phrygian Acmonia and M. Plancius Varus from Pamphylian Perge.

It is with Ti. Iunius Montanus, however, (Halfmann no. 6, *cos. suff.* 81 CE) that we first encounter an easterner with at least one documented military post, *tribunus militum* of the *legio VMacedonica*, then stationed in Moesia. But even this man, probably descended from a colonist in Alexandria Troas, holds posts only in provinces without legions in his later, curious career.

Our first senator other than Pompeius Macer who was most probably descended from a local elite Greek family is Antonius Flamma from Cyrene, but only his proconsulate of Crete and Cyrene is known. Our second may well be the unknown from Miletus who is claimed by an inscription to have been the first senator from Miletus and Ionia and the fifth from the province Asia. Since his father was an *archiereus*, *prophetes* and gymnasiarch he may well be from a local family; but nothing is known of his own career, and he may not.

71 On Theophanes see Bowie 2011: 181–3; on Macer see Bowie 2013: 245–6.

72 Syme 1999: 125–6, in a note 'Eastern senators before AD 48' observes that de Laet 1941 also admitted two Artorii, the sons of M. Artorius Asclepiades, Augustus' doctor from Smyrna, A. Castricius and a Demonstratus. Halfmann 1979: 108 explains their exclusion.

73 *SEG* 2.696.

74 On Roman settlers in Pamphylia see Halfmann 1979: 53–4.

Both the *consules ordinarii* of 105 CE may have Asia Minor origins. But of one, Ti. Iulius Candidus Marius Celsus (Halfmann no. 11), the exact area is uncertain (indeed Petersen in *PIR*² thought he was from Narbonensis, not Asia Minor) and we know nothing of posts he held before his legateship of Cappadocia and Galatia. That was indeed an armed province, but his posting there might be due to his local knowledge and connections rather than to an appetite for things martial. C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus, the other *ordinarius* of 105 CE, is agreed to have combined an Asia Minor origin with a career that involved two provinces with legions, first Cappadocia and Galatia, and then later Syria. But Quadratus was never the governor of either province, and his apparent adlection *inter praetorios* exempted him from earlier legionary posts like *tribunus militum* and *legatus legionis*. Nor, despite extensive epigraphic commemoration, is it quite clear from what background he came: a long established family in Phrygia seems likelier than a wholly Greek family in Pergamum.⁷⁵

The career of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus from Sardis has already been discussed above under equestrians. The same phenomenon of a career that begins with equestrian military posts is found in—tilius Longus from Bithynian Apamea. Although Longus' adlection by Vespasian was *inter praetorios*, he preceded it with (?) two military posts (as against Polemaeanus' one), and we know of only one subsequent post, legate to the *proconsul Asiae*.

A more complete documentation of this pattern is found in the case of M. Arruntius Claudianus, from Xanthus in Lycia. An inscription from Ephesus published in 1968 has given us the equestrian posts which in an earlier text from Xanthus Claudianus had summarised with the phrase τὰς ἐν ἱππικῇ [τάξει ἀρχὰς διελθὼν] μέχρι ἐπιτροπ[ιχῶν]: these were *praef. cohortis*, *trib. II*, *praef. alae et vexilli praetorianorum*, and *praef. classis Moesiae et ripae Danuvi*, this last held around 92/3 CE. Then he was adlected, it seems by Domitian, *inter aedilicios*, and held a praetorship. What then followed was a series of posts of which most made no use of his military experience—*leg. pro pr. provinciae Achaiae*, *leg. pro pr. provinciae Asiae II*, and finally *proconsul* of the province of Macedonia. Just before that last position, however, he was legionary legate of the *leg. II Traiana*, probably stationed in Syria. But whether Claudianus is 'Greek' is very doubtful: he seems rather to be from the many descendants of Italian settlers in Lycia and Pamphylia.

Against all these careers with minimal military involvement there stands out that of C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus, a *vir militaris par excellence* whose

75 On C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus and for the problem of distinguishing him from C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus see Syme 1946: 162–3; for a good study of both men's careers see Ventroux 2013.

eminence in two Dacian campaigns and in the Parthian war led him to the governorship of the recently created province of Dacia, where he died in battle. That he is not simply a member of the Pergamene civic elite is shown by his claim to royal kinship.⁷⁶ Nobody who appears to be from a Greek city elite has a career at all comparable. Equally, if the C. Iulius Bassus known from Pliny's letters is his father, in his case too the family pedigree may have drawn him only to administrative posts, though we know too little to exclude a military career.

A more surprising military career is that of Sex. Iulius Maior (?Pythodorus) from Nysa (Halfmann no. 54). His description of his post in charge of the *legio III Augusta* at Lambaesis as *legatus Aug. pro. pr. leg. III Aug.* is unusual, and perhaps relates to some special appointment by Hadrian. It is followed (after his suffect consulate) by positions of governor in two provinces with legions, Lower Moesia and Syria. Only in his last appointment, proconsul of Asia c. 141/142 CE, does he return to the civilian administration we might expect from a rich Greek from the Maeander valley with a great interest in, and substantial benefactions at, the Asclepieion at Epidaurus. But then he too was no ordinary member of a Greek city elite: he had connections with the last king of Pontus.

Another illuminating case is that of L. Iulius Marinus Caecilius Simplex (Halfmann no. 23). His family from Syria, probably Berytus, was almost certainly of colonial descent. His father entered the senate, but we know much less of his career than of the son's—a man who held two military posts in a string of administrative positions, some of which, like his membership of the *fratres Arvales*, shows him much in evidence in Rome itself, though the provincial posts he held are all in Greek-speaking provinces. He comes across as somebody who may have felt himself Roman, not Greek, but able to exploit his Eastern origins in his career. The two military posts tell us little about Greek vision.

M. Pompeius Macrinus Theophanes (Halfmann no. 44) may also have felt himself as Roman as Greek—since Theophanes the friend of Pompey the family had a presence both in Rome and in Mytilene. So when a career involving posts in Italy and in mainly Greek provinces was interrupted by service as *legatus legionis* of *legio VI Victrix*, currently in Germania Inferior, it may reflect his Roman side.

Finally I note C. Iulius Eurycles L. Vibullius Pius (Halfmann no. 29). He too has posts in Achaia and Baetica, but then (his latest known post) serves as *legatus legionis* of *legio III Gallica* in Syria. We cannot tell whether the absence of other military posts from his known career is choice or chance.

76 Habicht *AvP* viii 3, 43 no. 21 lines 21–2.

The Invisibility of *Viri Militares* among πεπαιδευμένοι

A corollary to the exiguous representation of elite Greeks in the Roman army is the rarity of military men's appearance in Greek literary texts of the period from Plutarch to Philostratus. The following review, which simply takes Philostratus, Aristides and Plutarch as test cases, makes no attempt to be exhaustive, but I doubt if a full and systematic investigation of the Greek literature of the empire would yield different results.

Philostratus

The reason for starting with Philostratus is a well-known anecdote in his semi-fictional work *On Apollonius* 5.38.2: when asked by Vespasian to request a benefaction, δωρεά, Philostratus' character Dio of Prusa raised the case of a pupil, Lasthenes of Apamea: while studying philosophy with Dio Lasthenes had fancied a military career, and had indeed entered one, but now wanted to return to the life of a philosopher (whether of a 'practising' philosopher or simply that of a philosophy student is not clear). Vespasian released him from his military obligations and gave him the privileges of veterans, τὰ τῶν ἐστρατευμένων. This last phrase may indicate that we should not think of somebody entering an equestrian or senatorial career by a military route (e.g. like the—ilius Longus from Apamea who was *tribunus militum* of the *leg. IV Scythicae*),⁷⁷ but simply enrolling, as a common soldier, presumably in a legion. The passage is therefore evidence for the possibility that a Greek at the social level from which students of philosophy were drawn might, at least in Philostratus' imagination, so enlist. It perhaps suggests that for Philostratus there was no stigma attaching to the choice; but equally it suggests that no stigma, and perhaps a certain credit, attached to the decision to return to the life of the πεπαιδευμένος. It may also hint that a readiness to enrol was something one might especially expect in a man from a Roman *colonia*, albeit not marked out by Philostratus as a *civis Romanus*.

To judge from a lexical *sondage* in Philostratus' *Life of the sophists*, however, a man like Lasthenes of Apamea will have found few others with whom to exchange barrack-room or officers'-mess stories when he returned to civilian life. The *Lives* uses the term στρατιά only once, in a quotation from a μελετή of Alexander of Seleucia in which he takes the role of a man advising Darius to bridge the Danube.⁷⁸ Since we know from a slightly earlier passage that

⁷⁷ Halfmann 1979: 18, see above p. 51.

⁷⁸ Philostr. *vs* 2.5.575. Presumably Alexander played the role of an Ionian Greek, cf. Hdt. 4.89.1.

Alexander actually went to join Marcus on the Danube and there took up the office of *ab epistulis graecis*, there must be a possibility that a version of this μελετή was actually delivered in something like its feigned historical setting, and the presence of a στρατιά in the discourse is partly explained by that frontier-zone performance context.⁷⁹

It is therefore of interest that one of the *Lives*' only two uses of στρατιώτης occurs in their account of the famous incident on this same Danube when Dio of Prusa allegedly harangued the Roman army as it contemplated insurrection at the time of Domitian's assassination.⁸⁰ Although Philostratus also introduces the terms στρατιώτης and ἀστράτευτος in a comparison that he offers for the advantages of Hermocrates of Phocaea in having an ancestor who was a sophist,⁸¹ the conjunction of his other use of στρατιώτης with that of στρατιά give the firm impression that things military do not belong in Athens or *provincia Asia* but on the distant frontiers where (in Aristides' term) Ares 'dances his ceaseless dance'.⁸²

It is no surprise, then, that the *Lives*' only use of στρατεύειν in a contemporary context takes us back to Marcus campaigning on the Danube.⁸³ It is, admittedly, used several times of actions within the fictional contexts of μελεται: of Philip warring against Byzantium, of Dias of Ephesus urging Philip to attack Asia and the Greeks to follow him; of Isocrates exhorting the Greeks to do the same;⁸⁴ and finally concerning Alexander of Seleuceia when he impersonates Artabazus dissuading Xerxes from mounting a second expedition against Greece—did this too have amongst its audience the emperor Marcus on the Danube?⁸⁵ The sense that military action belongs not in the *hic et nunc* but in the temporally or spatially remote is reinforced by the *Lives*' uses of στρατηγεῖν—employed only of Antiphon in fifth-century Athens—and of στρατηγός, employed only of P. Hordeonius Lollianus holding the Athenian office which still carried the title στρατηγός ἐπὶ (τῶν) ὅπλων but whose duties

79 Philostr. *vs* 2.5.571.

80 Philostr. *vs* 1.7.488, twice.

81 εὐκλεέστερος μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκης ὁ ἐξ Ὀλυμπιονίκων οἴκου, γενναιότερος δὲ στρατιώτης ὁ μὴ ἀστρατεύτων, Philostr. *vs* 2.25.611. It is significant that the comparandum coupled by Philostratus with military service is an Olympic victory, cf. below p. 62.

82 οὐ μὴν οὐδ' Ἄρης γε ὑμῖν ἡτίμασται, οὐδὲ δέος μὴ συνταράξῃ τὰ πάντα, ὥσπερ ἐν Λαπιθῶν δαίπνῳ παροφθεῖς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ταῖς ὄχθαις ἔξω τῶν ποταμῶν χορεύει τὴν ἄπαυστον χορείαν, αἵματος καθαρά σῶζων τὰ ὅπλα, Arist. 26.105K.

83 Philostr. *vs* 2.5.571.

84 Philostr. *vs* 1.3.485 and 485–6; 1.17.505.

85 Philostr. *vs* 2.5.575.

were now centred not on weaponry but on grain-distribution.⁸⁶ Unsurprisingly neither centurions (ἐκατοντάρχαι) nor *tribuni militum* (χιλίαρχοι) enter the narrative of the *Lives*.

Aelius Aristides

In Aristides' works mention of soldiers, generals and armies is common enough within the imagined world of the μελετή—the Trojan plain in the *Embassy to Achilles*, the Athenians and their enemies in the *Panathenaic*, Platonic and Sicilian orations. But their appearance in his accounts of the Roman world is prominent only in 26K, εἰς Ῥώμην, where they are always presented as a feature of Roman power and never associated with Greeks.⁸⁷ Certainly the correct relation of obedience of soldiers to their general is embedded in Aristides' *imaginaire*, and he often uses it in comparisons.⁸⁸ But in works addressing contemporary issues his references are few. To his contemporary Rhodians he recalls the military energy of their ancestors when the city Rhodes was founded, contrasting it with the peaceful conditions they now enjoy;⁸⁹ he recalls to Marcus and Commodus the services done by Smyrna to Rome in wars of the late Republic;⁹⁰ and he mentions regular movement of armies and governors to and from Britain.⁹¹ But in his extensive account of his years of illness in the *Sacred Tales* we hear nothing of camps, expeditions or generals, and Aristides' only mention of a soldier is to illustrate the breakneck speed of his own winter journey to Rome.⁹² At least one of the men whom Aristides encountered at the Pergamene Asclepieion was once thought to have had a military career—the Sedatus who was a praetorian senator from Nicaea,⁹³ a friend of L. Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus.⁹⁴ Bowersock had identified Sedatus with M. Sedatius Severianus, the 'foolish Celt' who consulted Glycon in 161 CE (Lucian's *Alexander*, calling him Severianus) before the military disaster at Elegeia.⁹⁵ But within a decade evidence emerged demonstrating that

86 Philostr. *vs* 1.15.498, 1.23.526.

87 Note also *Or.* 35 (εἰς βασιλέα).29K and 30K.

88 For Aristides' various uses of soldiers, generals and army-camps in comparisons see 23.34K, 27.42K, 28.126K, 33.9K, 34.53K, 43.17 and 26K, 45.13K.

89 *Or.* 25.54K. For the ascription of 25K to Aristides see Jones 1990.

90 *Or.* 19.11K.

91 *Or.* 36.91K.

92 οὔτε γὰρ οἱ τὰς ἀγγελίας κομίζοντες τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἡμᾶς γε παρήλθον, ἵνα μὴδὲν εἶπω πλεόν, *Or.* 48 (= *Sacred Tale* 2).61K.

93 *Or.* 48 (= *Sacred Tale* 2).48K, *Or.* 50 (= *Sacred Tale* 4).16K.

94 *Or.* 50 (= *Sacred Tale* 4).43K.

95 Bowersock 1969: 86–7, cf. *Luc. Alex.* 27.

M. Sedatius Severianus was indeed from Gaul.⁹⁶ Despite dreaming of meetings with Marcus and Lucius Verus and joining them in tours of inspection of civil constructions,⁹⁷ Aristides' account of his time at the Asclepieion, in *provincia Asia* and journeying to and from Rome gives no hint that the Roman army might be a visible part of his Greek world.

*Plutarch's Addressees and Participants: Quaestiones Convivales
and Other Dialogues*

The world of Plutarch's intellectual exchanges, whether set in Athens, Aedepsus, Thespieae or Delphi, is one where it is rarely if ever suggested or revealed that a Greek character has military credentials. Is this because very few of his friends did, or because he chooses not to mention these credentials? In many cases we simply lack the evidence to check whether one of his dedicatees or characters had military service which Plutarch does not mention. But in a few cases epigraphy has revealed a military post. Thus as we have already seen the addressee of *de capienda ex inimicis utilitate*,⁹⁸ Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, came from a distinguished family in Epidaurus: his grandfather had been a victor in Caesarian games at Epidaurus and *agonothetes* of the Isthmian games. As we know thanks to an inscription from Corinth,⁹⁹ Plutarch's Pulcher was himself helladarch, *Ilvir quinquennalis* at Corinth and in due course archon of the Panhellenion; he was also a procurator of Epirus, and so perhaps the addressee of a barb uttered by Epictetus.¹⁰⁰ Latterly (and certainly later than his appearances in Plutarch) he was *iuridicus* of Egypt and Alexandria during Hadrian's reign. Another inscription tells us he was *tribunus militum* of the *legio IV Scythica*, which was long based in Syria, latterly at Zeugma. How 'military' was this post, the only military post in what is otherwise a career divided between prominent positions in Corinth and Greece and two administrative equestrian posts?

A similar profile at a somewhat higher level can be discerned for the addressee of *de laude ipsius*, Herculanius. This is C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanius Vibullius Pius, descended through thirty-five generations from the Dioscuri, one of the very top Greeks in Sparta and indeed in the province: he was also a Roman senator who became *quaestor* in his own province Achaia, *tribunus plebis*, *praetor* and eventually governor of the Spanish province Baetica (*leg. pro pr. prov. Hispaniae Baeticae*). At an early stage in this senatorial career he

96 Halfmann 1979, 164.

97 *Or.* 47 (= *Sacred Tale* 1).47–49.

98 *De cap. ex inim. utilitate* 1 = *mor.* 86b. On Pulcher see p. 52 above.

99 *IG* iv 1600 = *Corinth* 8.1.80; the post of *trib. mil.* is only attested by *IG* iv 795.

100 *Epict. Diss.* 3.4.1.

served as *legatus* of *legio III*, probably *III Gallica*, which at that point was also stationed in Syria.¹⁰¹

In the absence of epigraphic supplementation we simply do not know if the addressee of *praecepta reipublicae gerendae*, Menemachus of Sardis,¹⁰² also had a taste of legionary life, or his friend Chaeremonianus of Tralles.¹⁰³ The Delphic inscription honouring the Hypatan L. Cassius Petraeus says no more of Roman posts than Plutarch.¹⁰⁴ Such too are the cases of Ti. Claudius Polycrates, a descendant of Aratus from Sicyon, and hence chosen by Plutarch as the dedicatee of his *Life* of Aratus,¹⁰⁵ and T. Flavius Philinus of Thespieae, a frequent interlocutor in *quaestiones convivales*.¹⁰⁶

Pulcher's post as *tribunus militum* and Herculaneus' as *legatus legionis* indeed show that there was some readiness to be part of the Roman army among Plutarch's Greek friends, though in each case a single post in Syria, where the Parthian frontier might prompt recollection of classical Greek victories over Persians, may indicate minimal commitment. Overall the vision of the Roman army in Plutarch's essays is a Greek and not a Roman vision.

Athletics as Displacement Behaviour

How, then, were the ambitious Greek youths in the cities of the Roman empire able to demonstrate their ἀρετή? It is worth asking whether for some νέοι athletic excellence was a substitute for ἀρετή on the battlefield. As was demonstrated by Louis Robert more than 80 years ago, the title ἄριστος Ἑλλήνων, 'best of the Hellenes', was given to athletes who won the race in hoplite armour at the Plataean *Eleutheria*, a four-yearly competitive festival which recalled and reaffirmed the military achievements of early fifth-century BCE Greeks in defeating Mardonius and his Persians at Plataea in 479.¹⁰⁷ Acquisition

101 For the evidence for his career (inscriptions from Sparta, Gytheion, Cythera, Mantinea, Asopus and perhaps Tegea) see *PIR*² I 302, Halfmann 1976: 125–6, no. 29 and above n. 61.

102 *praec. ger. reip.* 1 = *mor.* 798a.

103 *QC* 2.7 = *mor.* 641b.

104 *Syll.*³ 825C; *Plu.* *QC* 5.2 = *mor.* 674f, *de Pyth. orac.* 29 = *mor.* 409b. For the evidence see *PIR*² C 514; Spawforth 1996.

105 *Vit. Arat.* 1; he was also honoured at Delphi, *Syll.*³ 846.

106 For T. Flavius Philinus see IG vii 3422 = *Syll.*³ 843 (from Chaeronea) Φιλείνος Πλούταρχον τὸν εὐ[ε]ργέτην θεοῖς | [ἀ]νέθηκεν, and the discussion of the family by Jones 1970: 225ff. This Philinus' grandson had a senatorial career in the late second century, culminating in a suffect consulate, with no military posts, and with administrative positions held exclusively in Eastern provinces.

107 Robert 1929, cf. van Nijf 2005.

and advertisement of athletic distinction was one way in which a Greek in the imperial period could fashion himself in a classical mould, a mould that was not threatening to Rome and indeed offered westerners an opportunity to demonstrate that they too could achieve *à la grecque*.¹⁰⁸

The training for athletic contests was of course closely bound up with what had once been military training, and was now formalized in the *ephebeia*—the most extreme case is Sparta, but the institution is widespread.¹⁰⁹ In the classical period young men had toned their bodies and improved their combat skills in the *palaestra* or *gymnasium*, and the effectiveness of that training could be measured on the field of battle or at the great pan-Hellenic competitive festivals. With extinction of inter-*polis* warfare only the latter remained as a measure of physical ἀρετή. It is no accident that when the Costoboci invaded Greece in 170 CE the most distinguished act of resistance was that of Mnesibulus of Elatea, who had himself been both ἄριστος Ἑλλήνων and twice victor in all the major Greek ἀγῶνες (δὲς περι[δονί]κου).¹¹⁰ Nor, I suggest, is it coincidental that the great majority of known Olympic victors between 300 BCE and 400 CE comes from the areas from which the least number of recruits is documented, Achaia and western Asia Minor.¹¹¹ It is also in this geographical area that the largest number of new festivals was established in the first three centuries CE, even if the enthusiasm for augmenting the round of local and even pan-Hellenic festivals is manifested all over the Greek world, including of course Italy.¹¹²

As van Nijf has rightly stressed, many of the competitors in these ἀγῶνες come from the local elites.¹¹³ There is therefore a parallel of sorts between the proliferation of athletic competitions and the efflorescence of rhetorical displays by sophists. Young men had once engaged in athletic training whose original purpose had largely been to prepare them for inter-*polis* battles, and when the opportunity for these was removed they continued to present themselves for testing against other Hellenes at local and international athletic

108 On the link between athletics, warfare and Greek identity see the important discussions of Newby 2005, especially her section 'Athletics and Identity in the Greek East', 141–281, and van Nijf 2005.

109 For the Athenian *ephebeia* see Newby 2005: 168–201; for Sparta see Kennell 1995, Newby 2005: 143–67.

110 *IG* ix 146; for his action against the Costoboci see Paus. 10.34.5.

111 See the map at van Nijf 1999: 179.

112 Note the newly discovered list of victors in the *Sebasta* at Naples of the year 94 CE, with a preponderance of victors from mainland Greece and Asia Minor. The text is being prepared for publication by Prof. Elena Miranda: for a foretaste see http://ciegl.classics.ox.ac.uk/html/webposters/53_MirandaDeMartinoDiNanni.pdf.

113 Van Nijf 1999.

competitions, γυμνικοὶ ἀγῶνες. A similar group of young men trained their skills in public speaking in a way originally designed to prepare them for intra-*polis* and inter-*polis* 'political' rhetoric; when the opportunities for that rhetoric were reduced (though certainly not extinguished) the sophistic μελετή offered some virtuoso speakers the chance of being applauded for their μίμησις of speeches delivered in a famous classical context and offered their audiences the chance of imagining that they too were participating in an important debate at a turning-point in Greek history.¹¹⁴

Conclusions

Several different types of evidence converge to reveal a Greek society in the imperial period whose vision of itself and of the Roman empire had very little place for Roman military structures. The behaviour of the Greeks of this period, both at elite level and lower in society, is strikingly different from that of Latin speakers in Africa and the western provinces. At the level of the common soldier some of the explanation is perhaps to be found in the processes of recruitment. But that cannot explain the difference in career pattern between members of eastern and western elites. Here, despite the admiration for battlefield achievement ever since Homer's *Iliad*, a poem more read than any other by Greeks during their schooling and in adult life, military engagement played a remarkably little part in the 'Roman' careers of Greeks. Partly, perhaps, many Greeks accepted the Romans' presentation of themselves as better at fighting wars than any other people. Partly, however, it may be suspected that, however many Greeks became involved in various parts of the Roman administrative system, the empire and its emperors continued to be envisioned as 'Roman' and not (e.g.) 'Greco-Roman'. Some 'Greeks', like C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus or Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus, showed that the achievement of great military distinction was not reserved for westerners: but as noted above, such men were not typical members of Greek *polis* elites. For these elites the distinctively Greek cultural practice of seeking to achieve outstanding athletic performances in competition with other Greeks in panhellenic *agones*, or the equally panhellenic and almost as arduous informal competition with other *pepaideumenoi* in sophistic rhetorical displays, offered an alternative and more satisfying route by which the ἀρετή of an ἀνὴρ might be measured, a state of affairs that betokens a very different vision of Roman power from that which can be found in the West.

114 See Bowie 1974.

Appendix 1

Legionaries

- (a) A legionary of the XX *Valeria Victrix* is attested in Britain between 69 CE and 117 CE from Nicopolis in Epirus, an Augustan *colonia*.¹¹⁵
- (b) A legionary of the XVI *Valeria Victrix* is attested in Germania Superior before 43 CE from a Heraclea. It is not certain from which Heraclea he came, but more probably Heraclea Lyncestis.¹¹⁶
- (c) A legionary of the XIV *Gemina* is attested in Upper Germany between 70 CE and 92 CE from the Macedonian highland area of Pelagonia.¹¹⁷
- (d) Three legionaries are attested in the VIIth legion (later the VII *Claudia*) in Upper Illyricum between 9 CE and 42 CE from, respectively, Alexandria Troas and Ninica—both of which cities were Roman *coloniae*—and from Isinda, which is near Ninica, though not itself a *colonia*.¹¹⁸ Two more are attested from a Heraclea and from Philippi (again a *colonia*).¹¹⁹
- (e) Two legionaries are attested in the XIth legion in Upper Illyricum before 42 CE from Amaseia.¹²⁰ Another is attested in the XIth legion in Upper Illyricum before 42 CE from Laranda,¹²¹ and one each from a Heraclea and from Philippi.¹²²
- (f) Two legionaries are attested in the VII *Claudia* in Upper Illyricum between 42 CE and 69 CE from Antioch by Daphne and Tavium in Galatia.¹²³ A third, whose legion is unknown, is attested from Alexandria Troas.¹²⁴
- (g) In Illyricum a legionary of the IX *Hispana* is attested between 19 BCE and 43 CE from Heraclea,¹²⁵ and another of the VIII *Augusta* before 45 CE from Pelagonia,¹²⁶ three more are attested in the XV *Apollinaris* before 62 CE, one from Thessalonice,¹²⁷ and two from Philippi.¹²⁸

115 *RIB* 160, Mann 1983: 89.

116 *CIL* xiii 8552, Mann 1983: 101.

117 *AE* 1965: 254, Mann 1983: 104.

118 *CIL* iii 2019, Betz 1952: (D) 28 and 20, Mann 1983: 110.

119 *CIL* iii 9734 (Heraclea), 2717 and 14939 (Philippi), Mann 1983: 110.

120 *CIL* iii 13263, Mann 1983: 111.

121 *CIL* iii 2818, Mann 1983: 111.

122 *CIL* iii 14999, 2031, Mann 1983: 111.

123 *CIL* iii 6120 (Antioch), *ILluc* 838 (Tavium), Mann 1983: 112–3.

124 Betz 1952: (D) 81, Mann 1983: 112–3.

125 *RIB* 255, Mann 1983: 116.

126 *CIL* iii 7325, Mann 1983: 116.

127 *CIL* iii 13483, Mann 1983: 117.

128 *CIL* iii 5636, Betz 1962: 315, Mann 1983: 117.

- (h) A legionary of the II *Adiutrix* is attested in Pannonia Inferior between 117 CE and 193 CE from Ancyra;¹²⁹ another attested between 193 CE and 300 CE is also from Ancyra.¹³⁰
- (i) A legionary of the X *Gemina* in Pannonia Superior between 193 CE and 300 CE returned to his home which had been Sebaste in Phrygia.¹³¹
- (j) Sixteen legionaries of the VIIth legion in Moesia before c. 9 CE came from places in central and northern Asia Minor: Amblada, Conana (three), Cormasa, Iconium (two), Laranda, Mylias (two), Pessinus (four), Phazenon, Sebaste, Sebastopolis, and Sinope.¹³² Some but not all of these might be considered 'Greeks', whereas the two from Iconium, P. Mestrius P. f. Maecianus and M. Lollius M. f. look like Italians, even though at that date Iconium itself was not yet a *colonia*.
- (k) A legionary of the V *Macedonica* attested in Moesia before 62 CE came from Amaseia, and another from Alexandria Troas.¹³³ Four were from Macedonia.¹³⁴
- (l) A legionary of the VIII *Augusta* in Moesia between 45 CE and 69 CE was from Philippi;¹³⁵ one of the VII *Claudia* between 56 CE and 69 CE was from Berytus, another from somewhere in Pontus.¹³⁶
- (m) The numbers in the years 69 CE to 117 CE rise: in the V *Alauda* two from Nicaea and one each from Caesarea, Isinda and a Heraclea; in the I *Italica* one each from Ancyra, Heraclea, Stobi and Nicopolis in Epirus;¹³⁷ in the V *Macedonica* two from Ancyra; from the VII *Claudia* one from Pessinus and one from Heraclea; and in the XI *Claudia* one from Amastris or Amaseia and one from Pelagonia.¹³⁸

129 *AE* 1971: 347, Mann 1983: 121.

130 *AE* 1972: 438, Mann 1983: 122.

131 *ANRW* ii 16: 740, Mann 1983: 125. We also know of another from the XIV *Gemina* who settled in Hierapolis in Phrygia (*IGR* iv 837), but there is no indication that it was his origin, Mann 1983: 125.

132 Amblada *CIL* iii 9737; Conana *CIL* iii 9733, Betz 1952: (D) 63 and 80; Cormasa *AE* 1961: 15; Iconium *IGR* iii 1476; Laranda *CIL* iii 2709; Mylias *CIL* iii 8847, 8848; Pessinus *CIL* iii 1818 (two), 2710, Betz 1962: (D) 68; Phazemon Betz 1962: (D) 44; Sebaste *CIL* iii 2048; Sebastopolis *CIL* iii 8493; Sinope Betz 1962: (D) 58. On all Mann 1983: 131.

133 Amaseia, *CIL* iii 14155/1, Alexandria Troas, *AE* 1912: 188, Mann 1983: 131.

134 Respectively from Beroea *ILLug* 29, Edessa *CIL* iii 14992, Stobera *CIL* ix 6155 and Stobi *AE* 1910: 173; Mann 1983: 131.

135 *CIL* ix 4684, Mann 1983: 132.

136 Berytus *ILLug* 42, Pontus *AE* 1910: 174; Mann 1983: 132.

137 Ancyra *AE* 1932: 52, Heraclea *CIL* iii 7441, Stobi *CIL* iii 12409, Nicopolis *CIL* iii 1644; Mann 1983: 132.

138 Ancyra *CIL* iii 6184, 6188, Pessinus *CIL* iii 12498, Heraclea *AE* 1934: 206, Amastris or Amaseia *CIL* iii 971, Pelagonia *AE* 1935: 78; Mann 1983: 132–3.

- (n) One legionary of the IV *Flavia firma* attested in Moesia Superior between 117 CE and 193 CE came from Ancyra and two from Stobi;¹³⁹ one in the VII *Claudia* came from Heraclea and one from Scupi;¹⁴⁰ and the recruits in the year 169CE included one each from Nicomedia, Pergamum, Heraclea, Philippi and Thessalonice, four from Nicopolis and thirty-one from Scupi.¹⁴¹ Another from Scupi is recorded between 193 CE and 300 CE.¹⁴²
- (o) Eleven legionaries of the V *Macedonica* in Lower Moesia between 117 CE and 193 CE came from Asia Minor: one from Amaseia, three from Amastris, two from Ancyra, one from Ephesus, one from Nicomedia and two from Pontus. One legionary of the I *Italica* was from Aspendus, another from Scupi. One in the XI *Claudia* is known to be Macedonian.¹⁴³
- (p) Two men in Syrian legions, the VI *Ferrata* before 69 CE and the XV *Apollinaris* between 62 CE and 71 CE, are from Caclouma in Cilicia and from Pisidian Antioch respectively.¹⁴⁴ Many more in the XV *Apollinaris* were locally recruited, and may be culturally as Aramaic as they are Greek: two from Antioch, one from Chalcis, three from Cyrrhus, one from Hierapolis, and one perhaps from Heliopolis.¹⁴⁵
- (q) Between 69 CE and 117 CE in Syria, Judaea and Arabia two men in the X *Fretensis* are respectively from Ancyra and Pessinus and one from Gadara, while one in the VI *Ferrata* is from Philadelphia.¹⁴⁶
- (r) One legionary attested in the XVI *Flavia* in Syria between 117 CE and 193 CE came from Athens, an *origo* sufficiently unusual to merit the text's citation: Γ. Ἰούλιος Λεωνίδης Ἀθηναῖος, στρατιώτης λεγεῶνος ιζ' Φλ. Φίρμης, θεοῖς καταχθονίοις καὶ τοῖς γονεῦσιν.¹⁴⁷ One in the II *Scythica* comes from Claudiopoli in Bithynia and

139 Ancyra *AE* 1962: 112, Stobi *AE* 1948: 147; Mann 1983: 134.

140 Heraclea *AE* 1910: 88, Scupi *CIL* iii 8201; Mann 1983: 134.

141 For all these see *CIL* iii 14507 with *JOAI* 4 (1901) Bb 95 and Mann 1983: 134.

142 *CIL* xiii 6823, Mann 1983: 134.

143 Amaseia *AE* 1914: 35, Amastris *CIL* iii 7501, 7502 (two), Ancyra *AE* 1920: 54, 1957: 266, Ephesus *AE* 1912: 189; Nicomedia *AE* 1935: 70, Pontus *CIL* iii 7502 (two), Aspendus *CIL* iii 14491, Scupi *SS* 71 p241 no. 642, the Macedonian *AE* 1939: 158. On all see Mann 1983: 135.

144 Caclouma *AE* 1972: 624, Antioch *CIL* iii 14358/20; Mann 1983: 144.

145 Antioch *AE* 1929: 205, 1937: 147, Chalcis *AE* 1929: 207, Cyrrhus *AE* 1929: 206, 209 and Betz 1952: 309, Hierapolis *AE* 1929: 220. On all Mann 1983: 144, who takes M. Alfius Olympiacus *vet. leg. XV Apollinaris* who had ILS 9200 inscribed at Heliopolis to have been recruited there, which seems to me uncertain.

146 Ancyra *CIL* vi 3614, Pessinus *CIL* vi 3627, Gadara *CIL* iii 6697, Philadelphia *AE* 1974: 659; on all Mann 1983: 144.

147 *IGR* iii 917 = *ILS* 8876 from Mopsuestia in Cilicia.

- another from Anazarbus in Cilicia;¹⁴⁸ one in the III *Gallica* from Syrian Apamea;¹⁴⁹ one in the VI *Ferrata* from Miletus; and one in the III *Cyrenaica* from Hierapolis, another from Arabia.¹⁵⁰
- (s) Three legionaries attested in Syria, Palestine and Arabia between 193 CE and 300 CE came from Asia Minor, one in the *legio I Parthica* from Balbura (Lycia); one in *legio III Parthica* from Nicomedia; and another in *legio III Parthica* from Isauria.¹⁵¹
- (t) Of men serving in the same area and period four were recruited from Syria, one in *legio I Parthica* from Antioch ad Hippium, the other three in III *Gallica* from Arethusa, from the Trachonitis and from an unspecified Syrian origin.¹⁵²
- (u) Between c. 273 CE and 300 CE one legionary from *legio I Illyricorum* perhaps came from Tralles.¹⁵³ In the III *Cyrenaica* many more were locally recruited, five men whose names or fathers' names were Semitic, and others from the Trachonitis, Palmyra and Nabataea.¹⁵⁴ Two others in an unknown eastern legion are from the Trachonitis and Auranitis.¹⁵⁵

148 Claudopolis *AE* 1954: 233; the Anazarbus text known to Mann 1983: 145 was unpublished.

149 *AE* 1939: 57.

150 Miletus *IGR* iv 825, Γ. Σήιος Ἀττικός, ὁ καλούμενος [Μοσ][χ]ᾶς, λεγεώωνος ἐκτῆς ὀπτίων, Μελήσιος, Hierapolis *AE* 1908: 258, Arabia *IGR* iii 1282; on all Mann 1983: 145.

151 Balbura *IGR* iii 479 Αὐρ. Κορνοῦς Ἑρμαίου Κάρμωνος, στρατευόμενος ἐν λεγεῶνι Πραιμοπαρθικᾷ ἀνέστησε ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Αὐρ. [Γ]ῆν Κάρμωνος, Βαλβουρεὺς τῆς κολωνία(ς) γειτοσύνης Πύρου ποτάμου (from Kosagatch, near Balbura), Nicomedia, *CIL* vi 36775, Isauria, *JHS* 78 (1958) 72 no. 18. On all these see Mann 1983: 145.

152 Antioch *Syria* 37, p247 no 7, Arethusa *CIL* iii 2904, Trachonitis *IGR* iii 1148, *natione Surus* *CIL* viii 4310. On all Mann 1983: 145.

153 *ILS* 8875, found at Tralles, but not proof of origin, see Mann 1983: 146.

154 Arabians *IGR* iii 1300, 1301, 1330, *AE* 1933: 163, Syria 1921: 349; Palmyra *IGR* iii 1035; Nabataea *IGR* iii 1257.

155 *IGR* iii 1131, *AE* 1933: 173. On all Mann 1983: 146. It is possible that more men of eastern origin are to be found among those who are known to have settled there. Thus from eastern legions before AD 69 a veteran from III *Gallica* settled at Sardis, *AE* 1933: 25; one from VI *Ferrata* and one from XII *Fulminata* settled at Tarentum, *CIL* ix 6157 and 6156; another from XII *Fulminata* at Calliopolis near Tarentum, *CIL* ix 7; and one from IV *Scythica* likewise settled at Tarentum, *AE* 1969/70: 133. Between AD 69 and 193 a veteran from III *Cyrenaica* settled at Acmonia in Phrygia, *MAMA* vi 283. Later a legionary of the II *Adiutrix* in Pannonia Inferior between 117 and 193 CE settled in Corinth, *AE* 1957: 22, another at Prusa, *CIL* iii 343. See Mann 1983: 125.

Appendix 2

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators down to c. 150 CE.

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
Q. Pompeius Macer	Mytilene / Rome	<i>praetor</i> 15	Unknown	1	P 626	
M. Calpurnius Rufus	Attaleia	<i>praetor</i>	<i>leg. Lyciae et Pamphyliae, leg. Cypri, leg. Ponti et Bithyniae, leg. prov. Asiae, praef. frumenti ex s.c.</i>	2	C 313	
L. Sergius Paullus	Antioch <i>ad Pisidiam</i> (?)	<i>curator riparum et alvei Tiberis</i>		3	S 527	
Q. Sergius Paullus	Antioch <i>ad Pisidiam</i> (?)	<i>procos. Cypri</i> c. 46/48		4	S 531	
L. Servenius Cornutus	Acmoneia	<i>leg. pro pr. prov. Asiae</i> c. 73/77.	<i>Xvir stlit.iud., quaestor Cypri, aedilis, praetor</i>	5	S 566	probably settler family from Umbria ¹⁵⁶
Ti. Iunius Montanus	Alexandria Troas (Augustan colonia)	<i>cos suff.</i> 81	<i>trib. mil. leg. V Macedonic., quaestor Ponti et Bith., tr. pl., praetor, procos. Siciliae</i>	6	I 781	several military posts held by possible grandfather (PIR I ² 780)
(M.?) Antonius Flamma	Cyrene	<i>procos. Cretae et Cyrenarum</i> before 70		7	A 831	<i>civitas Romana</i> to ancestor probably from triumvir ¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Levick 1967: 106–7.

¹⁵⁷ Reynolds 1959: 97 with n.18.

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators . . . (cont.)

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
M. Plancius Varus	Perge	<i>procos. Ponti et Bithyniae</i> between 70 and 79	<i>Xvir stlit. iudic., quaestor pro pr. Ponti et Bithyn., tr. pl., praetor, leg. Achaiae, leg. pro pr. Asiae</i>	8	P 443	Rich settler family in Perge ¹⁵⁸
L. Sergius Paullus	Antioch ad Pisidiam (an Augustan <i>colonia</i>)		<i>trib. mil. leg. VI Ferratae</i>	9	S 529	son of Halfmann 3, nephew of <i>procos. Cypri</i> 46/48
L. Calpurnius Longus	Attaleia			10	—	συγκλητικός (inscr. honouring wife)
Ti. Iulius Candidus Marius Celsus	Asia Minor	<i>cos. suff.</i> 86, <i>praef. urbi</i> 103/4, <i>cos. II ord.</i> 105	<i>leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Cappadoc. et Galatae</i> 87/8–90/91	11	I 241	
Ignotus	Miletus		Unknown	12	—	First senator from Miletus & Ionia, fifth from <i>prov. Asia</i>
C. Caristanius Fronto	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>colonia</i>	<i>cos. suff.</i> 90	<i>trib. mil., praef. alae Bosporan., leg. Ponti et Bithyn., leg. leg. IX Hispan., leg. Lyciae et Pamph.</i> 81–84	13	C 423	<i>praef. alae</i> in Syria

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Mitchell 1974.

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
L. Iulius Marinus	Syria, perhaps Berytus		<i>procos. Ponti et Bithyniae</i>	14	I 401	father of H23
L. Iulius Procleianus	Tripolis, Phoenicia (?)	<i>leg. Aug. Cappadociae et Galatiae</i> 79–81/2		15	—	
Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus	Sardis and Ephesus	<i>cos. suff.</i> 92 <i>procos. prov. Asiae</i> c. 105/6	<i>trib. mil. (angusticl)</i> <i>leg. III Cyrenaicae, leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Cappadoc. Galat. etc</i> <i>c. 77–9, leg. leg. IV Scyth. c. 79–82, procos. Pont. et Bithyn. 84/5, praeef. aer. mil.</i>	16	I 260	<i>leg. III</i> in Alexandria; <i>adlectus inter aedilicios</i> 73/4.
C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus	Pergamum / Phrygia	<i>cos. suff.</i> 92, <i>cos. II ord.</i> 105, <i>procos. Asiae</i> 109/110.	<i>leg. pr. pr. Bithyniae, leg. pr. pr. Asiae II, leg. Aug. prov. Cappadoc. Galat. etc</i> <i>81/2–84, procos. Cretae et Cyren. c. 85/6, leg. Lyciae et Pamphyl. 90–93, leg. pro pr. prov. Syriae</i> 100–104	17	I 507	Early career Rome <i>VII vir epulonium, frater Arvalis</i>
-tilius Longus	Apamea in Bithynia colonia		<i>trib. mil. leg. IV Scythicae</i>	18	—	
C. Iulius Bassus	Pergamum (?)	<i>procos. Ponti et Bithyn. c. 100/1</i>	<i>quaestor Ponti et Bithyn. 70–79</i>	19	I 205	probably father of H26

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators... (cont.)

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
Iulius Paullus	Antioch ad Pisidiam colonia	<i>praetor</i>	Unknown	20	I 452	perhaps related to H9
Ti. Claudius Sacerdos Iulianus	Asia Minor	<i>cos. suff.</i> 100	Unknown	21	I 1003	also <i>magister fratrum Arvalium</i> 101
C. Iulius... Cornutus Tertullus	Perge (or Attaleia) ¹⁵⁹	<i>cos. suff.</i> 100, <i>curator viae Aemil. leg. Aquitan. censuum acc., leg. Ponti et Bithyniae</i> 111/2–114/5, <i>procos. Afric.</i> 116/7	<i>quaestor urbanus, aedilis ce[rialis], adlectus inter praetorios</i> c. 73/4, <i>leg. Cretae et Cyren.</i> c. 76/7, <i>procos. Narbonens.</i> c.78/79, <i>praef. aerari Sat.</i> 98–100	22	I 273	Daughter or sister Iulia Tertulla marries H23
L. Iulius Marinus Caecilius Simplex	Syria, perhaps Berytus	<i>leg. Lyciae et Pamphyl.</i> 96–99, <i>procos. Achai.</i> 99–100, <i>cos. suff.</i> 101, <i>fratr. Arval.</i> 91–101	<i>IV viar. cur., trib. mil. leg. IV Scyth., quaestor Macedon., aed., praetor, leg. Cypri</i> c.87/8, <i>leg. Ponti et Bithyn.</i> c.89/90, <i>cur. viae Tiburt., leg. Aug. leg. XI Claud.</i> c. 93–6	23	I 408	son of H14; marries sister or daughter of H22
L. Antonius Albus	<i>provincia Asia</i>	<i>cos. suff.</i> 102		24	—	father of H58

¹⁵⁹ Perge, Halfmann 1979: 117; Attaleia, Syme 1985a: 346 = 1988: 474 'a patent product of the Italian diaspora'.

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
C. Iulius Alexander	Asia Minor (links with East and with Perge)	<i>cos.suff.</i> c. 101–104		25	I 136	βασιλεύς, son of Tigranes V, ἀνέψιος of H62 father of H46
C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus	Pergamum	<i>cos. suff.</i> 105, <i>leg.Aug. pro pr. prov. Syriae</i> 115–117, <i>leg.Aug. pro pr. prov. Daciae</i> 117	<i>trib.mil. leg. XIII Gem.</i> , c.87, <i>leg.Aug. leg.XI Claud.</i> 99–101, <i>praepos. vexill. leg IV Scythic.</i> etc <i>bello Dac.</i> 101–2, <i>leg. Iud.</i> 102/3–5, <i>adlect. inter comites Aug. exped.Dac.</i> II 106, <i>praepos. vexill. leg. III Gallic.</i> 114–5	26	I 508	killed fighting as <i>leg. Daciae</i> 117
Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes	Athens	<i>leg. Iudaeae</i> 100/1 or 109/112, ¹⁶⁰ <i>cos.suff.</i> ?108	<i>praetoriis ornamentis ornatus ex.s.c.</i>	27	C 801	Father of H68
M. Arruntius Claudianus	Xanthus, Lycia	<i>praetor, leg. pro pr. prov. Achaiae, leg. pro pr. prov. Asiae II, leg. Aug. leg. II Trai.</i> 101+, <i>procos. prov. Macedoniae</i>	<i>praef.cohortis, trib. II, praef. alae et vexilli praetorianorum</i> 86, <i>praef. classis Moes.et ripae Danuvi</i> 92/3(?)	28	—	<i>adlect. inter aedilicios</i> after equestrian military posts, mentioned but not listed <i>ILS</i> 8821. First Lycian senator, perhaps consul ¹⁶¹

160 Eck 1970: 157 n.190 opts for 100/101, Halfmann 1979: 122 for 109/112.

161 Syme 1985b: 358.

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators... (cont.)

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus L. Vibullius Pius	Sparta	<i>praetor,</i> <i>leg. pro pr. prov.</i> <i>Hisp. Baeticae,,</i> <i>leg. Aug. leg. III</i> <i>Gallicae</i> (in Syria)	<i>quaestor pr.pr. prov.</i> <i>Achaiae, tr.pl.</i>	29	I 302	Prob. nephew of H29a: heirs build stoa at Mantineia for ἐπιχῳριος θεός Ἀντίνοος
Sallustius Rufus	Aphrodisias	unknown		30	S 96	father of H59
C. (Iulius?) Plancius Varus (Cornutus?)	Perge	? <i>leg. Aug. Ciliciae,</i> <i>?cos. suff.</i> (Hadrianic)		31	I 470	son of H8, adopted by H22?
C. Caristanius Fronto	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>			32	C 424	son of H13
C. Caristanius Paulinus	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>			33	C 427	son of H13
C. Caristanius Iulianus	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>	<i>praetor, leg. pr.pr</i> <i>prov. [...] procos.</i> <i>Achai. 100/101</i>	<i>trib.mil.</i> <i>(angusticlav.) leg.</i> <i>XII Fulm., praef.</i> <i>alae.</i>	34	C 426	Perhaps nephew of Half 13
P. Anicius Maximus	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>	<i>procos. Ponti et</i> <i>Bithyniae</i> 98–109		35	A 603	Perhaps grandson of H35a
P. Anicius P. f. Ser. Maximus	Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>	<i>praef. exercitu</i> <i>qui est in Aegypto,</i> <i>donato ab imp.</i> <i>donis militaribus</i> <i>ob expeditionem</i>	<i>prim.pil. leg. XII</i> <i>Fulm.</i> <i>praef. castror. leg. II</i> <i>Aug. in Britannia,</i> <i>honorato corona</i> <i>murali et hasta pura</i> <i>ob bellum Britannic.</i>	35a	A 604	Honoured at Antioch by Alexandria <i>ILS</i> 2696 (Latin); (?) grandson <i>procos</i> <i>Ponti et Bith.</i> Plin. <i>ep.</i> 10.112

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
C. Iulius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus	Commagene/ Athens	<i>cos. suff.</i> May–Aug. 109	none (<i>adlect. inter praetorios ab imp. Traiano</i>) ἄρχων in Athens c.87/88	36	I 151	grandfather aids Nero in Parthia, Titus in Jewish war; father aids Otho (T. <i>hist.</i> 2.25.2) & Titus (J. <i>Bf</i> 5.460–5)
Ti Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus	Sardis	<i>cos. suff.</i> Apr.–Jun. 110		37	I 168	son of H16
L. Catilius Severus Iulianus Claudius Reginus	Asia Minor, but perhaps not <i>prov. Asia</i>	<i>cos. suff.</i> Jul.–Sep. 110, <i>leg. Cappadoc. et Armen.</i> 114–7, <i>leg. Syriae</i> 117–9, <i>cos. II ord.</i> 120, <i>procos. Africae</i> c. 124/5, <i>praef. urbi</i> ?—138	[<i>qua</i>] <i>est. [pr. pr.] Asiae</i> , [<i>sevir e</i>] <i>q[u. Rom., tr. pl.]</i> , <i>praetor urb.</i> , <i>leg. pr. pr. Asiae</i> II c. 101–3, <i>praef. frumenti dandi</i> , <i>cu[r. viar. . . .] iae</i> , <i>leg. leg. XII Primigen.</i> (Mainz)	38	C 558	Perhaps (Halfmann 135) descendant of –ilius Longus of Apamea, H18
C. Claudius Severus	Pompeiopolis	<i>cos. suff.</i> Sept.–Dec. 112	<i>praetor urbanus</i> c. 102, <i>leg. Aug. Arabiae</i> 106–115 (first governor)	39	C 1023	<i>adlect. inter quaestorios</i> c.98, <i>inter tribunic.</i> c.100. Father of H72
Sex. Quinctilius Sex. f. Ani. Valerius Maximus	Alexandria Troas	<i>leg. Aug. ad corrig. statum lib. civitatum</i> <i>prov. Achaiae</i> pre-108	<i>quaestor Ponti et Bithyniae</i> 97/8, <i>trib. plebis</i> c.100, <i>praetor</i> c.103.	40	Q 25	<i>lato clavo exornat. a divo Aug. Nerva.</i> Father of H49. Many local offices.
P. Sestius Pollio	Cyrene	<i>leg. Cretae et Cyrenarum</i>	<i>quaestor urbanus</i> , <i>aed. curulis</i> , <i>praetor</i>	41	S 614	ἱερεὺς Ἀπόλλωνος in Cyrene 111

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators... (cont.)

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
C. Iulius Fronto	Pergamum		συγκλητικός, (IGR iv 1687)	42	I 326	nephew of H17, bro'H43.
C. Iulius Nabus	Pergamum		συγκλητικός, (IGR iv 1687)	45	I 436	nephew of H17, bro' H42
M. Pompeius Macrinus Neos Theophanes	Mytilene	<i>cos. suff.</i> Sept.–Dec. 115 <i>procos. prov.</i> <i>Africae</i> c. 130/1	<i>IVvir viar.cur.</i> , <i>quaest. Ponti et</i> <i>Bithyn., tr. pleb.,</i> <i>praetor, curator viae</i> <i>Lat., leg. leg. VI victr.</i> c. 108–110 (Germ. <i>Inf</i>), <i>leg. Ciliciae</i> 110/1–113, <i>procos.</i> <i>Sicil.</i>	44	P 629	post of <i>leg.leg.</i> surprising in otherwise administrative career
Ti. Iulius Frugi	(NW?) Asia Minor	<i>procos. Maced.</i> <i>leg. Aug. pro pr.</i> <i>prov. Lyc. et</i> <i>Pamph.</i> 113–115	<i>Xvir stlit.iud.</i> , <i>trib.</i> <i>mil. leg.[...]</i> , <i>quaestor prov.[,]</i> , <i>leg. Ponti et Bithyn.,</i> <i>praetor</i>	45	I 329	
C. Iulius Agrippa	Apamea on Orontes	<i>quaestor Asiae</i>		46	I 130	son of βασιλεύς H25
C. Iulius Alexander Berenicianus	?Judaea	<i>cos. suff.</i> Sept.–Dec.116, <i>procos. prov.</i> <i>Asiae</i> 132–3	<i>leg.Aug. pr. pr.</i> (<i>bello Parthico</i>)	47	I 141	perhaps brother of H46
Sex. Quintilius Valerius Maximus	Alexandria Troas	<i>leg. pro pr. prov.</i> <i>Achaiae</i>	<i>trib.mil. leg.I Italic.</i> <i>et XIII Geminae</i>	49	Q 26	father H40 gets <i>latus clavus</i> from Nerva 96/97

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
Ti. Iulius Candidus Caecilius Simplex			<i>frater Arvalis</i> between 105 and 119	50	I 237	son of H11, brother of H51
Ti. Iulius Candidus (Capito?)		? <i>cos. suff.</i> 122	<i>frater Arvalis</i> between 105 and 120	51	I 239	son of H11, brother of H50
L. Marcius Celer M. Calpurnius Longus	Attaleia	? <i>cos. suff.</i>	<i>IVvir viar.cur, trib. mil. leg.I Ital., leg. Ponti et Bithyn., leg. or procos. Achaiae,</i>	52	M 221	descendant of H10
Ti. Iulius Iulianus Alexander	Alexandria or Judaea	<i>cos. suff.</i> 126, <i>curator aedium sacr. et op. locorumque publicorum</i> 128	<i>leg.Aug. pr.pr. prov. Arabiae</i> c.123–6	53	I 142	grandson of Ti. Iulius Alexander <i>praeef. Aeg.</i> 66–69 (I 139)
Sex. Iulius Maior (Pythodorus?)	Nysa	<i>cos. suff.</i> c.126, <i>leg.Moesiae inf.</i> 132/3–135, <i>leg. Syr.</i> c.133–7, <i>procos.? Asiae</i> c. 141–2	<i>leg.Aug. pr.pr. leg. III Aug.</i> 123/4–126	54	I 397	descendant of king of Pontus; benefactor of Asclepieion at Epidaurus
L. Aemilius Iuncus	Tripolis, Phoenicia	<i>cos. suff.</i> Oct.–Dec. 127, <i>leg. Aug. ad corrig. statum lib. civitatum prov. Achaiae</i> c. 129/130–135		55	A 355	?philosopher, Oliver <i>AJP</i> 98, 1977, 168ff.

Outline Careers of 'Eastern' senators... (cont.)

Name	Origin	Major posts	Early posts	Half-mann	PIR ²	Comments
L. Flavius Arrianus	Nicomedeia	<i>cos. suff.</i> ? 129 <i>leg. Cappadoc.</i> 131/2–137/8, ? <i>leg. Syriae</i>	<i>procos. Baeticae?</i> c. 122	56	F 219	priesthood Nicomedeia, Ἀρχων Athens 145/6, philosopher
Ti. Claudius Iulianus	?Sardis	<i>praetor</i> c.117, ? <i>cos. suff.</i> 129/ 130, ? <i>procos.</i> <i>Asiae</i> 145 (PIR ² C896)	<i>trib.mil. leg.IV</i> <i>Scyth., quaestor</i> <i>Achaiae, tr.plebis,</i> <i>leg. pr.pr. Achaiae</i>	57	C 902	nephew of H37, great-nephew of H16
L. Antonius Albus	<i>provincia Asia</i> and Rome	<i>praetor</i> c. 121, <i>leg. Asiae,</i> <i>curator viar.,</i> <i>procos.Achaiae</i> c. 127/8, <i>cos. suff.</i> c.132/3, <i>procos.</i> <i>Asiae</i> c. 147–9	<i>IIIvir monetal, trib.</i> <i>mil. leg.I Minerv.,</i> <i>quaestor cand.</i> <i>Caes.c.117, tr.pleb.</i> <i>cand.Caes. c.119</i>	58	A 810	son of H24
M. Sallustius Rufus Titillianus	Aphrodisias			59	S 97	son of H30
M. Calpurnius Rufus	? Antioch ad Pisidiam <i>Colonia</i>	<i>procos. Achaiae</i> 117–138	<i>praef. frument.</i> <i>dandi ex s.c., leg.</i> <i>Cypri, leg. Ponti et</i> <i>Bithyn., leg. Asiae</i>	60	C 313	

Accommodation, Opposition or Other? *Luke-Acts*' Stance Towards Rome

John Moles

This contentious topic needs working assumptions.

The Gospel according to Luke and *Acts of the Apostles* constitute a unified 'double-work'.¹ Titular authenticity, authorial identity, ethnicity, and location matter little; Christian tradition visible from the late second century makes 'Luke' a convenient name, intriguing here because basically Roman.²

Written ca 100,³ *Luke-Acts* covers the life, death and alleged resurrection of Jesus (ca 30 CE) and the Jesus movement until two years after Paul's arrival in Rome (A. 28.30–31), culminating in his trial and death in 64 (narratively foreshadowed). While the term 'Christian' is controversial, the fact that *Acts* uses it twice (11.26; 26.28) and once transitionally—employed by Romans but acceptable to Christians (11.26)⁴—sufficiently justifies it here. The crucifixion of Jesus, Jewish riots in Rome under Claudius (occasioning expulsions of Christians), widespread Jewish hostility, Neronian and Domitianic persecutions, and general Roman and Greek antagonism, both elite and popular, generated considerable Christian anxiety.⁵ The antagonism originated in Jesus' conviction as pretender king of a Roman province, which labeled his followers quasi-revolutionaries. Christian mission produced incomprehension and hostility as well as conversion.

The Roman capture of Jerusalem and destruction of the Temple in 70 accelerated Christians' detachment from Judaism.⁶ *Luke-Acts* traces the progressive

* I thank all at Odense, the Editors, John Barclay, Manfred Lang, Tony Spawforth, Francis Watson and Bill Telford. Space restrictions and endless bibliography dictate economy and selectivity. Textual paraphrase implies neither historical nor theological reliability. This paper has local overlaps with others but remains substantially independent. Translations are mine.

1 Talbert 1974; Tannehill 1986, 1990.

2 Plummer 1913: xviii.

3 Moles 2011a: 124.

4 See below p. 95.

5 Crook 2010.

6 Goodman 2007: 512–561.

failure of the Jewish mission and assumes a largely Gentile future, although envisaging the Jews' eventual 'healing'.⁷ The audience/ readership⁸ includes Christians and (still) Jews. Are there others? 'God-fearers' (Gentile followers of Judaism who had not converted), surely.⁹ Other Gentiles are targeted at a remove, because Luke provides Christians 'fair copies' for key situations¹⁰ (addressing superstitious pagans [A. 14.15–17] and philosophers [A. 17.18–31]; defending oneself before Roman governors, emperors,¹¹ or client kings). But a text aiming for the Christianisation of the world (A. 1.8) should address it directly.¹²

Although Luke's language—basically functional, 'professional' Greek—¹³ is straightforward, his literary merits include verbal economy and creativity; intertextual allusiveness, explicit or implicit, both to biblical and classical material; vivid story-telling and scene-painting; psychological realism; sustained imagery; elaborate narrative patterning; and density and intensity of effects. This Greek-Christian-Jewish text has Classical pretensions,¹⁴ attracted 'Classical' readers from the second century,¹⁵ and resonates challengingly with the Classical texts considered elsewhere in this volume.

Luke-Acts and Rome

Luke is well-informed about Roman provincial government, legal procedures, army officers, the geography of the Roman East and Greece, and Rome's topography,¹⁶ and has some acquaintance with Roman literature.¹⁷ But Rome is not merely the inevitable or neutral historical background: she looms large, characteristically in charged contexts far beyond the crucifixion narrative. Why?

7 Moles 2011a: 159–64.

8 Lang 2008: 15–95; Moles 2011a: 121–22.

9 See below p. 90.

10 Sterling 1992: 382–6.

11 Since *Acts* foreshadows Paul's trial in Rome (p. 99), Paul's various 'apologies' (19.33; 22.1; 24.10; 25.8, 16; 26.1, 2, 24) anticipate his 'apology' before Nero; Still 1923: 11.

12 Streeter 1930: 535–9; Lang 2008; Moles 2011a: 121–22; 2011b: 465.

13 Alexander 2006/7: 231–52.

14 Pervo 1987; MacDonald 2003; Moles 2006b; 2011a; 2011b; 2013; Alexander 2006/7; Lang 2008.

15 Moles 2011a: 121; also 123 for knowledge of the Passion at Nero's court.

16 Wallace & Williams 1993.

17 E.g. *Res Gestae* (p. 87), Livy's *Preface* (p. 84) and *Aeneid* (p. 100).

NT scholarship, like Classical, probes 'attitudes to Rome', broadly considered (rule, emperors, officials, culture, inhabitants and subjects), as major drivers of Greek texts, whether explicit or implicit. Traditionally, most hold *Luke-Acts* accommodationist, favourable to Roman power, and anxious to demonstrate (to Christians or Romans) that Christianity is compatible with Rome,¹⁸ others hold it existentially hostile, arguing that Jesus as Lord and Saviour and Christian 'good news' decisively trump Roman equivalents.¹⁹ Three important books were unavailable in 2009 or published later: Manfred Lang's *Die Kunst des christlichen Lebens: Rezeptionsästhetische Studien zum lukanischen Paulusbild*; Kavin Rowe's *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*; and Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom's *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*.²⁰

Lang, adducing comparative material from Seneca, Plutarch and the like, and developing parallels between Euripides' *Bacchae* and key episodes, explores the *possibility* that *Acts* could be read by Romans (particularly in Rome) as a protreptic to the Christian 'philosophical way'. Rowe argues that '[*Acts*] is a highly charged and theologically sophisticated political document that aims at . . . the construction of an alternative total way of life . . . that runs counter to the life-patterns of the Graeco-Roman world' and is 'culturally destabilising', hence the danger (realized) that 'outsiders . . . [would] . . . construe Christianity as sedition or treason', hence Luke's 'negating the charges of [Paul's] opponents on the basis of a revisionary reading of Roman law', hence 'profound tension . . . at the heart of Luke's . . . program', 'new culture, yes-coup, no', 'not . . . sedition or treason but . . . the light and forgiveness of God'.²¹

Yamazaki-Ransom holds that Luke redefines the people of God as 'those who follow Jesus as Lord, not those who belong to ethnic Israel' and concomitantly redefines 'the opponents of the people of God', mapping his representations of relations between Roman and Jewish rulers and this people of God onto Jewish models of the relations between God, Israel and, where relevant, Gentile rulers;²² religion and politics, the divine and the worldly cannot be separated, and the Roman Empire is under demonic control, hence inevitable and existential conflict between the kingdom of God and that of Satan.²³

18 E.g. Cadbury 1921; Walaskay 1983; Alexander 2006/7: 183–206 surveys helpfully.

19 Cassidy 1978; 1987; Horsley 1989: 107–23; 2011 *passim*; Hendricks 1996.

20 Lang 2008; 2011; Rowe 2009, especially 53–89; critical debate on Rowe's claims in *JSNT* 33 (2011); Yamazaki-Ransom 2010.

21 Rowe 2009: 4–6.

22 Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 3–4.

23 Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 69–70.

For both Rowe and Yamazaki-Ransom, Romans lack both the language and the lived Christian experience to understand the truth of Christian claims.

My reading has significant contact with both Lang's and Rowe's and some with Yamazaki-Ransom's. Nevertheless, large differences remain. Neither Lang nor Rowe considers *Luke-Acts* as a unity. Lang's approach neglects many non-philosophical elements of *Acts*. While Yamazaki-Ransom's claim (which I cannot pursue), for Luke's 'mapping' is important (if schematic), focus on restricted categories and cases yields limited results. If Luke can be *shown* to include Romans within his audience/ readership, all three readings are greatly extended. Lang's 'thought experiment' immediately becomes reality. *Luke-Acts* gives Romans the language and lived Christian experience that they currently lack. The revisionary reading of Roman law finds its proper readers. The category of 'good Romans', for which neither Rowe nor Yamazaki-Ransom can account, is explained. And beyond all this, there are simply many new things to say.

I combine sequential reading with thematic accumulations. The former establishes Rome's integrality to Luke's developing Christian story, the diverse logics of her inclusion, and the relevant interpretative frameworks; the latter the insistence and density of the material.

The Preface (*L.* 1.1–4)²⁴ leads us in:

Since indeed many have set their hand to draw up [ἀνατάξασθαι] a narrative guide [διήγησιν] about the things done which have been persuasively brought to fulfilment [πεπληροφορημένων] amongst us, (2) just as those who became from the beginning eyewitnesses and servants of the word gave them on to us, (3) it seemed good to me also, having closely followed [παρηκολουθηκότι] all of them accurately from the up [ἀνωθεν], to write them down for you in order [καθεξῆς], most powerful Theophilus [κράτιστε Θεόφιλε], (4) so that you may additionally know/ experience/recognise [ἐπιγνῶς] the truth/security/safety/unslipperiness [τὴν ἀσφάλειαν] about the words in which you have been orally instructed.

Which elements matter here?

First, unobserved by scholars, 'road imagery'²⁵ ('narrative guide', 'brought to fulfilment', 'having closely followed', 'security'/ 'safety' [applicable to roads]) figures both *Luke-Acts* and Christianity as 'roads'. Consequently, 'the road to Jerusalem' taken by Jesus (*L.* 13.33–19.44) is the major structuring and

²⁴ Moles 2011b; 2013: 102–9.

²⁵ Moles 2013.

Christological device of *Luke; Acts*, a 'quest narrative' (1.8), commemorates Christianity as 'the Road' (9.2); Paul's journeys (including the thrice-narrated 'Road to Damascus' [9.3–9; 22.6–16; 26.12–17]) dominate *Acts*, which closes with 'roads' into Rome (28.15). The geography of the Roman world fits organically within this imagery.²⁶ But also, since the text is a road, and the road of, or to, the Road of Christianity, everyone who reads it, 'induced' by the Preface, is already, to some extent, willy-nilly 'walking the road' of Christianity. If they reach the end of the textual road, they face a choice.²⁷

Second, again unobserved by scholars, the Preface imitates a Greek decree.²⁸ Luke's community (1.1–2 'us') is a 'polity', himself its 'legislator'. What is its relationship to other 'polities', including Rome? But also, the 'polity' implication, plus the 'succession' vocabulary (2 'gave on') and the stated goal (4 'security'), figures Christianity, like Judaism, as a 'philosophy',²⁹ thus somewhat normalising it and soliciting philosophically-minded readers.

Third, generically, *Luke-Acts* announces Classical historiography,³⁰ which does many other things besides simply commemorating the past. Interpretation of any item involves consideration of function. Is it recorded 'just because it happened'? Is it exemplary? Does it validate present practice? Is it imaginative projection? The Preface also contains allusions to historians, including Herodotus and Thucydides,³¹ suggestive of 'Classical' readers, and Livy,³² suggestive of Romans.

Fourth, 'us' (1–2) casts *Luke-Acts* also as a 'local' history or history of a 'people',³³ with two effects. Christians are a distinct 'people', with, we have seen, their own 'polity', and cut across, and supersede, normal ethnicities. And, if Christians are characteristically constructed as 'other',³⁴ the outside reader is now invited to become 'one of us/ them', and, ultimately, when the world-wide Christian mission succeeds, the 'them-us' polarity will dissolve and everybody will become 'us'.

Fifth, the complicated final clause includes the notion of 'looking at a monument that cannot fall'.³⁵ That suits allusions to Herodotus, Thucydides and

26 *Acts*' 'geography': diversely, Alexander 2006/7: 69–131, 207–29; Sleeman 2009.

27 See below p. 99.

28 Moles 2011a.

29 Lang 2008: 304 n. 228; Moles 2011b: 470.

30 Moles 2011b: 462–4.

31 Moles 2011b: 476–9.

32 Moles 2011b: 478–9.

33 Sterling 1992: 349.

34 Crook 2010: 2.

35 Moles 2011b: 476–8.

Livy, who all use the inscriptional analogy to represent their Histories as solid, permanent things in an uncertain world, but also figures Christianity itself as such—in contrast both to Livy's *History* and the collapsing building which Livy is shoring up: Rome herself.³⁶ Further appeal to Romans: security lies *here*, not *there*; further reassurance for *all* readers: despite all appearances, despite persecutions, often deadly, Christianity provides *security from falling*; but also, potentially, further contrast: Christianity is unlike Jerusalem and the Temple, destroyed, as all readers know, by the Romans, but whose destruction *Luke-Acts* blames on the Jews:³⁷ further Christian self-definition, further appeal to Romans, distinguishing Christians from justly punished Jews.

Sixth, Theophilus. Whether its bearer is real or fictional, the name (repeated at A. 1.1), inculcates a right religious attitude, emphasized throughout *Luke-Acts*, and signifies both 'loving God' (of all who seek God) and 'loved by God' (as all humans are):³⁸ further indication of the universality of Luke's readership. But the emphasis on active 'theophiles' suggests their opposite, the 'theomachs'³⁹ who are a major concern of *Acts*. But also, the epithet attached to 'Theophilus', 'most powerful', suggests considerable status for the addressee conceived as an individual. Two Roman governors are also thus addressed, by a centurion and Paul (A. 23.26; 24.3; 26.25), one of whom 'knows rather accurately the things about the Road' (sc. Christianity [24.22]), just as Theophilus has been orally instructed in Christianity, figured as a road. No matter, again, whether Theophilus is real or fictional, he is represented as of similar status to Roman governors, thereby included in Luke's readership.

Seventh, beyond the 'us-them' contrast, is a series of pregnant contrasts or inversions. First, that between divine power and worldly power: 'brought to fulfilment', sc. by God; 'servants of the word'; 'Theophilus' and 'most powerful'; and *qua* 'most powerful', 'Theophilus' himself embodies that contrast, and anticipates powerful officials within the narrative who face the challenge of divine power. Second, that between 'down-ness' and 'up-ness': 'draw up'/'from the up'/'to write them down'; this includes the contrast implicit in the fifth element: 'falling'-'not falling'. Third, that between 'small' and 'great': the arresting literal smallness of the Preface; the greatness of the theme: 'the things brought to fulfilment [by God]'. All three contrasts readily bear on the relationship between Christianity and Rome; the second on the centrality to Christianity of resurrection (ἀνάστασις ~ 'standing-up'): ultimate guarantee

36 Moles 2011b: 478.

37 See below p. 92.

38 Some deny the second meaning, but the double reference was seen by Church fathers (Just 2003: 4; Martin 2006: 2).

39 Moles 2006b: 78.

of Christian 'security from falling'; the second also links with the other two. The idea of 'smallness' connects both to road imagery and to philosophical colouring to create another generic implication: as a 'small' 'road' to the 'road' of Christianity as the best 'road' through the 'road' of life, *Luke-Acts* is a philosophical 'epitome' (or 'vade mecum'): a 'short-cut road' containing the essentials about Christianity, philosophy and life.

After the magnificently complex Preface, the pregnancy/ birth sequences have mythical aspects: 'the prophecy of Jesus' birth would have made excellent sense to any Hellenistic reader'.⁴⁰ The angel Gabriel (1.33) foregrounds the first of the Preface's contrasts or inversions: 'And he will be king over the house of Jacob for the ages, and of his kingdom there will be no end'. Might Romans (and some Greeks) hear direct challenge of 'King' Jupiter's prophecy about the Roman imperium early in the first book of the *Aeneid* (1.278–9): '*his [Romanis] ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono; imperium sine fine dedi*'/'To them I put no limits nor temporal restrictions of their power: I have given them empire without end'? Towards the end of *Luke-Acts*, competitive allusion to *Aeneid* I seems convincing,⁴¹ as, earlier, does another, more general allusion to Aeneas.⁴² Links between beginning and end of the double-work are themselves plausible (as repeatedly emerges). Further, we soon find another Roman/ Caesarian allusion in the narrative. From the beginning, 'Christian imperialism' competes with Roman; similarly, and framingly, Jesus' own injunction at the start of *Acts* (1.8): 'you will be my witnesses . . . to the end of the earth'.

The pregnant Mary (1.46–55) exultantly celebrates all prefatory contrasts:

My soul *magnifies* the Lord,
 And my breath has rejoiced in God my *saviour*;
 Because he has looked upon the *lowliness* of his slave,
 For look! From now on all generations call me blessed,
 Because *the mighty one* has done *great things* for me,
 And holy is his name,
 And his pity extends to the generations
 He has done *power* with his arm,
 He has scattered the *uppity* in the false thinking of their hearts,
 He has dragged dynasts *down* from their thrones and raised *up* the *lowly*,
 He has filled the poor with good things and the rich he has sent away
 empty.

40 Johnson 1991: 38.

41 See below p. 100.

42 See below p. 104.

This 'programme' looks organically 'programmatic', unambiguously revolutionary, radically hostile to 'dynasts' (including Roman emperors), and unequivocally punitive. Precision, however, is needed. The perspective is that of 'all generations' 'from now on'. The present flows into the future and as far as 'last things': this is Christian 'inaugurated (sc. by Jesus' birth) eschatology' which retrojects absolute eschatological principles on to 'present' realities and projects 'present' realities on to absolute eschatological principles, the 'present' itself consisting of a long series of 'presents' extending to 'last days'. Romans could comprehend Christian 'inaugurated eschatology': pagan prophecy can represent the future as having happened (cf. *Aen.* 1.279), Sibylline prophecy can forecast eschatological futures,⁴³ and *Roma aeterna* competes with Christian eschatology.

Practically, the 'programme' does not announce immediate 'systems collapse' or validate *human* revolutionary activity. Nevertheless, 'inaugurated eschatology' proclaims ultimate realities, effected by God, mandating universal alignment with Christianity and the erasure of Roman power, the Preface has already deconstructed *Roma aeterna*, and individuals, including 'present dynasts', should put themselves in the right by accepting Jesus, thereby promoting the already 'inaugurated' eschatology. The eschatological perspective presses even harder when allied to the theme of divine justice.⁴⁴

In the historical narrative proper, Rome takes the foreground. Both the Jesus birth narrative and Baptist mission narratives are prefaced by wide-ranging Roman contextualisations and synchronisms (deftly echoed in *A.* 11.28; 18.2): 'And it came to pass in those days there went forth a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the inhabited world should be written up' (2.1–3); 'In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the land of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, (2) in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came to John the son of Zechariah in the desert' (3.1–2). The whole narrative movement of the double-work is towards Rome: Augustus' decree begins the *Luke* narrative, which ends with Pontius Pilate (23.1–25). In *Acts* (19.21), Paul proclaims, 'I must also see Rome'; the Lord exhorts (23.11), 'As you have testified the things about me to Jerusalem, so must you testify them to Rome also'; Paul's trials before Roman governors occupy much of *Acts*; his travels and voyages end with the words (28.14), 'That was how we came to Rome', as if the goal of all Paul's wanderings, and there the narrative closes (28.31).

43 Momigliano 1992; Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* is relevant.

44 See below p. 90.

Augustus' unhistorical world-wide decree demands investigation. Rather than convict Luke of incompetence, it is better to credit him—as 'literary' scholars would a Classical historian—with purposeful invention.⁴⁵ Clearly, the item contextualises Jesus' birth within Roman, and world, history. Moreover, unnoticed by scholars, Augustus reappears, subliminally, at the end of *Luke-Acts*: the humane Roman centurion in Paul's shipwrecked voyage is '*Julius* of the *Augustan Cohort*' (A. 27.1)—another instance of Rome's 'book-ending' the double-work. Augustus' decree also fulfils a vital narrative and theological function, enabling the Davidic Jesus' prophetic birth in Bethlehem: Augustus is thus an agent of the Christian god;⁴⁶ Romans have a stake here. This functionality, however, does not guarantee virtue, since God can use non-good, even bad, people for good. But Christian apologists could represent Augustus positively.⁴⁷ Were they right? Did they so read Luke? Is another of Augustus' functions to introduce the category of 'the good Roman'? Does 'Julius of the Augustan Cohort' validate Augustus' virtue? Is Augustus the paradigm of 'a good emperor', who does not persecute Christians, indeed, promotes Christianity? Is this possibility strengthened by the presence in the text of the great persecuting emperor Nero, who is referred to, though unnamed, in the speeches of Paul's later trials,⁴⁸ and whose violent, premature death is narratively encoded?⁴⁹

But there are strong negatives. A second main function of Augustus' fictional world-wide decree is to bring the Preface's Christian 'polity' and Rome into direct relationship.⁵⁰ As the Preface already stages a contrast between divine power and human power, that contrast intensifies here. Within the developing text, there can be no doubt that Jesus is Lord (2.11), not Augustus. Roman *power* is further diminished by the Preface's implication that Christianity, not Livy's *History*, not Rome itself, is 'the monument that cannot fall'. Further, the use of the name 'Augustus', the term 'the whole world', and the commonalities of inscription/decreed imagery, of self-identification as Greek historiography, and of imitation of Herodotus (in 'equation' of theme and treatment)⁵¹ bring Augustus' *Res Gestae* and *Luke-Acts* into competition, again to the detriment

45 Moles 2011b: 471.

46 Blumenthal 2011.

47 Millar 1977: 555–66.

48 A. 25.8, 10–11, 21, 26.

49 See below p. 90.

50 Moles 2011b: 471.

51 Moles 2011b: 473; Woodman 2012: 198–200.

of the Roman text, particularly because of their contrasting ultimate visions: *Luke-Acts* raises people *up*, Augustus' *Res Gestae* subjects them.⁵²

Thus the balance tells against a positive reading of Augustus and Rome. Yet the long-range link between 'Augustus' and 'Julius of the Augustan Cohort' raises the *possibility* of better things. Meanwhile, although 'Julius' treats his prisoner Paul humanely and saves the prisoners' lives, he wrongly prefers the captain's advice to Paul's (A. 27.11), so Paul remains the *superior* 'authority figure'.

Joseph takes Mary to Bethlehem: Christians obey imperial decrees. And the aged Simeon's '*nunc dimittis*' eulogises 'my salvation, which you have prepared in the face of all peoples, a light for revelation of the races, and glory of your people Israel' (2.30–2). The Romans are included within 'all peoples' and 'the races'. In *Luke-Acts* any visceral anti-Roman feeling is excluded by the Gentile 'outreach' proclaimed from the start of *Luke* and systematically implemented throughout *Acts*, following the risen Jesus' injunction (1.8); by the category of 'the good Roman'; by exhortations such as Jesus' 'Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you' (L. 6.27), and by the Christian claim that 'God is impartial' as between races (A. 10.34, cf. 15.9).

The Baptist's ministry is validated by a prophecy (3.4–6 = *Isaiah* 40.3–5) announcing further inversions: 'a voice of one shouting in the desert, Prepare the road of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley will be filled, and every mountain and hill will be made low, and the crooked will be made straight, and the rough made smooth, and all flesh will see the salvation of God'. The perspective is again that of inaugurated eschatology. The Romans are necessarily included in the salvific prospectus—'all flesh shall see the salvation of God', and there is no implication that they will *reject* it.

That Romans belong within Luke's 'catchment area' is further indicated by the presence, among the groups who thronged to the Baptist, of Roman soldiers, by their question: 'what shall we too do?', and by John's reply: 'do not shake anyone down or bear false witness and be content with your wages' (3.13–14). This obviously fictional item speaks directly to Roman soldiers and more generally to any Romans seeking reassurance that Jesus' immediate predecessor was no revolutionary but supported good provincial governance and contented soldiers.⁵³ Christian readers are given a 'proof text' of John's (and, consequently, Jesus') peaceful prospectus and confirmation that Romans—even soldiers—can be included within the Christian project. Thereafter, *Luke-Acts* consistently shows Jesus and his followers associating with imperial

⁵² Moles 2011b: 481.

⁵³ Kinman 1993.

functionaries: Jesus enlists Levi the tax-collector among his disciples, fraternizes with tax-collectors (*L.* 5.27–30),⁵⁴ and in Jerusalem dines with Zacchaeus the tax-collector (19.1–30). As sinners (5.30; 19.7), they come under Jesus' salvific prospectus. In a development and intensification of the theme, once the Gentile mission gathers pace, *Acts* emphasizes Peter's and Paul's free association with Romans of status, whether centurions, governors, or Asiarchs. As with 'the most powerful Theophilus', Christianity is 'aiming high' by appealing directly to Roman authority figures: not merely passively responding to them as investigators or instigators of persecution.

Narratively, the soldiers who throng to John anticipate the category of 'good Romans'. The first substantial example comes with the centurion at Capernaum, whose slave Jesus heals (7.2–10).⁵⁵ He seems to be a God-fearer (5), addresses Jesus as 'Lord' (6), recognises Jesus' superior authority (6–8), and prompts Jesus' acclamation (9): 'I say to you: not even in Israel have I found such belief'. The episode marks a significant advance upon the Roman soldiers and John. Being a Roman soldier, even an officer, is no obstacle to responding to Jesus, indeed, to becoming a Christian: 'Jesus is Lord' is a Christian confessional formula. Clearly, the centurion will not stop soldiering; equally clearly, he recognizes that Jesus is superior 'Lord' to Caesar. This centurion's responsiveness to Jesus finds further (surely fictional) expression from another centurion at the crucifixion (23.27): 'And . . . having seen what had been done, [he] praised God, saying: "This man was just indeed"'. The Capernaum episode is further paralleled and developed in *Acts* (10.1–48), in Peter's encounter with the centurion Cornelius, who is a God-fearer, devout and an alms-giver, whose goodness is attested by the whole Jewish nation, and who receives direct prompting from an angel. For his part, Peter learns that Jewish food and cleanliness laws can be suspended in dealings with Gentiles and God is impartial. Cornelius and his household speak in tongues and are baptised. The episode fleshes out the practical implications of the conversion of Roman officers to Christianity.

In a further development (*A.* 13.7–12), the proconsul Sergius Paulus, 'an intelligent man', actively summons the apostles Barnabas and Saul in order to hear the word of God. When a magician tries to turn the proconsul away from the faith, Saul/Paul blinds him and the proconsul believes, thunder-struck at the teaching of the Lord. Again, the gaoler at Philippi (16.16–40) responds to Paul and Silas' miraculous release by intended suicide, is dissuaded by Paul, asks, ambiguously (30), 'Lords, what must I do in order that I be saved?', is baptized

54 That Levi is a tax-collector for Herod Antipas, not Rome, is immaterial (see p. 94).

55 Functionally, *pace* some, he is Roman, even if (which I doubt) Luke envisages Antipas' army.

along with his family, and provides the apostles hospitality. The roll-call continues: Titius Justus, God-fearer, with whom Paul lodges in Corinth (18.7); the Asiarchs, friends of Paul, and city official who restrain Ephesian hostility (19.31, 35); the humane Julius (27.1–43); and the hospitable Publius, Malta's first man (28.7).

Since *Luke-Acts'* functions as exemplary historiography and biography (A. 26.29), these 'good Romans' exemplify for Romans good ways in which they should respond to Christians, the responses ranging from simple kindness to absolute conversion. For Christians, they exemplify the *possibility* of favourable Roman responses, despite the dreadful events of 64 and other occasions, despite the intrinsic problems. The most substantial figures, the centurions in *Luke* and *Acts*, are both also God-fearers, and Luke repeatedly emphasises that (somewhat elastic) identity,⁵⁶ which suggests both direct appeal to 'God-fearer' readers and implicit exhortation to Christian readers to target this category particularly among Romans.

All this positive material about Romans is counterbalanced by constant emphasis, established from the beginning, on eschatological divine justice. John prophesies concerning Jesus (L. 3.17): 'his winnowing fork is in his hand, to clear his threshing floor, and to gather his wheat into his repository, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire'. Thereafter, great emphasis is placed on the Second Coming, with its rewards and punishments (L. 12.35–48; 54–56; 17.24, 30–37; 19.11–27; 21.27–36); Jews and Jewish cities are condemned (10.12–15; 11.29–32; 13.24–28; 21.20–24), in contrast to Gentiles (13.29–30), who must include Romans; all will perish unless they repent (13.3, 5); the just will resurrect (14.14) and be vindicated (18.1–8), or the disciples will be enthroned as judges of Israel (22.30), or everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved (A. 2.20). Sometimes, eschatological divine justice is invoked in contexts of human justice, to the latter's diminishment: Paul proclaims Jesus judge on the Last Day when he is addressing the Areopagus (17.31) and when Roman justice is also on trial, because of earlier political charges against the Christians (17.6–7); the governor Felix grows fearful when Paul dialogues on the judgement to come (24.25).

Divine justice can also be immediate. When the impious Herod Agrippa I ascends the tribunal to announce terms to Tyre and Sidon, 'immediately an angel of the Lord struck him, because he had not given God the glory, and he breathed his last eaten by worms' (A. 12.23). Since the emphasis on his people's acclamation of the king's 'divine voice' evokes Nero, punished for persecution

⁵⁶ Also A. 13.16, 26, 43, 50; 16.14; 17.4, 17.

of the Christians by untimely death,⁵⁷ this episode acquires timeless paradigmatic application to the clash between unjust human power and just divine power. The Apostles have similar power: Peter ‘executes’ the dishonest Ananias and Sapphira (5.5, 10), and Paul blinds the magician before Sergius (13.11). All readers see writ large the perils of resisting the Christian god.

When the narrative turns to Jesus, the Temptation (4.1–13), Jewish-Christian equivalent of the Choice of Hercules,⁵⁸ is readily ‘translatable’ by Gentile readers. The episode is programmatic both for Jesus within the narrative and for readers. It describes ‘all the kingdoms of the world’ as the fiefdom of the Devil, underlining the commandment (*Deuteronomy* 6.13): ‘You will worship the Lord your god and you will serve him alone’ (4.1–8): within the totality of ‘kingdoms’, the Roman empire, Roman ‘kings’ and imperial cult are firmly enrolled ‘on the other side’. The ‘either-or’ choice is emphasised throughout *Luke-Acts*, for example, in the sayings ‘He who is not with me is against me and he who does not gather with me scatters’ (11.23) and ‘No servant can serve two masters’ (16.13), and the terminology sometimes implicates Rome, as in the question ‘what does it profit a man who gains the whole world but loses or punishes himself?’ (9.25), the rival kingdoms of the devil and of God (11.14–23), Peter’s pronouncement ‘and there is salvation in no one else, nor is there any other name under heaven given among human beings in which we must be saved’ (A. 4.12), his application of *Psalms* 2.1 to Jesus’ trial—‘the kings of the earth stood together and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Anointed’ (4.26), and Jesus’ commission to Paul (26.18) ‘open [the Gentiles’] eyes, to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God’.⁵⁹ At the end of *Acts*, readers still face that choice (28.31).

Jesus’ first sustained teaching, the Beatitudes (6.20–37; ‘blessed are you poor, for the Kingdom of God is yours,’ etc.), continues the inversion/subversion of worldly power structures and values, and there are other similar sayings (9.24; 13.30; 14.11; 18.14). Romans could easily read these paradoxical ethics and economics as counter-cultural ‘Cynic’.⁶⁰

In the Temptation of Jesus, ‘the kingdoms of the world’ oppose the kingdom of God—or of Jesus himself, as prophesised by Gabriel. This takes various forms. There is Jesus’ own teaching about the Kingdom,⁶¹ carried on in

57 Klauck 2000: 43–4; Moles 2006b: 91 n. 114.

58 Downing 1988: 15, 23.

59 Pragmatic compromise is rare, e.g. *L.* 6.37; 9.50; cf. also p. 102.

60 Downing 1988: 19–21; Moles 2006a.

61 *L.* 10.9–11; 11.18–20; 22.30.

Acts,⁶² and the Lord's Prayer (*L.* 11.2–4). There is the prostitute who anoints Jesus (7.36–50). Among other implications, one is that Jesus is being 'anointed' as 'Christ' or 'Messiah', such 'anointing' marking Jewish kings, though Luke diplomatically 'pulls his punches' by using the verb ἀλείφω, not χρίω. And, climactically, there is his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when 'the whole multitude of his disciples' hail him (38): 'Blessed is the coming one, the king coming in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven and glory in the highest', and Jesus himself accepts the salutation: when some of the Pharisees ask him to rebuke his disciples, he replies: 'if these are silent, the very stones will cry out'. This, again, is the perspective of 'inaugurated eschatology', of divine 'peace' as opposed to immediate, earthly strife.

As the narrative builds towards 'the Road to Jerusalem', there is strong emphasis on Jesus' prophecies of his death (9.22; 17.25; 18.32). These include mention of Romans: 'The son of man will be handed over to the Gentiles, and will be mocked and violently mistreated and spat upon' (18.32), which duly happens: 'The soldiers also mocked him . . .' (23.36). They also emphasise the persecution of his followers: 'and when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious how or what you answer in defence or say' (12.11); 'They will lay their hands on you and persecute you, handing you over to the synagogues and prisons, dragging you before kings and governors for the sake of my name' (21.12–17). The persecutors include Roman authorities and governors, and 'for the sake of my name' foretells trials of 'Christians' *sub nomine*. Useless to deny that Romans crucified Jesus and sometimes persecuted Christians. Jesus even emphasises that he will cause violent strife (12.49–51): 'I came to cast fire upon the earth . . . Do you think that I came to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division' (body politic metaphor). This disturbing material is offset by the Christological dimension, and there is another level on which Romans could read Jesus' death positively: as a king who heroically sacrifices himself for his people, like Leonidas of Sparta (*Hdt.* 7.220), or Roman generals who 'devoted' themselves to secure victory.

Jesus' prophecies of the destruction of the Temple (19.42–44; 21.5–7, 20–24) have several aspects. There is Jewish failure to recognize Jesus' salvific function and ignorance of how to maintain peace (19.44): the Jewish revolt is prophetically condemned and Christians exonerated. The Romans appear as God's agents, as Augustus had been: further encouragement to Romans. But 'the times of the Gentiles' will yield to the Second Coming. The *eschatological* message for Romans remains the same as Mary's.

62 1.3, 8.12; 19.8, 25, 28.30–1.

Jesus' riposte to the challenge of Jewish spies, 'Give to Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and to God the things that belong to God' (20.25), seems to justify payment of tribute and warrant some sort of wider 'Church-State demarcation', somewhat blurring the polarity 'no man can serve two masters'. Simultaneously, however, it implies sharp questions: *what* things (besides tribute) belong to each? is it not blasphemous that Jews (or Christians) use coins bearing the *image* and inscription ('son of the divine Augustus', *pontifex maximus*) of Gentile/ pagan kings who claimed divinity and made other strong religious claims? Is this not collusion with the imperial cult and the divinisation of humans—collusion already damned in the Temptation narrative and roundly excluded in *Acts*: the death of the impious Herod Agrippa I ~ Nero (12.20–23); Peter's rejection of such addresses by Cornelius (10.25–6); Paul and Barnabas' rejection of the same at Lystra (14.8 ff.); and Paul's rejection of the whole category of 'images' or 'idols' (17.16, 23)?⁶³

The plot against Jesus (22.2 ff.) is initiated by chief priests and scribes; the fictional absence of Roman soldiers at Jesus' arrest (22.47) conciliates Roman readers; only at 23.1 is Jesus brought before Pilate. Romans can read the interim aetiological institution of the Last Supper (22.14–23) as analogous to cult meals in pagan mysteries, especially those of Dionysus, just as they can read Jesus' death and resurrection as parallel to Dionysus'.⁶⁴ The debate about greatness (24–7) inverts worldly values, but Jesus' phraseology ([25] 'the kings of the races lord it over them, and those in authority over them are called benefactors. (26) But not so with you; rather let the greater among you becomes as the younger and the leaders as the server. (27) For which is the greater, the one who lies at table or the server? Is it not the one who lies at table? But I am among you as the server') could be heard by Classical readers as resembling Cynic 'redefinitions' of kingship.⁶⁵ At the arrest Jesus curtails armed resistance by his disciples (22.49–51); later (23.25), '[Pilate] released the one thrown into prison for *stasis* and murder...'; Christianity's commitment to peace is again underlined. There remain the tense ambiguities of Jesus' status as 'Messiah' and 'seated at the right hand of God' (22.67–70), that is, as eschatological king.

Before Pilate, the Jews accuse Jesus of misleading the nation, forbidding tribute to Caesar (untrue), and claiming himself as anointed king. When Pilate asks Jesus if he is the king of the Jews, Jesus sidesteps: 'that's what you say', and

63 28.6, where the Maltesers say Paul is a god without being rebuked, seems to be indulgent characterization of 'philanthropic', credulous people.

64 Generally, Moles 2006b; Seaford 2006: 120–30; Shorrock 2010: 54–55; note *L.* 7.32 (with Moles (2006b: 76), 'trailing' the Dionysus parallel.

65 Höistad 1948.

Pilate finds no fault. Is this alleged 'kingdom' a threat to the Roman empire or Roman rule over Palestine? The answer is: ultimately, most certainly; immediately, ambiguously. The Temptation has already shown that Jesus' kingdom does not involve dramatic physical gestures, and all readers know that Jesus must die. Contextually, Pilate's instant dismissal of such a charge lacks any historical credibility. Luke has already palliated the charge's seriousness by emphasising it more in the entry into Jerusalem. The Jews next accuse Jesus of 'stirring up the people' throughout Judaea. Pilate sends Jesus to Antipas, as being within his jurisdiction; these buck-passings remind readers that, while the Herodians are Jewish (or half-Jewish), they are thoroughly Hellenised and Romanised, and, as client kings, agents of Roman power. In *Luke-Acts* they are categorisable as 'Roman'.⁶⁶ When Jesus remains silent before Antipas' curious questioning and Antipas and his soldiers have mocked and abused him, Antipas returns him to Pilate and the two former enemies cynically become friends. Pilate wants to release Jesus after beating, but under Jewish pressure releases Barabbas and consigns Jesus to crucifixion.

Four obvious points: first, Pilate's repeated conclusion that Jesus has done nothing wrong emphasises Jesus' innocence; second, Pilate, while not faultless,⁶⁷ is unhistorically white-washed; third, 'the Jews' are unhistorically 'black-washed'; fourth, Antipas is portrayed more hostilely than Pilate. The first of these is driven home by the centurion's reaction (23.47). The second and third are Luke's general line.⁶⁸ The second contrasts starkly with Luke's earlier representation of Pilate's bloodthirstiness (13.1). There is much less inconsistency with the earlier representation of Antipas,⁶⁹ sexual sinner, evil-doer, prisoner (3.19) and executioner of John (9.9), would-be killer of Jesus, who calls him 'that fox' (13.31), and gross and heartless sybarite (16.19–31).⁷⁰ Clearly, the first three elements appeal both to Christian and Roman readers.

Acts, focusing on Jesus' followers as well as Jesus himself, both earthly and risen, develops the notion of the Christian community, people, and polity. Romans, already sensitised by Cynic colouring in the representation of Jesus, would naturally read the 'communism' of the Jerusalem community (2.44–6; 4.32–7) as Cynic-like.⁷¹ The Jerusalem decree (15.19–20, 24–29), defining Gentile

66 Similarly, Rowe 2009: 54; Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 71–9.

67 Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 110–14 exaggerates negatives.

68 *L.* 24.20; *A.* 2.22–23, 36; 3.13–15, 17; 5.30; 10.39; 13.27–9; *contra* 4.25 ff. (everybody against Jesus).

69 Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 166–70.

70 Horsley 2011: 147.

71 D.L. 6.72.

Christians' relationship both to Jewish food and purity laws and (partially) to imperial cult, substantiates the 'polity' implications, both political and philosophical, of the Preface. And, climactically (11.26) and brilliantly, 'in Antioch the disciples were first called [χρηματίσαι] Christians'. Precision is needed. *χρηματίσαι* is passive in meaning: other evidence shows that, in the first century, 'Christians' is other people's term: Christians call themselves other things.⁷² The term is intrinsically pejorative, recalling that 'Christ' was executed as a political subversive, that Christians were 'political' and could be prosecuted *sub nomine*. Furthermore, as sounded identically to a word cluster differing only by the vowel 'e' and sometimes itself so spelled, it allows hostile puns ('the so-called "Goodies" are "baddies", "Christians" are "dead", etc.).⁷³ The negatives are on one level operative here, because Luke sandwiches this notice between persecutions (11.19; 12.1). But he registers this first naming of Christ's followers with appropriate historiographical solemnity. Further, within the unity of *Luke-Acts* the notice recalls *L.* 21.17, establishing 'Christians' legitimacy as true followers of 'Christ'.⁷⁴ Further still, Luke subverts the negative associations of the name by the pun (registering the eta spelling): *χρηματίσαι* ~ *Χριστιανούς*: 'Christians' are 'useful': 'Christians' are 'the real thing'. Thus Romans are invited radically to reevaluate 'Christians', Christians to find positives in the term.⁷⁵

Acts also develops the Jesus-Dionysus analogy, to rich and diverse effect: ambiguously characterizing Jesus as a 'new' and, undoubtedly, disruptive divinity; appealing to pagans generally and to Dionysians in particular by the closest parallel to Jesus in the pagan pantheon; boosting *Luke-Acts*' 'Classical' qualities by deft and architectural use of *Bacchae*; and exploiting the Dionysian myth to emphasise alike the tremendous physical powers of the risen Jesus (doubtless contrasting with the bogus Dionysian powers of Roman kings), the ever-present choice between acceptance or persecution of Jesus and his followers, and the recurrent pattern of Christian persecution, divine punishment of the persecutors and Christian liberation.⁷⁶

Saul/Paul unites many themes. Foreshadowed in the Lukan Preface,⁷⁷ and introduced into the narrative as accomplice to the murder of Stephen, first Christian martyr (*A.* 7.58–8.1; 22.20), the 'whoreish' Saulos⁷⁸ becomes lead

72 Tac. *Ann.* 15.44.2; 1st *Peter* 4.16; *A.* 26.28 (p. 98).

73 Karrer 1991: 82–3; Crook 2010: 49.

74 p. 92.

75 *Contra* Rowe 2009: 15.

76 Moles 2006b; Lang 2008: 201–50; 376–77; 382, 385–6.

77 Moles 2013: 111–12.

78 *LSJ* s.v.

Jewish persecutor of the Christians, imitating Pentheus against Dionysus and his followers (8.3; 9.1–2; 22.4–5; 26.9–11). On the Road to Damascus (9.3–9; 22.6–20; 26.12–18), he encounters the risen Jesus himself at his most Dionysian. Jesus reveals that persecution of his followers is the same as persecuting himself; Christians are now further defined: as ‘the body of Christ’: ‘Persecutors, beware!’

Saul/Paul chooses rightly, as, later, does, the Roman gaoler at Philippi, but Herod Agrippa I does not. Paul now finds himself at the receiving end of persecution. A series of episodes both echo Jesus’ own trial and exemplify the trials and prosecutions Jesus prophesised for his followers. Luke’s subtle representations of the complex legalities and power relationships of provincial government have been well studied. I comment briefly.

At Philippi, after Paul exorcises in the name of Jesus Christ the slave girl whose prophesying enriched her owners, the latter accuse Paul and Silas of disturbing the city as Jews and proclaiming customs unlawful for Romans. The crowd joins in, and the magistrates strip, beat and imprison the apostles. After their miraculous release and the gaoler’s positive response, the magistrates order their release and peaceful departure. Paul’s insistence on their proper vindication as Roman citizens (cf. 22.25–29; 25.10–12; 28.17–20) alarms the magistrates, who come and beseech their departure (16.16–40). Several points emerge. The apostles stand out as Jews who (unlike most) ‘make trouble’ by opposing paganism, which often has economic implications;⁷⁹ Christianity is generally assumed to be illegal (cf. 11.26); but the magistrates register the miraculous release and have qualms about rough treatment of Roman citizens (as Jesus was not).

When Gallio, proconsul of Achaia (18.12–17), dismisses the Jews’ ambiguous accusation against Paul (‘this man is trying to persuade people to worship God contrary to the law’) as a matter of ‘word’ and ‘names’ and internal Jewish law, without allowing Paul to speak, the response suits the historical context, but would not have been plausible after 64 (when Christians were persecuted, but Jews were not), still less 70, so does not herein have paradigmatic value. While better than punishment, it is premature, contemptuous of Judaism, and unsubtle (‘word’ and ‘names’ matter, especially in this context).⁸⁰ When ‘all’ the Jews beat up Sosthenes, ruler (presumably Christian) of the synagogue, in front of Gallio’s tribunal, he does nothing. He represents Roman governors with only elementary concern for law, civic or religious, and a short attention span.

79 Similarly, Rowe 2009: 26–7.

80 Similarly, Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 129–31.

In the riot at Ephesus following Demetrius the silversmith's charge that Paul's preaching will harm trade (cf. 16.16) and destroy the temple of Artemis and her worship, there are sharp ironies:⁸¹ Demetrius' demagoguery risks *stasis* and Roman intervention (19.38–40), averted by the Asiarchs, Paul's friends, and the city official; yet Demetrius sees the existential threat posed by Christianity, as they do not (19.37). They represent a particular 'good Roman': well-meaning, humane and public-spirited but, unlike Sergius Paulus, rather unintelligent. Demetrius' picture of the effects of Paul's teaching of course exaggerates greatly: the historiographical narrative is here ideally or futuristically true.

The proceedings in Jerusalem involving the tribune, Claudius Lysias (21.27–23.33), are still more complicated and ambiguous. On the one hand, Lysias calms civil disturbance, saves Paul from death, allows him to address the crowd and Sanhedrin, fearfully recognizes his rights as Roman citizen, releases him temporarily, protects him from renewed Jewish violence and murderous plots, and sends him under escort to Felix the governor, with a letter in which he judges Paul innocent of any charge worthy of death or chains. On the other, he immediately arrests and chains him, examines him by scourging, and when the chains are removed does not finally release him, passing the buck to Felix, taking the same view of the issues as the crass Gallio, and white-washing his own treatment of a Roman citizen. No reader should miss *Lysias'* ironic failure finally to *release* Paul. The *Bacchae* paradigm reinforces a generic contrast between Christian 'freedom' and Roman 'unfreedom'.

Felix (23.33–24.27) also exhibits ambiguities, though rather different ones. After Jewish accusations and Paul's defence, Felix puts them off, 'knowing rather accurately the things about the Road', says he will make a decision when Lysias comes (mutual buck-passing between superior and inferior), ensures Paul's custody be as free as possible, summons Paul and listens to him about belief in Christ Jesus (compare Sergius, contrast Gallio), fears Paul's teaching about justice, self-control and the coming judgement, protracts things in the hope that Paul will bribe him and keeps Paul chained in order to secure favour with the Jews. The general point is clear: Felix has the requisite knowledge, but cannot commit himself, cannot finally treat Paul rightly, cannot become a true Theophilus (24.22 ~ *L.* 1.1–4).

His successor Festus (25.1–26.32) keeps Paul at Caesarea, thwarting a Jewish murder plot, and hears charges against Paul, who asserts his innocence regarding Jewish law, the Temple and Caesar. Wishing to do the Jews a favour, Festus offers Paul trial at Jerusalem, but Paul appeals to Caesar and Festus agrees. The arrival of Agrippa and Berenice prompts him to consult them. Festus asserts

81 Similarly, Rowe 2009: 49.

the Roman tradition of proper trial and, like Gallio, regards the dispute as an internal Jewish matter but again accepts the appeal to Caesar. Agrippa's curiosity (reminiscent of his grandfather's about Jesus [*L.* 23.8]) prompts a further hearing; Paul proclaims Jesus and his conversion within the context of ancestral Judaism. Festus exclaims that Paul is mad, but privately they agree his innocence. Festus seems paradigmatic of three governmental types: those whose conduct is a mixture of good and bad; those who think Christians simply mad; and those who think them innocent. Agrippa's 'verdict' (26.31), 'this man could have been freed, if he had not called upon Caesar', chillingly underlines the double-edgedness of Roman justice.

As for Agrippa, the unexplained introduction of Berenice, the emphasis on 'appearance' (25.23), and the general 'oriental' colouring recall the scandalous incest, rendering the 'whole trial . . . a comedy'.⁸² Both this last Herodian, towards the end of the narrative, and Antipas, towards the beginning, are sexually defiled. And, challenged by Paul to answer his claim that the prophets prove Jesus' messiahship, Agrippa resorts to the sneering 'Roman' sense of the term 'Christian'. Nevertheless, he and the others are not too corrupted to acknowledge Paul's innocence: it is worthwhile to persist in attempting to convert even the very immoral. There is always hope—as Paul himself demonstrated. More, the juxtaposition of sneer and 'verdict' of innocence (26.28, 32) undermines prosecution 'sub nomine': as if Luke answers the dubiety of Roman governors whether to punish Christians for their name or their crimes.⁸³ In Luke's Christian narrative, even so corrupt a character as Agrippa can serve good purposes. The name 'Christian' is now completely decontaminated (cf. 11.26).⁸⁴ Roman readers, aware that in 64 Christians were put to death for being Christians, are encouraged to rewrite the history next time.

The end of the text (28.30–1), one of ancient historiography's greatest, purveys complex and powerful messages:

And he remained there for a whole two years in a private lodging and received all those who came in to him, (31) heralding the kingdom of God and teaching the things about the Lord Jesus Christ with all frankness and unhinderedly.

82 Mason 2005: 164.

83 Plin. *Ep.* 10.96.2.

84 Similarly, Rowe 2009: 132.

Readers know—and have been repeatedly reminded⁸⁵—that just beyond the end of the narrative road in Rome lie Paul's trial before Nero, conviction and death, and the events of 64. The climactic stress on Jesus' Lordship and God's kingdom rings with the start of *Luke* (1.33; 2.11) and commemorates their diametric opposition to the Neronian and Caesarian equivalents.⁸⁶ Paul will suffer a martyrdom like Stephen's (9.16 'I [God] will show him how much he must suffer for my name'), noble and exemplary: that is, precisely, an 'example' that Christians may always have to follow, but which will unite them with Jesus. So, under house arrest and destined for martyrdom, Paul enjoys full 'frankness' and 'unhindered-ness', the earlier Christian Dionysian-style physical 'freeings' now redefined at a far profounder level. Paul's whole protracted 'Road to Rome' in *Acts* (19.21–28.13) parallels Jesus' protracted 'Road to Jerusalem' in *Luke*, and the choice for the Roman reader at the end of that road is the same as at the beginning, in the Temptation of Jesus, as at Jesus' trial, and always: do you persecute Jesus/ the Christians or accept Jesus and become Christian yourself? But it acquires particular force here, through the reminiscences of the original fate of Jesus and the subsequent fate of Paul: need we go through this yet again? Given the plasticity of myth, that question resounds through the later persecution (before the time of writing) of the tyrannical Domitian, divinely punished like Nero, the persecution of Trajan (whose beginnings coincided with the time of writing), of Decius, Diocletian, and the rest.

But there is even tougher theology. Jewish, then Christian, and still Jewish, Paul is also Roman (13.9; 16.37; 22.25–28), and his inclusion, along with Nero, within the Penthean persecutor paradigm makes him also representative of Roman persecutors. So his noble martyrdom is also reparation for his role as persecutor (9.16): persecutors get theirs. But Paul also shows that even the greatest persecutors can become Christians—and great Christians. Legally innocent, Paul also encapsulates another key Lukan claim: Christians' right to protection under Roman law, but, while, as Festus insists, that law is a wonderful thing, it is also a terrible thing, when it condemns and executes innocent Christians. A final twist. Paul knows that he will fail to persuade Nero (9.16, cf. 20.24–25).⁸⁷ Yet go to Rome he must. His 'appeal to Caesar' is one way of 'hitching a ride'. Christians must bear witness, whatever the costs, for themselves or for fellow-Christians. This is a text of steel, demanding the respect of Romans, Paul the greatest of tragic heroes.

85 9.16; 20.17–38; 26.31–2; 27.24.

86 Similarly, Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 159.

87 Moles 2013: 116.

The end comports another dimension. Paul, not in prison but under house arrest, yet discoursing ‘with all frankness’ and ‘unhinderedly’ about ultimate realities, looks not only like Jesus himself but also like Socrates the night before he died. Roman readers are further encouraged to approve of Paul through the comparison not only with Socrates but also with Seneca and the various ‘Stoic martyrs’ of the Empire, especially under the dramatically contemporaneous tyrant Nero and the recent tyrant Domitian. ‘Paulus Socraticus’ crystallizes Christian ‘philosophy’. More: this culminating scene combines with *Acts* 17 to convey Christians’ claim that they—not Epicureans or Stoics or the rest—are Socrates’ true heirs.⁸⁸

Paul also serves to define the relative ‘geometry’ and ‘geography’ of Christianity and Rome. That ‘Saul’ also possesses the Roman name, ‘Paul’, by which he is called for the remainder of the narrative, emerges in his encounter with Sergius Paulus (13.9). ‘Good Roman’ as the latter is, the encounter stages the superiority of divine to Roman justice. Can any reader miss that ‘Paulus’ means ‘little’, that ‘Paulus’ is here the ‘bigger’ man? The pun becomes even sharper when Paul, before Agrippa, Berenice and Festus, ‘testifies both to small and great’ (26.22). The relationship between the ‘great’ of this world and the ‘little’ Christian Paul is absolutely inverted, again recalling Mary’s programmatic Magnificat.

Paul’s climactic (and brilliant) assertion to Agrippa (26.26), ‘this [the whole Jesus story] was not done in a corner’ has a triple function: it inverts the ‘small-great’ relationship geographically: Bethlehem/Judaea is the ‘great’ sphere, not Rome or the empire;⁸⁹ Rome is only superficially, only provisionally, the ‘end’ of the narrative; it extends Christian philosophy’s outreach from the narrow school context to the whole world;⁹⁰ and ‘architecturally’, it signals the supersession of the Temple by the Christification of the ‘temple’ of the world.⁹¹ The first of these implications is further developed when Paul’s shipwreck evokes Aeneas⁹² (another telling ring structure between beginning and end of *Luke-Acts*), the Aenean foundation of Rome (*Aen.* 1.11) superseded by Paul’s ‘refoundation’ of a Christian Rome subservient to a Christian world.

88 Sandnes 1993; Alexander 2006/7: 62–8; Lang 2008: 251–314; 316–337; 344–55; 361–86; 386–407.

89 Chrysostom, *Hom.* 52.4.

90 Malherbe 1985/6: 210, cf. Plat. *Gorg.* 485d.

91 Cf. A. 3.11 (‘This is the stone, the one rejected by you builders, the one that has become the corner-stone’).

92 27.13–14 (winds, sand-bank) ~ *Aen.* 1.102–12.

Paul also provides some mediation between Christianity as both ‘new’ and ‘old’. If the Dionysian Jesus looks ‘new’, as dimly perceived by the Athenian philosophers (17.18–21),⁹³ the last third of *Acts* repeatedly stresses Paul’s Jewishness (21.20–26; 24.14; 28.17). That of course reflects the historical Paul, but it combines with the explicit separate provision for Gentile Christians to convey a continuing truth about Christianity and to give all readers, whether Christian or Roman, reassurance that Christianity is the legitimate fulfilment of Judaism combined with the energizing excitement of ‘the new’.

Paul also defines Christian ‘politics’. There is turmoil in Thessalonica when Jason and other Christians are accused by Jews of ‘standing the world upside down’ (ἀναστατώνσαντες) and ‘acting against the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus’ (17.6–7), which disturbs the crowd and the city rulers. The scene replays Jesus’ own trial in *Luke*. Then both in the Athenian *agora* and before the Areopagus Paul proclaims ‘the standing up’ (ἀνάστασις [17.18, 31]). Similarly, at the start of a long sequence (21.38), Lysias takes Paul as the Egyptian who ‘made an uprising’ (ἀναστατώσας); at the end of the sequence (23.6), Paul claims to be on trial concerning the ‘rising (ἀνάστασις) of corpses’. Again, before Felix, the prosecutor Tertullus alleges that ‘this man sets in motion risings (κινούντα στάσεις) among all the Jews throughout the world’ (24.5), to which Paul responds that he has never been found ‘creating a rising’ (ἐπίστασιν ποιούντα [24.12]), even as he continues to proclaim the ‘rising’ (ἀνάστασις) of both just and unjust (24.15) and of the corpses (24.21). This crucial pun,⁹⁴ unnoticed by scholars, clarifies: Christians are not revolutionaries, but the resurrection ‘revolutionises’ everything throughout the world. And only this *inversion/resurrection/revolution*, with all its implications, produces *security from falling* (L. 1.4)—or divine peace.⁹⁵ Classical readers should admire Luke’s Christian inversion of Thucydides’ *stasis* analyses. All readers should note how the Christian lexicon of ‘standing’ systematically undermines Rome’s boasts of her own ‘standing’ as a ‘state’ and her ‘subjection’ of the world.⁹⁶ And all this fundamentally affects *Luke-Acts*’ ‘stance’⁹⁷ towards Rome.

93 Moles 2006b: 84–5.

94 Moles 2011a: 154–55.

95 10.36; 24.2; Rowe 2009: 152; Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 37.

96 *OLD* s.v. ‘sto’ 14, 15, 16; ‘status’, *m.* 8; p. 88 above.

97 *LSJ* s.v. στάσις, B.I.2.e; 3; *OLD* s.v. ‘status’ *m.* 3.

Conclusions

Luke highlights contradiction.⁹⁸ Christians obey Rome, pay tribute/tax, embrace peace, reject violence, insist on their compatibility with Judaism and with Roman law, decrees, and the Caesars and on their entitlement to Roman legal protection; Romans repeatedly judge Jesus and Paul innocent. But Jesus brings fire and division; Jesus, not Caesar, is Lord and King;⁹⁹ Christian mission repeatedly produces disorder, alike social, political and economic, and alike in Jewish, pagan, Roman and mixed contexts; opponents' accusations, whether Jewish, pagan or Roman, have some purchase; Romans execute Jesus and Paul. Pragmatic obfuscations (rare) and palliations (more substantial but localized) do not erase the contradiction.

Luke represents conflict as inevitable. Christian exclusivist monotheism and pagan polytheism are irreconcilable, polytheists wrong, their gods non-existent. The religious debate could not be acuter, admits only one answer, and is unavoidable. Beyond Judaea, polytheism pervades public space, and has social, economic and political, as well as religious, consequences. All coalesce in the growing imperial cult, which Christians must reject. Christianity proselytises—far more than Judaism or any form of polytheism.¹⁰⁰ Christian mission first targets fellow-Jews, generally unreceptive, defensive of their contrary interpretation of Judaism, and anxious about their own position vis-à-vis Rome and local pagans. Similarly, paganism's apparent pluralist tolerance has its own boundaries¹⁰¹ and economic anxieties. Disorder inevitably results, illimitably, because Christians must 'witness until the ends of the earth', whatever the cost. Rival world empires must collide. 'Witnessing' entails both 'telling' and 'living' the story, hence construction of the Christian life (service, healing, poverty, communism, peace, and partial separatism), inevitably and radically opposed to pagan ways of life and Roman conceptions of power and empire, hence relentless and implacable Christian inversions. The clash of values and authority is elemental. And if pagans misinterpret the 'revolutionary' implications of Jesus' 'resurrection' and kingship, their misinterpretation is largely chronological. For Christianity will win, polytheism lose, the Roman empire, demonic, like all worldly empires, fall, and the Ephesian silversmiths go bust. The eschatological perspective cannot be parked: it is already inaugurated and Christians must cooperate with God in promoting and realizing it.

98 Similarly, Rowe 2009: 54–5.

99 Similarly, Yamazaki-Ransom 2010: 151, 158–60.

100 Rightly, Rowe 2009: 118.

101 *A.* 17.19; Rowe 2009: 168.

But Luke seeks to persuade Romans (and everybody). To the interrelated charges of Christians' causing *stasis*, being revolutionary and being 'new', he makes a range of replies. (1) Disorder is caused by others, as they react with physical hostility to Christian mission. (2) Christians themselves reject revolution and violence (though not the 'divine violence' of Jesus/ God), and embrace peace, so they are entitled to the protection of Roman law, which should have acquitted Jesus and Paul, hence prosecution 'sub nomine' is unjust. (3) Christians participate in Roman life as far as possible (they pay taxes, ply trades, welcome, 'serve' and heal others). (4) Christianity is both profoundly¹⁰² new and profoundly not-new. Jesus is a new manifestation of God, the resurrection a new and decisive event in world history which sets the clock ticking towards 'end times' (A. 3.17–26; 17.30), Christians a new race, and pagans must adopt a new way of life, but Christianity *fulfils ancient* Judaism and Christian eschatology is eternally true. (5) Paradoxically, only Jesus' 'up-rising'/'standing-up' brings *everybody* peace and 'security from falling'. (6) Human unity will be achieved when all the world becomes 'the Christian people'. (God's 'impartiality' is not liberal pluralism, *Roman* unity is rejected.)

Luke's persuasion involves appeal through Roman traditions (literary, philosophical, religious and legal). All should admire his Classicising skills. Positive exemplarities are extended. Clothing Christianity philosophically builds bridges (strictly one-directional) and justifies dogmatism, missionary zeal, and heroism under persecution. Casting Jesus as Dionysian conveys many truths. Aesthetics and exemplarities aside, such appeals are tactical and provisional (good Romans are 'good' if they accept Christianity; the Christian story triumphs over Classical historiography; pagan philosophical schools will close; Dionysus does not exist). It also involves some anti-Jewishness. This also, however unpleasant, is (mainly) tactical: all humans are sinners. It combines the serious stick (the threat of divine justice, immediate and eschatological) with the serious carrot (everybody's need for 'security from falling', guaranteed by Jesus' 'proven' resurrection, promise of universal 'healing' and 'peace'). This persuader is (mostly) unflinchingly honest about the issues and stakes, and essays that most difficult persuasive task: that of maintaining peace and cooperation with the target, while emphasizing fundamental incompatibilities, and arguing the certainty of an outcome which will save the target but which ultimately requires his abandoning practically all defining aspects of his identity except his humanness. Unsurprisingly, Paul did not persuade Nero and his court. But Luke aims to do better.

102 Contrast the trivialising curiosity of Antipas (L. 23.8), Agrippa (A. 25.22) and Athenians (17.21).

It is not naïve to ask of Classical historiography whether, in what senses and to what degree it is true. It is not true that first-century Christians risked their lives, or Romans persecuted, continuously, nor did all Christians take absolutist religious or political stances. To a debatable degree, Luke combines an ‘ideal’ analysis of Christian-Roman relations with ‘true history’. But Classical historiography also probes generals, universals, and futures:

Peter said to him: “Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you. Stand up and make your bed”. And immediately he stood up. And all the inhabitants of Lydda and Sharon saw him, who indeed turned to the Lord (A. 9.34–5).

Peter, of course, like Paul, reached the sick Rome, as all Christian readers (and some Romans) knew. He here heals ‘Aeneas’ in the name of ‘the Healer’; as elsewhere, the healed person’s ‘standing-up’ anticipates (and in a way already instantiates) his final ‘standing-up’ at the Last Days. This is another ‘futuristic’, multi-temporal, indeed, ultra-temporal, historiographical narrative.¹⁰³

Whereas Herodotus (1.5.3–4) ‘knew’ only that human good fortune never remains in the same place and Thucydides (1.1.3; 22.4) could only ‘conjecture’ on the basis of ‘the human thing’, Luke ‘knew’ that his own amazingly ambitious and self-confident text would eventually convert Rome. He proved right. Such was the power of the Christian version of Classical historiography. Luke also ‘knew’ that conversion of Rome was only a step—albeit major—on the eschatological road. That, however, is a story Classicists may leave to theologians. This paper’s conclusion is that *Luke-Acts’* stance towards Rome is radically different from anything in contemporary Greek literature or thought.¹⁰⁴

103 Moles 2011a: 151.

104 The nearest parallels, still very distant, are perhaps Dio’s *Orations* 13 and 36.

Adopting the Emperor: Pliny's Praise-giving as Cultural Appropriation

Roger Rees

Pliny the Younger's speech of thanks to Trajan for the suffect consulship of 100 CE was delivered in the Senate on 1st September; later, Pliny revised and expanded the speech and made it the subject of a private recitation (*Ep.* 3.18.4–5).¹ Unless it underwent further revision, it is likely that this is the version transmitted to us as the *Panegyricus*.² This long and elaborate work has few modern admirers but the feedback his recitation received was very different, if Pliny is to be believed:³ in his letter to Vibius Severus, Pliny tells of the occasion:

cepi autem non mediocrem voluptatem, quod hunc librum cum amicis recitare voluissem, non per codicillos, non per libellos, sed 'si commodum' et 'si valde vacaret' admoniti—numquam porro aut valde vacat Romae aut commodum est audire recitantem—foedissimis insuper tempestatibus per biduum convenerunt, cumque modestia mea finem recitationi facere voluisset, ut adicerem tertium diem exegerunt. 5 mihi hunc honorem habitum putem an studiis? studiis malo, quae prope exstincta refoventur

But I took particular pleasure that when I had wanted to recite this speech to my friends (invited not by notes or letters, but 'if convenient' and 'if you can spare the time'—although the time can never really be spared and it is never convenient to attend a recitation in Rome), and what's more the weather was quite terrible, they came for two days, and

-
- 1 It is not clear that *Epistles* 3.13 and 3.18 refer to the same version. The version which accompanied 3.13 to Voconius Romanus may have been the initial textual version after the live delivery; Sherwin White 1966: 245–6. For some recent discussions of the speech, see Roche 201b, and on the issue of 'versions', esp. Noreña 2011a: 40–41.
 - 2 *Panegyricus* is not Pliny's name for the speech—see below and Rees 2010: 17–18.
 - 3 For modern reactions, see Radice 1968: 169–70, Rees 2001: 150, Moreno Soldevila 2010: lxxiii–iv, Roche 201b: 4.

when my modesty thought to bring the recitation to an end, they insisted I add a third day. Should I think this honour is due to me or to intellectual activity?—to intellectual activity, I think, which is being revived after its near extinction. (Pliny *Ep.* 3.18.4–5)

Readers of his letter collection will be familiar with Pliny's capacity for disingenuousness, and will note, as he cuts his own figure, how he effectively insinuates himself into the new literary climate to be enjoyed under Trajan—*studiis? studiis*.⁴ Nor is Pliny fashioning himself as a maverick but as part of a community of supporters of Trajan who enjoy a good speech—he is amongst *amici*. And if we pause to deconstruct the letter—ostensibly sent to Severus who had clearly missed the recitation and, if correctly identified as non-senatorial, would have been excluded from the original delivery⁵—we might suspect that one function of the letter was to facilitate circulation of the revised text, but that a major ambition of the letter's publication was to seek to control the speech's wider reception by intimating the reception it had enjoyed to date.⁶

We have no details about the guest list at the recitation; nor can we know how accurate an account of events Pliny is giving, and given the disparity in enthusiasm for the speech between the Trajanic and modern eras, we might wonder about these allegedly enthusiastic and supportive *amici*. But if we put aside the scepticism that is prompted by the likelihood that Pliny had much to gain from his speech's reputation, and accept the 'fact' of this private, well-attended, extended recitation in Rome, who do we imagine can have been there? And what could their sensibilities and interests be such that they would give up so much time to hear Pliny recite his work?⁷

It is well known that in socio-economic terms, the group to whom Pliny's speech would have most appealed would, no doubt, have been senatorial, since it is their political perspective that the *Panegyricus* represents.⁸ For example,

4 Henderson 2002: 20–1, 141–51; Gibson and Morello 2012: 23–7.

5 Sherwin-White 1966: 307.

6 We do not know if Vibius Severus appreciated the copy of the speech; see Marchesi 2008: 205; see also 3.13, with Gibson and Morello 2012: 242–3.

7 Marchesi 2008: 198–205 discusses connections between 3.18 and 4.28, which is also addressed to Severus. On the prosopography and socio-economic status of Pliny's friends, Syme 1960, 1968, 1985a.

8 Hammond 1938; Durry 1938: 21–4; Syme 1938: 223; Radice 1968: 168–71; Leach 1990: 37; Morton Braund 1998: 62; Seelentag 2004; Rönning 2007; Roche 2011b: 16–17.

at the speech's outset, Pliny casts it as the Senate's brief that he is fulfilling in addressing Trajan (4.1); the senatorial rank is first named as the group to be embraced by Trajan on his return to the city (23.1); and Trajan's respect for senatorial protocols is variously and elaborately extolled (56–7, 60–3, 65–6, 69, 71, 77–8). So we might assume that the *amici* who so enjoyed Pliny's recitation of the revised version were themselves senators (actual or wannabee), or sympathetic to the senatorial order.⁹ But, as I hope to show in this chapter, this can be taken further. I shall argue that prosopographical details, Pliny's epistolary and rhetorical manoeuvres, and a sense of the ethnic-cultural rather than socio-economic profile of Pliny's audience/s combine to suggest some deliberate posturing on his behalf in his praise of Trajan. With different versions and different circumstances and media of reception, the sceptical critic would have no difficulties imagining that Pliny tailored aspects of each version of his speech to better win the approval of its particular audience/readers;¹⁰ but if we take him at his published word, and accept that the transmitted version is different to the original principally in terms of scale (*spatiosus et uberius*, 3.18.1), we can set the speech against the range of ethnic-cultural groups represented across the different contemporary audiences/readers to consider the possibility that that aspect of personal identity is likely to have determined or influenced the approval or otherwise that the speech met in Trajanic Rome. It is, of course, only a single text (albeit a big one), but taken in its performance- and publication- contexts, the relationships it seeks to fashion between various constituencies of Rome's political classes reveal not only an individual's ambition to further his own reputation and influence, but also the bold and coercive means by which he could pursue that goal. I turn first to those whom Pliny names.

Trajan, of course, was of Spanish birth and, if the assumption is safe that he gave his approval to the ideological content of his coin issues, was happy to be known to be from Spain.¹¹ Voconius Romanus, the recipient of *Letters* 3.13 and a

9 Voconius Romanus, the recipient of the other letter about the speech (3.13), seems to Sherwin White to have been made a senator by Trajan; 1966: 173–4, 177–80, 245, 563; cf. Eck 2000: 220–1 with bibliography, following Syme 1960: 365, that he did not become a senator. If Pliny's petition to Trajan had failed (like an earlier appeal to Nerva), would *Epistles* 10.4 have been published? On the prominence of social rank in Pliny's *Epistles*, see Méthy 2007: 64–74.

10 On the 'long chain of intermediate reproductions', see Marchesi 2008: 203; on the reception of the speech in later antiquity see Rees 2011a and Gibson and Rees 2013.

11 E.g. the HERCULES GADITANUS series of c.100 CE; Morton Braund 1998: 67.

(revised?) text of the speech, was also Spanish. In a letter to Priscus, Pliny invokes the moral associations of Voconius' Spain as part of his recommendation of him (*scis quod iudicium provinciae illius quanta sit gravitas*, 'you know that province's good judgement, and great dignity', *Ep.* 2.13.4).¹² A connection between the regional and the ethical was a familiar rhetorical conceit, recommended in treatises such as that of Quintilian, one of Pliny's own professors.¹³ But in Pliny's other surviving letter of recommendation of Voconius Romanus, no connection is made between his Spanish origin and his moral qualities—in fact Spain is not mentioned at all (*Ep.* 10.4). Intriguingly, in addition to the fact that Pliny knew of but chose not to deploy the ethnic-ethnic association, this petition for Voconius was made to Trajan, a fellow Spaniard. What one says in recommendation of someone can vary over time, of course, but also according to who is listening. Now, we can only speculate as to why Pliny thought Voconius' Spanishness could usefully be invoked before Priscus but not before the Spanish emperor—did some brand of stereotyping regionalism or colonialism inform Pliny's relationship with Priscus, perhaps?—but whatever the underlying prejudices and sensibilities, we can suspect their conscious exploitation by Pliny. Orientation towards ethnic-cultural identity would be part of his self-definition and political negotiation.

A more marked example of the absence of this conceit concerns Trajan himself. In a speech of praise to the Spanish emperor Theodosius in 389, the Gallic orator Pacatus Drepanius devoted a whole chapter to the virtues of Spain, such as its climate, mineral reserves and famous sons, including Trajan and Hadrian (*Panegyrici Latini* II(12)4). Pacatus Drepanius knew Pliny's speech and probably anthologised it, but the element of *laudes Hispaniae* is his innovation, for no such equivalent exists in Pliny's speech to Trajan.¹⁴ That is, although the speech was expanded to extraordinary length and Trajan was the first non-Italian emperor, Pliny makes no reference to his home country. Again, the motivation for and effect of this silence are matters for speculation, but the issue was surely keen, especially among the senators of Spanish origin whose numbers had been growing for several decades and would no doubt have been in the Senate House to hear Pliny's speech. Was Pliny trying quietly to circumvent the challenge posed to him as orator by Trajan's adoption?¹⁵ Would Spanish

12 Sherwin-White 1966: 176–8.

13 Quint. *Inst.* 3.7.10, also Cic. *De Inv. Rhet.* 2.177, *Part. Orat.* 74, Men. *Rhet. Basilikos Logos* 369–70, Theon 2.110–11. Rees 2007 on epideictic rhetoric in letters of recommendation, inc. Pliny *Ep.* 1.14.4, and 7.22.2.

14 On Pacatus and Pliny, see Rees 2013.

15 Innes 2011: 81.

senators have felt short-changed or snubbed that their fellow-countryman's origins were not being lavishly worked over in elegant words? Vibius Severus, the recipient of *Letters* 3.18 and a revised text, was probably from northern Italy (like Pliny), and so perhaps more likely to collude in rather than be the object of any rhetorical-political manipulation by Pliny on cultural grounds.¹⁶ But what of the other, unnamed audience for the speech?

If Voconius was in the Senate House on September 1st, he would have seen a far more culturally diverse group of fellow senators than would have been the case a few decades earlier.¹⁷ In addition to the Spaniards and Gauls who had featured in the Senate since Nero's reign, in recent years more Greeks had taken up senatorial positions, and by the time of Hadrian's accession, a wide base of Greek senators would be firmly established.¹⁸ Given his inconsistent and surprising deployment of Spanishness as rhetorical leverage, analysis of Pliny's orientation to 'Greekness' in his address to Trajan should cast further light on the role of cultural affiliation in elite political display.

In his letter collection, Pliny's displays of philhellenism are conspicuous, many and various: he characterises in affectionate terms Euphrates, a philosopher in Rome (1.10);¹⁹ he mentions a Greek tragedy he wrote as a teenager (7.4.2), and his enthusiasm for translation between the two languages (7.9.1); he enjoys the Greek poetry of his Latin speaking friend Arrius Antoninus (4.3); Terentius Junior is admired for his facility in Latin and Greek (7.25.3–4); Greece is represented as the origin of all civilisation (*humanitas*) (8.24.2);²⁰ he uses Greek words and technical terminology (eg. 1.2.4, 1.5.15, 10.10.1, 10.65.2);²¹ he cites Greek authors and quotes from Greek literature (eg. 1.2.2, 1.7.1, 1.18.4, 1.20.4, 17ff., 5.20.8, 8.2.8, 9.1.3, 9.13.20, 9.26.6ff). Deane counted up 55 letters with Greek references to 37 different recipients (including Trajan), and concluded 'the evidence is sufficient to show that Pliny shared the traditional respect of the Roman aristocracy for the genius of the Greeks and the expressive qualities of the Greek language'.²² Galimberti Biffino observes that across the format

16 Sherwin-White 1966: 307. For the publication date of the revised version, see Woytek 2006, rejected by Moreno Soldevila 2010: xxxviii.

17 See n.9. Did Voconius ask for a copy of the speech (*exigenti* 3.13.3) because had enjoyed Pliny's performance or because he had missed it?

18 Tac. *Ann.* 11.23–5; Syme 1958: 510–11; 1982b and 1987; Eck 2000: 218–20, and n.23 on the controversy about whether the greatest expansion was under Domitian or Trajan, see Madsen 2009: 62–3.

19 Sherwin-White 1966: 108.

20 Galimberti Biffino 2007: 287–9.

21 Venini 1952.

22 Deane 1918: 54.

of a letter-collection—lacking certain articulation and coherence—it can be difficult to trace a balanced and organic pattern in Pliny towards Greek literature and high culture, but that a general attitude can be identified which chimes with the intellectual pretensions of his readers.²³

Also, of relevance to his speech to Trajan is that Pliny was a self-confessed fan of Greek oratory. The names of Demosthenes, Aeschines, Lysias and Isocrates, are dropped in his letters, with Demosthenes his particular favourite (1.2.2, 6.33.11, 7.30).²⁴ His *Letters* also show that his enthusiasm for Greek oratory was not confined to a canon inherited from classical Athens; in 2.3, for example, Pliny describes in gushing admiration the virtues of Isaeus composing and delivering extemporaneous speeches, in Greek, in Rome.²⁵ Furthermore, epideictic oratory—that is panegyric and invective—was Greek in origin and it is identified as such in various Latin discussions, from the Republic through to late antiquity.²⁶ There was, it seems, in various versions, a tendency towards an insistence among Latin authors, to identify praise-discourse as a Greek cultural invention, for which Roman society had no, little or at least different outlets.²⁷ And a further factor which might have heightened Pliny's awareness of an anticipation of Greek associations in his speech to Trajan was the Greek tradition of kingship theory. This genre of political philosophy had flourished in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, but in Rome in 100 CE the exponent of Greek kingship theory to spring most immediately to mind is likely to have been Dio Chrysostom, recalled to Rome after exile under Domitian, and the author of four surviving treatises on kingship, delivered it seems directly to Trajan.²⁸

But on the other hand, it is notable that not one single letter by Pliny is addressed to a Greek, and as Greg Woolf has shown, in the letters 'Greekness' could inflect in short order to signify either sophistication or decadence

23 Galimberti Biffino 2007: 285–7.

24 Galimberti Biffino 2007: 294–5.

25 Whitton 2013: 89–90.

26 'It rarely appears in our society' (*raro accidit in vita*, *Ad Herennium* 3.15); 'we [Romans] are little accustomed to employing panegyric' (*nos laudationibus non ita multum uti solemus*, Cic. *De Or.* 2.341); Quintilian distinguishes between Greek and Roman use of demonstrative oratory (display v practical, 3.7.1–2); see also 'most [panegyrics] discuss the interests of Greece' *plerumque de utilitatibus Graeciae loquuntur*, 3.4.14; Morton Braund 1998: 53–4; 2009: 19–21.

27 Morford 1992: 583; Rees 2010: 14–21; Rees 2011b: 85–8.

28 Jones 1978; Moles 1990; Madsen 2009: 107–119.

(or other things, no doubt): at the end of a letter to Sempronius Rufus, Pliny concludes that the Greek-style games at Vienne and those at Rome had infected citizens' morals (*mores . . . infecerat*) (4.22.7).²⁹ Characterisation as 'Greek' or philhellenic could be damning, in both private and public contexts. Juvenal's famously sexist harangue turns racist too when the taste for Greek traits, including language, among Italian females is viciously condemned (6.184–199). The philhellenism of the emperors Nero and Domitian was an easy shorthand for their condemnation by Pliny's friend Suetonius, writing his imperial biographies about the same time:³⁰ on his return to Rome after a tour of Greece, Nero is disparagingly described wearing a Greek cloak (*chlamys*) and an Olympic crown on his head (*vita Neronis* 25.1);³¹ nor is there any mistaking the critical tone when Suetonius details the Greek-style Capitoline Games in Rome which Domitian launched in 86;³²

instituit et quinquennale certamen Capitolino Iovi triplex, musicum, equestre, gymnicum, et aliquanto plurimum quam nunc est coronarum. certabant enim et prosa oratione Graece Latineque, ac praeter citharodos chorocitharistae quoque et psilocitharistae; in stadio vero cursu etiam virgines. certamini praesedit crepidatus purpureaque amictus toga Graecanica capite gestans coronam auream

He also established quinquennial Games for Capitoline Jupiter, with three dimensions, music, riding and gymnastics, and with many more prizes than nowadays. For they competed in Greek and Latin prose oratory, and as well as lyre-players, there were lyre choruses and soloists; in the stadium, there were running races for maidens. He presided at the Games, in [Greek] sandals, cloaked in a purple toga of Greek style, and wearing a golden crown on his head. (Suet. *Dom.* 4.4)³³

In respect of praise discourse in particular, examples from a wide chronological range show that at its most extreme, Latin characterisation of 'praise'

29 Woolf 2006. Whitton 2013: 90 'P. is no philhellene *tout court*'.

30 Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 186–9.

31 Warmington 1969: 108–22; on contempt in Juvenal for Greek clothing and accoutrements in contemporary Roman life see Rudd 1986: 184–92.

32 Coleman 1988: xvii; Jones 1996: 42; Woolf 2006: 172–4.

33 Text from Jones 1996; see Jones 43–4 on Domitian's choice of clothing.

as Greek in origin could refract into racist shorthand, to present Greeks as flatterers and liars.³⁴ In Rome, ‘Greekness’ could signal different things at different times, and so, as Pliny rose to deliver his speech to Trajan before a senate featuring Greeks, the cultural polemics of political praise were surely delicately poised.

Less delicate were the remarks about Greek influence on Roman oratorical culture made by a character in the *Dialogus de oratoribus* of Pliny’s friend Tacitus. Perhaps published c.102 but with a dramatic date of 75, the *Dialogus* is set in the house of Curiatus Maternus and, in the mouths of a small cast, stages a series of opinions about the contemporary state of Latin oratory.³⁵ The dialogue’s opening premise (1.1) is that oratory had declined, and in his closing contribution Maternus himself attributes that to the constitutional change from Republic, where there were multiple opportunities for public oratory, to Monarchy where one individual’s supreme wisdom (*sapientissimus et unus*, 41.4) rendered oratory unnecessary.³⁶ The sincerity and conclusiveness of the particular interlocutors’ arguments are points of academic contention, but their plausibility within their dramatic setting is manifest, and it is in this context that an attitude expressed by Vipstanus Messalla has application to the question of Greek influence on contemporary Roman oratory. Messalla narrates how in earlier times the sons of Roman nobles had been entrusted to their mothers for their early education, whether their ultimate career would be in the army, law or oratory (28.4–6). This heyday of moral instruction at the heart of the natural family is then contrasted with current practice:

at nunc natus infans delegatur Graeculae alicui ancillae, cui adiungitur unus aut alter ex omnibus servis, plerumque vilissimus nec cuiquam serio ministerio accommodatus. horum fabulis et erroribus virides statim et rudes animi imbuuntur

But nowadays, a newborn son is delegated to some Greekling slave-girl, accompanied by one or other from all the slaves, generally the cheapest and not suited to any serious service. By their stories and delusions, their young and tender minds are immediately imbued. (Tac. *Dial.* 29.1)

34 E.g. Cicero on *iudicales laudationes* from Greeks, *Flac.* 9–10, Rees 2011b.87; Juv. 3.86; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 1.15.13 and Isid. *Etym.* 6.8.7, Rees 2010: 15–16.

35 On the question of the date of the *Dialogus* see Murgia 1980, Mayer 2001: 22–27, Edwards 2008; and Woodman 2009 and Whitton 2012.

36 Bartsch 1994: 101–25.

The identification of the slave-girl as Greek and the pejorative use of the diminutive *Graeculae* are clearly racially motivated;³⁷ in fact, so arrant is the anti-Greek sentiment that it is easy to forget that these remarks take their place in a dialogue about decline in oratory. But no matter how unjustified or offensive, Messalla's remark serves as a useful temperature gauge when considering Greek elements in Pliny's speech to the first Spanish emperor.

The speech, which Pliny did not refer to as the *Panegyricus* (a Greek word)³⁸ contains no Greek and, with very few exceptions, there are no nods to the Greek world—no Grecisms of syntax, no Greek citations, quotations, tags, or loan-words, and no references to Greek history, geography or culture.³⁹ Unsurprisingly perhaps, the exceptions to Pliny's apparently deliberate avoidance of things Greek are instructive. Allusions to Hercules feature twice (14.5, 82.7), according to Innes 'a delicate hint that Trajan will earn deification.'⁴⁰ The context for the first explicit reference to the Greek world is a discussion of Trajan's involvement in military training and, in particular, how this marks an improvement on received practice:

postquam vero studium armorum a manibus ad oculos, ad voluptatem a labore translatum est, postquam exercitationibus nostris non veteranorum aliquis, cui decus muralis aut civica, sed Graeculus magister assistit quam magnum est, [unum] ex omnibus patrio more, patria virtute laetari, et sine aemulo ac sine exemplo secum certare, secum contendere

After interest in weapons passed from practising by hand to watching, to amusement from hard-work, after the one attending our exercises was not one of our veterans, decorated with the mural or civic garland, but some little Greek instructor, how great it is that out of everyone one man delights in the country's custom, the country's virtue, and without rival and without example, competes with himself, vies with himself. (*Pan.* 13.5)

As with Messalla's trajectory of oratorical decline, caused or at least characterised by the typical influence of the *Graecula* (Tac. *Dial.* 29.1), so too Pliny

37 Mayer 2001: 97.

38 Rees 2010; Innes 2011: 67; Hostein 2012: 50–4.

39 Gamberini 1983: 459–60.

40 Innes 2011: 82; see also Hekster 2005: 205–10.

associates an aspect of cultural decline with a *Graeculus*, whose deleterious effects Trajan has managed to reverse. But the similarity in the arguments should not blind us to the two very different contexts in which the anti-Greek sentiments were pronounced: Messalla's dramatic context was a private conversation in a friend's bedroom; Pliny addressed the Senate. Pliny's rhetorical force derives from the insistence on the political progress made since the dark days of Domitian (*postquam... postquam*), one of the speech's many examples of the figure of comparison being used to engineer praise. Comparison is standard fare in epideixis, and criticism of the dead is often delightfully risk-free, but the apparently racially motivated slur in *Graeculus magister* is more sinister, given the presence of Greeks among Pliny's senatorial audience.⁴¹ The orator has gone out of his way to flavour the potentially harmonious 'the present v. the past' model with a sour anti-Greek note that must have been divisive—and quite possibly surprising—in performance context. The effect of this posturing is perhaps better calibrated when considered together with the passage's characterisation of Trajan who is said to take pleasure in *patrio more, patria virtute*.⁴² The 'country' here can hardly be Spain, which nowhere features in the speech, but the polyptoton anticipates Pliny's discourse on Trajan's allegedly reluctant acceptance of the title *pater patriae* ('father of the country', *Pan.* 21). Pliny's praise claims Trajan for a country which marginalises Greeks.

An awkward and contrived argument provides the setting for the second example of Greek material in the speech. The subject is the different attitudes Trajan, Nerva and Domitian had held towards popular entertainment. The difficulty for Pliny is that Trajan and the (unnamed) Domitian had pursued the same policy:

41 Gamberini 1983: 459–60, 487. nb the contemptuous tone of the diminutive *Graeculus* at Cic. *De Or.* 1.47, 102, 221; Tac. *Dial.* 3.4; Juv. 3.78, 6.186; *Pan. Lat.* XII(9)6.1; Moreno Soldevila 2010: 20. On criticism of the dead, see Flower 2013: 59.

42 Henderson 2011: 156–7. cf. Martial *Ep.* XII.9, where the (Spanish) poet thanks the (Spanish) emperor for sending in the person of the governor Palma, his own welcome *mores* to Spain. A comparison between the *Panegyricus* and the eleven late antique speeches with which it was anthologised offers further instruction on this point: Pacatus Drepanius both celebrates Theodosius' Spanish origin (*Pan. Lat.* II(12)4) and contains multiple references to Greek culture (e.g. Alexander the Great 8.4, Spartan gymnasia 13.4, Pinthias and Damon 17.1, Charybdis 26.4, Megaera 35.1, the Dioscuri 39.4); Menander Rhetor recommends comparative material be drawn from 'Roman emperors and generals, and most respected Greeks' *Basilikos Logos* 37; Flower 2013: 44–9.

obtenuit aliquis, ut spectaculum pantomimorum populus Romanus tolli pateretur; sed non obtenuit, ut vellet. rogatus es tu, quod cogebat alius, coepitque esse beneficium, quod necessitas fuerat. neque enim a te minore contentu, ut tolleres pantomimos, quam a patre tuo, ut restitueret, exactum est. utrumque recte: nam et restitui oportebat, quos sustulerat malus princeps; et tolli restitutos. in his enim, quae a malis bene fiunt, hic tenendus est modus, ut appareat, auctorem displicuisse, non factum. idem ergo populus ille aliquando scenici imperatoris spectator et applausor, nunc in pantomimis quoque aversatur et damnat effeminatas artes, et indecora saeculo studia

Somebody secured the Roman people's toleration of the cancellation of pantomimes, but he did not secure their will. What another used to enforce was requested of you, and what had been an obligation began to be a benefit. For no smaller a consensus lobbied you to cancel pantomimes than had lobbied your father to reinstate them. In both cases it was right; for it was right to reinstate what a bad emperor had taken away, and to cancel what had been reinstated. For when good things are done by bad men, the principle must apply that the author of the deed be seen to be crossed, not the deed itself. Therefore, the same public who watched and applauded a theatrical emperor are now opposed to pantomimes as well, and condemn effeminate arts and literature unworthy of the age. (*Pan.* 46.1–4)

Pantomimoi, in which myth narratives were performed in dance to musical accompaniment, was a Greek cultural import (spearheaded by Pilades of Cilicia and Batilus of Alexandria), and its best known practitioners were Greek.⁴³ As with his appeal to racial and cultural prejudice in his reference to the *Graeculus magister*, Pliny seems consciously to elaborate praise of Trajan by demonstrating his distance from Greek practice. However, the inescapable fact that both Domitian and Trajan banned pantomimes ruled out any simple differentiation of the two emperors, and given Domitian's policy, pantomime's roller-coaster fortunes might have been more easily passed over in silence.⁴⁴ Hence the need for Pliny's contrived argument. In addition to his insistent claim for Domitian's tendency towards compulsion (*cogebat; necessitas*)⁴⁵ the

43 See *pantomimus* in *RE* (Wüst); Friedländer 1928: II.100–117; Durry 1938: 154; Jory 1981; Moreno Soldevila 2010: 59.

44 On Domitian banning pantomimes, Suetonius *vita Domitiani* 7.1; Jones 1996: 63–4.

45 Recalling *Pan.* 1.6.

popular associations as well as the intrinsic nature of *pantomimus* culture in Rome allow him further to vaunt Trajan by opposing his reign with another imperial hate-figure. Nero would be *ille scaenicus* ('that theatrical one') to his enemies in Tacitus' *Annals* as well as to Pliny, in neither case to the last Julio-Claudian's credit;⁴⁶ Pliny's quiet slippage from Domitian to Nero and from *pantomimus* to theatre seems irrigated by the principle that to Hellenise is to demonise.

The theatricality of contemporary oratory was something Tacitus' Messalla condemns in the *Dialogus* (with its dramatic date of 75 CE). Messalla clearly states his preference for the oratorical styles of the generation before Cicero over those of the early imperial period, before commenting on current practice:

malim hercule C. Gracchi impetum aut L. Crassi maturitatem quam calamistros Maecenatis aut tinnitus Gallionis adeo melius est orationem vel hirta toga induere quam fucatis et meretriciis vestibus insignire. neque enim oratorius iste, immo hercule ne virilis quidem cultus est quo plerique temporum nostrorum actores ita utuntur ut lascivia verborum et levitate sententiarum et licentia compositionis histrionales modos expriment; quodque vix auditu fas esse debeat, laudis et gloriae et ingenii loco plerique iactant cantari saltatique commentarios suos⁴⁷

By god, I would prefer the forcefulness of Gaius Gracchus or the richness of Lucius Crassus to Maecenas' curling-tongs or Gallio's jingles, so much better it is to dress oratory in a shaggy toga than to make it stand out in a harlot's red dress. For that's not an oratorical manner—by god, it is not even manly—that most of today's lawyers adopt, so that they copy actors' rhythms with their lewd words, their slight thoughts and their licentious arrangements; and what scarcely ought to be heard, instead of praise and glory and intellect, they generally boast that their model speeches are sung and danced. (Tac. *Dial.* 26.1–3)

The passage appears before Messalla's explicit condemnation of the *Graecula ancilla* (29.1), but its cultural preferences clearly anticipate that racist outburst. The power of Gracchus' and Crassus' oratory consists in its plainness,

46 Tac. *Ann.* 15.59; Henderson 2011: 162.

47 Following the text of Mayer 2001; see *ad loc.* for *commentarios suos*.

characterised by association as manly, unpretentious and indigenous; and the effeminate, venal, tainted contrast is essentialised in the image of Greek curling-tongs, a metaphor for over-embellished oratory also found in Cicero's *Orator*.⁴⁸

Pliny's willingness to elide different arguments and details in a general wash of anti-Greek sentiment is confirmed a few chapters later when he compares imperial praise under Trajan and Domitian. By this point in the speech the theme is well-worn (see, for example, *Pan.* 2.1–3), but its rehearsal after mention of the banning of pantomimes proves particularly effective. In this passage, Pliny contrasts the social contexts of praise-giving under the two emperors:

et quis iam locus miserae adulationis manebat ignarus, cum laudes imperatorum ludis etiam et commissionibus celebrarentur, saltarentur, atque in omne ludibrium effeminatis vocibus, modis, gestibus, frangerentur? sed illud indignum, quod eodem tempore in senatu et in scaena, ab histrione et a consule laudabantur. tu procul a tui cultu ludicras artes removisti. seria ergo te carmina, honorque aeternus annalium, non haec brevis et pudenda praedicatio colit: quin etiam tanto maiore consensu in venerationem tui theatra ipsa consurgent, quanto magis de te scaenae silebunt

And what place remained free from wretched adulation, when praise of emperors was celebrated even in games and competition-speeches, danced and broken down into all manner of effrontery, with effeminate voices, manners, gestures? But it was shameful that at the same time in the senate and on the stage, they were praised by an actor and a consul. You have distanced the trivial arts far from the honours paid to you. Therefore, serious poetry and the everlasting dignity of historiography honour you, not this fleeting and shameful heralding; in fact, the greater the concord with which the theatres will rise to venerate you, the greater will be the theatrical scenes' silence about you. (*Pan.* 54.1–2)

The rhetoric is carefully choreographed; in the first two sentences, Pliny's outrage at the equivocation of political and theatrical discourses under Domitian is

48 *Orat.* 78–79.

underscored by couplets and catalogues, his disdainful tone prominent in sneering phonetic play (*laudes... ludis... ludibrium... laudabantur... ludicras*), the effect conspicuously impressionistic (*laudes... celebrarentur, saltarentur... frangerentur*); unflinchingly, the rhetorical movement is towards a contrast, which is delivered with *tu procul*... after which adjectives (*seria... aeternus... non .. brevis et pudenda*) sustain the ideological weight before the expansive closing expression seals the argument that Trajan's excellence is reflected in the dignity of the cultural contexts in which he is praised, just as the tawdry setting for flattery of Domitian mirrored his vices.⁴⁹ And as if the rhetorical conceit of contrast (with Trajan) was not sufficiently damning of Domitian, by accumulating lexical echoes from chapter 46 (given above), Pliny cleverly elides this withering characterisation of Domitianic praise-giving with the pantomime culture Trajan had outlawed—despite the fact that Domitian had outlawed it as well.⁵⁰ Further to assert the equivalence between Domitianic praise-discourse and pantomime are the unusual verb *salterentur* (for which, compare the similarly metaphorical use of *saltari* by Tacitus, *Dial.* 26.3 above), since dance was the defining activity of the pantomime, and *histrion*, which can be a synonym for *pantomimus*.⁵¹ So although Pliny cannot deny that Domitian banned the pantomimes, he manages to damn him anyway, by folding Nero into his treatment and by triggering pejorative lexical associations: and, of course, underlying both pantomime culture and Domitian's Capitoline Games is their essential Greekness. At the same time, in contrast to Domitian, the appropriate media for celebration of Trajan's reign are serious 'poetry' and 'historiography'. This pairing was perhaps to be the inspiration for Pacatus Drepanius in the close of his speech to Theodosius nearly 300 years later (*a me argumentum poetica a me fidem sumet historia*, 'from me poetry will take its argument, from me history-writing will take its reliability', *PanLat* II(12)47.6), but if so, it is notable that that Gallic orator adopted terms derived from Greek, *poetica* and *historia*: notably, consistent in his insistence on the seriousness and sincerity of discourse about Trajan, Pliny uses the Latin terms *carmina* and *annales*.

49 On the rhetorical movement, Henderson 2011: 162–3; on *adulatio* as denoting flattery, Rees 2010: 12–13.

50 For *scaenici* 46.4, *effeminatas, artes* 46.5 cf *in scaena, effeminatis* 54.1, *artes* 54.2; also comparable are *indecora* 46.5 and *indignum* 54.1. On Pliny 'having it both ways', see Maguinness 1933: 117–24.

51 On dancing in pantomime, Lucian *Salt.* 34; Friedländer 1928.II: 100–117; on *histrion* *TLL* 6.2844.81ff; Friedländer 1928.II: 109; Jones 1996: 63.

Considered in isolation, Pliny's orientation towards Greekness in the *Panegyricus* seems uncomplicatedly abrasive, but political rhetoric does not function in a vacuum, and given the wealth of information available about Pliny's self-fashioning (particularly in his *Letters*) and the varied ethnic/cultural profile of Trajanic Rome, the speech's attitude towards the relationship between power and ethnicity reveals a considered move to draw up lines of exclusion and association which would have meaningful consequences.⁵² From his *Letters*, we know Pliny to have had some philhellenic traits and Greek friends;⁵³ we know too that Trajan was favourable towards aspects of Greek culture. A virulently anti-Greek attitude in his speech might have been a powerful means of demonising Domitian, but it could also have lost Pliny friends and influence. Instead, Pliny is more discrete. He avoids rank racism—he is no Umbricius—and so could plausibly deny xenophobic intent. But in his suggestive association of Domitian (and, to a lesser extent, Nero) and Greekness, we can perhaps detect an attempt to promote a model of leadership which is consciously hyper-Roman.

A distinct attraction of this strategy to Pliny, if correctly identified, would be that it allowed him to align his own rhetorical-literary project closely with the Trajanic regime within which he hoped to thrive. *discernatur orationibus nostris diversitas temporum* ('let the change in the times be seen in our oratory', 2.3) is a programmatic statement which, as Bruce Gibson has demonstrated, is not borne out by the speech's many continuities with the rhetorical manoeuvres of Flavian panegyric, such as in the pages of Statius, Martial, and Frontinus.⁵⁴ The details accumulated by Gibson expose a faultline in Pliny's case, but its attractions to Pliny are manifest—he had, of course, done rather well under the Flavian regime, and his *Letters* and speech can be seen together as in part a project to demonstrate his commitment to the new Nerva-Trajanic rule. Pliny's marginalisation of Greekness was a way of distancing himself from the 'extorted praise discourse' and the reigns of Nero and Domitian with which he associates it. Pliny's new rhetoric was not just new because it was (allegedly) sincere, but because (allegedly) it had none of the imported Hellenistic decadence and flamboyance that corrupted earlier political

52 Woolf 2006: 163, 178.

53 See nn. 20, 25.

54 Gibson 2011. The claim to newness surfaces variously in the speech, e.g. 1.6, 3.4, 4.2, 75.6—Henderson 2011: 146.

discourse.⁵⁵ Behind this manoeuvre, Pliny could (and did) commit to considerable stylistic flamboyance, but was able to do so by attributing that quality to the new licence to freedom of expression, rather than to inherited convention.

The speech's orientation to Greekness as a claim for its own indigenously Roman character allowed Pliny deftly to dissociate himself from the Hellenised praise discourse of previous decades and Domitian's regime in particular. In step with this is the presentation of Trajan not as a Spaniard but a homeland Roman. We saw above how the *Graeculus magister* of Domitian's army had been replaced by Trajan's demonstration of the 'country's custom, the country's virtue' (*patrio more patria virtute*, 13.5). This association of Trajan with the Roman *patria* can be seen in his role as *pater patriae* (21 *passim*, 42.3, 84.6) but in another passage, the underlying rhetoric of which is again a comparison of Trajan with Domitian, the characterisation of the Roman homeland extends to intellectual activity:

quid? vitam, quid? mores iuventutis quam principaliter formas! quem honorem dicendi magistris, quam dignationem sapientiae doctoribus habes! ut sub te spiritum et sanguinem et patriam receperunt studia! quae priorum temporum immanitas exsiliis puniebat, cum sibi vitiorum omnium conscius princeps inimicas vitiis artes non odio magis, quam reverentia, relegaret. at tu easdem artes in complexu, oculis, auribus habes.

And what of the lifestyle and habits of the youth?—how imperially you shape them! What respect you have for teachers of rhetoric, what regard for professors of philosophy! How, under you, intellectual activity has regained its spirit, its blood, and its homeland—intellectual activity which the monstrosity of times gone by would punish with exile, when an emperor was acquainted with all vices and banished arts that are inimical to vice, not out of hatred but out of fear. But you hold these same arts in your embrace, your eyes, your ears. (*Pan.* 47.1)

The antitheses of past and present, arts and vice, and exile and repatriation work in concert to present intellectual activity as a homeland virtue and, of course, to favour Trajan. The implied fall guy is Domitian, who is said in various

55 On sincerity, see Bartsch 1994.

sources, including Pliny himself, to have banished philosophers from Rome.⁵⁶ But Pliny's language is revealing on this issue: in his letter to Julius Genitor, Pliny speaks of his close relationship with Artemidorus, whose name reveals Greek ethnicity, and who is said to have been one of the *philosophi* expelled from the city [under the Flavians] (*Ep.* 3.11.1–2). This is one of nine occurrences of the Greek loan-word *philosophus* in Pliny's letter collection; but the term he uses in his speech, where he is sketching Trajan's *repatriation* of philosophy, is the Latin term *sapientia*.⁵⁷ The Greek loan-word would have undermined the argument. Similarly disingenuous is the impression Pliny gives here that rhetorical instruction was an indigenous Roman practice, neglected by Domitian but rehabilitated by Trajan; for, Suetonius reveals that rhetorical instruction was a [Greek] cultural import which was banished in 161 BCE and further denounced in 91 BCE (*Rhet.* 1);⁵⁸ indeed, the first state sponsorship of a Chair of Rhetoric was as late as 78, when Vespasian appointed Quintilian. For Pliny to imply that the intellectual activities of rhetoric and philosophy were originally indigenous to Rome is brazen, but effective in distinguishing his addressee from his predecessors.

Pliny's inclination to distinguish Trajan from Domitian on cultural grounds dubiously premised as geographically determined can even be found in discussion of imperial dining habits, when Domitianic and Trajanic practices are compared: *neque enim aut peregrinae superstitionis ministeria aut obscaena petulantia mensis principis oberrat, sed benigna invitatio et liberales ioci et studiorum honor* ('For no observance of foreign superstition or obscene wantonness floats before the emperor's table, but a kind welcome, liberal good humour and respect for studies', *Pan.* 49.8).⁵⁹ Designation of Domitian's conduct as foreign confirms its opposite—the acceptance of Trajan's as homespun. The argument anticipates Pliny's account of the contrast in literary discourses between Flavian and Trajanic regimes (54.1–2) and chimes too with Pliny's letter to Vibius Severus—*studiis? studiis*.⁶⁰ At the same time, this repeated characterisation of *studia* as enjoying a warm homecoming in the new regime insinuates Pliny centre-stage in Trajanic politics and culture.

56 Pliny *Ep.* 3.11.2; Tacitus *Agr.* 2.12; Suetonius *Vita Dom.* 10.3; Cassius Dio 67.13; see Durr 1938: 155, Sherwin-White 1966: 240–241 and Moreno Soldevila 2010: 60.

57 See above on *carmina* and *annales*.

58 Culpepper Stroup 2007.

59 Durr 1938: 160. For *honor* for *studia* see also Pliny *Ep.* 4.16.1 and 6.2.2 (*bis*).

60 See the opening paragraph above.

In sum, the cultural polemics of Pliny's *gratiarum actio*, with no concessions to Greekness or Spanishness, presents a revived, newly enfranchised *Romanitas* as a welcome alternative to Hellenised praise-discourse, one which (disingenuously perhaps, but coercively too) Pliny could claim as a new rhetoric for a new age. In appropriating or repatriating praise-discourse for *Romanitas* Pliny distanced his speech from the reputation for debased, hackneyed, extorted, insincere praise he could neatly align with the Greek associations of Flavian rhetoric. As an intellectual response to a regime change within Roman power, this is edgy, quietly and perniciously efficient. Pliny appropriates for *Romanitas* a Spanish emperor who had not long been in the city. In this particular aspect of its cultural agenda, Pliny's speech was not to be a model for the later *Panegyrici Latini*, nor more immediately for the demonstrative oratory of Fronto 40 years later—happily senatorial, by confession an author of *laudationes*, and a Greek/Latin bilingual of course.⁶¹ But in the precise historical context of the (wrongly named) *Panegyricus* rather than its *nachleben*, there is the sense of live oratory trying to represent and organise some complicated cultural politics. It is a long speech, but it has its silences, and its gaps and whispers reveal a tension, at least in Pliny's mind, between Greek and Roman attitudes towards imperial power. With its push and pull, the speech can be seen as an assertive response to the Hellenised character of courtly and political literature.

The potential for personal-political advantage was clearly considerable.⁶² As a writer and supporter of *studia* Pliny presents himself as a key agent in the supposed intellectual revival under Trajan. But as the record of his letters suggests, this attempt to use cultural affiliations to impress upon his audience a decisive break from the past was not consistent with Pliny's attitude elsewhere towards Greek culture. Personal cultural schizophrenia aside, what this alerts us to is the rhetorical potential of a Greek-Roman polarity in high politics of the time; the implied cultural affiliation of Pliny's speech constitutes part of his attempt to influence Trajan.⁶³ Would Greek senators have been offended by the association of Greekness with Domitian? Were any of Pliny's Greek friends at the private recitation of the extended version of the speech? They were perhaps few—too few for any reverberations to be serious. With its strategies of silence and implication, the version we have is such that Pliny could have perhaps hoped to reassure any offended Greeks that the

61 Swain 2004.

62 For discussion of the speech as 'an instrument for Pliny's self-fashioning' see Noreña 2011a (quotation at 42).

63 On the protreptic function of epideictic, see Morton Braund 1998.

general tenor of the speech damned Domitian on moral rather than racial grounds. But nonetheless, Pliny's modelling of Trajanic power as Latinate and indigenous was a rejection of multicultural alternatives, precisely at a time when the cultural demographic of the Senate was beginning to accelerate its diversification.

The Representation of Greek Diplomacy in Tacitus

Bruce Gibson

The presence of material in Tacitus such as the earthquake affecting the province of Asia in 17 CE in *Annals* 2, or the dispute of 22 CE over *asylum* rights in *Annals* 3, has usually been interpreted in terms of the historian's biography. Thus Ronald Syme offered a famous discussion of the historian's interest in that province, while, more recently, Glen Bowersock has suggested that Tacitus may also have been a legate in Achaia and Asia at an earlier stage in his career, though Anthony Birley has questioned this.¹ This paper, however, will consider such material in terms of how diplomatic exchanges are represented in Tacitus and what their significance might be.

To begin with, it may be useful to consider some of the background to the historiography of diplomacy between Greek communities and Rome.² Here a key text is Polybius, and not simply because many of the Constantinian excerpts that we have from the later books concentrate on diplomatic matters.³

* I am indebted to Rhiannon Ash, Salvador Bartera, and Tony Woodman for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this chapter.

- 1 Syme 1958: 466; Bowersock 1993: 7–10; Birley 2000: 245–6. Talbert 1984: 329 observes that the exceptional level of detail in these and other reports of senatorial business is likely to reflect consultation of the senatorial *acta*; see also Matthews 2010: 57–84 on Tacitus' use of the *acta* in his account of Tiberius' accession. For an overview of Tacitus' treatment of the Greeks, see Syme 1958: 504–19, though the historian's hostility is perhaps overstated.
- 2 The historical study of Roman diplomacy has been productive in recent years. On the republican period, see e.g. Auliard 2006, and the magisterial collections of Canali de Rossi 1997, 2000, 2007, with the supplementary material published in 2009; on diplomacy under the empire, see e.g. Talbert 1984: 408–25, Millar 1988, Ziethen 1994, Habicht 2001/2002. Eilers 2009 is a major collection of essays covering both periods; see also Matthews 2010: 157–79 on travel and diplomacy. Williams 2012 is an important discussion of Tacitus' treatment of senatorial embassies to rebellious legions during the 'Year of the Four Emperors'.
- 3 On the Constantinian excerpts, the surviving remnants from the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' project of making excerpts from historians on a range of topics, see e.g. Rambaud 1870: 117–28, Marincola 1997: 188–9. Moore 1965: 125–67 gives a detailed overview of their place in the textual tradition of Polybius; see also Brennan 2009

In the first instance, Polybius treats the conduct of diplomacy in his discussion of the Roman constitution, highlighting the responsibility of consuls for introducing embassies to the senate (6.12.2), and commenting on the importance of the senate in both sending and receiving foreign embassies (6.13.6–7). Polybius also emphasises how Rome becomes a focus for diplomatic activity as an indication of its changing status in the world. One important moment is the conference at Naupactus in 217 BCE between Philip V of Macedon and various Greek states at the end of the Social War. The discussions include the famous ‘clouds on the west’ speech from Agelaus of Naupactus (Plb. 5.104), with its warning of the dangers facing Greece from the eventual winner of the Second Punic War between Rome and Carthage, but this passage is also juxtaposed with Polybius’ explanation in the next chapter (5.105.4–10) that this was the moment at which Greek communities, not only in Greece itself, but also in the Aegean and in Asia Minor, began to focus their diplomatic energies on the west.⁴ After Rome’s victory over Carthage, accounts of Greek embassies to Rome become increasingly frequent. A notable instance is found at 23.1, where Polybius acknowledges the exceptional number of Greek embassies to Rome in 183 BCE, in the light of the opportunities for complaint about Philip V.⁵ This is a detail taken over by Livy, who also reports that there was never before such a gathering in the city (Liv. 39.46.6). The fact that Livy here and indeed elsewhere shares Polybius’ interest in diplomatic activity between Rome and Greece indicates the transferability of such material into Roman historiography as well.⁶

It is important also to note that diplomacy involving provincial communities and Rome continues unabated into the imperial period, as the epigraphic record demonstrates. A substantial number of inscriptions survive recording details of embassies to Rome. As has been pointed out by Corey Brennan, the tendency of inscriptions to commemorate successful diplomatic activity (except in cases honouring individuals who have died in the course of their mission) perhaps gives a one-sided picture, at least when compared to

for a discussion of the embassies in the *de legationibus*. On diplomacy in Polybius, see Koehn 2007: 19–44.

4 On Polybius’ concept of the *symploke*, literally ‘intertwining’, of events in the Mediterranean, see Walbank 1975, Quinn 2013.

5 On the embassies of this year, see Canali de Rossi 1997: 54–8, 465–9; cf. the discussion of the Spartan embassies in Errington 1969: 178–82. Under the empire the accession of emperors was a typical occasion for embassies to be sent *en masse* from cities to offer congratulations: Millar 1977 (1992²): 412–18.

6 For Livy and Polybius, see e.g. Briscoe 1973: 1–8, 1981: 1–3, 2008: 1–4, 2013, Tränkle 1977, Levene 2010a: 88–97, 127–63.

literary evidence where a more balanced picture which includes the possibility of diplomatic failure occurs.⁷ Nevertheless, the ubiquity of such activity, typically involving significant and lengthy journeys to Rome, is widely attested for a long period.

If we turn to Tacitus, a number of different types of diplomatic activity between Rome and the East are represented; the material covered allows various comparisons with earlier periods. One example is the earthquake which took place in the east in 17 CE (*Ann.* 2.47), which resulted in a reduction of the burden of taxation for various communities, and the despatch of a representative from the senate to assess the impact on those affected.⁸ One might compare this with historiographical traditions such as Polybius' account of the support offered to the island of Rhodes by various Hellenistic monarchs (5.88–90).⁹ Similarly, Tacitus' account of the various embassies that come to Rome to discuss the topic of *asylum* (*Ann.* 3.60–3) might be seen as a kind of continuity with the past.¹⁰ The interpretation of such continuities is of course open to debate: thus Judith Ginsburg argued for the possibility of an ironic interpretation, with the senate being offered the chance to decide only on matters that were entirely unimportant.¹¹ And the discussion over the immunity of the isle of Cos in *Annals* 12.61 might likewise seem to recall Tacitus' historiographical predecessors.

Diplomatic activity can moreover be regarded as something that falls between the two elements of the antithesis which Tacitus draws between his own writing and that of his predecessors who had much more glorious material available to them (*Ann.* 4.32.1–2).¹² Tacitus contrasts the lively external subject

7 Brennan 2009: 175, 177–9.

8 For the sources relating to the earthquake, see the discussion of Goodyear 1981: 336; see further Magie 1950: i.499–500, ii.1358–9 (with discussion of the epigraphic evidence); Ziethen 1994: 82–3.

9 See also Mitchell 1987: 349–52 for discussion of the general pattern of crisis, petition and imperial response during the empire, and Hellenistic precedents. Even if one were to question Syme's belief that Tacitus lived on into Hadrian's reign (see e.g. Syme 1958: 473, and the powerful case for considering the possibility of Hadrianic resonances in the *Annals* made by Birley 2000: 241–7), readers in the 120s could still have read the earthquakes covered in the *Annals* in the light of the earthquake which affected Asia Minor in 120 CE. For the famous intervention by Hadrian to assist Nicaea and Nicomedia: see e.g. Robert 1978: 396–8; Boatwright 2000: 121–3.

10 See Koestermann 1963–1968: i.535 ad loc. comparing Plb. 6.13.7.

11 Ginsburg 1981: 90–1; contrast Woodman and Martin 1996: 431 and n. 1.

12 See e.g. Woodman 1988: 180–5, Martin and Woodman 1989: 169–72, Moles 1998: 103, 174. Levene 2010b is an important recent discussion of the presentation of warfare, which sets

matter enjoyed by previous historians, including *ingentia illi bella, expugnationes urbium, fusos captosque reges*, 'mighty wars, stormings of cities, routed and captured kings',¹³ whose counterpart in the more inglorious subject-matter of his own work is *immota quippe aut modice lacescita pax*, 'peace was immovable or only modestly challenged'. But the antithesis between war and peace is not absolute in any event, and it is in any case worth noticing that diplomatic activity can be associated with both war and peace.¹⁴

In the first instance the representation of diplomacy allows Tacitus to explore the nature of Roman power. I begin with some simple broad-brush examples which show the Romans conducting diplomacy away from Rome, which, it should not be forgotten, is an important aspect of the way that diplomatic activity is presented in Polybius and Livy as well. To start with an example of what we might have lost, we can only regret as we speculate on how Tacitus might have portrayed Nero's liberation of Greece in 67 CE, with its huge potential for evoking the historiographical traditions regarding Flamininus' Isthmian proclamation of 196 BCE (see Plb. 18.46, Liv. 33.32–33). Plutarch's life of *Flamininus* affords an interesting comparison, commenting on the fact that both Flamininus and Nero made proclamations of Greek freedom at Corinth (Plutarch, *Flam.* 12.13).¹⁵ A rather different example is the behaviour of Cn. Piso in Athens (Tac. *Ann.* 2.55.1–2), which reflects a wider historiographical tradition of cantankerous Romans on diplomatic missions in the east:¹⁶ one might compare a figure like Q. Caecilius Metellus who harangues the magistrates of the Achaean league at Argos in 185 BCE (Plb. 22.10).¹⁷ Similarly, Tacitus'

out the view that Tacitus' accounts of battles in the *Annals* are characteristically abbreviated and simple: for his discussion of *Ann.* 4.32–3, see esp. pp. 226–7, 231–2.

- 13 All translations from the *Annals* are from Woodman 2008. All other translations are my own.
- 14 For diplomatic activity and conflict, see e.g. Zecchini 2005: 22–3; Ager 2009.
- 15 See further e.g. Swain 1988: 342–3, Griffin 1996: 211. Gowing 2005: 99 n. 72 notes that the link with Flamininus entered the historical tradition, even though the epigraphic record of Nero's speech (*ILS* 8794) makes no reference to Flamininus. For the dating to 67 CE, see Gallivan 1973.
- 16 Hardinghaus 1932: 45–6 sees this episode as a contrast with Germanicus' visit to Athens in *Ann.* 2.53.3, while Syme 1958: 513 sees the juxtaposition in the context of a generally harsh attitude towards the Greeks on the part of Tacitus. But the pairing of the two visits might be seen as an exploration of how differing republican attitudes to Greece and Greek culture continued to be at issue under the empire. Germanicus' visit to Athens echoes Livy's account of Aemilius Paullus' visit to Athens (45.27.11–28.1), as Woodman (forthcoming) discusses.
- 17 See further Canali de Rossi 2000: 88–91. For the contrasting theme of the behaviour of Roman ambassadors abroad as an illustration of Roman superiority, see Torregaray Pagola 2009: 140–52.

treatment of the eastern frontier and some of the diplomatic exchanges can be seen as reflecting periods of history and events covered in earlier historiography. Piso's highly charged censure of Athenian support in the past for Mithridates and Antony at *Ann.* 2.55.1–2 is a striking example of the role that could be played by past history, but the importance of such retrospectives comes out at *Annals* 12.10–11 when the Parthians request that Meherdates to be returned to them,¹⁸ which is explicitly cast by Tacitus as an echo of the dispatch by Augustus of Vonones that is narrated at the start of *Annals* 2 (2.1–2).¹⁹ But these kind of arrangements can be traced back further in earlier historiography: thus the praise which Claudius offers to Meherdates at *Annals* 12.11 might usefully be compared with the plaudits which Philip V's son Demetrius, now on an embassy to Rome but also having been a former hostage there, receives from the senate at Livy 39.47.²⁰ Again, as Tony Woodman suggests in a forthcoming article, there is scope for exploring the parallelism (and I accept that here I am stretching the boundaries of what one might term diplomatic activity) between Tacitus' account of Germanicus' travels in the east (*Ann.* 2.53–4, 59–61), and the travels of Aemilius Paullus in Greece after the defeat of the Macedonian kingdom at Pydna (Livy 45.27–8).²¹

I turn now to consider a few episodes of diplomacy in the *Annals* in greater detail. The first example is the account of proceedings in the senate relating to the claims to the rights of *asylum* of various Greek communities at *Annals* 3.60–3.²² Though Syme suggested²³ that the episode reflects the interests of Tacitus himself in the province of Asia, we should also be willing to consider the episode in terms of the precedents offered by earlier historiographical accounts of diplomatic interactions conducted in the senate between Greek communities and Rome. The opening of 3.60.1 records how Tiberius gives the

18 See Ziethen 1994: 181.

19 Tacitus also notes (*Ann.* 12.11.1) Claudius' failure to mention Tiberius' attempt to send Phraates to Parthia in 35 CE which Tacitus himself narrates in *Ann.* 6.31–2.

20 On this embassy see Canali de Rossi 1997: 465–9.

21 Woodman (forthcoming); Syme 1958: 733 briefly notes the Livian influence here, though Goodyear 1981: 353 is sceptical. See also Pelling 1993: 72–4, who notes the association of Germanicus with the past during Tacitus' account of his eastern travels, Santoro L'hoir 2006: 93–5, Kelly 2010; on Livy's treatment of Aemilius Paullus, see Levene 2006. Fragments of Polybius' account of Aemilius' travels are found at Plb. 30.10, on which see now Russell 2012.

22 See further Ziethen 1994: 94–7. On the examination of *asylum* rights undertaken in 22–23 CE, see further Herrmann 1989: 127–31; Rigsby 1996: 580–6.

23 Syme 1958: 285 and n. 4: 'What earlier writer would have reported at such length on the asylum-rights of the cities (III.60–63)? Commenting on the Senate's role, Tacitus reflects the nostalgia of his own time (III.60.3).'

senate the opportunity to consider the views of the provinces, within the wider context of consolidating his own power.²⁴ This action is, literally, an 'image of the past', *imago antiquitatis*,²⁵ just as Tacitus comments on the grandeur of the day later on in 3.60, *magnaue eius diei species fuit* ('and great was the scene on that day', 3.60.3),²⁶ and this, as we shall see, is characteristic of how such diplomatic activity might be seen. Similarly, at 3.60.3, it is explicitly said that the senate's activities involve a retrospective over a whole series of diplomatic arrangements, and the pointed remark that the senate also had the freedom, *ut quondam* ('as formerly'), to make alterations in the various arrangements perhaps carries the implication that in general there has been change to the way such business is conducted, even if the senate is able to act with more freedom on this occasion. We shall return to the content of the various representations made to Rome a little later on in this paper, but for now it is also worth noting the weariness of the senators mentioned at 3.63.1. Tacitus' tone is comparable

24 Here I follow Woodman and Martin 1996: 432 in seeing a contrast in *Ann.* 3.60.1 between *uim principatus sibi firmans*, 'while reaffirming for himself the essence of the principate', which looks back to Tiberius' efforts to promote his son Drusus (cf. 3.56.1), and the diplomatic business entrusted to the senate; for this kind of contrast, perhaps compare *Ann.* 15.31 *scilicet externae superbiae sueto non inierat notitia nostri apud quos uis imperii ualet, inania tramittuntur*, 'Evidently, habituated as he was to foreign haughtiness, he had no understanding of us, by whom the reality of empire is rated but the trumpery disregarded'. Under the principate, it was possible for embassies to make their approach to the senate or to the emperor: see further Talbert 1984: 419–25; Millar 1977 (1992²): 343–50, 410–20; Eck 2009: 203. Woodman and Martin 1996: 445 (on *Ann.* 3.63.3) note that *Inscriptionen von Didyma* 107 records an embassy from Meniscus *pros ton Sebaston* ('to the Augustus'), which, if it refers to this current embassy, would confirm Tacitus' account that the emperor was approached first and then referred the embassy to the senate.

25 *Tiberius... imaginem antiquitatis senatui praebebat, postulata prouinciarum ad disquisitionem patrum mittendo*, 'Tiberius... presented to the senate an old-fashioned image in sending demands from the provinces for investigation by the fathers'. On the meaning of this phrase, see Woodman and Martin 1996: 432–3, where it is noted that *imaginem antiquitatis* might seem to correspond to the ensuing *ut quondam*, 'as formerly' (3.60.3), being comparable to 1.77.3 *silente Tiberio, qui ea simulacra libertatis senatui praebebat*, 'with silence from Tiberius, who would present the senate with such representations of freedom'. For the senate's traditional primacy in diplomatic affairs in republican times, see Polybius 6.13.7.

26 For *species*, cf. *Hist.* 1.74.2 *Otho, revocatis quos Galba miserat legatis, rursus ad utrumque Germanicum exercitum et ad legionem Italicam easque quae Lugduni agebant copias specie senatus misit*, 'Otho, when the ambassadors which Galba had sent had been recalled, again sent ambassadors to both German armies, and to the Italian legion, and to the forces which were based at Lyons, under the pretext of the senate'.

to some of Livy's comments in his account of the embassies of 183 BCE, where he concedes that some of the complaints about Philip V could be described as *parua*, 'small' (39.47.2); likewise, the complex disputes arising between the various factions that beset Sparta during the 180s BCE are described as being largely trivial (*multae et paruulae disceptationes iactabantur*, 'many small debates were bandied around', 39.48.2). Livy also revealingly declares, when he reaches the end of this material, with regard to a conflict between the Achaean league and the Messenians, that he will only treat of external matters in so far as they are part of Roman affairs (39.48.6). In the *Annals*, Tacitus engages with these very same issues, and, as we shall see, will discuss a dispute between the Messenians and the Spartans in some detail, in spite of the precedent of Livy.

A significant aspect of Tacitus' presentation of diplomacy in the *Annals* is the emphasis on the past. In 3.60.3, in the passage we have just been considering, Tacitus refers to the splendour of the scene in Rome, as he evokes the decisions which would have been taken in the senate in the past. Thus we might wish to see this passage as reflecting on a different kind of Roman historiography, and the obvious connection might be to see a link with the kind of historiography one finds in either Polybius or Livy, where senatorial decisions in responses to embassies are carefully recorded.

However, the actual content of the episode presents a more complex and nuanced picture. In the first place, the retrospective given here is one that goes back not just into earlier history, but even into the territory of myth. This is most striking in *Annals* 3.61, the speech of the Ephesians, where several lines of mythological material relating to *asylum* rights are then followed by only the most perfunctory glance at more recent historical events with the acknowledgement that neither the Persians nor the Romans have done anything to prevent the right of *asylum* at Ephesus. There is thus a contrast between the kind of material which seems anticipated in 3.60.3, where the impression is given that the senate will be investigating the history of Roman policy, and the bulk of what the Ephesians actually say. 3.62 does however see a shift to Roman times, first with the Magnesians, and then with the cities of Aphrodisias and Stratonicea. However in both cases the material is in some ways loaded: thus the Magnesians rely on the edicts not only of Sulla, identified with *dominatio* in the opening chapter of the *Annals* (*Ann.* 1.1.1), but also L. Cornelius Scipio. This is not Scipio Africanus, the victor of Zama, but his brother, consul in 190 BCE, and victorious over Antiochus III at Magnesia, but also deprived of the public horse by Cato as censor in 184 BCE.²⁷ Thus the antithesis that

27 On Cato's action against L. Scipio, see Astin 1978: 81.

one might expect between the imperial present and an idealised republican past does not turn out to be quite so straightforward here, as figures from the past mentioned by the Magnesians suggest. In the next example, the cities of Aphrodisias and Stratonicea base their arguments on their good deeds towards the party of the dictator Caesar, and also a decree of Augustus praising them for their unswerving loyalty to Rome in the face of the Parthians (*Ann.* 3.62.2).²⁸ Here too the evocation of the past is a complex one that evades any kind of simplistic opposition between the principate and the republic, and the deployment of an argument about support for the dictator Caesar in close collocation with mention of Augustus is a reminder of the kind of progression that Tacitus presents in *Annals* 1.1, where various forms of individual power culminate in the principate of Augustus.²⁹ The next example, in 3.62.3, also may undermine the claims of Tacitus that what we have here is an *imago antiquitatis*; the Hierocaesarienses are after all a very recent coinage indeed, having renamed themselves from Hieria Kome during Tiberius' reign in order to honour him, and they use a mixture of arguments, alleging a cult which had been dedicated in the time of the Persian king Cyrus, and then referring to support which they had received from Perpenna (*cos.* 130 BCE, who defeated Aristonicus), and Servilius Isauricus, Caesar's colleague in the consulship of 48 BCE.³⁰ Chapter 62 then ends with the appeal of the Cypriots entirely to myth, which goes back to the earliest foundation of the cult of Venus.

Chapter 63 then presents further claims to the right of *asylum*. At first the narrative moves away from individual communities to an overarching sense of the weariness with which such claims were received by the senators, who then make the procedural decision to refer the matter back to the consul, who would in turn be able to bring the matter back to the senate (*Ann.* 3.63.1). What then emerges is an acceptance that the argument made by Pergamum in the case of *asylum* rights linked to a cult of Aesculapius is valid, but that most of the other claims rest on beginnings that are uncertain due to their antiquity (*Ann.* 3.63.2–3): the list that follows then largely mirrors the earlier points made by cities in 3.61 and 3.62 in that appeal is made to the establishment of *asylum* by divine oracles, prophecies, and by historical figures, down to, in the case of Crete, an appeal rather strikingly based on the presence of an image

28 For discussion of the possibility that both cities presented the same arguments, see Woodman and Martin 1996: 439–41.

29 The reference to support for Caesar is also a mirror image of Piso's earlier complaint about Athenian support for Mark Antony (*Ann.* 2.55.1).

30 See Woodman and Martin 1996: 442, with further bibliography.

of the divine Augustus. The upshot is that restrictions are then placed on the right of *asylum* for communities whose claims are felt to be too tenuous, and arrangements are made to ensure that the right of *asylum* is clearly defined for the future by the setting up of bronze inscriptions in temples (*Ann.* 3.63.4),³¹ a process that is of course mirrored in the commemoration also effected by Tacitus' own writings here.

In effect this episode presents an historical investigation of the past, which might also be seen as an historiographical investigation as well.³² A series of competing voices demand the attention of the senate, and of the reader, who is presented with what is apparently an *imago antiquitatis*. On the one hand, the Greek past comes across as multifarious, distinguished, but also as sometimes mythic and ultimately unverifiable.³³ And, in another vein, the Roman past that such material reveals turns out perhaps not to be so straightforwardly simple, since it can include (at best) ambiguous figures such as Sulla and L. Scipio; it is also made clear that the pattern of Rome's past interactions with the Greek east have continuities that stretch into the time of Caesar and indeed of Augustus, so that the antithesis one might expect between the republican past and the imperial present is softened and blurred.³⁴

The passage thus functions in its own terms as a meditation on the historical past and on past historiography. Just as the middle of *Annals* 4 provides an explicit comparison of the remoter past and the imperial period, with Tacitus contrasting his work's concerns with those typically found in republican historiography, this passage in *Annals* 3 can also be seen in a similar light. The wider context within Book 3 is worth noting here: shortly before the passage on *asylum* rights Tacitus provides a digression on luxury, which in fact does not follow the model of unbroken decline that the casual reader might expect,

31 On the nature of these provisions, see further Woodman and Martin 1996: 445–6, with further bibliography.

32 Cf. Devillers 2003: 262: 'En ce sens, le débat sur le droit d'asile accordé par les sénateurs aux cités d'Asie (III.60–63) pourrait presque être entendu comme une métaphore de la méthode historique de Tacite: les consuls, chargés du dossier par le Sénat, privilégient les droits bien établis aux traditions obscures par leur ancienneté (III, 63, 1); de la même manière, l'historien accorderait la préférence aux documents plutôt qu'aux élaborations littéraires ou orales non prouvées.'

33 Compare *Ann.* 2.88.3 for Tacitus' verdict on Greek annals: *Graecorum annalibus ignotus, qui sua tantum mirantur* ('though unknown to the annals of the Greeks who marvel only at their own').

34 On the republican past in Tacitus, see e.g. Gowing 2005: 28–31, 158–9.

since luxury turns out to be diminished under the Flavians.³⁵ Tacitus ends the section at 3.55.5 with the observation that it is not the case that everything was better in the past, and that the present too has scope for competition with the past,³⁶ a remark which might be seen as informing how one might interpret the *imago antiquitatis* that follows in his treatment of *asylum* rights. Moreover, Tacitus then follows this passage with an explicit discussion of historiography at *Ann.* 3.65. This vexed passage includes Tacitus' statement of his decision only to include *sententias* that are *insignes per honestum aut notabili dedecore*, 'distinguished by honorableness or of noteworthy discredit' (*Ann.* 3.65.1).³⁷ Here, I would argue that the view that the senatorial business is somehow applauded by Tacitus in 3.60.3³⁸ is open to modification, especially since Tacitus has indicated that the material is such that the senators might be rendered exhausted by it (also recalling Livy's suggestion that diplomatic activity could on occasion be wearisome or trivial in his treatment of the embassies of 183 BCE). Moreover, Tacitus in 3.65.1 refers specifically to his practice in recording *sententiae*, which might be an odd way to refer to the senate's participation in 3.60–3, since there are no real *sententiae* offered (in the classic sense of opinions offered in a senatorial debate); what the senate's deliberations produce instead is honorific *senatus consulta* (3.63.4), without any record of individual *sententiae*. The discussions which take place in the senate in *Ann.* 3.60–3 would only seem to have to meet a rather low threshold, if they are to count as *insignes per honestum*.

This episode thus emerges as a complex dialogue with the Roman and Greek past, simultaneously suggesting the kind of historiography that Tacitus differentiates from his own in *Annals* 4, but also drawing attention to continuities with the past, so that even the view of the republic as something irremediably different is also called into question.

Annals 4 itself contains further material which reflects some of these concerns. In the year following, 23 CE, Tacitus reports (*Ann.* 4.13.1) a decision to offer help to two communities, one in Asia and one in Achaëa, which have suffered the effects of an earthquake. A brief detail can be noted here: the decision to provide assistance blurs the powers of emperor and senate, *factaque*

35 On this digression, see Woodman and Martin 1996: 376–413, who note (376–7; cf. 238) that the passage is itself set in counterpoint to the digression on the history of law at *Ann.* 3.25–8; on Tiberius' letter to the senate at *Ann.* 3.53–4, see Ash 2013.

36 On this passage, see further Woodman and Martin 1996: 408–13.

37 Note that Woodman and Martin 1996: 451–3 offer differing individual interpretations of this passage.

38 Woodman and Martin 1996: 431, 453.

auctore eo senatus consulta ut . . ., 'and on his initiative there were passed senate's decisions (*senatus consulta*) that . . .'. It is true that Tacitus tends to stress the involvement of the emperor in such financial matters,³⁹ and the use of this kind of language for the proposer of a motion to the senate can be paralleled in Livy, at 37.47.2.⁴⁰ The phrase *eo auctore*, however, perhaps sits uncomfortably with an emperor who in Book 3 was supposed to be allowing the senate jurisdiction in such dealings with overseas communities. Suetonius moreover attests to Tiberius' own distaste for the word *auctor* and his awareness of its implications:

alium dicentem sacras eius occupationes et rursus alium, auctore eo senatum se a[u]disse, uerba mutare et pro auctore suasorem, pro sacris laboriosas dicere coegit.

He forced one, who spoke of his 'sacred responsibilities', to change his words, and to say 'laborious' instead of 'sacred'; and again another who said he had attended the Senate 'on the emperor's authority' (*auctore eo*) to say 'advice' (*suasorem*) instead of 'authority'.

(Suet. *Tib.* 27)

In this passage from Suetonius the potential for *auctore eo* to be interpreted as the language of power is quite evident, which is why Tiberius is said to have preferred to be referred to as a *suasor* (literally, 'persuader') rather than an *auctor*.

39 Koestermann 1963–1968: ii.72 on *Ann.* 4.13.1: '**auctore eo**: Bei Erlassen, die das Aerar betrafen, trat normalerweise, wie bei anderen schwerwiegenden Vorgängen, die Initiative des Kaisers in Erscheinung (vgl. 1.76,2. 2.47,2. 12,58. 61. 62. usw.).'

40 Livy 37.47.2: *C. Laelius consul ex Gallia Romam rediit. is non solum ex facto absente se senatus consulto in supplementum Cremonae et Placentiae colonos scripsit, sed, ut nouae coloniae duae in agrum, qui Boiorum fuisset, deducerentur, et rettulit et auctore eo patres censuerunt*, 'C. Laelius the consul returned from Gaul to Rome. Not only did he enroll supplementary colonists for Cremona and Placentia in accordance with the senate's decree that had been passed in his absence, but he put to the motion that two new colonies should be sent out to the territory which had belonged to the Boii, and the senators voted in accordance with his proposal'.

Tacitus' account of 23 CE also includes details of further requests for *asylum* status (*Ann.* 4.14.1–2),⁴¹ which, as has been noted by Martin and Woodman, also look back to the treatment of the issue in *Annals* 3.60–3.⁴² Again, Tacitus' treatment presents differing kinds of historical voices, with the Samians relying on a decree of the Amphictyonic council, while the representatives from Cos add the fact of their providing refuge for Roman citizens facing death at the time of Mithridates.⁴³ Strikingly, however, Tacitus does not report the outcome of these embassies, so that material which might ostensibly seem again to reflect the senate's past glories (cf. *Ann.* 3.60) turns out to come to nothing.

The same year also includes the theme of imperial deification, with the conviction of Lucilius Capito resulting in a decision to allow the cities of Asia to establish a temple in honour of Tiberius, his mother and the senate (4.15.3).⁴⁴ This decision is then revisited in *Annals* 4.55–6, three years later (26 CE), with the arrival of embassies from different cities seeking to gain permission for the temple to be sited with them.⁴⁵ As with the episode in Book 3, context is significant with this passage as well, since Tacitus makes it clear (4.55.1) that Tiberius is present in the senate because he wishes to avoid the rumours of his intention to bring about Agrippina's death that had been mentioned in 4.54.2. Moreover Tacitus' introduction of the proceedings in the senate makes it clear that the emperor is the person who is the most significant audience of these embassies, *legatosque Asiae ... plures per dies audiuit*, 'and over several days [he] listened to legates from Asia'.⁴⁶ When it comes to consideration of the various claimants, the perspective is different from that used in *Annals* 3, where Tacitus concentrates on the content of the various representations made. Instead, Tacitus emphasises here how the embassies were received,

41 See further e.g. Sherwin-White 1978: 149 and n. 359; Ziethen 1994: 37, 148 n. 8.

42 Martin and Woodman 1989: 136.

43 See further Sherwin-White 1978: 138–9.

44 Note also Tiberius' rejection of similar honours offered from Spain in *Ann.* 4.37–8. On the imperial cult in Asia Minor, including its architecture and imagery, see Price 1984. Mitchell 1993: i.100–17; see also the brief but useful remarks on imperial cult in the East in Kaizer 2007: 447–8.

45 See Ziethen 1994: 55, 85, 98–9. For rivalry between cities of Asia Minor, see the classic study of Robert 1977 on Nicaea and Nicomedia, Mitchell 1993: i.204–6. For competitiveness between cities in relation to the imperial cult, see Price 1984: 64; cf. 126–32.

46 On the processes of decision-making involved in relation to establishing imperial cults, see Price 1984: 65–77, who analyses the phenomenon in terms of theories of gift-exchange.

so that the listing of embassies from various communities in 4.55.2 is essentially a list of reasons for ruling out all but two of the competing claims. What emerges here is again a sense of the failure and decline of Greek communities, in spite of the similarity of the claims made in support of their own cases.⁴⁷ In 4.55.2, Tacitus mentions four communities who are instantly ruled out as being too weak to merit the award of the temple, and then even the citizens of Ilium are ruled out, in spite of their role as the metropolis of Rome, with the remark, *nisi antiquitatis gloria pollebant*, '[not even the Ilians]... were a force, except in their glorious antiquity'.⁴⁸ This represents an interesting shift from their presence in Livy as signatories to Rome's treaty with Philip V at the end of the First Macedonian War (Liv. 29.12.14), or from Livy's account of L. Scipio's sacrifice there in 190 BCE, to the delight of both Romans and Ilians (Liv. 37.37.3). An even more striking parallel is the award to the Ilians of Rhoeteum and Gergithus in the settlement of 188 BCE, not so much for any of their deeds, but because of their antiquity (*et Iliensibus Rhoeteum et Gergithum addiderunt, non tam ob recentia ulla merita quam originum memoria*, 'and they added Rhoeteum and Gergithus to the territory of the people of Ilium, not so much on account of any recent deeds that were deserving, than because of the memory of their own origins', Liv. 38.39.10).⁴⁹ Tacitus thus recalls Livy in having the Romans recognise the Trojan past, but in the *Annals* that Trojan past does not count in the matter in hand, and no special concessions are made. A series of other places are then rejected as possible locations, leaving the contest as one between Sardis and Smyrna.

This then allows Tacitus to devote the remainder of his coverage to the dispute between the two cities. Again, as in Book 3, we can see different kinds of histories in competition, with the representatives of Sardis beginning by referring to their earliest connections with Etruria, before a brief reference to their treaty with Rome at the time of the Third Macedonian War, and the qualities of their location (*Ann.* 4.55.3–4). With the people of Smyrna, the antiquities are the briefest part of their concern, and their victory in the contest is perhaps precisely because of their recognition that practical involvement with Rome is likely to be the most important factor, *transcendere ad ea quis maxime fidebant, in populum Romanum officiis...*, 'they moved on to the items in which they

47 On the topos of Greek decline under the empire, see the examples assembled by Day 1942: 120–6, and see also the classic treatment in Walbank 1944, on which see further Gibson and Harrison 2013. Alcock 1993: 1–32 wisely cautions against the alluring nature of historiographies of Greek defeat and failure.

48 See Erskine 2001: 252.

49 See further Erskine 2001: 175–6.

placed most confidence, their services to the Roman people ...' (*Ann.* 4.56.1). One possible approach here might be to see the people of Smyrna as victorious, precisely because they recognise that the most ancient and recondite material, such as the appeal made by the people of Sardis to their Etrurian connections, is unlikely to be successful. The diplomacy of these Greek communities thus allows an exploration of the realities of how best to operate under Roman power (*Ann.* 4.56.1–2), so that help to Rome in its wars, the decision to construct a temple in honour of the goddess Roma in the consulship of M. Porcius Cato (*cos.* 195 BCE),⁵⁰ and an act of generosity to the armies of Sulla, a figure who again appears in the context of these diplomatic exchanges, are what cause the senators to vote in favour of Smyrna. The debate shows different degrees of cooperation with the Romans, something that again has its place in the historiography of Rome's eastern involvements: one can compare for instance the way in which the Rhodians famously came unstuck for their attempt to mediate in Rome's war against Perseus, giving rise to Cato's oration in their defence,⁵¹ or, in Greek historiography, Polybius' account of the speech of Callicrates on how the senate should pay most attention to those most assertively supporting the interests of Rome, rather than simply appealing to factors such as laws (*Plb.* 24.9).⁵² Only at the end of this section do we then get anything approximating to senatorial business, with the senators voting in favour of the people of Smyrna, with the task of overseeing the temple eventually being assigned to Valerius Naso.

In between the two episodes in Book 4 that deal with the imperial cult that have just been discussed, there is a further episode worth mentioning, the dispute between the Spartans and the Messenians concerning the temple of Diana Limnatis, in *Ann.* 4.43.⁵³ Here, we can note the level of detail offered by Tacitus, all the more striking, since Livy had ostentatiously declined to give any detail relating to the Romans' involvement in the affairs of the Peloponnese in his account of the events of 183 BCE (*Liv.* 39.48.5–6), affairs which had precisely

50 On the temple constructed by the Smyrnaeans, see Mellor 1975: 14–16, 21; cf. Gruen 1984: 178, 543. The reference back to the Smyrnaeans' links with Rome in the period leading up to Rome's war against the Seleucid king Antiochus III directly recalls accounts of such exchanges in earlier historiography: see e.g. *Plb.* 18.47.1 with Walbank 1957–1979: ii.614–15, 18.52, *Liv.* 33.38 with Briscoe 1973: 321.

51 See further Gell. 6.3 (cf. *Liv.* 45.25.2–3), with Astin 1978: 272–80.

52 See further Canali de Rossi 1997: 62–4. On the embassy of Callicrates, see e.g. Champion 2004: 155–6, 225–6, with further bibliography.

53 For discussion of this episode, and the complex ideological significance of the border region of the Dentheliatis between Messenia and Laconia, see now Luraghi 2008: 16–27; cf. Cartledge and Spawforth 2002: 138–9.

included the secession of the Messenians from the Achaean league. Livy's reason for not including such material is that it would breach his resolve *non ultra attingere externa, nisi qua Romanis cohaerent rebus*, 'not to go any further in dealing with the affairs of other nations, except any which are bound up with Roman matters'. Tacitus' decision to devote such coverage to what is essentially local history, even if it is of course concerned with communities within the Roman province of Achaëa, thus represents what is an effect a move towards going beyond the parameters that Livy had laid down in his coverage of the Roman republic and its diplomatic affairs. In keeping with Tacitus' engagement with Livy here, the dispute itself between the Messenians and the Spartans is explicitly cast in terms of a debate between two different traditions, with each side claiming the support of historical writing (*annales*) and poetry (*carmina*),⁵⁴ with the Messenians rebuffing the claims of the Spartans, but also showing a better understanding of their own history, as well as also drawing attention to the physical remains (*Ann.* 4.43.2).⁵⁵ The presence of the word *annales* twice in this passage remains very striking, not only because it applies a word to the history of the Messenian past which Tacitus uses for his own writing on Rome,⁵⁶ but also because of its occurrence in a context of competing historical claims. The claims of the Spartans and the Messenians involve dispute as to the actions of Greek kings (the Messenians dispute the Spartan claim that the award of the territory to the Messenians by Philip II of Macedon was simply a case of *force majeure*, and back up this point by appeal to the subsequent affirmation of the decision by Antigonos III),⁵⁷ but the dispute also reflects on the contested arena of the *Roman* historical record. The Spartans appeal to the actions of Julius Caesar and Mark Antony in granting them the territory, but are trumped by the Messenians, who first refer to (4.43.3) *idem imperatoris Mummii iudicium*, 'the same [had been the verdict] ... of the commander Mummius', and

54 Tac. *Ann.* 4.43.1, 3. For appeals to historiography in resolving disputes, note *I. Priene* 37, relating to a territorial dispute between Samos and Priene, where seven historians are referred to by name, and see the discussion of Curty 1989 (who also cites other examples). For the pairing of historical and poetic evidence in the context of a dispute over territory, cf. *I. Magnesia* 105, line 65 ποιητῶν καὶ ἱστοριογράφων ἀποδείξεις, with Curty 1989: 30.

55 Luraghi 2008: 17 suggests that the Messenians may possibly have been referring to inscriptions as well as to monuments.

56 See *Ann.* 3.65.1 *praecipuum munus annalium*, 'a principal responsibility of annals', and 4.32.1 *annales nostros*, 'my annals'.

57 For the debate as to whether *Antigoni* in Tacitus refers to Antigonos III Doson, or to Antigonos II Gonatas, see Walbank 1957–1979: i.288 on Plb. 2.70.1; Luraghi 2008: 18–19 takes the passage to be referring to Antigonos Doson.

then refer to an arbitration effected by the Milesians in 135 BCE,⁵⁸ and finally (*postremo*) the decision made by the praetor of Achaea, Atidius Geminus. This is the only reference that survives to Atidius Geminus, but Nino Luraghi has made the valuable suggestion that he is likely to have been governor of Achaea in the early years of Tiberius' reign.⁵⁹ As the Messenians show in their account of verdicts on the issue of the temple, Roman decisions over the fate of the temple have a continuity extending back not only to the Roman republican past, but also to the decisions of various Greek kings beforehand.⁶⁰ The arguments adduced by both sides also curiously echo aspects of the Cremutius Cordus trial earlier on in Book 4 (*Ann.* 4.34–5).⁶¹ That episode is concerned with how the recent history of Rome is viewed; Cremutius' approach to the period of the civil wars at the end of the Republic is shown to be misguided and dangerous, and his appeals to precedents from that era do not save him. The Messenians similarly perhaps prevail because they recognise that a recent decision (that of Atidius Geminus) is liable to carry more weight than an appeal to the chequered figure of Mark Antony. For all the historical precedents from the past, the Messenians know that a recent precedent, probably from Tiberius' own reign, is likely to be the most powerful.

The dispute over Diana Limnatis is then followed by an embassy from the Segestans, requesting that the temple of Venus at Eryx be restored.⁶² Here, again, we can see the familiar pattern of evocation of the historical past, but in a context that emphasises difference. The embassy recalls earlier appeals to the Romans from the Segestans on the grounds of their kinship.⁶³ For while there were traditions of Segestan links with Rome on the grounds of shared Trojan kinship from

58 Note that Luraghi 2008: 19–21 argues on the basis of *lvO* 52 that the reference to Mummius in Tacitus may in fact reflect a rather different historical reality, with the arbitration of the Milesians being concerned with the status of the territory in the time of Mummius' command in Greece. While this is likely to be the case, Tacitus' treatment clearly has the Messenians claiming that Mummius had made a judgement in their favour.

59 Luraghi 2008: 22–3.

60 Note that Luraghi 2008: 19–21 sees the reference to Mummius not to a decision made by the consul of 146 BCE, but as simply an indication of a decision made at the time of his magistracy (or promagistracy).

61 On this episode, see e.g. Martin and Woodman 1989: 176–84, Moles 1998, Gowing 2005: 26–7, Sailor 2008: 250–313.

62 On the significance of the cult of Venus Erycina, see Erskine 2001: 198–205.

63 On the wider traditions of kinship diplomacy between Greek communities and Rome, see Erskine 2001: 162–85.

the people of Segesta, possibly going back as far as the First Punic War,⁶⁴ the pattern is altered here, as the Segestan appeal is based on direct kinship with the emperor, whose goodwill is essential to the renovations going ahead (*suscepit curam libens ut consanguineus*, 'and as a blood relative he undertook the concern gladly', *Ann.* 4.43.4). The episode thus looks back on wider traditions from the Republican period of Greek communities making appeals to Rome based on kinship, whilst at the same time providing a powerful reminder of how one family was now central to the tradition of kinship with Troy, the family of the Julio-Claudian emperors.⁶⁵

The third embassy mentioned here (*Ann.* 4.43.5) also looks back to Republican times. The Massiliots make a request for approval for the exiled Volcacius Moschus (who had been condemned for poisoning) to be deemed a Massilian citizen (since he had bequeathed his possessions to Massilia). The appeal is based on P. Rutilius Rufus' award of citizenship by the people of Smyrna, where he had gone into exile, after his unjust condemnation for *repetundae* in 92 BCE. The episode again operates on several levels: on the one hand, the Massiliots represent one of Rome's most venerable Greek allies, whose long tradition of support for Rome was well known.⁶⁶ Likewise, the reference to Rutilius, whom Tacitus also mentions at the start of the *Agricola* for his memoirs (*Ag.* 1.3), evokes a complex Republican past, not only of virtuous conduct, but also of the unjust manipulation of the judicial process, a theme included in Tacitus' list of the grim material that his own historiography of the principate must cover at *Ann.* 4.33.3: *nos saeua iussa, continuas accusationes, fallaces amicitias, perniciem innocentium et easdem exitii causas coniungimus, obuia rerum similitudine et satietate*, 'but in my case it is savage orders, constant accusations, deceitful friendships, the ruin of innocents, and always the same reasons for their extermination that I link together, confronted as I am

64 See Erskine 2001: 178–84 for a discussion of such literary sources as Cic. 2 *Verr.* 4.72, and the debated reference in Zonaras 8.9 to the Segestans killing a Carthaginian garrison and then joining forces with the Romans on the grounds of their kinship with Aeneas.

65 Compare the striking detail of the mask of Aeneas being carried at the funeral of Tiberius' son Drusus at *Ann.* 4.9.2, where Woodman 1998: 233 has suggested a possible echo of Virg. *Aen.* 6.754.

66 For a convenient listing of sources and bibliography on Rome's contacts with Massilia, which go back at least to the fourth century BCE, see Rich 1996: 20 n. 78. For the Massilians' long history of loyalty to Rome, cf. e.g. Cic. *Font.* 13, 34 *fidelissimorum sociorum Massiliensium* 'of our most loyal allies, the Massiliots', Luc. 3.307–9. Note too Tacitus' praise of the virtues of Massilia as the city in which Agricola had spent some of his earliest years (Tac. *Agr.* 4.2).

by a satiety of similar material'. But, the parallel adduced by the Massiliots is a most peculiar one, since they are attempting to act in favour of an individual who was not the innocent victim of a baseless trial for extortion motivated by political concerns, but an individual who had been condemned for poisoning. An impressive *exemplum* from the past is thus brought to bear in a context which is rather less auspicious.

This grouping of embassies in *Ann.* 4.43 sets us in mind of the past, and the historiography of the past, but at the same time points to the way that relations between Greek communities and Rome have changed, just as Rome itself has changed. In effect, the debate between Sparta and the Messenians turns out to be something of a sideshow: it is a much less significant episode than the real area of rivalry between Greek cities in Book 4, the contest over where the imperial cult in Asia would be situated. Likewise the appeal of the Segestans on the grounds of kinship with Aeneas and his descendants has historical precedents, but the general sense of affinity with Rome has now been replaced by the opportunity offered by the chance to exploit a personal connection with the family of the Caesars. And the embassy of the Massiliots recalls more than one past glory, but is in the end concerned with an attempt to use historical precedent to ameliorate the lot of a convicted poisoner.

Tacitus returns to similar territory in Book 12, in 12.61–3.⁶⁷ These chapters deal with requests from Cos and Byzantium for relief from taxation, and, as in the examples we have seen from Books 3 and 4, the emphasis is on antiquity. Context however is everything, and in this instance we also see continuity, but also perhaps some self-reflexive comment on diplomatic practice. The key piece of context is 12.60, a chapter in which we hear of Claudius adjusting various forms of practice, with the extension of his own powers to the procurators, and then some discussion of the equestrian order, and how its relevance has ceased to matter given the importance of freedmen under Claudius.⁶⁸ This context then informs the discussion of immunity from taxation on Cos that follows. This kind of discussion can be paralleled in earlier historiography: thus in Livy 38.39.7–9 we hear of the senate's commissioners deciding that communities which had supported Rome in the war with Antiochus III would be granted *immunitas*.⁶⁹ Miriam Griffin has noted that Claudius, in making his proposal largely as a result of his personal connection with the doctor Xenophon (who will shortly turn out to be involved in the emperor's death, *Ann.* 12.67.2), does not bother to go back to the precepts of the past, but simply makes the grant

67 See further Sherwin-White 1978: 146–52; Ziethen 1994: 77, 89.

68 See Griffin 1990: 487; on C. Stertinius Xenophon, see Sherwin-White 1978: 149–52.

69 On this episode see Canali de Rossi 2000: 82–7.

of *immunitas* without even concealing his reasons.⁷⁰ A further Livian passage is also instructive here, Liv. 38.48.3–4, where Manlius Vulso, in explaining the case for his triumph over the Galatians, points out that the senate now has sway over new regions, and that their powers include the granting of *immunitas* to various states. The content of 12.61 thus recalls the type of issue which the senate might have dealt with in the past, but procedurally it is the emperor who determines how the matter will be handled, with the senate merely confirming Claudius' decision, which is motivated only by a personal friendship—all the more striking in view of Claudius' own antiquarian interests.⁷¹

The two chapters that follow deal with the pleas of the Byzantines for a reduction of their burden of taxation (*Ann.* 12.62–3). Here we are in territory closer to the diplomatic requests made by Greek communities in Book 4, with the Byzantines citing the nature of their past connections with the Romans,⁷² again evoking not a divide between the era of the principate and the republican past, but a sense of continuity. In narrative terms, in chapter 63, Tacitus then breaks off from relating the content of their speech to the Romans, giving instead an antiquarian account of the foundation of their city, and how they had surpassed the people of Chalcedon, who had blindly chosen to live on the wrong side of the Bosphorus. The narrative of the Byzantines that is given in this section is however not one of onward and upward ascent but one of decline, with a sense of their enervation as a result of various wars. The embassy of the Byzantines thus serves a range of functions in this context. First, it points to the procedural oddity of Claudius' intervention on behalf of the people of Cos, with the emperor seeing no need to rehearse arguments relating to services conferred on the Roman people. Tacitus also points to the role that communities such as Byzantium might have played in relation to Rome in the past, with military support, thus emphasising his earlier point about emperors being unwilling to expand the bounds of the empire (*Ann.* 4.32), and how such a role now is characterised by enervation and weakness. Once again, this episode of Greek diplomacy allows Tacitus to reflect not only on the past in terms of historiographical precedent, but also to use embassies as a way of looking both at the Greek world, but also at Rome itself.

To conclude, just as ethnography in antiquity so often moves from looking at external societies to an implicit examination of the ethnographer's own

70 Griffin 1990: 487.

71 On the interplay between Claudius' antiquarianism and his principate, see e.g. Levick 1978.

72 For the reference to Byzantine assistance against 'Pseudo-Philip' here, see Gruen 1984: 22 n. 50.

perspective, so too can Tacitus' presentation of diplomatic activity be seen as a way of reflecting on Rome and its past. An anecdote told by Tacitus, not about a Greek embassy, but an embassy from the Frisians (*Ann.* 13.54.3–4) confirms this point. Sent to Rome to negotiate when confronted by the threat of Roman military might, the Frisian ambassadors find themselves in the theatre of Pompey. Instead of paying attention to the entertainment, they concentrate on the way in which hierarchy is enshrined in seating arrangements, until they notice individuals sitting amongst the senatorial seats in foreign dress. On hearing that such seats of honour are given to those of special note from foreign embassies who are preeminent in virtue, they at once join them. The upshot is citizenship for the envoys themselves, an interesting glance at the tendency to emphasise the contributions of individuals in ancient diplomacy, then further coercion of the Frisians, and, eventually, military action against them. In this anecdote we find the failure of traditional procedure (there is no need even to mention an audience in the senate, and such diplomatic activity as there is takes place in the theatre), as the representation of diplomatic interaction allows an examination of how Roman power is used; but the opportunity to examine external peoples also allows examination of Rome itself. The emphasis on the ambassadors' almost ethnographic curiosity about the arrangements for seating of dignitaries in the theatre is a wonderful way of reminding us how far we are from the diplomatic activities of the republican senates of Polybius and Livy. Though Tacitus claims that senatorial diplomacy in Book 3 is an *imago antiquitatis* (*Ann.* 3.60.1), the presentation of diplomacy in the *Annals* is always accompanied by reminders of the complex and slippery quality of what can only be an imagined past, and of the divide that separates it from the imperial present.

Fractured Vision: Josephus and Tacitus on Triumph and Civil War

Rhiannon Ash

After the War is Over

In the aftermath of a war, it might seem reasonable to infer that victors and defeated will experience polarised emotions: relief, pride and euphoria on one side, contrasted with bitterness, shame, and sadness on the other. In a Roman context, it was the visual splendour of the triumph which above all served as the focal point for such collective responses amongst the victors, particularly after 19 BCE, when full-blown triumphs were reserved for members of the imperial family.¹ The feelings engendered by that single glorious occasion were then further bolstered, both by erecting victory monuments and statues which immortalised the general's achievements and promulgated the glory of Rome more permanently, and by crafting polished literary *monumenta* through *res gestae* and histories which kept the achievement alive long after the war had ended.² The result is a series of concentric celebratory circles, moving through time and space from the initial point of victory, all working together to foster long-lasting pride in national identity (provided that the defeated enemy was foreign, or conveniently recast as such).³

Yet the Flavian triumph of 71 CE, celebrated in Rome to mark (however misleadingly) the end of the Jewish war must have been viewed in an unusually

-
- 1 The triumph of L. Cornelius Balbus over the Garamantes was the last held by anyone outside the imperial family. See Hickson 1992 for Augustus manipulating triumphs to his own advantage. Modern literature on the triumph is potentially vast, but see Coarelli 1968, Versnel 1970, Warren 1970, Künzl 1988, Brilliant 1999, Beard 2007, and Östenberg 2009.
 - 2 Thomas 2004: 24–6 comments usefully on how victory monuments ‘punctuated’ the history of Rome’s centre. See Ando 2000: 296–303 for more on victory monuments. Yet as Brilliant 1999: 212 reminds us, ‘Nothing, however, was so immediately felt, so spectacular, so visually and psychologically demanding as the celebration of the triumph itself.’
 - 3 In the opposite direction, see Wardle 2011 for the evolution of a powerful strategy for handling military defeat (designating a military disaster by the commander’s name).

complex way even by the victorious Romans.⁴ Coming so soon after the self-destructive civil wars of 68–9 CE, perceptions of the Jewish War must have been filtered through contemporary experiences of the civil wars. At the very least, the suppression of the Jews, culturally so different from the Romans, potentially offered onlookers a refreshing distraction from the uncomfortable ‘mirroring’ between (all too similar) enemies which marked the civil wars. Here finally was an opportunity for Romans to feel good about themselves once again. Nonetheless, even if the fledgling Flavian dynasty was now directing Roman military might towards a superficially more appropriate target, contemporaries could hardly forget that before the Jewish war, the Flavians’ robust martial credentials had been bolstered by defeating fellow-Romans in Italy. Any celebration of the Roman victory in Judaea therefore was probably viewed in complex ways because of fresh memories of the internal conflict which brought Vespasian to power. In addition, after Judaea was annexed under Augustus in 6 CE, Jerusalem had been governed by a string of Roman procurators for decades before the rebellion of 66 CE.⁵ Vespasian was hardly celebrating a straightforward conquest over barbarian outsiders or the acquisition of fresh territory, even if his spectacular triumph deployed techniques of staging which were historically associated with precisely that sort of victory. We should remember too that under the early empire, one of the largest concentrations of Jews outside Judaea was in Rome itself, and the city had its own synagogues.⁶ If Jews were outsiders, at best they were the outsiders within.

All in all, a great deal was at stake for the new Flavian dynasty in celebrating this triumph. As Noreña observes, ‘A prominent announcement of foreign conquest—for that is how the Romans chose to represent the suppression of provincial rebellions against Roman rule—was also useful to Vespasian for publicizing the military credentials of the upstart dynasty, an important step in establishing the political legitimacy of the new regime.’⁷ Vespasian must have hoped that the triumph would prompt his fellow citizens to forget about the

4 The Jewish war properly ended with the fall of Masada (Joseph. *BJ* 7.252–406) in either May 73 CE (Rajak 1983: 174) or May 74 CE (Cohen 1982: 401; Campbell 1988: 158). Cotton 1989 surveys the evidence for both dates. Either way, Masada fell significantly after the Flavian triumph.

5 See Curran 2005 for a historical survey of relations between Rome and Judaea.

6 See Williams 1998 on the structure and organisation of the Jewish community in Rome during this period. At *Satire* 1.9.69–70, Horace’s companion Fuscus alludes to a (possibly fictional) Jewish festival (the thirtieth Sabbath), which at the very least suggests that Jewish rituals were sufficiently well-known to be casually mentioned in conversation.

7 Noreña 2003: 35.

murky events of the past and encourage them to look forwards optimistically.⁸ No doubt for these reasons the triumph itself had been carefully planned in advance, although it required meticulous preparation: Aemilius Paulus had once said that if spectacles were to be any good, they had to be organised with as much care as the military campaigns which inspired them (Diodorus Siculus 31.8). Certainly, even before Vespasian's official *dies imperii* on July 1st 70 CE and the Flavian triumph in 71 CE, the programme of measures to bolster the new regime had been initiated promptly. So, months before Vespasian himself returned to Rome, the religious rituals surrounding the laying of the first stone in the building project to restore the Capitol on June 21st 70 CE (Tacitus *Histories* 4.53) were clearly intended to restore morale and win back the favour of the gods, who had apparently forsaken Rome on a temporary basis.⁹ Barnes characterises the potential turning-point in strong terms: 'The Jewish victory provided the equivalent of a foundation myth for the Flavian dynasty, which came to power in 69 through civil war: the routine suppression of a provincial insurrection was turned into a great and glorious triumph of Roman arms'.¹⁰

Josephus: Author and Audiences

The broad purpose of this volume is to explore the different ways Greek and Latin writers from the late first to the third centuries CE experienced and viewed Roman power and state institutions. There is perhaps no more relevant focal point here than the Roman triumph, but the Flavian triumph of 71 CE is an especially compelling instance, above all because of its role in legitimising the new Flavian dynasty, swept to power through civil war. Furthermore, in

8 The dynasty subsequently tried to preserve links between Vespasian and triumph, even after his death. As Thomas 2004: 26 notes, the Temple of the Deified Vespasian was built on the *Clivus Capitolinus*, a strategic location giving the building a prominent spot on the usual triumphal route, although that could on occasion be changed. Miller 2000 discusses two instances where the endpoint was displaced to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine hill, including Nero's return from Achaia in 67 CE and his 'triumph' for musical and athletic victories: the Flavian triumph of 71 CE may have been pointedly countering aspects of this Neronian occasion.

9 Chilver and Townend 1985: 66 point to the stone's significance: 'This is clearly the *lapis Terminus*, described as on the site before the construction of the original temple and preserved as a guarantee of the perpetuity of the empire'. The epitomised Dio 65.8.2 records one colourful portent from 69 CE, huge footprints on the Capitoline Hill, suggestive of Jupiter having left his temple.

10 Barnes 2005: 129.

lieu of an extended Roman narrative of this pivotal event in Latin, we have to turn to a writer whose identity is notoriously controversial and elusive, Flavius Josephus. Born in Jerusalem in c. 37 CE, Josephus was deeply involved in the politics and religious life of his home city and initially played a leading part in the anti-Roman revolt which broke out in 66 CE, but after surrendering to the Romans, he spent the rest of his life in Rome, living and working in close proximity to the Flavians, and writing in Greek.¹¹ The notion of identity under the Roman Empire is always complex and multi-faceted, but Josephus' shifting status (as he moved from unwilling rebel general to co-operative prisoner of war, from Jerusalem to Rome, from *actor* to *auctor*) makes his viewpoint uniquely valuable.¹² He had enough direct experience of Rome and Roman institutions to understand them, but the fact that he had once operated on the periphery meant that he did not take things for granted, and it was clearly part of his agenda in the *Bellum Iudaicum* to explain Roman institutions to a wider audience. So, his account of the imperial army (*BJ* 3.70–109, inspired by Polybius' description of the Republican army at 6.19–42) was explicitly intended to console his defeated countrymen and to deter others from futile revolt (*BJ* 3.109).¹³

It is intriguing (sensational even) that Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* is our main surviving source for the Flavian triumph, offering an eyewitness account both of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the subsequent Roman celebration of that event.¹⁴ As Rajak notes, the prospect of narrating these events must have confronted Josephus with a uniquely difficult ideological task, which goes right to the heart of his 'split' identity as both Flavian dependent and former Jewish general. No doubt his Flavian patrons would have expected an enthusiastic and magnificent representation of the triumph, however ambiguously Josephus might have felt about constructing such a narrative.¹⁵ Particularly for Roman writers, this triumph had a pivotal role in terms of periodisation and organising a meaningful historical narrative. So Pliny the Elder's history from the end of Aufidius Bassus may have ended climactically with the Flavian triumph.

11 On Josephus' Greek, see Redondo 2000. Ward 2007 identifies various Latinisms in his Greek.

12 See Bilde 1988: 27–60 for an overview of the different phases of Josephus' life.

13 See Walbank 1995: 283. Eckstein 1990 explores how Josephus adopts Polybian themes more generally.

14 Beard 2007: 93 allows for the possibility that Josephus had not seen the triumph for himself, but drew on contemporary accounts. However that may be, his narrative creates the *impression* that he had been present.

15 Rajak 1983: 217: 'However, there were also more acute and sensitive problems attached to framing a concluding book for the *Jewish War*. How was the Roman victory to be handled?'

Josephus himself perhaps knew and consulted this account, even though Pliny had apparently set aside the work for publication only after his own death to avoid charges of pro-Flavian bias.¹⁶ Yet Josephus can go one better, having been present during the war itself, and his account of the harrowing events which lay behind the glittering triumph of 71 CE was therefore likely to have held a special fascination for a wider contemporary audience.¹⁷ In terms of narrative dynamics, we can compare *Aeneid* 2, where Dido insists on hearing about the fall of Troy from Aeneas himself, however much he dislikes the prospect of telling her about it: *infandum, regina, iubes renouare dolorem*... (*Aeneid* 2.3). Nonetheless, whereas Dido and her Carthaginians as the internal audience are not the agents of Troy's destruction, the Flavians and the Romans (part of the audience of the *Bellum Iudaicum*) are responsible for the siege and brutal assault on Jerusalem, which resulted in the shocking destruction of the temple (a pivotal moment in the evolution of Jewish identity);¹⁸ and moreover it was Vespasian who instituted the *fiscus Iudaicus* to levy special taxes on the Jews.¹⁹

-
- 16 Barnes 2005: 142 suggests that Pliny may have been Josephus' main source. For the idea that the triumph formed the climax of Pliny's narrative, see Syme 1958: 699, Levick 1999: 93, and Beard 2003: 558.
- 17 Cf. Woodman and Martin 1996: 169: 'The ancients generally (though not exclusively) maintained that seeing is more reliable than hearing... consequently, those historians and story-tellers who could not claim autopsy... claimed instead that they had heard from someone else who had seen'. Josephus accentuates the valuable status of his evidence for the events leading up to the fall of Jerusalem at *Ap.* 1.49.
- 18 Rajak 1983: 206 notes that Josephus ascribes to Titus concern for saving the Temple and underscores that the fire was an accident (cf. Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* 1.13–14, praising Titus for deliberately destroying the Temple). See further Leoni 2007. Josephus says (*Vit.* 361–4) that he presented a copy of (some or all of?) the Greek version of the *Bellum Iudaicum* to Vespasian, which suggests that the emperor was envisaged an important member of its readership. Most scholars conclude from internal evidence that it was published between 75–79 CE (Bilde 1988: 79), although compelling arguments have been made for later publication of *BJ* 1–6 under Titus and *BJ* 7 under Domitian. Cohen 1979: 84–90 and Barnes 2005 suggest that the traditional publication date of 75–79 CE is (a) incompatible with the traditional death-date of Vitellius' general Caecina (79 CE), portrayed negatively by Josephus despite the favour in which he was held by the Flavians, and (b) incompatible with the fact that Josephus names Titus alone in the preface (not Vespasian) and that he shows a 'perceptible coolness towards Vespasian in much of his narrative' (Barnes 2005: 139). Both Cohen 1979: 85–7 and Barnes 2005: 140 therefore argue that *BJ* 1–6 should be dated to Titus' principate and that *BJ* 7 followed early in Domitian's principate. See Schwartz 1986 on *BJ* 7.
- 19 See Levick 1999: 101 on the tax (perhaps producing 40–48 million HS per year), including Nerva's intervention early in his principate to suspend the humiliating tax (which

In some ways, it is extraordinary that Josephus chose to write about the traumas of the Jewish war at all, particularly in a work which was to serve as his literary debut in Rome.²⁰ His explicit reason for so doing is allegedly to provide an accurate account of historical facts, avoiding the extremes of other writers, who have either flattered the Romans or expressed their hatred for the Jews (*BJ* 1.2).²¹ Such claims to truthfulness are a standard feature of historical prefaces. What is much more unusual is Josephus' subsequent claim, that constructing this accurate narrative will nevertheless allow him to lament his country's misfortunes (*BJ* 1.9); and he conjures up an extraordinary bifurcation between a factually accurate and impartial *written* history and an emotionally driven *writer* (*BJ* 1.12).²² That explicit rejection of a dispassionate attitude (at least from himself, as opposed to his book) at the opening of the work is worth remembering when we turn to consider the account of the triumph at its end.

Unsurprisingly, Josephus' description of the triumph has attracted much attention and prompted a wide range of reactions. Some scholars, such as Goodman, point to its surprisingly pro-Roman character: 'In the light of his heartfelt comments elsewhere in his histories about the disaster which had befallen the Jews, the description of the ceremony is remarkable for its consistently Roman viewpoint'.²³ Others, such as Stern, prefer to differentiate between Josephus' supportive attitude towards Titus the individual (and to a much lesser extent Vespasian) in the *Bellum Iudaicum* and his 'conspicuous lack of any cultural or spiritual solidarity with the empire'.²⁴ It seems generally true that while cultural historians certainly appreciate that Josephus provides the most extensive literary description of a triumph which has survived

was soon reinstated). Goodman 2007: 469–70 offers a useful overview; Goodman 2005 is essential.

- 20 Josephus refers to a previous version of the *Bellum Iudaicum* written for the 'barbarians of the interior' (*BJ* 1.6), presumably in Aramaic: 'But there is no reason to think that the first work bore much similarity to the second in scope or literary form ... Speeches and digressions, characteristic formal features of Graeco-Roman historiography, are likely to have been absent' (Rajak 1983: 176). Hata 1975–6 discusses the question extensively.
- 21 One writer to provoke Josephus' indignation for compiling an untruthful account of the war was Justus of Tiberias, who apparently criticised the *BJ* strongly. Josephus denounces him extensively and vividly at *Vit.* 336–67 (a direct address). See Rajak 1983: 152–4 and Bilde 1988: 108–9 on this passage; and Rajak 1973 on Justus generally.
- 22 This separation between author and (personified) book had of course been fruitfully deployed by the poets (Horace *Epistle* 1.20, *Ov. Tr.* 1.1, Martial 1.70). See Hinds 1985, Pearcy 1994, and Mordine 2010.
- 23 Goodman 2007: 452.
- 24 Stern 1987: 78.

from antiquity, the biographical background leaves critics feeling distinctly uneasy. Chapman's reaction, in an article on spectacle in Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum*, captures the general sense of disquiet: 'What is noteworthy here in the triumph scene, and what so disturbs some modern scholars, is the lack of emotion displayed by the author or even his internal audience... Where are the lamentations now over his country's fate?'.²⁵ I want to propose that, if we insist on viewing the narrative of this triumph in isolation from the previous books of the *Bellum Iudaicum* and fail to look below the surface, there is a risk that we will miss Josephus' suggestive turns of emotive expression in the account of the triumph. Signs of lamentation about the fate of Jerusalem are present, but it should not surprise us if Josephus, living in exile in Rome under direct Flavian patronage, chooses not to parade his disquiet too openly. Mason, in a thought-provoking article on figured speech and irony in Josephus, has suggested that Josephus can sometimes be seen to adopt a distinctly ironising narrative voice, which demands a more nuanced response from modern readers than he is generally afforded.²⁶ As I intend to demonstrate, the triumph is a good instance of a narrative unit which repays careful reading along these lines.

Multiple Realities: The Narrative of the Flavian Triumph

In the preliminaries of the triumph (*BJ* 7.121–31), Josephus sets up the scene artfully, using the transition from night to day to draw his readers' eyes towards the glittering central figures, Vespasian and Titus. So he immediately zooms in on the expectant audience in Rome's crowded streets (7.122), but then leaves them in suspended animation, jostling to find a good viewing place for the spectacle.²⁷ Josephus then puts the clock back and describes how the army marched out in companies and divisions during the night (7.123). Next just as dawn breaks, Vespasian and Titus emerge from the temple of Isis (7.124) dressed in crimson robes: the eulogistic association between father and son and the rising sun is clearly meant to engender optimism and reprises a flattering device used in a variety of contexts, including epic poetry and ruler-cult.²⁸ The

25 Chapman 2005: 310.

26 Mason 2005. For Josephus' positive assessments of Titus, see Yavetz 1975.

27 See Favro 1994 on this practical aspect of viewing the triumphal procession.

28 So, Brutus is called the *sol Asiae* (*Hor. Sat.* 1.7.24; cf. *Cic. Phil.* 10.12); Publius Africanus *sol alter* (*Cic. Nat. D.* 2.14); Pompey is *sol* (*Cic. Att.* 9.10.3); Virgil's Pallas is memorably compared with the morning star (*Aen.* 8.589–91); and Apollo compares Nero with the

pair then take up position at the *porticus Octaviae*, where they are acclaimed by the troops, recite prayers, and then offer the soldiers a celebratory breakfast (7.124–30). After the pair put on their triumphal robes and make sacrifices, the triumphal procession begins, explicitly being said to pass through unspecified theatres in order to give the people watching a better view (7.131). The actual topography and route here probably matter less than Josephus' efforts to open up the visual register of spectatorship and to trigger *enargeia*.²⁹ All these preliminaries tantalisingly defer the main description and gradually stir the audience's curiosity.

Everything is set up for the main *narratio* of the triumphal procession, but Josephus now imposes his authorial voice to deliver a general disclaimer:

Ἀμήχανον δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν εἰπεῖν τῶν θεαμάτων ἐκείνων τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν ἐν ἅπασιν οἷς ἂν τις ἐπινοήσῃεν . . .

It is impossible to talk adequately about the number of those spectacles and their magnificence in all the ways one could contemplate . . . (7.132).

Of course, claiming that something is impossible to describe before then describing it constitutes a standard aggrandising rhetorical ploy for any author wanting both to inject a note of modesty and to whet his audience's appetites for the special nature of the portrayal to follow.³⁰ Appeal to the impossibility of adequate description was a well-established ploy for epic poets from Homer onwards, and features in panegyric contexts. So, Velleius Paterculus 2.89.1 vividly accentuates the impossibility of adequate description when

sol... lucidus (Sen. *Apocol.* 4.1.28–9). There is an obvious relevance in associating the sun with the Flavians, a dynasty which sprang from the east (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 3.24.3). Vespasian himself exploited the link, e.g. by redesignating Zenodorus' colossal statue of Nero (intended for display in the *Domus Aurea*) as the sun (Plin. *HN* 34.45; Dio 65.15.1), although it seems likely that such solar symbolism was already there in the original statue. See further Albertson 2001. Bergmann 1998 comprehensively surveys the sun in the context of ruler-cult (231–42 on the Flavians, including solar imagery on coinage).

29 See Makin 1921 and Beard 2007: 92–105 for the triumphal route.

30 Cf. the 'not if I had a hundred tongue' topos. Austin (1977), 199–200 on *Verg. Aen.* 6.625 cites Hom. *Il.* 2.488, Enn. *Ann.* 561, Virgil *G.* 2.43, Ovid *Met.* 8.533, *F.* 2.119, *Tr.* 1.5.53, Silius Italicus 4.525, Valerius Flaccus 6.36, Apul. *Met.* 11.25, and Macrobi. *Sat.* 6.3.6. Gowers 2005 has a compelling discussion. See Becker 1992: 19 for the theme in ecphrasis. It was such a familiar literary device that by Nero's time, the satirist Pers. could make fun of it (*Sat.* 5.1–2).

narrating Octavian's return to Italy in 29 BCE.³¹ Josephus himself has already used a similar technique by characterising Herod's palace as παντὸς λόγου κρείσσων, 'beyond all description' (*BJ* 5.176) before (inevitably) proceeding to describe the building in great detail. Yet the long literary pedigree of the *adunaton* topos (potentially a 'very tired expression' even by Virgil's time, as Gowers suggests)³² may set up a smokescreen, which dissipates if we consider this assertion from a biographical stance. It is unusually expressive when considered in context. For this statement functions in multiple ways, as a general literary motif on the one hand and as a reflection of the narrator's specific lived experience on the other. For from Josephus' perspective, the hackneyed topos has fresh resonances: he himself lacks adequate language to describe the triumphal procession because of his perspective as a former inhabitant of the city whose destruction is being depicted and celebrated. Not only that, but his readership includes the very men who engineered that defeat. In this sense, words really cannot describe the triumph adequately for much darker and more personal reasons. Josephus' expression of *aporia* can be seen to reflect his emotional turmoil within, however safe and familiar the protestation appears on the surface.

So, although it would be easy to take Josephus' opening gloss on the triumphal narrative at face value as adding straightforwardly pro-Roman colouring, a more sensitive reading is also possible. For behind the festive veneer of the triumph lie deeply harrowing events, which Josephus has already narrated in great detail, namely Jerusalem's long siege by the Romans and the resulting famine, which grows progressively more devastating over *BJ* 5 and 6. That narrative of suffering culminates in the sensational description of Mary, the child-killing cannibal who murders her own baby and roasts him for food (*BJ* 6.201–13).³³ This is a harrowing scene, which Josephus concludes in language casting a particularly suggestive light on the subsequent triumph:

ἀνεπλήσθη δ'εὐθέως ὅλη τοῦ μύσους ἢ πόλις καὶ πρὸ ὁμμάτων ἕκαστος τὸ πάθος λαμβάνων ὥσπερ αὐτῷ τολμηθὲν ἔφριττε. σπουδῇ δὲ τῶν λιωπτόντων

31 I owe this example to Simon Malloch. See further Woodman 1983: 249.

32 Gowers 2005: 171.

33 Chapman 2005: 302 calls this scene 'an insane and tragic permutation of a ritual sacrifice'. See too Chapman 2000. Gleason 2001: 75 reads the moment where Mary uncovers the uneaten portion of her child as a perverse demonstration which paradoxically reasserts her own power.

ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον ἦν, καὶ μακαρισμός τῶν φθασάντων πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι καὶ θεάσασθαι κακὰ τηλικαῦτα.

From that moment the entire city was full of this abomination; everyone saw the tragedy before his own eyes and shuddered as if he himself had dared to commit the crime. The one desire of the starving was for death and they called happy the ones who had gone before seeing and hearing about such appalling horrors (*BJ* 6.212–13).

What is striking about Josephus' language here is his insistent focus on the visual, with each person putting the horror of the cannibalism before his eyes and counting as lucky those who died before *seeing* such an abomination (even though most inhabitants had not directly witnessed the transgressive meal themselves).³⁴ Causally, this act of cannibalism proves pivotal, since it prompts the disgusted Titus to destroy a city where mothers can eat this sort of food (*BJ* 6.217). Yet the highly visual aspect of the city's reaction to Mary's actions has connections with Josephus' remarkable concluding passage of the central description of the *pegmata* ('moving stages') in the triumph:

ἡ τέχνη δὲ καὶ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων ἡ μεγαλουργία τοῖς οὐκ ἰδοῦσι γινόμενα τότ' ἐδείκνυνεν ὥς παροῦσι.

The art and marvellous craftsmanship of these constructions now displayed the incidents to those who had not seen them happen, as clearly as if they had been there (*BJ* 7.146–7).

Josephus' language of visualisation here, plus his conspicuous engagement with the notions of presence and absence, provocatively recalls the citizens' collective reaction of vicarious guilt in Jerusalem after the cannibalism. In both cases, mediation comes in to play. So, the Roman spectators are described as not having seen the events for themselves, even if the depictions on which they gaze temporarily create the illusion that they had been present and thereby engender vicarious pride. Despite the ingenuity of the technicians who create the moving stages, these onlookers only have 'partial vision' of

34 There is perhaps an echo here of Aeneas' vivid debut, specifically his famous opening words as he faces imminent death (or so he thinks) in the violent storm and calls happy (*beati*) those who died in Troy before their parents' eyes (*Verg. Aen.* 1.94–6). Evoking a passage centred on the concept of noble death witnessed by one's parents is hugely ironic and expressive in the context of a baby killed and eaten by his own mother.

reality. The formulation seems designed to make readers think back to those who *had* been there. In that context, there is a curious link between the spectators in Rome gazing in admiration at visual representations of events which they had not seen, as if they had in fact been present, and the distressed citizens of Jerusalem, who did not personally witness Mary's cannibalism for themselves, but who still picture the horrific event in their minds' eyes and shudder as though they themselves were the perpetrators. The circumstances are very different for the Roman spectators at the triumph and the citizens of Jerusalem after the cannibalism, but in each case visualisation at one remove (involving real images for the Romans, imagined ones for the citizens of Jerusalem) engender similar emotional results: just as the triumphal procession in Rome makes onlookers feel as if they themselves participate in the victory, so in Jerusalem the vivid picture created in the minds' eyes of the citizens makes them all feel guilt and shame. Through overlapping language involving the visual dimension, Josephus establishes a link between the Roman spectators and the citizens of Jerusalem. While discussing the vivid triumph narrative, Mary Beard asks: 'With *mimesis* like this, who needs reality?'.³⁵ Yet the essential point is that reality (or at least Josephus' representation of it) is still a silent presence in the description of the triumph, obliging readers to filter the current jubilant celebration through past horrors. That prompt towards 'double vision' would not be lost on the more sophisticated members of Josephus' audience: 'From well-established rhetorical practice, Romans were well accustomed to visualise the unseen, as if it were actually present'.³⁶

Given Josephus' personal circumstances, it would have been understandable if he had chosen to avoid completely in describing the triumph details which potentially betrayed pathos or expressed personal regret (suggesting hostility towards the Romans).³⁷ Nonetheless, such aspects are still tangible. A particularly bold example is the central tableau of the phases of the war depicted on the huge moving *pegmata*:

διὰ πολλῶν δὲ μιμημάτων ὁ πόλεμος ἄλλος εἰς ἄλλα μεμερισμένος ἐναργεστάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ παρεῖχεν· ἦν γὰρ ὁρᾶν χώραν μὲν εὐδαίμονα δηουμένην, ὅλας δὲ φάλλαγγας κτεινομένας πολεμίων, καὶ τοὺς μὲν φεύγοντας τοὺς δ' εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀγομένους τείχη δ' ὑπερβάλλοντα μεγέθει μηχαναῖς ἐρειπόμενα καὶ φρουρίων ἀλίσκομένας ὀχυρότητας καὶ πόλεων πολυανθρώπους περιβόλους κατ' ἄκρας ἐχομένους, καὶ στρατιὰν ἔνδον τειχῶν εἰσχεομένην, καὶ

35 Beard 2003: 551.

36 Brilliant 1999: 224.

37 See Joseph. *Vit.* 416 for the dangers facing him in 70 CE from Romans and Jews alike.

πάντα φόνου πλήθοντα τόπον, καὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων χειρὰς ἀνταίρειν ἱκεσίας, πῦρ τε ἐνιέμενον ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκαφὰς οἴκων ἐπὶ τοῖς δεσπόταις, καὶ μετὰ πολλὴν ἐρημίαν καὶ κατήφειαν ποταμοὺς ῥέοντας οὐκ ἐπὶ γῆν γεωργουμένην, οὐδὲ ποτὸν ἀνθρώποις ἢ βοσκήμασιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἔτι πανταχόθεν φλεγομένης·

The war was shown by numerous representations, in separate sections, affording a very vivid picture of its episodes. Here was to be seen a prosperous country being devastated, there whole battalions of the enemy being slaughtered; here men in flight, there others being led into captivity; walls of surpassing size being demolished by siege-engines; and strong fortresses being captured; and cities with well-manned defences being completely mastered; and an army pouring within the ramparts; and an area all deluged with slaughter; and the hands of those incapable of resistance raised in supplication, as well as temples set on fire, and houses pulled down over their owners' heads, and, after much desolation and woe, rivers flowing, not over a cultivated land, nor supplying drink to man and beast, but across a country still on every side in flames (*BJ* 7.142–5).

The sense of complete, devastating *peripeteia* is signalled immediately through the broad opening focus on a prosperous country utterly devastated. This general picture is then fleshed out by a relentlessly paratactic list of individual points elaborating the details, first through two paired items (linked by μέν and δέ), then through an expansive list of nine items in polysyndeton.³⁸ Initially, it seems as if the focalisation will be through the Romans, in that Josephus refers to ὅλας δὲ φάλαγγας κτεινομένας πολεμίων, 'whole battalions of the enemy [i.e. the Jews] being slaughtered'. Yet gradually the passage's emotional focus gravitates towards the Jews, as we get poignant details which should stir sympathy for the Jewish victims and accentuate the Roman aggressors' brutality.³⁹ So, after the opening two pairs, the passage is arranged in an (unevenly) bipartite way, with the first part showing the disintegrating physical fabric of man-made structures through military action (walls being demolished,

38 Östenberg 2009: 250 stresses visual demarcation between the scenes represented, envisaging separate panels displaying each of these events sequentially; she sees the *pegmata* not as paintings, but as 'multimedial stagings' (254).

39 Josephus achieves this effect without depicting on the *pegmata* the protagonists' emotions (cf. Becker 1992: 16 for this technique on the pseudo-Hesiodic ecphrasis of the shield of Herakles). Yet his preceding narrative of the siege and downfall of Jerusalem in *BJ* 5 and 6 regularly depicts the emotions on both sides.

fortresses being captured, cities being mastered). Then we are given the pivotal image, the Roman army streaming within the ramparts.⁴⁰ This is followed by a series of five items concentrating on the domestic sphere and emphasising the human cost (an area filled with slaughter, suppliants raising their hands, temples set on fire, houses demolished with their owners still inside, rivers flowing though the blazing countryside). The huge scale of the destruction and the very heartlessness of its execution should gradually entice Josephus' audience to see the situation from the Jewish perspective. We can see how Tacitus will use a very similar arrangement for the deadly impact of the fire of Rome, where he purposefully splits his account into two, with the first part (*Ann.* 15.38.2–3) outlining the fire's progress through the physical landscape of the city, and the second part (*Ann.* 15.38.4–6) cranking up the emotional level by putting the spotlight on the human victims.⁴¹ Josephus in this central panel hardly offers an unambiguous celebration of the Roman victory through the visual representations on the *pegmata*. As Östenberg (2009: 112) observes, when we look more closely at Josephus' narrative of the triumph, 'it becomes clear that his narrative sequence is more complex than might first be assumed'.

It is not just the internal detail and arrangement which hints at how we can potentially respond in a nuanced way, rather than simply dismissing the whole description of the triumph as the sycophantic outpouring of a Flavian lackey. From the start, Josephus clearly signals that he is opening up the ecphrastic register with the phrase ἦν γὰρ ὁρᾶν.⁴² Perhaps the most famous ecphrasis in all Greek literature is Homer's seminal description of the shield of Achilles (*Iliad* 18.468–608).⁴³ Just as Hephaistos tells Thetis that any mortal will wonder (θαυμάσσεται) when seeing the shield (*Il.* 18.467), so too Josephus says that what caused the greatest wonder (θαῦμα) in the triumphal procession was the succession of *pegmata*. However, readers' responses to Homer's ecphrasis are inevitably notoriously complex, and extend well beyond simple wonder. As Scully suggests, 'Rather than inspiring a specific response from characters in the poem, the detailed description of the scenes on the shield... invites the audience of the poem to consider Hephaistos' creation against the larger story

40 Josephus' water imagery here also features in Homeric battle scenes. See Fenno 2005.

41 Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.464–93, the tableau of the Trojan war in Juno's temple in Carthage, where the focus is restricted to people, not buildings.

42 There are many useful modern discussions of ecphrasis, but see especially Perutelli 1978, Rosand 1990, Fowler 1991, Becker 1992, Laird 1993, Elsner 1996, Putnam 1998, Beck 2007, Goldhill 2007.

43 On the shield of Achilles, see Taplin 1980, Hardie 1985, Becker 1990, Hubbard 1992, Becker 1995, Scully 2003.

of which it is a part'.⁴⁴ As I have already suggested, we can apply the same wider contextualisation to Josephus' description of the triumph with fruitful results, which differ markedly from reading the passage in a self-contained way. What I also propose is that Josephus' portrayal of the *pegmata* invites a more ambiguous reading if it is seen as engaging directly with Homer's description of the images on Achilles' shield.⁴⁵

It is not so much direct verbal allusion in play here, but a compelling set of conceptual links, which make the Homeric shield a relevant point of comparison. One of the most memorable features of the whole shield is the contrasting portraits of the two cities (both unnamed), one in peacetime (*Il.* 18.490–508) and one during war (*Il.* 18.509–40).⁴⁶ This second city is depicted under siege, surrounded by two armies uncertain whether to storm the city or to reach an agreement with the inhabitants and take half their property. The scenario has some striking points of contact with Josephus' depiction (before the triumph) of Jerusalem, a city also under siege. So, Homer's army, divided into two (*Il.* 18.509–10), finds a parallel in Titus' troops, likewise split into two divisions around Jerusalem's walls (*BJ* 6.130–35); the dilemma of Homer's besieging army about how to treat the city (*Il.* 18.510–12) can be compared with Titus' council of war (*BJ* 6.236–43) about what they should do regarding the Temple; and the daring sally of the trapped inhabitants from Homer's city (*Il.* 18.513–40) can be compared with the Jews' surprise sortie against Titus' forces (*BJ* 6.71–97). Yet whereas Homer's city under siege is left in suspended animation (its ultimate fate unknown), the images of Jerusalem on the *pegmata* show the ugly reality of the siege's brutal endgame. The climax of the wholesale destruction in Josephus involves highlighting the rivers, which (he says) *should* be flowing amidst tilled fields, benignly supplying water to men and animals: but in fact the rivers must progress through land still ablaze with fire.⁴⁷ By saying what the rivers are *not* doing, Josephus makes an emotive point, subtly

44 Scully 2003: 29.

45 Paul 1993 considers how Josephus repeatedly uses the past unreal conditional in the *BJ* to heighten dramatic moments and suggests that he was inspired by Homer. Josephus later claims that he studied Greek literature extensively, though he still spoke Greek with an accent (*AJ* 20.263–4; published in 93/4 CE).

46 A contrasting pair of cities, one besieged and one at peace, is reprised in [Hesiod]'s *Shield of Herakles* 237–84, and followed by fruitful pictures of agricultural activity (285–300), just as in Homer.

47 It is striking too that Josephus uses the metaphor of a river to describe the 'flow' of the silver, gold, and ivory spoils along the triumphal route (*BJ* 7.134). Rivers in Jerusalem flowing through barren and burning terrain have been transformed into glittering rivers of wealth in Rome.

alluding to the cessation of normal agricultural activity during the siege and recalling the terrible debilitating famine which gripped Jerusalem. His (brief but alliterative) reference to the γῆ γεωργουμένη may also prompt his readers to think again of Homer's ecphrasis: there, the measured rhythms of agricultural life are depicted in a separate portion of the shield and reassuringly surround the paired cities at peace and war, as we are presented with ordered images of agricultural work and the fruitful products of farming, including the joyful gathering of the grape-harvest (*Il.* 18.541–72), and cattle and sheep going to their pastures (*Il.* 18.573–89). Yet in Josephus' narrative of the triumph, it is as if the turbulent world of the city at war has overflowed and polluted Homer's enveloping circle of agricultural life. It is pointed too that Josephus' negative formulation that the rivers were *not* flowing over tilled fields serves as a subtle reminder of the devastating impact of famine on Jerusalem's inhabitants, whose fate made even the marauding Roman soldiers feel pity (*BJ* 6.405–6). Starving people into submission was hardly something to bolster Roman military glory, and any hint of the famine is generally played down in the triumph, except perhaps for here.⁴⁸

So, comparison with the famous images from Achilles' shield casts an intriguing light on Josephus' superficially jingoistic and pro-Roman account of the Flavian triumph. In narrative terms, it is as if Josephus has taken the Homeric 'before' (the image of the city at war), refracted aspects of it throughout the extended account of the siege of Jerusalem in *BJ* 6, and then supplied the siege's absent finale in the Homeric original through his own grim ecphrasis of Jerusalem's death-throes depicted on the *pegmata*. Fowler, while discussing the images on Juno's temple in Virgil *Aeneid* 1, comments: 'Just as with allusion, with any passage where in any sense we for a moment "stand back" from the narrative, we have two realities: the passage taken in isolation and its wider context... Precisely because the correspondences and contrasts are figured, the interpretation of them cannot be simple or clear: there is room for disagreement'.⁴⁹ By reading Josephus' Flavian triumph against the backdrop of the extended narrative of the siege of Jerusalem in *BJ* 5 and 6, and by exploring possible engagement with Homer's famous ecphrasis of Achilles' shield, we can open up more complex ways of reading the triumph and see it

48 Cf. the celebratory Roman banquets with which bookend the triumph at the beginning and end (*BJ* 7.131, 7.156). See Ash 1999: 149–51 on the dubious status of victories achieved by a blockade which deprives people of food. Cf. Tacitus on the Roman soldiers' assessment of the impending siege of Jerusalem: *neque enim dignum uidebatur famem hostium opperiri, poscebantque pericula...* (*Hist.* 5.10.2).

49 Fowler 1991: 35.

as reflecting deeply held emotions to which Josephus lays claim at the start of the *BJ*. Josephus must have known that this part of his history would be scrutinised particularly carefully (and perhaps even detached and read separately from the main narrative), so he had to create something which would satisfy patriotic Roman readers. His narrative certainly dazzles and engages a pro-Roman audience, who may indeed have been prompted to remember not only Homer's shield, but also (assuming they were bilingual) Virgil's reworking of it, which famously culminates in Augustus' triumph (*A.* 8.714–28).⁵⁰ Yet this potential for a positive reaction does not exclude the possibility of other more ambiguous responses as well. In a discussion of ecphrasis, Goldhill observes: 'Visualization amazes. In so doing, visualization *conceals* facts'.⁵¹ This is a particularly telling remark to bear in mind while reading Josephus' triumph.

The Homeric model seems an especially relevant intertext in another way too. I have already commented on how extraordinary it was that Josephus wrote about the war and the subsequent triumph while living in Rome. Here too the images from Achilles' shield are suggestive. Just as Homer's city at war is contrasted with a city at peace, so Josephus has experienced both ends of the spectrum after living first in war-torn Jerusalem and then in Rome, where celebrating the new Flavian peace on a huge scale in *Roma Resurgens* was big business. Ambitious projects such as Vespasian's Temple of Peace and the Arch of Titus, as well as images and legends on Flavian coinage, all worked together to foster the notion that Rome was now a victorious city defined by its peaceful status.⁵² For a writer with the polarised and dramatic life story of Josephus, the contrasting images described on the shield of Achilles must have offered a telling and relevant model for thinking about his own experiences in Jerusalem and Rome.⁵³ Yet instead of Homer's juxtaposition of two cities represented

50 Josephus' ἦν γὰρ ὁρᾶν (*BJ* 7.143) recalls Virgil's *cernere erat* (*Aen.* 8.676), while Josephus' stress on the impossibility of adequately describing the triumph (*BJ* 7.132) calls to mind Virgil's description of the shield as a *non enarrabile textum* (*Aen.* 8.625). On this last phrase, see especially Rossi 2010: 153–4. Adams 2003a: 15–18 offers an overview of Greek-Latin bilingualism.

51 Goldhill 2007: 5.

52 The Temple of Peace can be dated to 75 CE and the Arch of Titus to the early 80s CE. See Millar (2005) on the building projects. Chapman (2009), 110 raises the intriguing possibility that Josephus' own description of the objects taken from the Temple in Jerusalem (*BJ* 7.148–52) perhaps inspired the physical depiction of the spoils on the southern relief of the Arch of Titus.

53 The Homeric model is also relevant to other contrasting pairs of cities of which Josephus had direct experience, such as the pro-Roman Sepphoris in Galilee (coins from 67–8 CE cast the city as 'Eirenopolis': Cohen 1979: 245–8; at *BJ* 3.30–31 Josephus says that her

side-by-side in an ecphrasis of a physical object, Josephus experiences and represents his two cities sequentially through time and space, looking back at the city of war on the margin from his new position in the centre in the city of peace.

Unfortunately, Josephus' narrative of the war and the Flavian triumph survives in isolation from other extended accounts of the same events, above all the parallel version from Tacitus' *Histories*.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, we can still capture something of the *color* of that missing narrative. Tacitus clearly intended to include his own account of the *famosae urbis supremum diem* ('the final day of that well-known city', *H.* 5.2.1). The tendentious and sharply polarised nature of Tacitus' excursus on the Jews (*H.* 5.2–10), in which 'otherness' is consistently accentuated, could theoretically create the expectation that his subsequent treatment of the fall of Jerusalem was likely to be pro-Roman and lacking in sympathetic images of the defeated.⁵⁵ However, in practice his tone may have been rather more reflective, if we consider a surviving 'fragment' from the *Histories* about the siege:

interea Iudaei obsidione clausi, quia nulla neque pacis neque deditionis copia dabatur, ad extremum fame interibant, passimque uiae oppleri cadaueribus coepere, uicto iam officio humandi: quin omnia nefanda esca super ausi ne humanis quidem corporibus pepercerunt, nisi quae eiusmodi alimentis tabes praeripuerat.

Meanwhile, the Jews, being closely besieged and given no opportunity to make peace or surrender, were finally dying of starvation, and everywhere the streets began to be filled with cadavers, for they were now unequal to the duty of burying their dead; moreover, they dared to resort to all kinds of unspeakable food, not even sparing human bodies, except those which the putrefaction of provisions of that kind had deprived them.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS, *Chronica* 2.30.3

inhabitants were the only people in Galilee who had peaceful sentiments) and the restive Tiberias, the city which consistently flouted Josephus' attempts to impose control. Miller 2001 discusses the antithetical portrait of Sepphoris and Tiberias in Josephus' *Vita* (but suggests that the depiction of the relations between the two cities in the *BJ* is more nuanced).

54 Cf. the famous Vesuvius letters of Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 6.16, 6.20), originally sent as 'raw material' for Tacitus, whose account of these events has not survived.

55 See Bloch 2002 for extensive discussion of Tacitus' Jewish excursus.

Now the status of evidence drawn from 'fragments' must be treated with caution, particularly since the intermediary (Sulpicius Severus) was writing in 400 CE and the source (Tacitus) is not named. Yet by assessing Sulpicius Severus' techniques when borrowing from parts of Tacitus' works which *have* survived, Barnes suggests that our intermediary tends to offer condensed summaries of events, which still preserve original Tacitean phrasing. He therefore regards this fragment about the siege as a relatively reliable reflection of Tacitus' version in the missing part of *Histories* 5.⁵⁶ If so, it looks as if Tacitus did not pass over the full horrors of the siege, but described acts of cannibalism in a way which was likely to have informed his readers' response to the subsequent triumph.⁵⁷ We can compare here Tacitus' assertion that Nero's brutal treatment of the Christians prompted people to feel *miseratio* towards them, even though they were guilty (*Ann.* 15.44.5). Given how sensitive Tacitus generally is when faced with the gap between appearance and reality (and the hypocrisy which this often entails from his protagonists), it seems likely that his account of the Flavian triumph would have actively engaged with the ambiguous status of the brutal victory it was designed to celebrate.⁵⁸ In addition, Tacitus surely played creatively with suggestive parallels between the Capitoline temple's destruction in Rome during the civil war (*H.* 3.70–72) and the fate of the Temple in Jerusalem.⁵⁹ In so doing, he may have suggested that Jews and Romans perhaps had more in common than at first seemed likely from a reading on *Histories* 5.2–10. This is all speculation of course, but it is possible that the 'insider' Tacitus' account of the Flavian triumph was much more explicitly uneasy about the display of power than Josephus, the 'outsider within', who had to find relatively subtle and subversive ways to register his own distress. This difference naturally reflects the essential fact that Tacitus was writing after the end of the Flavian dynasty, while Josephus published his work while the Flavians were still in power. Yet Josephus' narrative of the triumph repays being examined from different angles: a superficially positive account can be seen as much more ambiguous when read in context.

This paper has suggested that we should respond much more sensitively and imaginatively to Josephus' unique narrative of the Flavian triumph of 71 CE. Reading this passage in the context of the whole work and setting the ecphrasis in dialogue with Homer's seminal ecphrasis of the two cities at war

56 Barnes 1977: 227.

57 Cannibalism features elsewhere in Tacitus: see *Agr.* 28, with Ash 2010.

58 Curran 2005: 96 calls the Jewish campaign 'a systematic war of unprecedented savagery'.

59 See Barnes 2005. Ash 2007 analyses Tacitus *Hist.* 3.70–72.

and peace on Achilles' shield allows us to see a complex narrative. As Barclay observes, 'the "public transcript" can be heard differently by different audiences: while those in power may hear only the compliance, others who know, or suspect, a hidden transcript can detect the oblique and circumspect strategies by which the subordinate maintain an alternative discourse'.⁶⁰ It is my contention that the way in which Josephus has crafted his account of the Flavian triumph allows us to see just such an alternative discourse in action.

60 Barclay 2005: 320.

‘Heus tu, rhetorisce’: Gellius, Cicero, Plutarch, and Roman Study Abroad

Joseph A. Howley

Introduction; or, *aliae creterrae*

In the middle of the second century CE, a young Roman named Aulus Gellius went to Athens to study. He was not the only Roman at Athens, nor the only student. He studied philosophy and rhetoric with prominent teachers of the day. Several generations earlier, Marcus Cicero, son of the orator, was sent to Athens to study by his father, who had himself toured the cities of Greece as younger man. Several, perhaps many, of Marcus’s peers were also in Athens at the same time. From a few literary accounts we have this evidence, and from this literary evidence modern historians have identified an ancient Roman practice very much like the modern one of *study abroad*.¹ Taking Gellius’s *Noctes Atticae* as its primary focus, this chapter will seek to reexamine the literary evidence for Roman study abroad *qua* literary evidence, and to interrogate that evidence more closely for what perspective, if any, it might offer on the experience of Roman imperial power.

What did study abroad mean in the Roman empire? Encomia of study abroad tend to advance two possible (and non-exclusive) rewards from the practice: first, that going to another—any other country—country is inherently rewarding and enriching, and second, that a particular country will confer benefits of experience, intellect or reputation on the student. Roman study abroad at Athens springs largely from the latter understanding on the part of Romans: Athens is special. A phenomenon discussed less often in modern study abroad is the effect on study abroad of an imbalanced power relationship between the origin and destination states. The academic world of the empire involved plenty of travel for study, most apparent in the record by Greeks between different Greek cities, or by Westerners around the West. But a Roman travelling from the seat of power east to study in Athens (or one of the other ancient centres of Greek learning)—to which this study is limited—is perhaps far closer to the dynamics of imperial power. Rome’s history of conquest of Greece, its

1 Daly 1950.

native scepticism but also fetish for Hellenic culture, and the persistence in Greece of native civic structures into which visiting Romans have the option of integrating themselves—all of these give study abroad the potential to be powerfully fraught with cultural politics.²

Our best single body of experiential evidence for Roman study abroad in Athens is in the recollections woven throughout the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius. It is there that we find Roman study abroad as a fully formed literary motif, integrated carefully into a larger narrative, and treated directly in personal recollections. This paper takes Gellius' account of study abroad as its main focus, using Cicero and Plutarch as foils through which to understand what study abroad means to Gellius, what function it serves in the *Noctes Atticae*, and to what extent the dynamics of imperial power are a part of that meaning and function. It argues that Gellius' depictions of study abroad depend for their force on a sensitivity to the Greek experience of study abroad as an articulation of Roman imperial power, not in the specifics of imperial policy but rather in the way the imbalance of power between (Greek) teachers and (Roman) students, and the Romans' varying attitudes toward the *paideia* for which they have ostensibly come to Athens. Gellius shows many of the same concerns as our earlier sources for study abroad, and is likely informed by some of them; but only Gellius applies the various Roman concerns for representing study abroad to other Romans with an understanding of how Greeks view Roman students. Roman study abroad, for Gellius, is a learning experience not just of curriculum or language, but of national identity; and that challenge of national identity is an integral part of the educational lesson. Gellius, uniquely among Roman sources on study abroad, sees reflected back the version of intellectual Roman-ness which the Greeks have constructed for him, and incorporates that vision into his own programme for intellectual self-improvement.

As a literary motif, study abroad figures as a recalled experience of substantial learning and changes to the student's worldview. It is necessarily a matter of revisiting experiences, of looking back at a youthful self with more mature eyes. Study abroad reminiscences do not take up most or even much of the *Noctes*, but they do establish critical patterns of self-reexamination. It is no accident that all of the key experiences and settings of Gellius' study abroad experience recur at least once or twice, and frequently in ways that complicate or elaborate the initial picture they give. Through the technique Johnson

2 For a broader picture of Romans in Greece, Errington 1998; nb esp. 150 n50, *contra* Marrou 1982: 384 n7, that no Romans seem to have been sent to Athens to join the *ephebeia*. We might also think of Greeks who would come to Rome for specialist study, such as would-be *nomikoi*; regrettably we lack accounts of their experience. See Jones 2007.

has termed 'typicizing,' Gellius throughout the *Noctes* introduces certain patterns of literary motif and character.³ Having acclimatised the reader to what occurs when, say, a student encounters a teacher, or a reader encounters a book, Gellius modulates subsequent similar encounters so as to explore their dynamics. Much of Gellius' intellectual programme is concerned with applying mature self-awareness and critical thought to the childhood educational experiences shared with his readers. 'Youthful zeal reexamined' is a popular theme, as is 'what I really learned from my teachers'—teachers, like Gellius himself, are imperfect authorities, figures whose strengths and idiosyncrasies emerge over time from a series of encounters, and who serve as foils, prompting and revealing particular qualities in the characters (and narrator) with whom they come in contact.⁴ Recollected education is more than just the origin of the work's title; it is a foundational component of a text designed to prompt in its audience critical reflection on learning and learnedness.⁵

So the motif of study abroad with which I am concerned, as it features in Gellius, has three aspects. Interactions *between student and teacher* have the capacity to test and challenge students, revealing and interrogating their particular motivations and qualities as students; Gellius shows himself passing these tests and so gaining access to new knowledge and experiences. Interactions *among students* allow those students who have passed their teachers' tests to challenge and interrogate one another, and the context of study abroad offers alternatives to national stereotype as a way of assessing one's peers. Finally, the *best students* are shown to be practising a kind of idealised Roman study abroad experience, carefully and precisely blending their interests as Romans with what they have learned in Greece. For each of these, one of the main bodies of historical evidence provides a useful literary comparison: the correspondence of Cicero concerns Marcus' experience and shows parallel concerns with teacher-student relations as well as varying student motivation levels, while Cicero's use of his own Athenian study as a literary device (which perhaps provides Gellius with a model) represents interactions among students in the absence of teachers in similar ways. Finally, Plutarch's various comments on intellectual behaviour of Romans at Athens seem to shadow closely the cultural politics of Gellius' ideals for such behaviour.

3 Johnson 2010: 101–9.

4 Cf the approaches of Holford-Strevens 2003, who sees them commemorated earnestly, and of Keulen 2009, who sees some subjected to vicious satire.

5 On use of skills learned in education later in life, McLynn 2005: 42–3, Cribiore 2001: 243–44. On Gellius' values for adult knowledge and intrinsically-motivated learning, Howley 2013.

Most scholarly attention on Roman study abroad has focused on the Republic and nascent Principate. Cicero, Horace, Ovid, Plutarch: from these sources is assembled Daly's exhaustive study on 'Roman Study Abroad,' which goes no further than the Augustan poets; Rawson uses a similar body of evidence in *Intellectual life in the Late Roman Republic*, but has recourse only to Gellius for the specifics of the experience.⁶ Daly takes as his subject

those instances in which Romans, young or otherwise, went or were sent to centers of Greek learning to stay for rather extended periods for the express and principal purpose of studying with or attending the lectures of recognized authorities, usually in the fields of philosophy or rhetoric, as a sort of supplement to their formal education.

We must not elide that interesting distinction between the students who *go*, and those who are *sent*. In the early Republican days of the institution, the distinction is a generational one; in Gellius' time, it seems to persist as one between mindsets and philosophies. This, we will see, is another of the distinctions Gellius wishes to draw in Athens: that between those who have come out of earnest desire for learning, and those seeking merely a veneer of Athenian learnedness. Gellius' observations of student community equip the reader to distinguish between the sincere and the cynical, and between those inordinately philhellenic or appropriately Latin in their interests.

Talking About Study Abroad

Apuleius has supplied the pithiest example of how an imperial Roman might talk about having studied in Athens: in *Florida* 20's intellectual autobiography, he imagines the Greek intellectual curricula—poetry, geometry, music, dialectics, philosophy—as a new round of drinks following the usual 'three bowls' of the normal educational *cursus* (*litterator, grammaticus, rhetor*).⁷ Athens is, unsurprisingly, identified with traditionally Greek disciplines; with the drinking metaphor, Apuleius addresses not only the subject matter of his studies but the intellectual environment of the symposium.

Gellius is at pains to indicate not just that he had been to Athens, but that it was *there* that he learned particular things. One scene early in the work, 1.2,

⁶ Rawson 1985: 11, and 12ff for other good details of the situation (and the paucity of evidence).

⁷ Apuleius *Florida* 20.3–4: *hactenus a plerisque potatur: ego et alias creterras Athenis bibi: [...]*

and one scene near its close, 19.1, are powerful echoes of one another and show not only of Gellius’ own progress at Athens but also of the way that progress is brought back to Rome. Though he came to Athens for the right reasons, when he leaves he has learned even more than he expected to; his youthful self and the authority it respected are gently ironised, and to the reader who has read the whole *Noctes* in a linear fashion, and has thus seen Gellius’ various subsequent adventures at Rome, the closing of the study abroad loop is a reminder that many of the skills that informed those experiences were learned at Athens.⁸

Noctes 1.2—a classic *locus amoenus* that sees the young student Gellius in learned and distinguished company at Athens—establishes the foundation for subsequent accounts of pedagogical encounters, and begins to delimit the Attic phase of his recollections. It is set at the country villa of Herodes Atticus which, we will later learn, is the same villa where Gellius ostensibly began to compose the *Noctes*.⁹ The setting is paradigmatic: the *amoenitas* consists of equal parts natural and man-made elements (1.2.2), just as the *Noctes* blends narrative artifice and real experience. The plot is one that will become familiar: a boastful *adulescens* claims unparalleled expertise of philosophy (1.2.3–4) and is put in his place by a more legitimate authority. In chastising the youth, Herodes Atticus establishes Attic study as an environment in which Greek learning is invoked with revivifying force: he summons a book of *Epictetus* and reads from it (1.2.6) a passage which silences the youth (1.2.13), and which Gellius appends (1.2.7: *lecta igitur sunt ex libro, qui prolatus est, ea, quae addidi*), offering us both a helpful quote and an illustration of how (ostensibly) he encountered it. And its opening lines set it clearly in the study abroad context:

Herodes Atticus, vir et Graeca facundia et consulari honore praeditus, accersebat saepe, nos cum apud magistros Athenis essemus, in villas ei urbi proximas me et clarissimum virum Servilianum compluresque alios nostrates, qui Roma in Graeciam ad capiendum ingenii cultum concesserant.

8 Linear reading—as opposed to random perusal, or targeted lookup using the Table of Contents—may be generally assumed for the purposes of drawing out strands of Gellius’ narrative projects, but should not be considered the sole exclusive way of experiencing the text. The chronology of Gellius’ autobiography is particularly ambiguous, and so which of the Roman experiences predate and which postdate Athens is a bit unclear, but Athens is given a clear and formative role in that autobiography.

9 *Noctes* 18.10.1.

Herodes Atticus, a man endowed with both Greek eloquence and consular rank, often invited me, when I was a student at Athens, to his estates near that city along with the Senatorial gentleman Servilianus and some others of our fellow countrymen who had retired to Greece for the purpose of clothing ourselves in cultivated talent. (1.2.1)¹⁰

Gellius alludes to this time of his life at Pr. 4. Throughout the work, *cum... Athenis* stands as a shorthand reference for this remembered student version of himself.¹¹ Nor is Gellius the only Roman there; the classicism *nostrates* conjures a crowd of other Romans who had, 'withdrawn for the sake of acquiring refinement of character.' At the rivalrous and traditionally tense interface between Greek and Latin culture (invoked by the booster, 1.2.4), *capio* recalls Horace's *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*.¹² We are encouraged then to make distinctions at Athens between students and teachers alike, a distinction that seems easy enough.

But the remembered simplicity of youth can be complicated by adult hindsight. In 19.1, Gellius is sailing west to Brundisum *en route* to Rome. A mirror-image of 1.2 makes the arc of Attic study suddenly clear.¹³ A long depiction of the horrors of a stormy sea voyage—complete with a trip to the bilges and some technical terminology for sea storms—is a perfect counterpart to the *locus amoenus* of 1.2 (19.1.1–3).¹⁴ The scene-setting aboard a boat alludes to the symposium, which by this point in the *Noctes* has become a powerful venue for testing Attic learning.¹⁵ And indeed the action of the scene features familiar characters.

in eadem fuit philosophus in disciplina Stoica celebratus, quem ego Athenis cognoveram non parva virum auctoritate satisque attente discipulos iuvenes continentem.

There was present a philosopher distinguished in the Stoic sect, whom I had become aware of at Athens as a man with no little authority who kept his young students in line rather well (19.1.4)

10 All Gellius translations are my own.

11 On youthful versions of the narrator/character, inter al Gunderson 2009: 157, 173.

12 *Ep.* 2.1.156.

13 9.4 and 16.6 also show this return trip; both are set at Brundisium and showcase Gellius' Greek-informed Latinity.

14 Complaints of a trip to Brundisium may also be a nod to Horace (*Satires* 1.5).

15 On the 'symposium at sea', Slater 1976.

The booster in 1.2 was also a Stoic; 19.1's Stoic is, however, one of good and proven reputation. He is conspicuous in the storm for his lack of stoic resolve, attracting both Gellius' silent curiosity and the rude mockery of 'some rich Greek from Asia' (19.1.7). The philosopher puts down the rich Asian with a learned quotation (19.1.9–10). We might expect from 1.2 that the scene ends here. No longer the silent observer to the learned *bon mot*, Gellius awaits a more appropriate time, approaches the teacher and asks earnestly and respectfully why he was affected by the storm (19.1.12). In response, the Stoic articulates what abilities Gellius is bringing back from Athenian study abroad.¹⁶

atque ille mihi placide et comiter 'quoniam' inquit 'audiendi cupidus es, audi, quid super isto brevi quidem, sed necessario et naturali pavore maiores nostri, conditores sectae Stoicae, senserint, vel potius' inquit 'lege; nam et facilius credideris, si legas, et memineris magis.'

And he, calmly and courteously, said, "Since you are desirous of hearing, hear what my *maiores*, the founders of the Stoic sect, thought about that certainly brief but necessary and natural fear—or rather," he went on, "read it; for you will more easily believe it, and remember it better, if you read it." (19.1.13)

The Athenian graduate thus also knows not only how to treat teachers, but how to impress and engage them. And reading—personal, direct interpretive encounter with text—is a significant theme of the *Noctes*, far more than room here allows for discussion. The Gellius leaving Athens can now take texts up himself. The teacher produces the book in question from his sack (19.1.14), and Gellius, reading from it, translates it into Latin before entering it into his *Noctes* (19.1.15ff). Not only will Gellius hold and scrutinise the text himself, he will internalise its Greek ideas thoroughly enough to re-articulate them in Latin. In 1.2, Gellius' translative efforts—a valuable skill in Gellius' programme¹⁷—were focused on Herodes' eloquent Greek speech (1.2.6: *tum Herodes Graeca, uti plurimus ei mos fuit, oratione utens* [...]).

Thus, the literary return: a sidelong glance back at 1.2 gently ironises different elements of that scene—the man of Greek learning but Roman power who is oddly dependent on material text; the earnest and eager young Roman soaking up unquestioningly the culture he has come to possess, paying slightly

16 I use 'graduate' figuratively. Cf McLynn 2005: 40–41 on departures and arrivals in Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine.

17 Cf. 11.16.

more attention to an impressive put-down; the artificial safe space of Cephisia with no real bearing on the actual experiences the philosophical mind might have to face—but it also makes clear that Gellius sees his Athenian study as a progressive experience over the course of which he acquired discrete skills which he then brought back to Rome.

The Roman Abroad; or, *apud magistros*

What does it mean for a Roman to come to Athens *ad capiendum ingenii cultum*? Gellius shows us the good students with the right mindset—like himself—but also those who seem less interested in their studies. It is the presence of an Athenian teacher that reveals these distinctions: the teachers have their own ideas about their Roman pupils, and classroom performance is a good metric. The room allowed in the teacher-student relationship for extra-curricular socializing provides a further test, as those who impress the teacher in class are invited to dinner. Gellius shows us a wealthy Roman student body of unmotivated students, but also highlights his own mindset and experience as a positive model.

The School of Taurus

Gellius' relationship with the philosopher Taurus is essential to his Athenian experience.¹⁸ For the historian in a hurry, in search of a pithy anecdote from which to extrapolate an entire intellectual culture, there is not much better than *Noctes* 17.20, Gellius' first performance in Taurus' classroom. Taurus articulates the Greek perspective on Roman study abroad: scepticism about the Romans' motivations, weariness of their disinterest, but commitment nonetheless to their education. Taurus, having read with his class a passage of Plato, puts the new Roman student on the spot:

haec verba ubi lecta sunt, atque ibi Taurus mihi 'heus' inquit 'tu, rhetorisce,'—sic enim me in principio recens in diatribam acceptum appellabat existimans eloquentiae unius extundendae gratia Athenas venisse—'videsne' inquit 'enthymema crebrum et coruscum...?'

18 For Taurus, Holford-Strevens 2003: 90–7 (and 317 for the problem of his name).

When these words were read, then Taurus said to me, “Ho there, little rhetorician”—for so he called me at first in the beginning, when I had just been admitted into his classroom, thinking I had just come to Athens for the sake only of beating my eloquence into shape—“do you see,” he said, “that rich, shining, well- rounded enthymeme . . .?” (17.20.4–5)

Taurus goes on to taunt his Roman student with the absence of such fine style in Latin literature, and then to challenge the class not to be distracted by the style but rather to focus on content. Gellius cannot help but attempt a translation to rival the stylistic elegance, which he submits for our own approval (17.20.7–9). This young, energetic Gellius, who is not yet very good at following directions, finds himself in the midst of a potent cultural encounter. The Plautine *heus* in Taurus’ mouth—typical of Gellius—is balanced by the unusual borrowing of *διὰ τριβῆς*. Thus are the tangled cultural politics of Romans studying at Athens embodied by this passage: in its language, in its ambiguous attitude toward its characters, and in its uncertain place in the overall Gellian curriculum.

Certainly the student body seems in need of Taurus’ improving teaching. One student threatens to abandon rhetoric for philosophy, and Taurus takes him to task with a bit of Demosthenes (10.19). A certain wealthy student (20.4.1) spends too much time in the company of musicians and actors: Taurus sends him a bit of Aristotle which he is to read every day. With the melancholy of an imperial Greek teacher, he recalls that in Socrates’ day his students walked all night to hear him, while today the teachers must wait on the students, who have spent all night drinking and are hungover until midday (7.10.5). Perhaps one such is the equestrian youth caught yawning in the presence of Peregrinus in the lost passage 8.10, of which we have only the promise of a rebuke (*cap.* 8.10).¹⁹

Gellius rises above not only this herd of disinterested rich kids but even the better students. He is careful to place himself ambiguously right on the edge of the group of Taurus’ *sectatores*,²⁰ asking a keen question in the classroom (1.26) and hanging back after class one day to observe as Taurus receives

19 To reconcile Gellius’ account of Peregrinus with that found in Lucian is a real challenge. Lucian alludes only briefly to Peregrinus’ time in Athens, focusing instead on his public conflict with Herodes Atticus. Gellius’ silence on this is tantalising, but little can be concluded.

20 On youthful identity as a *sectator*, Keulen 2009: 68.

the Roman governor of Crete and his elderly father (2.2).²¹ An intimacy develops between student and teacher: Gellius tags along as Taurus, on the way to Delphi, stops to visit, with great concern, a seriously ill friend (7.15). Later, Gellius himself is ill, and receives a similar visit from Taurus and his *sectatores* (18.10), a powerful claim on his teacher's affection.

From a series of dinners with Taurus (7.13, 17.8), Gellius learns the theory and practice of sympotic and problematic discourse. In these passages the voice of the expatriate reporter is strong in depicting a fundamental activity. The word 'sympotic' and the difference in dinnertimes at Athens are reported with almost Herodotean deliberateness.²² We are situated thus in Gellius' early, formative stages when, as a sign of his growing closeness to his teacher, he is invited to participate in a new level of Athenian learning:

factitatum observatumque hoc Athenis est ab his, qui erant philosopho Tauro iuniores: cum domum suam nos vocaret, ne omnino, ut dicitur, immunes et asymboli veniremus, coniectabamus ad cenulam non cuppedias ciborum, sed argutias quaestionum. [...] sed ea omnia cum captiones esse quidam futtiles atque inanes dicerent, 'nolite' inquit Taurus 'haec quasi nugarum aliquem ludum aspernari. gravissimi philosophorum super hac re serio quaesiverunt: ...'

The following was the observed practice at Athens of those who were rather close to the philosopher Taurus: when he invited us to his house, so that we would not be entirely tax-free (as they say) or scot-free, we got together for dinner not gustatory delicacies but finely-wrought brain-teasers. [...] But when the complaint was raised that these [brain-teasers] were all just sophistic tricks, vain and foolish, Taurus said, "Don't disdain these as some trivia game. The weightiest philosophers have seriously inquired about this matter: ..." (7.13.1–2, .7–8)

Again Taurus' presence prompts Gellius to model Latin-Greek fusion in coordination of idiomatic terms (*immunes et asymboli*). Taurus offers a vigorous defence of sophisms, or *captiones*, as having the potential to stimulate lofty

21 He watches Taurus use philosophy to solve the problem of who should get the room's only chair, then confirms that solution with reference to Roman exemplary history. He is learning Greek ways, but is on the inside still a Roman.

22 *cap.* 7.13 and 17.8.1–2, respectively. Perhaps of note is Herodotus, invoked at 17.8.16. 'In X country, they do Y like this' should be familiar to any modern veteran of study abroad (or their acquaintances).

discussion. The sophism itself is small, but when subjected to the rigorous interrogation of the symposium it may lead to fruitful ideas. Gellius elsewhere treasures riddles, problematic literature, and the possibility that something small can be a stimulus to something great. This is in fact part of the goal of the *Noctes*: he tells us in the preface he has provided starting-points or shortcuts to learning (Pr.12). When Gellius is invited back again in 17.8, a lull in dinner as the olive oil is discovered to be frozen leads to an impromptu sympotic interrogation as Taurus asks Gellius why oil freezes before wine. Gellius acquits himself well (17.8.11): he not only knows the answer, but can hold up his end of the dialogue.

Dinners with Cratippus

In opposition stand the yawning, drunken *rhetorisci* who seek only a Grecian veneer on their education and speech. If not in earnest pursuit of knowledge, as Apuleius claims to have been, why have they come to Athens? Lloyd Daly determined that Marcus Cicero Jr. (henceforth, Marcus) belonged to the first generation of young men *sent* to Athens by their parents, at roughly the same age, for the purpose of tutelage in rhetoric and philosophy at Athens.²³ It is from the letters of Cicero that we reconstruct this generation's experience and concerns. Several points emerge: first, that the study is expensive, and finances a regular concern;²⁴ second, Cicero has clear expectations of his son's progress, which Marcus seeks to meet through correspondence; and third, that Marcus finds himself part of a larger community of Roman and other students sometimes more interested in carousal than study.

Cicero's friend Atticus oversees the logistics of the trip. There is not yet a regular way of doing this, it seems: Cicero seeks the advice of Atticus (*ad Att.* 12.23), who agrees to oversee the logistics and finances (*ad Att.* 12.17). Cicero is concerned that Marcus never be wanting for money, and gives his son as allowance the income from rental properties at Rome (*ad Att.* 12.32, *ad Att.* 16.1). There is concern for appearances, but only as far as other Romans go; that Marcus be sufficiently supplied with cash is a matter of Cicero's own dignity, but the excessive luxury of a carriage is forbidden, and Cicero assures Marcus that no other Roman student abroad will be better-funded (*ad Att.* 12.32).

23 Daly 1950: 49.

24 Gellius tastefully elides the details of his own expenses, but for an estimation of fees, see Watts 2006: 29.

Among other resources Marcus requests are Greek-trained secretaries to copy his notes (*ad Fam.* 16.21).

Cicero hires and fires tutors from a distance; moreover, he is always on the lookout for evidence of progress in his son's correspondence. That rhetoric and style are a major goal of the study trip is clear from Cicero's delight at one such letter:

a Cicerone mihi litterae sane παπινωμέναι et bene longae. Cetera autem vel fini possunt, πίνος litterarum significant doctiorem.

I have had a long letter from Marcus, really classically phrased and pretty long. Other things can be assumed, but the style of the letter shows he has learned something (*ad Att.* 14.7.2)²⁵

Yet scepticism sets in immediately. Marcus' tutors' reports are couched in ominous—to Cicero—qualifications (*ad Att.* 14.16, *ad Att.* 15.16). He plans a visit in person to see for himself (*ad Att.* 14.16). And Marcus seems distracted, asking Cicero's friend Trebonius for permission to join his staff in Asia; but Cicero thinks not. (*ad Fam.* 12.16)

Perhaps the moment that gets us closest to Gellius' own pose is a letter from Marcus to Tiro. There, he alludes to some indiscretions thus far in his studies (*ad Fam.* 16.21.2), but goes on to demonstrate his redoubled dedication to his learning by noting his growing intimacy with his teacher, Cratippus:

Cratippo me scito non ut discipulum sed ut filium esse coniunctissimum. Nam cum [et] audio illum libenter tum etiam propriam eius suavitatem vehemeter amplector. Sum totes dies cum eo noctisque saepe numero partem; exoro enim ut mecum quam saepissime cenet.

I can tell you that Cratippus and I are very close, more like father and son than teacher and pupil. I enjoy hearing him lecture, and quite delight in his own pleasant company. I spend all day with him and often part of the night, for I beg him to dine with me as frequently as possible (*ad Fam.* 16.21.3)

Here, though, it is the student who invites the teacher.²⁶ Marcus goes on to describe the various studies he is pursuing with his peers. Finally, he assures

25 All letters trans. Shackleton-Bailey.

26 Rawson 1985: 81.

Tiro that he has followed his father’s instructions in firing his declamation teacher, Gorgias (16.21.6). Gorgias, he says, was ‘very useful,’ but by other accounts the rhetorician was a negative influence on a distractible youth.²⁷

Marcus’ experience forms a precursor to Gellius’, not just in the structure of the practice (the details of which remain admittedly vague) but also in the concerns of its rhetorical self-representation by those who participate in it. We see the Greek hosts and Greekness as signifiers of progress and commitment, and we see the student haunted by the prospect of other concerns. Even the boast of dinnertime intimacy with Cratippus brings us close as to the relationship with Gorgias, which focused more on (according to Plutarch) ἡδονὰς καὶ πτότους: the learned table may well also see overindulgence. And of all these concerns, the audience in question is other Romans. ‘Romanness’ is unquestioned by these students, and if encounters with their teachers challenge it the way Taurus does for Gellius, they do not mention it.

The City as Resource; or, *cum Athenis*

In the presence of teachers, Gellius the student only has eyes for them. It is in paying attention to his teacher that he begins to learn not just how to read Plato but how to behave in a symposium—as well as getting an initial glimpse of how he and his Roman peers are perceived by their hosts. As a consequence, the dominating personalities of teachers direct his attention, secondarily, to the other inferior students. Imagined this way, teachers are also interesting in their absence: onto what else does that attention latch? For Gellius, at least, the answer is clear—onto their surroundings, and each other. The Athenian student community (in the absence of teachers) provides another key motif for the *Noctes*. What students do together, outside the classroom, is another test of their own character.

Romans and Greeks come together outside of the classroom: they look around at the sights, and in the conversations that arise organically, they reveal not where they are from, but what they are interested in. In this way, something unsurprising happens: the city and its environs are, to the students abroad, as important and experience as the teachers and classrooms. Here Gellius is very much in Cicero’s shadow, and a comparison of the two authors’ uses of ‘recollected student Athens’ reveals an important continuum of Roman attentions, but also changes in Roman reactions.

27 Plutarch *Cicero* 24 has Gorgias as part of the problem.

vos opici

As today, the ancient travel-for-study experience seems to have left plenty of room for tourism. In 2.21, Gellius and a group of students seem to have gone to Aegina.²⁸ The scene finds them returning to the Piraeus on the calm sea of a summer night.

ab Aegina in Piraeum complusculi earundem disciplinarum sectatores
Graeci Romanique homines eadem in navi tramittebamus. Nox fuit et
clemens mare et anni aestas caelumque liquide serenum. sedebamus
ergo in puppi simul universi et lucentia sidera considerabamus.

Several of us, students of the same topics, Greeks and Romans, were crossing in the same boat from Aegina to the Piraeus. It was night and the sea was peaceful and the summer season and the sky was crystal-clear. So, we were sitting in the stern and all looking up at the bright stars (2.21.1–2)

The narration here appeals to a basic knowledge of local geography: from the stern of a boat going north, the most visible thing in the sky is the constellation known in the United States as the *Big Dipper*, in the United Kingdom as the *Plough*, and in Denmark (as throughout Northern Europe) as *Karlsvognen*. Constellations provide a special opportunity for cultural encounter: unlike with local geographic features, no culture has any particular prior claim on their name for a thing that has always been visible to everyone.²⁹ But distinctions of nationality have specifically been elided (*Graeci Romanique*), and so this encounter reveals to Gellius a slightly different kind of distinction.

tum, qui eodem in numero Graecas res eruditi erant, quid ἄμαξα esset, et quāenam maior et quāe minor, cur ita appellata et quā in partem procedentis noctis spatio moveretur et quāmobrem Homerus solam eam non occidere dicat, tum et quādam alia, scite ista omnia ac perite diserebant. Hic ego ad nostros iuvenes convertor et ‘quin’ inquam ‘vos opici dicitis mihi, quare, quod ἄμαξαν Graeci vocant, nos ‘septentriones’ vocamus?

28 The passage, like most in the *Noctes*, is interlinked with other parts of the work, including the following essay, 2.22, in which the constellation under discussion features as the name of one of the many winds pontificated upon by Favorinus.

29 Which is not to say that Roman intellectual attitudes did not afford Greeks a primary authority in such matters.

Then, those of our number who were particularly learned with respect to Greek matters, discussed what the ἄμαξα was, and which was the greater one and which the lesser, and why it was called that and into what part of the sky it moved in the space of a night and why Homer says that it alone does not set, and other things then too, and all of them cleverly and knowledgeably. Here I turned to my young companions and said, “Why don’t you *opici* tell me why what the Greeks call ἄμαξα, we call *septentriones*?” (2.21.3–4)

This is not the only occasion on which the anxiety of astronomical nomenclature moves Gellius to deploy the old Greek slur on Romans’ Italian barbarism, *opicus*: Tiro’s account of the early Latins’ incompetence with Greek casts them unfairly as *opici* (13.9.4). And a Greekless Roman to whom Gellius struggles to translate a Plutarchan title proves himself an *opicus* with his obstinate inability to access Greek concepts. The slur’s reclamation by its original targets is complete: is there a greater embarrassment for an Antonine Roman than to prefer Greek to the exclusion of Latin?³⁰

Fortunately, someone else on the boat has read their Varro, and various etymologies for the Latin name are offered and exchanged (2.21.6–10). The group is able to reconvene around this, ultimately approving of the etymology most empirically verifiable (2.21.11). Everyone is allowed into the conversation, as long as they want to discuss the Latin term. This, then, is the action of the scene: the students as a group look at something in their surroundings, and their conversational responses divide them into sub-groups. They negotiate this division through learned discourse; they then look again at the scenery, having reached a consensus. In Athenian settings, Latinity is the priority. Those who have come to take possession of Greek learning are always in danger of being possessed by it in turn, it is the place itself that threatens with this power of possession.

It is in the course of sympotic discourse—what the good Roman students learn through intimacy with their teachers—that, in the *absence* of teachers, the study abroad community begins to show promise: they become able to conduct their own philosophical interactions. So in 15.2 we learn that the youths who were at Athens were accustomed to hold weekly *convivia* on their own. At one, a philosopher from Crete exposes his ignorance of Plato’s *Laws*—the dialogue set at Crete—by claiming that in that work Plato sanctioned the philosopher’s raging alcoholism. Together the student symposium is able to

30 On labels and intellectual cliques among students, McLynn 2005: 29–30 on Gregory Nazanzianus at Athens.

identify and reject the fraud. The rejection of overindulgence in drink gestures obliquely to the bad students; the exposure of fraud that both verifies knowledge of Plato and enacts his methods (a reflexiveness that extends to Gellius' role in this as author) confirms that the symposium is functioning properly. The frauds that haunt the city are no danger to these clever students.³¹

If place has power to guide the mind's attentions and activities, whether in a boat to Piraeus, in a sympotic gathering, or in the bookstores of Rome,³² the sights of Athens might seem to pose a similar challenge. Only on one occasion in Gellius is a physical landmark of classical Athens mentioned, but it is the most loaded with significance for our interest in imperial subtexts. A visit to the Lyceum is disrupted by the presence of a character common in the *Noctes*: the boastful, fraudulent authority.³³ The narrative opens with this character, deferring the surprising setting until late in the sentence.

eiusmodi quispiam, qui tumultuariis et inconditis linguae exercitationibus ad famam sese facundiae promiserat neque orationis Latinae usurpationes rationesve ulla didicerat, cum in Lycio forte vespera ambularemus, ludo ibi et voluptati fuit.

A certain fellow of that sort who, with some haphazard and crude study of language, claims a reputation for himself of eloquence but has not studied any usages or rules of Latin speech, provided us with a delightful amusement one evening by chance as we strolled in the Lyceum (7.16.1)

The fraud complains of a supposed misuse by Catullus (92.3) of *deprecor*. The students enjoy this hilariously obvious ignorance, and Gellius spends the rest of the passage providing various pieces of evidence. As in the boat from Aegina, we have only the participants' behaviour to judge them by. It seems at first that they are reenacting the Lyceum of Aristotle's day, the Latin *ambulo* standing in nicely for the Greek περιπατέω.

This juxtaposition of setting and activity is not as incongruous as it seems. As with many of the great Greek schools, Gellius is interested in how Aristotle taught, and a later passage explores the uses to which the Lyceum was put.³⁴ *Noctes* 20.5 explains the two different kinds of teachings conveyed by Aristotle, 'teacher of King Alexander' (20.5.1): the 'exoteric' and the 'acroatic.' While the

31 Cf. *Noctes* 9.2.

32 On which see White 2009.

33 E.g. 13.31, 16.6, 19.10.

34 Cf. 1.9 on Pythagoras, 1.26 on Plutarch.

acroatic teaching was conducted in the morning among and select group of students,

illas vero exotericas auditiones exercitiumque dicendi eodem in loco vespere faciebat easque vulgo iuvenibus sine dilectu praebebat, atque eum δειλινὸν περιπατοῦν appellabat, illum alterum supra ἑωθινόν; utroque enim tempore ambulans disserebat.

But he gave those exoteric lectures and exercises in speaking in the same place, in the evening, and offered them generally to youths without discrimination, and called it the “evening stroll”—and the other one “the morning stroll”—for in both of them he lectured while walking (20.5.4–5)

Gellius’ activity fits: it is evening in the Lyceum, and so ‘less than philosophical’ topics are fair game in the Lyceum, and there are no entry standards for participants.³⁵ With classical Latin literature and the finer points of Latin grammar on the table, we get a clear picture of Roman students reviving Aristotelian educational culture for their own purposes and interests.

But this exploration of Aristotelian teaching does more than just contextualise the *ambulatores* in the Lyceum: it is the preface to a discussion of Aristotle’s *published works*, and the question of whether written accounts of teaching can substitute for classroom experiences. Aristotle published both sets of teachings, we hear from Gellius, separately. Alexander, though busy with the *negotia* of empire, became concerned that the publication of the special acroatic teaching might cause him to lose his special advantage as a pupil of the philosopher. *nam qua alia re praestare ceteris poterimus*[...]? he asks Aristotle in Gellius’ translation of letters Gellius takes as authentic (and presents in both languages, 20.5.8–12).

20.5, then, is a story about the relationship between foreign rulers and the prized learning of Athens. Imperial *negotia* cannot distract Alexander from concern over his exclusive access to Athenian learning. And Aristotle’s response reminds us of the difference between learning from a book and the apparently irreproducibility of firsthand experience.³⁶ We are left, then, with a rather unsettling ironisation of Gellius’ whole project: can his account of his own Attic nights ever capture anything like the experience itself? And Romans studying abroad, we are reminded, represent an alien, imperial power; Athens

35 Nb also *exercitium* in 20.5 and *exercitationibus* in 7.16.

36 A problem also raised, albeit implicitly, by Epictetus, who as we saw bookends Gellius’ Athenian study.

is just one conquered territory whose local natural resource, learning, is to be exploited by the conquerors.³⁷ In pacing the Lyceum and engaging in his own exoteric activity, Gellius is not just boasting of Roman conquest of Greek learning—he is signalling an uncomfortable awareness of it.

The Ghosts of Greece

If Marcus is the latter half of Daly's formulation—a Roman who was *sent*—his father, who did the sending, is the former: one who *went*. Cicero's recollections of his travels in Greece figure repeatedly in his writing, and anticipate Gellius' in key ways. Most interestingly, Cicero shows a clear awareness of the cultural and political awkwardness inherent on both sides in a Roman's visit to Athens. In *de Oratore*, he has Crassus and Antonius reflect on their own experiences in Athens (1.45). Although neither went for explicitly or exclusively educational purposes (as indeed few if any of their generation seems to have done), both indicate that they have benefited from being in Athens and talking to the learned rhetoricians and philosophers there. Each stresses that he visited Athens only on the way to some other provincial appointment in the east. Imperial *negotium* gives Romans an excuse to stop in Athens and sample its famed learning and avoid the charge of philhellenism. Furthermore, Crassus shares an anecdote of Roman imperiousness in action: he would have stayed longer in Athens, he says, but he became angry with the authorities. He had missed the celebration of certain mysteries by only a few days, and asked the Athenians to repeat them for his benefit. To his shock, they refused (3.75). Imperial power, intellectual tourism, and the general cultural tone-deafness of the outsider are here in tension; the character Crassus may not see the humour, but Cicero certainly does.³⁸

These twin concerns—for Roman prejudice against Greece, and for the dynamics of imperial power—seem to run through Cicero's treatments of his own experiences. The main autobiography of his eastern study comes in the *Brutus* (313–316). Physically weakened by early forays into oratory, he went—against all advice—to the east. He spent six months at Athens among philosophers and rhetoricians. In Asia Minor, he was admitted into the company of

37 On Athens's other resource, olives, and the relationship between the two businesses, Watts 2006: 26–7, with notes.

38 The quality displayed by Crassus here is a persistent Roman one the Greeks understand as *ὑπερηφάνια* (Balsdon 1979: 170–1. with n56). Cf. Pausanias 7.11.1 for an example of this trait coupled with disdain for Greek historical context.

the greatest rhetors. The culmination of his study was at Rhodes. Athens, in this account, is just one stop on what feels somewhat like an account of provincial conquest on the intellectual, rather than the military, plane. It is framed clearly as a circuit, a trip from which to return, better and stronger, to his career at Rome.³⁹

In Cicero, too, we encounter a sensitivity to the psychological power the place has over its Roman visitors. In the dedication of *de Officiis* to his son, he articulates his confidence that his son will benefit not only from teachers at Athens but also the city itself and the *exempla* it has to offer (*de Officiis* 1.1). The physical city is imagined as a collection of reminders and prompts to *exempla* from the Greek past; but in the course of the rest of the work, such Greek *exempla* are combined with Roman to enact Cicero’s concern with combining Greek and Latin studies. The Roman studying at Athens is mining two different local resources—the expertise and authority of its living teachers, and the memories of its past. But that Roman must walk carefully the middle road between not pursuing Greek learning at all, and pursuing it to exclusion.

The emphasis on the *city* of Athens is clarified in the preface to *de Finibus* 5. Cicero here recalls time spent sightseeing in Athens with fellow Romans—his brother Quintus, his cousin Lucius, their friend Piso, and the man who would later become Atticus. They are taking an afternoon stroll in the Academy, and discuss the experiences they are sharing as tourists.

tum Piso: ‘Naturane nobis hoc,’ inquit, ‘datum dicam an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam si quando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? velut ego nunc moveor. venit enim mihi Platonis in mentem, quem accepimus primum hic disputare solitum.’

Thereupon Piso remarked: “Whether it is a natural instinct or a mere illusion, I can’t say; but one’s emotions are more strongly aroused by seeing the places that tradition records to have been the favourite resort of men of note in former days, than by hearing about their deeds or reading their writings. My own feelings at the present moment are a case in point” (*De Finibus* 5.2)⁴⁰

39 By comparison to, e.g., his friend Atticus, for whom *not* coming home was a defining characteristic.

40 Trans. Rackham.

Quintus agrees that passing through Colonnus not only made him think of Sophocles, but conjured before his eyes a vision of Oedipus.⁴¹ The Roman students visiting Athens, together, see the sights of 1st century BCE Athens through a kind of augmented reality that populates it not just with the great figures of Classical Athens, but the characters of their literary works. The parallel to Gellius—strolling in the Lyceum, and exposing the Cretan—is striking, but so is the way in which the two diverge: Gellius and friends made a new, Roman περίπατος, while Cicero and friends are content, as they practice their Latin philosophy, to wander a city of ghosts and think mainly of the past.

That Republican Romans, in their veneration of Classical Athens, saw the modern city as a ghost town is underscored by the letter of consolation from the jurist Servius Sulpicius to Cicero on the occasion of his daughter Tullia's death.

ex Asia rediens cum ab Aegina Megaram versus navigarem, coepi regiones circumcirca prospicere. post me erat Aegina, ante me Megara, dextra Piraeus, sinistra Corinthus, quae oppida quodam tempore florentissima fuerunt, nunc prostrata et diruta ante oculos iacent. Coepi egomet mecum sic cogitare: 'hem! nos homunculi indignamur si quis nostrum interiit aut occisus est, quorum vita brevior esse debet, cum uno loco tot oppidum cadavera proiecta iacent?'

As I was on my way back from Asia, sailing from Aegina towards Megara, I began to gaze at the landscape around me. There behind me was Aegina, in front of me Megara, to the right Piraeus, to the left Corinth; once flourishing towns, now lying low in ruins before one's eyes. I began to think to myself: "Ah! How can we manikins wax indignant if one of us dies or is killed, ephemeral creatures as we are, when the corpses of so many towns lie abandoned in a single spot?" (*ad Fam* 4.5.4)

Two centuries before Gellius sailed from Aegina to the Piraeus and had eyes only for the stars (and their Roman names), Servius surveyed the same landscape and, like Cicero in the Academy, saw only the ghosts of Greek majesty past.

Cicero offers Gellius one more image of uncomfortable Roman activity at Athens. It is difficult not to imagine, in the way Gunderson notes happens with his references to the annalist Cn. Gellius,⁴² that Aulus is, in taking on the pose

⁴¹ Cf. the tree at *de Oratore* 1.28–9 that puts the interlocutors in mind of the *Phaedrus*.

⁴² Gunderson 2009: 71.

of ‘Roman gone to Athens,’ living at least somewhat in the shadow of the Lucius Gellius who is the butt of a joke in *de Legibus*. Lucius, Cicero’s Atticus recalls, had offered to settle the Athenian philosophers’ disputes once and for all with his Roman *auctoritas*.⁴³ The humour of this account does nothing to decrease the marked awareness of the humiliations that attend Roman ὑπερηφάνια at Athens.

The Roman in Athens is under constant scrutiny. His very presence there is tested by both the Greeks he meets and the physical sites of the city. Any interaction will be tinged with the subtexts of imperial power: the only question is how self-aware he is about his status as alien ruler, and how he behaves as a consequence. Study abroad cuts to the heart of this dynamic, because it is in learning and culture that Athens is most revered by Romans. What appreciation Cicero and friends have for the city around them is historical, and even when they see what is around them, they seem to be in a museum; Sulpicius laments the ruins of Corinth, leaving his reader to remember that it is the Roman conquest that so reduced it.⁴⁴

The City as Test; or, τῆς δ’ Ἑλλάδος τὴν τύχην

Even when aware of the tensions both at home and abroad around their use of Athens as a travel-for-study destination, Cicero and his peers take an imperial approach to Athens that is essentially exploitative: its best days are behind it, its ruins fit to be mined and shipped home for use at Rome. Cicero would send his son to Athens in the conviction that once he was there, Hellenistic erudition would simply rub off on him. The city is an inert, static resource—which is, it seems, how Marcus and other disinterested students are inclined to treat it. By contrast, although the literary poses are very similar, Gellius’ student experience is beginning to look rather distinctive: he and his peers make Athens a site for new and productive activity. It is Roman activity, but the comparative dynamism is distinctive. The good kind of Antonine Romans in Athens respond to the city not with the apathy of their wealthy, alcoholic peers, or with the nostalgic romanticism of Cicero, but with a zeal that combines Greek learning and Roman. Athens is not an abandoned site to be explored, but a derelict machine for Romans to refuel and fire up, to operate for their own purposes.

43 *de Legibus* 1.53. Rawson 1985: 6–7.

44 Pausanias 7.16.7–9.

We have seen different ways in which Gellius tests his and his colleagues' motivations, attitudes, and progress. One constant through these encounters has been the proper moderation of philhellenism, and its subordination to Roman culture; no matter how venerable the Athenian landmark in whose shadow they walk, Gellius expects his fellow students to care first for Latin language and Roman culture. This particular test, of how well the Romans keep their priorities in order, comes to a head in two interlinked passages of *Noctes* Book 18 that provide not only the apex of virtuous Roman study abroad but also connect the practice, thoroughly to the programme and structure of the *Noctes* as a whole.

Learned Dice Games

In one final uncanny similarity between the Roman and modern study abroad experiences, the Romans at Athens gather to celebrate, *in exilio*, a national holiday: the Saturnalia. But in an indication of their proper relationship with Athenian study, they observe it as a sympotic party, exercising the skills they have learned from their Athenian teachers. The layering is dense: a Roman holiday celebrated with a Greek practice; a Greek discursive form directed at Latin subject matter. And the Saturnalia scene itself provides one of the clearest internal reflections of the *Noctes* as a work of literature, serving as something of a mission statement for the motif of Attic study.

In these scenes we have penetrated to the inner sanctum of excellent Roman students abroad, where leisure time is spent in edifying activities based on clear principles of intellectual ethics.⁴⁵

Saturnalia Athenis agitabamus hilare prorsum ac modeste, non, ut dicitur, remittentes animum—nam 'remittere' inquit Musonius 'animum quasi amittere est'—, sed demulcentes eum paulum atque laxantes iucundis honestisque sermonum inlectationibus. Conveniebamus autem ad eandem cenam conplusculi, qui Romani in Graeciam veneramus quique easdem auditiones eosdemque doctores colebamus.

We observed the Saturnalia at Athens by all means joyously and modestly, not, as they say, relaxing our minds away—for “to relax the mind”, says Musonius, “is to lose it”—but soothing them a bit and loosening them with the pleasant and honest charms of conversation. So several of

45 Cf. 13.11 on Varro's principles for edifying recreation.

us came together for the same meal, we who Romans who had come to Greece and who attended the same classes and teachers (18.2.1–2)

From Taurus, at dinner, Gellius learned the value of the humble *captio*, and it is from such little puzzling questions that the students fashion problematic symposia to serve as their Saturnalia festivities.

quaerebantur autem res huiuscemodi: aut sententia poetae veteris lepide obscura, non anxie, aut historiae antiquioris requisitio aut decreti cuiuspiam ex philosophia perperam involgati purgatio aut captionis sophisticae solutio aut inopinati rariorisque verbi indagatio aut tempus item in verbo perspicuo obscurissimum.

But the questions were of this sort: either a saying of an old poet, delightfully obscure but not pedantic, or a point of ancient history, or the correction of some philosophical doctrine incorrectly circulated, or the solution to a sophistic ‘catch,’ or the tracking-down of an unusual and rather uncommon word, or likewise a rarely used tense of an otherwise obvious word (18.2.6)

This list of topics is instantly familiar to anyone who has been reading the *Noctes* for any length of time: it describes, in part, the kinds of questions Gellius himself is interested in. Some questions are teased with partial answers, some are—as is not uncommon elsewhere in the text—left as exercises for the reader.⁴⁶ Among the best of the best Roman students at Athens, then, we find an activity that looks very much like the *Noctes* itself.

The emphasis here on *captiones* is a strong reminder of the lessons of 7.13. The intellectual ethics here involve a careful seeking of a middle ground: questions that are, at face value, not of any great worth, but have the potential to lead to greater things, if properly interrogated and pursued. This casts the party games, and the contents of the *Noctes*, as dynamic starting-points for inquiry rather than static data points for learning and recitation. There is an inherent caution, in the Saturnalia festivities, about not relaxing the mind too much. 18.13, in a coda to 18.2, the Athenian Saturnalia is revisited in slightly different terms that continue this theme.

Saturnalibus Athenis alea quadam festiva et honesta lusitabamus huiuscemodi: ubi conveneramus complusculi eiusdem studii homines ad

46 Cf. 12.6.

lavandi tempus, captiones, quae sophismata appellantur, mente agitabamus easque quasi talos aut tesserulas in medium vice sua quisque iaciebamus.

We amused ourselves in the Saturnalia at Athens with certain festive and honest games of this sort: when several of us folks studying the same things came together at the hour of bathing, we tossed around in our minds *captiones*, which are called 'sophisms', and cast them as if they were dice or game-pieces in the midst of our group, each one in his turn (18.13.1–4)

The Saturnalia is perhaps the only context in which an elite Roman might not be embarrassed to report playing *alea* games.⁴⁷ And that metaphor engages a seemingly important idea for Gellius; like *captiones*, *tesserulae* can be signifiers of something greater than themselves, as they are in his version of the story of Quintus Fabius at the Carthaginian Senate (10.27). Of the two versions he cites (neither of which is that of Livy *AUC* 21.18), he prefers Varro's, in which Fabius symbolises war and peace with *tesserulae*, each of which has a *simulacrum* of the respective *signum*, a herald's staff and a spear (10.27.3–5).⁴⁸ These dice are thus a loaded symbol of both the risks and promises that attend sympotic pursuit of *captiones*.

What all of this adds up to is a layered mess of distancing and inversion supremely appropriate to both the occasion of the Saturnalia and the Gellian programme of anti-encyclopaedism. What we find at the expatriate Saturnalia is not a simple internal reflection of the text's overall function, but rather a careful set of warnings about how that function is incomplete and dynamic, dependent on careful attention to appropriateness and context, as well as—most importantly—interactive interrogation and examination by those who use it. The *Noctes*, of course, does not include everything there is to know, but examples and lessons about what and how to know; just so, the expat Saturnalia is not learning itself, but a way of exercising one's mental faculties.

This scene is not a classroom. Its relevance to Roman study abroad at Athens is not that it depicts such study, with its teachers and teachings, but rather only that it involves the Roman students. One of the most important things that Romans who have come to Athens to study can do, it seems, is to be learnedly Greek even when at their most Roman. This is Gellius' alternative

47 On *alea*, cf Suetonius *Augustus* 70–71, and see Purcell 1995.

48 Gellius' preferred version is also closest to that of Pomponius, *Digest* 1.2.2.37, who credits Q. Mucius with the gesture.

to the rich drunkards who want only to burnish their eloquence. We might imagine Taurus nodding in approval at hearing how the Romans spent their holiday, not in complete rejection of their Romanness but in earnest pursuit of the skills of Greek *paideia*. If Taurus reflects for Gellius the Greek perspective on Roman study abroad, in the Saturnalia episodes, we seem to see Gellius having taken that insight to heart.

Roman Heroes of Study Abroad

I have argued thus far that Gellius' perspective on the Roman study abroad practice in which he is engaged shares much with earlier Roman perspectives, but also has a strong undercurrent of scepticism for both the philhellenism and the superficiality which are the Scylla and Charybdis of Romans' motivations for pursuing such study. Unsurprisingly, he finds some of the most potent tests of students' motivations and performance to be well outside of the classroom.

Plutarch's *Lives* offer the final source of evidence to flesh out this picture. Although most often a source for the particular details of Republicans' time in Athens, they might be equally if not more helpful for what they show of a learned imperial Greek perspective on Roman study at Athens. For Plutarch, too, time at Athens is a test of a Roman's character; though in the *Lives* he is telling stories of earlier visitors (and seems not to discuss any contemporary study abroad activity), his ideas on the relationship between Greece and Rome and their respective intellectual climates are much closer to Gellius'. Though he advertises no reading of the *Lives*, Gellius is a regular reader of other Plutarchan works, and owes much to him conceptually in terms of theories of reading and interpretation.⁴⁹ And Plutarch is prominently identified as a venerated teacher by none other than Taurus.⁵⁰

Simon Swain has shown the way Romans in the *Lives* are held particularly to account for their attitudes toward Greek *paideia*.⁵¹ *Paideia* is inherently alien to them, and so they are scrutinised for the extent to which they earnestly seek out and value it; the more *paideia*-pursuing they are, the more virtuous they seem to be through their Life. A survey of Plutarch's accounts of Romans who go to Athens for one reason or another reveals that as relationship with

49 The processes of reading, reflection and re-articulation dramatised most clearly (inter al.) in *Noctes* 9.4 have much in common with Plutarch's theories of critical response, on which J. König 2007.

50 1.26.3: *Plutarchus noster*.

51 Swain 1990.

paideia is a litmus test for virtue of character, so visiting Athens is a litmus test for relationship with *paideia*. Athens, in the *Lives*, is defined by learning, and the veneration and acquisition of Greek knowledge is the activity in which a Roman there should be engaged.

The least successful Roman by these standards would be Sulla, who in his assault on the city in the war against Mithridates is depicted as specifically blind to, and then explicitly derisive of, Athens' antiquity and intellectual stature (a striking contrast with Cicero's self-presentation in *de Finibus* 5). Plutarch has him ransack the Academy and Lyceum out of a twisted view of the city as a prize, possessed by 'some dreadful and inexorable passion for the capture of Athens' (*Sulla* 13.1). And when the Athenians plead for peace, he responds:

ὁ Σύλλας "Ἀπιτε," εἶπεν, "ὦ μακάριοι, τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἀναλαβόντες· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ φιλομαθήσων εἰς Ἀθήνας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐπέμφθην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀφισταμένους καταστρεψόμενος."

Sulla said: "Be off, my dear sirs, and take these speeches with you; for I was not sent to Athens by the Romans to learn its history, but to subdue its rebels" (*Sulla* 13.4)⁵²

Neither living residents nor sites of prior achievement have any effect on him: destruction of and derision for Athenian *paideia* and its *loci* are just some of his many depredations.

For Plutarch as for Gellius, Athens casts a harsh light on Romans, throwing the exact qualities of their Romanness into relief. Pompey, making a tour of the cities of Greece, is kind but imperious (think of Crassus in *de Oratore*): he gives every sophist at Rhodes and every philosopher at Athens a talent, and puts up funds for reconstruction in Athens—all to make himself look good at Rome (*Pompey* 42.5–6). Caesar's innate talent for politics becomes clear as he studies rhetoric at Rhodes, which explains why he does not even make it as far as philosophical classrooms of Athens (*Caesar* 3.1). Antony goes to Greece in his youth to study oratory and military tactics (*Antony* 3.4); later, he returns to raise money and listens to enough discourses to be hailed as φιλαθῆναιος (23.2–3), but the luxuries of Asia Minor prove more attractive (24.1ff).

The most disturbing failure among Plutarch's Romans is Brutus, who perfectly illustrates how Roman pursuit of *paideia* is never pure. In Brutus' case, his intellectual efforts are especially cynical in an especially Roman way.

52 All Plutarch trans. Perrin.

... διητάτο μὲν παρὰ ξένῳ τινί, Θεομνήστου δ' ἀκροώμενος τοῦ Ἀκαδημαικοῦ καὶ Κρατίππου τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ καὶ συμφιλοσοφῶν, ἐδόκει παντάπασιν ἀργεῖν καὶ σχολάζειν. ἔπραττε δὲ τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἀνυπόπτως. καὶ γὰρ εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἔπεμψεν Ἡρόστρατον, οἰκειούμενος τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ στρατοπέδων, καὶ τοὺς σχολάζοντας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἐν ᾧσφι νέους ἀνελάμβανε καὶ συνεῖχεν.

...he stayed with a certain guest-friend, attended the lectures of Theomnestus the Academic and Cratippus the Peripatetic, discussed philosophy with them, and was thought to be wholly given up to literary pursuits. But without any one's suspecting it, he was getting ready for war. For he sent Herostratus into Macedonia, desiring to win over the commanders of the armies there, and he united in his service all the young Romans who were studying at Athens (*Brutus* 24.1)

Brutus' Roman political ambitions corrupt not only his own Athenian study, but those impressionable younger students also there.

Meanwhile, Cicero embodies the proper attitude for a visiting Roman. His tour of Greece culminates in a declamation in front of the rhetor Apollonius, who declares,

‘σέ μὲν ὦ Κικέρων ἐπαινῶ καὶ θαυμάζω, τῆς δ' Ἑλλάδος οἰκτίρω τὴν τύχην, ὁρῶν, ἃ μόνᾳ τῶν καλῶν ἡμῖν ὑπελείπετο, καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίοις διὰ σοῦ προσγιγνώμενα, παιδείαν καὶ λόγον.’

“You indeed O Cicero I admire and commend; but Greece I pity for her sad fortune, since I see that even the only glories which were left to us, culture and eloquence, are through you to belong also to the Romans.” (*Cicero* 4.5)

And as an exerciser of Roman power towards Athens, rather than the ham-fisted munificence of a Pompey, he shows considered, *paideia*-cherishing benevolence, arranging for Cratippus to have the benefits of Roman citizenship with no interference to his teaching (*Cicero* 24.5).

In Plutarch's intellectual landscape of Greece, Rhodes stands for rhetoric, and Athens for philosophy; so a Roman at Athens has thus reached the heart of Greek intellectual territory. And Plutarch is interested primarily in the generation who ‘went.’ These two factors make Athens, for each Roman, a test in much the same way as it is for Gellius, one they pass or fail by the magnitude and sincerity of their commitment to the *paideia* that seems innate to the city

itself. Plutarch sees that Romans are political and imperious in their own ways, and understands that Attic study offers them a cachet back home that has little to do with the habits or substance of Greek thought. Plutarch's view of Romans at Athens is, in short, strikingly close to that understanding of himself and his peers that Gellius sees reflected in Taurus's eyes.

Conclusion; or, 'the American Embassy'

Apuleius' formulation proves telling: whether literally, in the overindulgence of the bad students, or figuratively, in the exploration of new discursive and deliberative modes, the *aliae creterrae* of Athens loom large. Study abroad is a literary motif rich in such significant metaphors, with questions cast like dice standing for larger concepts, and in doing so standing for greater curricular progress, which in turn stands for the text's own dynamics. One Greek teacher may stand for a general Greek perspective or even longer Greek historical experience, and an anonymous fellow countryman can stand easily for the hazards of an incorrect relationship to one's learning even as his embarrassment in the classroom stands for the larger cultural embarrassment to which he exposes his peers. The rhetorical force for Romans of study abroad as a mode of self-representation are as old as the practice itself; what makes Gellius' use of them so interesting is that he claims not just achievement or edification but a sense of self-awareness in terms of nationality that seems timeless in its profundity.

Modern study abroad is the persistent bugbear of this sort of inquiry, providing both a useful comparison and countless snares of anachronism. In analysis of its relationship to national identity, though, we may find guidance. A set of studies of American students studying abroad in the years following September 11, 2001 and subsequent American military adventures, which often highlighted for American allies their government's relationship with that of the USA, shows that the experience of study abroad, especially in a politically charged atmosphere, offers students substantial opportunities for reflection on their national identity.⁵³ Among the studies' author's conclusions are that 'American identity is only invigorated in a situation where students become "other," and are thus compelled to interrogate their national location,' and 'American students become aware that they are not the sole authors of their assumed, national, "American" identity. Instead, they encounter a postnational reality, in which 'American-ness' is constructed (or authored) as much outside, as inside, the physical borders of the state.'⁵⁴ The students surveyed

53 Dolby 2004, Dolby 2007.

54 Dolby 2004: 162.

for the study reported a variety of challenging encounters with Australians' attitudes toward Americans, recalling, for example, that 'the tour bus drivers would make some comments about Americans on the sly. Or we'd pull up to a McDonald's and they'd be, like, oh the American embassy.'⁵⁵ Here, global commercial power provides a focus for resentment and mockery in a way that takes the student entirely by surprise. Few, if any, of these encounters occur in the classroom, although more than a few involve alcohol consumption. These sorts of challenges that remind the student of their Americanness are not always guaranteed to happen, as Dolby acknowledges.⁵⁶ Nor are they as closely tied to the educational context as they necessarily are for Gellius. But Gellius' realisation seems in large part to have been exactly that of these subjects—that he is not the 'sole author' of his Roman identity—and that realisation's effect, in the context of his programme, is to prompt reexamination of the terms in which that identity is constructed. A fuller account of the politics of post-classical recollected-study-abroad-narratives may well be in order here, but the modern data suggests that the aspects of Gellius' use of the motif which set him apart from his predecessors tap into some essential dynamic of study abroad itself.

Much of what there is to say about Gellius' treatment of study abroad may be said of his overall attitude to learning. If Roman study at Athens is a matter of Roman fashion,⁵⁷ it fits well into Gellius' interest in tempering the zeal for fashionable pursuits—not rejecting, but questioning terms and prescribing attitudes—like Latin 'archaism.'⁵⁸ But while the factors usually associated with imperial rule are otherwise deeply submerged in the *Noctes*, at Athens they are relatively closer to the surface.⁵⁹ Yet 'rule' might be the wrong word: with the exception of Herodes Atticus, formal power structures are largely implicit. Gellius' Athens is situated clearly in an imperial world, and the Greek perspective he assimilates to his own is not so much on power as on the shadows power casts on the intellectual plane.

Gellius' depiction of Roman study abroad is informed by the common experiences and concerns of Romans since before the practice began. But it is also

55 Dolby 2004: 165.

56 Feinberg, who reports opposite experiences in which Americans formulate their experiences entirely in terms of popular culture narratives of American self-obsessed self-discovery.

57 As Daly supposes, e.g. 1950: 56–8.

58 On which see Vessey 1994, Holford-Strevens 2003: 6, 8, 362–4; Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 203. Most clearly articulated in 1.10 and 11.7.

59 They are not entirely gone. One interesting comparison is 19.9, where the Spaniard Antonius Julianus responds to some Greek youths' mockery of his accent by asserting the excellence of ancient Latin poetry—wherever in the Empire a Roman comes from, Gellius seems to suggest, what matters is his Latinity.

markedly sensitive to the perspective of his Greek hosts. While earlier Roman ways of representing their intellectual experiences at Athens seemed unself-consciously to enact the flows of imperial power on which they depended, Gellius makes awareness of the Greek intellectual experience of Roman rule a key factor of his own account, even as he argues forcefully for the primacy of Latin learning in that context. The implicit challenge to his Roman reader—*what kind of Roman are you?*—depends critically on a more explicit reminder that the sensitivity to the Greek perspective provides: *you are a Roman*. In a sense, we might see Gellius' literary use of Athens as no less exploitative than Cicero's: it is a place to go to learn about yourself, its natural resource of *paideia* now supplemented by the mirrors of the *diatribae* and *convivia* that reflect uncomfortable but necessary self-awareness. But essential to the role Athenian study abroad plays in Gellius' programme is an awareness that in addition to just being a point of cultural contact, it *is* an articulation of imperial power. Identifying and understanding the perspective and experience of Rome's Athenian subjects, and re-examining oneself in their light, is essential to Gellius' curriculum for Roman study abroad at Athens.

There are helpful lessons in this for our understanding of Gellius: concerned as we often are with the 'reality' of his everyday experiences, we can see that this element of the text, at least, is likely to be both highly accurate in the emotional intimacy of its experience *and* crafted with great literary care in terms of its internal consistency, use of extant tropes, and protreptic force. Individual scenes are vivid not just in the detail of real experience but the significance with which their author, as a later, reflective narrator, imbues them. In the expatriate Saturnalia we have an image of the *Noctes Atticae* as not encyclopaedia but starting-point for learning. In Gellius' peculiar use of the Lyceum, we can see the anxiety of the foreign rulers' exploitation of Athenian learning, as well as an uncertainty about the place of text in learning: it is not enough to have read Greek books, which one can do anywhere, but to go to Greece and live among the Greeks. This is the value of Greek study, and this is the value—to Gellius—of recollections of Greek study.

But the Greek study, the Attic nights, cannot stand on their own. The Roman students who go to Athens must come back, so they can say they have been, and so they can put that learning to work. Attic nights are a fraction of a fraction of Gellius's *Noctes Atticae*, because—in his vision for a Roman life of learning—they are an important step, but just one of the first. The Saturnalia revellers must leave their symposium, the student must come home, and the reader must put down the book: Attic nights must be followed by Latin days.

Triple Vision: Ulpian of Tyre on the Duties of the Proconsul

Jill Harries

In a short passage on the conferring of *colonia* status on provincial cities,¹ the early third-century lawyer, Domitius Ulpianus (Ulpian) gave pride of place to his own city, Tyre in Syria:

there is, in Syria Phoenice, the most splendid *colonia* of the Tyrians, from which I originate, outstanding in her territories, most ancient in the tale of years, powerful in war, and holding most loyally to the treaty struck with the Romans.²

Why the city's great antiquity should matter is not explained. Ulpian is silent on Tyre's past as a founder of colonies or its continuing overseas connections with its daughter-cities, such as Lepcis Magna in Tripolitania, the home city of Ulpian's first imperial patron, Septimius Severus.³ Nor is any concession made to the penchant of the Greek elites for constructing their polis identities on the basis of ancestry and local cultic and historical sites, a process, which both accommodated and challenged Roman supremacy,⁴ or to the legendary associations of the city with Kadmos, Europa and Dido commemorated on the city's coinage.⁵ Instead, pride of place is given to the loyalty of the city to the imperial power, Rome. The sense that the historical geography of Syria was being redrawn by Ulpian as 'Roman' is reinforced by the second entry, on Berytus (Beirut), another Phoenician city, which became a *colonia* of Roman citizens,

1 Ulpian also discusses Severus' conferring of the *ius Italicum*, a tax exemption privilege, on favoured cities, which had supported him in the civil war against Pescennius Niger.

2 Digest 50.15.1.pr. *est in Syria Phoenice splendidissima Tyriorum colonia, unde mihi origo est, nobilis regionibus, serie saeculorum antiquissima, armipotens, foederis quo cum Romanis percussit tenacissima*. Cf. reference to Tyrian fellow-citizen at Digest 45.1.70.

3 Millar 1993: 292. On inscriptions, Tyre is titled 'metropolis', mother-city.

4 As recorded for 'old Greece' by Pausanias. For varying approaches to the relationship of (civic) microidentities to (imperial) macroidentities, see Whitmarsh 2010.

5 Millar 1993: 288–90.

when veterans were settled there in 15 BCE; by the end of the third century, Berytus would become a recognised centre for the study of Roman law.

Ulpian was not alone in reshaping the past in order to reinforce a present identity but his distancing of himself from his Greek heritage makes him unusual. But the reason that he elected to 'be Roman' is straightforward: he was an expert in Roman law and the Latin legal tradition, an expertise, which would deliver him a distinguished career in the imperial administration. Therefore to launch into an extended encomium of his place of origin in a legal treatise would have been inappropriate. However, as this paper will argue, he differed in important respects from Roman lawyers reared at Rome or from Italy, because he retained a 'provincial' perspective. Moreover, he was conscious of the need to communicate to a non-Roman readership, and in particular to Greek-speakers, a need only partly explained by his mission to educate new Roman citizens in Roman law in the aftermath of Caracalla's grant of near-universal Roman citizenship in 212. Ulpian, therefore, is an example of what might be termed 'triple vision'; he wrote as a Roman lawyer, as a communicator with Greeks and as the native of a city with a 'provincial' identity containing both Greek and residual Phoenician elements.

The 'Honour' of the Provincials⁶

To reveal Ulpian 'the provincial', we will focus on Ulpian's account of what was expected of the proconsul on his arrival in his province. The treatise in ten books, *De Officio Proconsulis*, one of his earliest works (c. 213), carried the authority of experience. Under Severus, Ulpian had probably held the post of secretary of petitions,⁷ down to perhaps 209. He held no office under Caracalla, but used his 'leisure' to good effect, publishing treatises totalling some 270 books explaining Roman law to those Roman citizens newly enfranchised by the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in 212. Under Severus Alexander, he returned as Prefect of the Grain Supply, rising quickly to the praetorian prefecture in 222. After murdering his two colleagues, Ulpian was himself killed, perhaps in 223 or 224.⁸

Few aspects of Roman textual culture appear more exclusively 'Roman' and 'Latin' than Roman law and, at first reading, Ulpian was a true Roman lawyer, versed in the technical language and traditions of his craft. Latin was the

6 *cum honori suo provinciales id vindicent*. See below, p. 200.

7 Honoré 2002: 18–22.

8 See P. Oxy.2565 for the death of Ulpian before May/June 224.

language of the administration, to which Ulpian aspired to belong, even in areas of the Greek East, where it was unlikely to be understood by the majority of the population, and it remained so as the medium of imperial lawmaking down to the 540s CE. Moreover, the literature of legal interpretation down to the end of the second century was largely Rome-centred. Its practitioners were drawn mainly from the Roman Senate or the Roman law schools. The 'law,' which they interpreted, had three main elements: the *ius civile*, the law of the citizen, which took as its starting point the Twelve Tables; the Rome-based jurisdiction of the praetors or *ius honorarium*; and, in a later development, Republican criminal statutes, along with other aspects of public and administrative law. Rome the city and what had happened there over the previous 700 years remained central, the city not primarily of 'letters' but of laws.

How far legal writings should count as 'literature' may be debated but the lawyers who wrote books were drawn from the Roman elite and their writings were shaped, to a point, by the conventions, in which they were educated as children and which were applicable to literature in general.⁹ It has been suggested that the intention of the types of Latin literary production at Rome indulged in by all Latin poets and many prose writers was 'to make subalterns of its readers, to disenfranchise most of those whom literacy might be thought to have empowered.'¹⁰ In this respect, Roman legal writing would differ fundamentally, because of the audiences, to which it was addressed. Roman juristic writing was a form of technical literature and its aim was to be useful to any citizen seeking legal redress for public or private wrong. As the Roman citizenship expanded and men from outside Italy became increasingly involved in government, at the highest level, Roman lawyers were obliged to take account of provincial attitudes and expectations. The purpose of Roman legal writing, therefore, by Ulpian's time, was not to disenfranchise the literate but to empower the enfranchised.

Prior to the advent of the Severans, however, Roman legal writers were slow to acknowledge the need for a wider perspective. Legal adaptations in the provinces were largely peripheral to the concerns of Roman jurists, with the exception of Gaius, the academic jurist writing under Antoninus Pius. Instead, legal writers perpetuated the assumptions of the governing class that provincials were passive recipients of Roman law; they were not expected to shape its requirements on their own account. These views were consistent with those of two well-known earlier provincial governors, who provided

9 In general, but to varying degrees, juristic writing avoided the techniques of persuasion regarded as essential by the literary elite.

10 Woolf 2003: 206 n.8.

extensive documentation of their dealings with those they governed. The letters of Cicero from Cilicia in 50 BCE and, *mutatis mutandis*, the correspondence of Pliny with Trajan from Bithynia early in the second century CE offer a Roman-centred perspective, in which the provincials feature as the source of acclamation (in Cicero's case) and of problems requiring top-down solutions to be formulated by the governor and his Roman friends (in Pliny's case, the emperor, no less). Both advertised their concern for good governance and the welfare of those they ruled, but neither admitted the idea that this was primarily an obligation to the provincials, rather than to themselves, or, as Cicero put it, to their *humanitas*.¹¹

Read in conjunction with what Cicero and Pliny had to say about their arrivals in Cilicia in 51 BCE and Bithynia (in c. 110 CE) respectively, and their governorships in general, Ulpian, writing in c. 213, appears to signal a remarkable shift of emphasis, favouring the interests of the provincials and downgrading the persona and aspirations of the governor. Although he wrote as an adviser to provincial governors, not as a governor himself, Ulpian's priorities were in line with those of an audience, which Cicero or Pliny would never have thought to address at all. Pliny, in particular, although an outstandingly conscientious governor, saw provincials as creating problems to be solved *de haut en bas*. Moreover, as the Bithynians would have known, Pliny had defended two previous governors on charges of alleged corruption, championing representatives of the ruling power against complaints from the governed.¹² By contrast, Ulpian addressed the concerns of those to whom he believed proconsuls were ultimately answerable, not the senatorial court at Rome familiar to Pliny, but the provincials. His advice to a proconsul on his duties would not be read only (if at all) by governors but also by provincials seeking information about what they should expect their governors to do and how they were to behave. They would not have been disappointed.

The governor's first duty was to manage his arrival in his province. This was a topic to which both Cicero, as governor of Cilicia, and Pliny in Bithynia, had also attached importance—but for very different reasons. Cicero, who had not wanted the job in the first place, was careful to note the date of his arrival in letters to his friends and was frank about his motives:¹³ he would be allowed to leave precisely a year later and that was what he intended to do, and in fact

11 *Ad Quintum fratrem* 1.1.27; Woolf 1998: 68–71.

12 Pliny, *Letters* 4.9 (Julius Bassus); 5.20, 6.5, 6.13, 7.6, 7.10 (Varenus Rufus). For Pliny's prosecutions, on behalf of provincials, of corrupt governors, see *Letters* 2.11 (Marius Priscus) and 3.9 (Caecilius Classicus).

13 *Att.* 5.15.1 *ex hoc die* (July 31, 51 BCE) *clavum anni movebis*.

did, leaving his province to the doubtful mercies of an untested subordinate.¹⁴ Pliny, on the other hand, addressed a short series of letters to Trajan on the subject of his health on the journey, evoking suitable (and subsequently published) expressions of concern on Trajan's part. He had arrived at Ephesus, the entry point to Asia, not Bithynia, and had proceeded thence by a combination of coastal vessel and overland carriage. However, delayed by the heat and fever at Pergamum and adverse winds, Pliny did not enter Bithynia until 17 September.¹⁵ Like Cicero, he notes the date, but no reason is given. In fact, no explanation was necessary. As both Pliny and Trajan would have known, under the rules, the new governor's jurisdiction (and that of any subordinates or delegates appointed by him) began on his date of entry. Where Pliny and Cicero would have agreed was that the date was significant for them and for how they were to do (or not do) their job, not for the provincials.¹⁶

Here now is Ulpian on the same topic:¹⁷

antequam vero fines provinciae decretae sibi proconsul ingressus sit, edictum debet de adventu suo mittere continens **commendationem aliquam sui, si qua ei familiaritatis sit cum provincialibus vel coniunctio**, et maxime **excusantis**, ne publice vel privatim occurrant ei; **esse enim congruens**, ut unusquisque in sua patria eum exciperet. (4) Recte autem et ordine faciet, si decessori suo miserit significetque qua die fines sit ingressurus; plerumque etiam incerta haec et inopinata **turbant provinciales et actus impediunt**. (5) Ingressum etiam hoc observare oportet ut per eam partem provinciam ingrediatur, per **quam ingredi moris est**, et quas Graeci *epidemias* appellant sive *kataploun* observare, in quam primum civitatem veniat vel applicent; **magni enim faciunt provinciales servari sibi consuetudinem istam** et huiusmodi praerogativas. **Quaedam provinciae etiam hoc habent**, ut per mare in eam provinciam proconsul veniat, ut Asia, scilicet usque adeo, ut imperator noster Antoninus Augustus **ad desideria Asianorum rescripsit proconsuli necessitatem impositam** per mare Asiam applicare *kai ton metropoleon Epheson* primam attingere.

14 *Att.* 6.3.1; 6.4.1; 6.6.3, the last on Coelius, who did replace Cicero, pending the arrival of his successor.

15 Pliny, *Letters*, 10. 15–17b.

16 Cf. Tac. *Agricola* 18, praising Agricola for launching campaigns immediately on his entry into Britain in 78 CE, by contrast with those who on their arrival indulge in pointless display and ceremonies.

17 Digest 1.16.4. 3–5 (Ulpian, *De Officio Proconsulis* 1).

(1) 'Before he enters across the boundaries of the province decreed to him, the proconsul should send ahead an edict concerning his arrival, containing some recommendations of himself, for example if he has some friendships or familial relationship with the provincials, and vigorously prohibiting anyone from coming to meet him in a public or private capacity; for it is fitting that everyone should receive him in his own native place. (4) Properly and in due order will he act, if he sends ahead to his predecessor and indicates the day on which he will cross the boundary; for in many cases, uncertainty over a governor's unexpected arrival causes inconvenience to provincials and frustrates business. (5) Concerning his entry he should take care that he makes his entry to the province via that part by which it is customary to make an entry, and which the Greeks call 'epidemiae' or 'kataplous', that is the first city to which he comes (by land) or at which he arrives (by sea); for the provincials attach great importance to the upholding of such customs for their benefit, and other privileges of this kind. Certain provinces even have this rule, that the proconsul should arrive into that province by sea. Asia, nowadays, is an example of that, as our emperor Antoninus (Caracalla) wrote in response to the wishes of the people of Asia that it was a necessary rule for the proconsul that he made landfall in Asia by sea 'and that of the metropoleis, Ephesus' was the first port of call.'

And here too, for the sake of completeness, is what should happen when the proconsul leaves:¹⁸

Meminisse oportebit usque ad adventum successoris omnia debet proconsulem agere, cum sit unus proconsulatus et utilitas provinciae exigat esse aliquem, per quem negotia sua provinciales explicant; ergo in adventum successoris debebit ius dicere.

The Proconsul should remember that he should carry out all business up to the arrival (in the province) of his successor, as it is in the interest of both the proconsul and the province that there is a requirement that someone should be available, through whom the provincials can conduct their legal business. Therefore, he should act as judge until his successor arrives.

¹⁸ Digest 1.16.10.

Nothing is said, in this extract, about the 'provincial edict' which governors under the Republic were expected to issue prior to their arrival, to explain how they would administer the law.¹⁹ Instead, the 'edict' is about conciliating 'the provincials' (*provinciales*).²⁰ Provincial acclamation cannot be assumed; it must be earned, before arrival, by a series of gestures of goodwill.²¹ Thus the 'edict' will advertise existing ties with provincials, and the date and place of the governor's arrival will be known well in advance. The reasons are entirely related to the convenience of the provincials: they will be able to conduct their business, secure in their knowledge of where the governor was to be at any given time, and without any obligation on their part to go out of their way to meet him. If proconsuls were still reluctant to observe provincial expectations on the place of arrival, the advice of Caracalla, agreeing with the provincials of Asia that, in accordance with custom, Ephesus was their port of entry, put the question beyond doubt.

Although all concerned, both proconsul and provincials were now, as citizens, equally subject to Roman citizen law, the proconsul's *officium* set him apart. He held *imperium*, and the *provinciales* were still subject to that *imperium*. In fact, Ulpian's labelling of those subject to the *imperium* of governors as *provinciales* contains the seeds of the new forms of legal or quasi-legal expression that would be necessitated by Caracalla's reforms. 'Provincials' were not people who lived in provinces, as opposed to Rome, but the citizens (and others) over whom *imperium* was exercised. Most of the content of Ulpian's ten books of advice to the proconsul dealt with the law that the governor was expected to administer in his province, by virtue of his *imperium*.

However, the framework within which the laws and their administration are presented modifies the nature of *imperium* itself, to the advantage of the provincials. The limitations on the exercise of gubernatorial *imperium* are set, as Pliny also appreciated, by the emperor's supremacy. But Ulpian's requirements went much further, suggesting that there was an expectation that the governor should provide a legal 'service,' and should ensure that his behaviour allows that service to be afforded to his provincial clients. Business convenience was part of the package, but so too were the governor's obligations to equalise the balance of power among provincial litigants, ensuring that schedules were not tampered with by the wealthy and that the weak and legally disadvantaged

19 Cic. *Att.* 5.17.5 on precedent of Q. Mucius Scaevola, the jurist and consul in 95 BCE, whose provincial edict Cicero used as a model for his own.

20 For evolution of the term *provincialis* post 212, see Mathisen 2009: 149–50.

21 Compare Cicero's account of the acclamations greeting his arrival in Cilicia (*Att.* 5.16.3), before the provincials knew anything about him.

had proper legal representation.²² Strict justice was not, of course, what invariably happened in practice, but it was the governor's duty, in theory at least, to work for the provincials' interest, not his own. His duties even extended to concealing boredom at the long-winded speeches of local reception committees:²³

si in aliam quam celebrem civitatem vel provinciae caput advenerit, pati debet commendari sibi civitatem laudesque suas gravate audire, **cum honori suo provinciales id vindicent.**

If he arrives in any very famous city or the provincial capital, he should bear with patience the commendations of the city made to him and hear his own praises with proper seriousness, as the provincials claim this right in honour of themselves.

It was what the *provinciales* wanted, as an expression of their own status, and the governor owed consideration of their concern with *honour* to them, not to himself.

The Tyrian as Roman

Does this apparent shift of emphasis from rulers to ruled reflect a genuine rebalancing of power between *provinciales* and imperial administration, driven by the expansion of citizenship, the increased clout of provincial elites and the unspoken dependence of the empire on the economic resources of the provinces? Or are these the idiosyncracies of a single writer? Was Ulpian writing as the native of Tyre in Syria that he boasted of being—or as the 'de-provincialised' spokesman of the ruling power? With the coming of Septimius Severus from Africa as emperor in 193, and, more significantly for present purposes, his wife Julia Domna from Syria, the cosy relationship of Latin, Rome the city, and law could no longer be taken for granted. The Rome-based elite had to reconsider how their position of predominance was to be justified, both to themselves and to others. What, now, was 'Roman' when a city that welcomed all peoples might be categorised as cosmopolitan—or as 'barbarised'?

Ulpian's 270 books on Roman law conform to the conventions of Roman jurisprudence, as practised since the first century BCE. His work is shaped by the accepted categories. Up to one half of it is taken up by lengthy

22 Digest 1.18.6.2 (Ulpian, *Opinions* 1).

23 Digest 1.16.7 pr. (Ulpian, *De Officio Proconsulis* 2).

commentaries on the *ius civile* (*On Sabinus*) in 51 books; and the 81-book *Ad Edictum* on the praetorian edict, codified by Iuventius Celsus (consul II in 129) and Salvius Julianus (consul in 148) at the behest of the emperor Hadrian in the 130s. Like his contemporaries, Ulpian contributed thoughts on Augustus' statute on adulteries, possibly a response to the formal termination of the last of the ancient public courts at Rome and the transfer of their jurisdiction to the urban prefect.²⁴ But, again in line with general convention, he devoted no separate treatise to criminal law as a whole.²⁵

Despite sustained attempts to explain himself as he went along, Ulpian could not avoid subscribing to the specialist discourse of the Roman lawyer, writing 'the praetor' for example, when referring to the content of the Praetorian Edict.²⁶ Like all preceding Roman jurists, he accepted the canon of 'authorities,' going as far back as Ateius Capito, consul in 5 CE, whose decree forbidding the forced marriage of a freedwoman to her patron he cites at second hand.²⁷ Moreover, in passages excluded from the Digest but preserved elsewhere, he shows a penchant for paraphrasing, and even citing verbatim, Republican statutes. Although outdated by his own time, Ulpian specifies the penalty of interdiction from fire and water imposed on arsonists by the Lex Cornelia on homicide;²⁸ and quotes directly from the same statute on the procedures of selection of judges and juries by sortition for purposes of trials held at Rome or within a mile from the centre.²⁹ His aim seems to have been to represent himself as purely Roman, more so even than those who could claim their place of origin as Rome the city. The strategy is in part an expression of his professional values as a lawyer, but may also reflect the anxieties of the parvenu, overdoing

24 Garnsey 1967. On the Urban Prefect, *Digest*.1.12.1 *Omnia omnino crimina praefectura urbis sibi vindicavit*.

25 E.g. the *Disputations*: *Digest* 48.4.2 (treason); 48.5.2 (adultery); 48.9.8 (parricide); 5.2.26 (forgery).

26 Lawyers were aware of the potential confusion here: cf. *Digest* 50.17.102 *qui 'vetante praetore' fecit, hic adversus edictum fecisse proprie dicitur* ('someone who does something, "while the praetor forbids it" should more correctly be said to have done it contrary to the (praetor's) edict').

27 *quod et Ateius Capito consulatu suo fertur decrevisse* ('which Ateius Capito too is said to have decreed while consul').

28 *Collatio of Mosaic and Roman Law* 12.5 and for the same or similar text, with the Lex Cornelia omitted (and some consequent incoherence), see *Digest* 47.9.12 pr. and 1.

29 *Collatio* 1.3.1. This and the preceding text (previous note) were both omitted by Justinian as irrelevant to the civil law as taught in the sixth century; if this was the policy, the extent of Ulpian's use of ancient legal history is probably underrepresented in the surviving extracts.

it a little, because uncertain of his status in his new environment. If so, he shared this characteristic with his probable relative, another Ulpian, whom we shall call Oulpianos, a diner at a series of fictitious banquets held at Rome and celebrated, as we shall see, by Athenaeus.³⁰

As an exponent of Roman law, then, Ulpian could be seen as an instrument of Roman power, the insider made good. It could even be suggested that his mission, to teach *others* what they needed to know, advertised a position of superiority to those who had not yet achieved his present eminence. Yet, Janus-like, he faces two ways at once. His didactic mission, which he conducted as a Severan insider, was aimed at bringing other outsiders, as he had once been, more fully into the Roman fold; their new knowledge of Roman law, which they would owe to him, would allow the former outsiders, to follow his example and to assimilate into the cosmopolis of law, as Romans.

In asserting his role as teacher, Ulpian knew also that he was opening himself to challenge on other fronts; the act of advancing one perspective also implies an alternative.³¹ Merely by being who he was, a native of Syria Phoenicia, Ulpian posed a challenge to the old ways. To fend off aspersions based on his origins, Ulpian had to prove himself as good a 'Roman' jurist as the best. Moreover, for anyone involved in the law, controversies were a way of life. In public seminars and literary works, jurists disputed energetically with each other, often on apparently minor points of detail, but details to which they attached great importance. In the courts, the opinions of jurists with authority were cited and decided the outcome of cases. And in all their areas of activity, the interpreters of law had to cope with the behaviour of advocates, bent on using language and argument, not to elucidate law but to win cases. Although jurists were not expected to employ the arts of persuasion, there were times when Ulpian felt obliged to plead with his imaginary reader:³²

hoc edictum summam habet aequitatem, et sine cuiusquam indignatione iusta: quis enim aspernabitur idem ius sibi dici, quod ipse aliis dixit vel dici effecit?

This edict contains the greatest possible fairness and should not inspire justified resentment in anybody: for who would reject the principle that

30 His (apparent) rejection of any concession to the Greeks is the flip side of 'Oulpianos' refusal to deal with things Latin.

31 Cf. Woolf. 2003: 213 'any overtly didactic text advertises the existence of an alternative position.'

32 Digest 2.2.1. pr. and 1.

the same judgement should be made of himself as he himself has applied or caused to be applied to others?

Self-evident, indeed, as it would appear, but the concept of 'fairness', while central to legal thinking, was also subject to shifts in social values. In advocating his concept of 'fairness,' Ulpian could anticipate that some advocate might, somehow, argue the opposite.

Ulpian and the Greeks

In his description of Tyre, with which we began, that city's Greek history and culture were ignored. But could the Greek world, from which Ulpian originated,³³ be so easily sidelined? The third element in Ulpian's 'triple vision,' his understanding of the needs and aspirations of his Greek readership, is consistent with his focus on modes of communication, which would be accessible to all literate new citizens, not merely to the elite. As the exponent of Roman law to all new citizens, Ulpian used Greek as a means of building bridges through linguistic signals to Greek-speakers in general. His method, as analysed by Tony Honoré, entailed the use of Greek words or short phrases in sentences, which added subtlety to the meaning, or otherwise reassured a Greek readership that these Latin texts had application to them as well.³⁴ Although Ulpian unobtrusively identifies himself as Roman, and the Greeks as 'other,'³⁵ he avoids the practice of referring to Greek-speech as something distinct,³⁶ preferring to integrate Greek words and phrases without comment, as if they always belonged in this Roman and Latin setting. Some Greek terms and phrases may already have been naturalised:³⁷ Ulpian adopts a Greek word for agreement (*synallagma*) from Pliny's friend, Titius Aristo,³⁸ and his use of the terms *en planei* and *paratatikos*, both meaning 'general' or 'flexible', are used earlier by Iuventius Celsus,³⁹ and Salvius Julianus, Hadrian's codifiers of the Praetorian

33 His family name suggests that he came from a Greek family, which acquired the Roman citizenship in the first two centuries CE.

34 See Honoré 2002: 89–92; also Adams 2003a: ch. 1.

35 Digest 43.8.2.22 *publicas vias dicimus quas Graeci basilikas, nostri praetorias, alii consulares vias appellant.*

36 E.g. Digest 22.3.28 *quod Graece dici solet.*

37 For example, *emphuteusis*, referring to a long lease of public land, amounting to virtual ownership, was integrated into praetorian law at an early stage, see Buckland 1966: 275.

38 Digest 2.14.7.2.

39 *en planei secundum Celsum erit spectandum.*

Edict.⁴⁰ What Ulpian did, therefore, was to expand the use of Greek words and phrases as an integral part of his didactic approach. In so doing, he addressed an audience far from the reading rooms of the capital, an audience far more numerous, less learned, more 'provincial.'

Not for this lawyer, then, the penchant for allusion, which makes so much of early (and late) imperial literature an obstacle course for the uninitiated; Ulpian's style is clear and unadorned, the result of hours of dictation to what must have been a sizeable scriptorium of slave secretaries. His writings, as we have them, contain almost none of the literary ornament expected of the cultured man.⁴¹ This cannot be dismissed as conventional adherence to the austerity, which characterised so much of legal writing. Ulpian's older contemporary, Severus' senior jurist, Aemilius Papinianus, did allow himself the occasional lapse into coded communication with fellow-intellectuals, versed in 'both languages', a demonstration that his cultural credentials stood comparison with the competition. In a world where contemporary situations were described in terms often applicable not to the present but the past, Papinian showed that he could play his part—if he chose. For example, early in his work on *Definitions* (a favourite topic for rhetors as well), Papinian declared that:⁴²

lex est commune praeceptum, virorum prudentium consultum, delictorum quae sponte vel ignorantia contrahuntur coercitio, communis rei publicae sponsio.

Law (or statute) is an instruction of the community, a resolution of wise men, a controller of misdeeds committed voluntarily or in ignorance, a mutual agreement of the res publica.

In Imperial Rome, this was clearly not the case in practice. But astute readers of Papinian (and perhaps later also of Marcian's *Institutes*, which gives

40 Digest 46.8.12.2, has Ulpian cite Julian on the matter of the timing of the performance of an agreement, arguing for flexibility; on my reading of the text, the phrase belongs to Julian, as reported by Ulpian. For *paratatikos*, Digest 42.4.2.4 (Ulpian), that 'defenderetur' in the Edict should be interpreted flexibly; and Digest 38.7.1 (Julian, *Digest* 27) on flexibility in timing over an inheritance.

41 An exception is his citation of the laws ascribed to Solon and Dracon, permitting as justified the killing of adulterers caught 'in the act' (Digest 48.5.24). The citation of Homer a few lines earlier (Digest 48.5.14) appears to be drawn from Sex. Caecilius Africanus.

42 Digest 1.3.1.

the game away)⁴³ would have recognised the paraphrasing of Demosthenes *Against Aristogiton* and might have thought too of the second-century BCE philosopher, Chrysippus, who was also a reference point for Cicero.

Such excursions into legal philosophy are the exception in ancient juristic writing, as we have it. The fact that they exist at all shows that lawyers were aware of the cultural expectations of their elite readership felt the need to respond to them.⁴⁴ Homer,⁴⁵ Xenophon,⁴⁶ Plato,⁴⁷ Demosthenes,⁴⁸ and even Theophrastus⁴⁹ occur in the Roman jurists of the second century, as concessions to literary expectations, which are largely immaterial to the legal content of their work. Such citations are, however, relatively rare.

Ulpian's inclusiveness was not confined to his efforts to communicate with non-elite Greek speakers. His, or his emperors', approach to citizens' dealings with each other under Roman law undermined the primacy of the 'two languages', Greek and Latin, by admitting others to the status of 'legal' languages for purposes of some formal agreements. Punic, 'Gallic' and the language of any other people, including, 'Assyrian' (Aramaic), all could be used for certain legal transactions.⁵⁰ While this development was a natural consequence of the expansion of citizenship, no explicit account is taken of what the implications for the operation of law might be, when highly technical terms were translated into their closest local equivalent. As Clifford Ando has observed, with reference to Latin legal documents rendered into Greek,⁵¹ the lack of precise equivalents for Latin technical terms would result in a process of negotiation between the parties concerned about how the law should work in practice. It is also in line with the universalising thinking of Septimius Severus (from Punic Africa), Papinian, from Africa or Syria, and of Ulpian himself. Though fully integrated into the Graeco-Roman world, these men brought to it a third dimension, an understanding of those excluded from the Greek and Latin

43 As also does the Digest (1.3.2). Marcian, *Institutes* 1, which supplies the Greek texts of Demosthenes and Chrysippus directly followed the Papinian citation.

44 Hence even Ulpian conceded that law should be referred to as the 'true philosophy' and jurists as the 'priests' of law (Digest 1.1.1.1 = *Institutes* 1).

45 Digest 18.1.1.1; 48.19.16.6.

46 Digest. 47.22.4 (Gaius, *On the XII Tables*, 4).

47 Digest 50.11.2 (Callistratus, *On Trials* 3).

48 Digest 48.19.16.6 (Claudius Venuleius Saturninus, *On the punishment of pagani*), qua de re maximus apud Graecos orator Demosthenes sic ait; Digest 1.3.2 (Marcian, *Inst.* 1), also citing Chrysippus.

49 Digest 1.3.3 (Pomponius, *On Sabinus* 25); D. 5.4.3 (Paulus).

50 Digest 32.11.pr. (on trusts); 45.1.1.6 (*On Sabinus*, referring to all languages).

51 Ando 2010: 26–7.

monopoly of cultural discourse and political power. It followed too that Ulpian understood local provincial usages and their importance in their local contexts; practices in Arabia, Egypt, Asia and Africa are named, the first three all in the treatise on the duties of the proconsul.⁵² Although these references are comparatively few, compared with the total of Ulpian's massive output, they do reflect a more socially inclusive perspective, on law in the Roman world.

Ulpian, Oulpianos, and Athenaeus

How was this likely to go down with those elite Romans (and Greeks) whose practice it had been 'to make subalterns of their readers'? The ambivalent figure of Ulpian's probable relation, Oulpianos of Tyre, the symposiarch at Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, may give pause for thought. Athenaeus' blockbuster was an 'account' of table-talk at a dinner party (or rather several such gatherings) at Rome in the early years of the Severan dynasty, hosted by a Roman knight, (P. Livius) Larensis.⁵³ David Braund has suggested that the two Ulpians must have been closely connected, perhaps even father and son.⁵⁴ If so, the intellectual interests of the two were widely divergent. Oulpianos is carefully distanced from any connection with juristic learning, which is the province of two other diners, "Masurius",⁵⁵ whose name recalls the Tiberian jurist and savant, Masurius Sabinus, and the host, Larensis himself, praised for his expertise in the religious institutions established by Romulus and Numa, and for his study of ancient decrees, resolutions and obsolete laws.⁵⁶ For much of that period, Ulpian was also probably based at Rome, perhaps settling to his job as petitions secretary in the early 200s, or broadcasting his explanations of Roman law to the uninitiated a decade later. Whether or not he attended the

52 Digest 47.11.9. (Arabia, in *Off. Proc.* 9); 47.11.10. (Egypt, *Off. Proc.* 9), also 32.55.5 (*On Sabinus*, 25); Asia: 1.16.4.5 (*Off. Proc.* 1); 3.2.4.2 (*On the Edict* 6).

53 Called Larensis by Athenaeus, but perhaps to be identified with the P. Livius Larensis commemorated at Rome by his wife (*CIL* VI 2126). An important objection to the identification is that the epitaph refers only to the officer of pontifex minor, whereas Athenaeus' Larensis was also procurator of Moesia (9.398c–399a; Braund 2000: 6–9). See also Jacob 2013: 15–19.

54 Braund 2000: 17–18.

55 Praised for his legal learning at 14.623e.

56 1.1c; i.3a; cf 6.274c–d on the Lex Fannia. This fits with his post as *pontifex minor*, a lesser Roman equestrian priesthood, in charge of ancient cults, such as that of Jupiter Latiaris. Interest in ancient Roman religion and Roman law are associated in the pontifical and antiquarian traditions.

type of function depicted as being patronised by Oulpianos, he would have been fully aware of the cultural sophistication (and obscurantism) favoured by such gatherings, and the fierce—and barely disguised—competitiveness of the participants.⁵⁷

‘What unites the speakers,’ wrote Fergus Millar, ‘is their common immersion in Greek literature; and it is within that context that his (Oulpianos’) local identity as a ‘Tyrian’, ‘Phoenician’ or ‘Syrian’ must be seen.’⁵⁸ But that apparent unity was also riven by tensions. Some among the diners hoped to pass themselves off as more ‘Greek’ than others, by erecting barriers against unworthy aspirants to ‘Greekness.’ Their strategy was to emphasise the ‘otherness’ of the ‘Syrian,’ combining this with the claim that a ‘Syrian’ could not be a true Hellene. The cultural connotations of Oupianos’ ‘Syrian’ identity, as presented by Athenaeus, are not the ones that he seeks to advocate (or possibly mitigate) through his unrelenting displays of obscure Hellenic learning; they are pejorative and imposed on him by his rivals among the symposiasts, who have their own elite status to protect, and indeed, on occasion, by the authorial voice itself.

Oulpianos is therefore shown as subtly out of step with the other diners. Although officially presiding, he is isolated on his couch; he eats little (9.385a) but drinks perhaps too much (an ‘arrythmic’ drinker, 10.445d). He specialises in the driest branch of Hellenic culture and had acquired the nickname of Keitoukeitos (‘found or not’) because of his penchant for seeking citations of obscure words in earlier Greek authors (his concern did not extend to Latin).⁵⁹ His Syrian origin is discreetly referred to in connection with fish (8.346c; 9.385a); more important is that his Syrian roots undermine his cultural credentials, opening him to the reproach of being a ‘Syratticist’—not a ‘real’ Greek. Nor is he very conversant with what happens at Rome. When the diners hear the sounds of flutes and cymbals, Oulpianos has to be told that this is the Roman Parilia, the celebration of the birthday of the city; his response is a disquisition on the right word for ‘dancing.’⁶⁰

Such criticisms as those levelled at Oulpianos would have shown Ulpian, as a Syrian without much obvious grasp of the finer points of Greek, what to expect. Indeed, Oulpianos is attacked most fiercely in his areas of strength.

57 For example, Oulpianos prides himself on his memory of the uses of *propoma* (appetizer), 2.58b–c. On the competitive ‘exchanges of blows’ (3.99b), see Wilkins 2000: 24–6.

58 1993: 291.

59 Ath. *Deip.* 1.1d–e, alleging that O. pursued his researches obsessively through the street, bookshops and baths. For his fellow-guests’ impatience with the word-searches, 9.385b.

60 Ath. *Deip.* 8.361e–362a.

His main bugbear at the feast, a cynic philosopher, repeatedly contradicts him over a number of etymological questions, alleging that he confuses the Greek for 'useless' and 'unused' and creates a ridiculous Greek neologism, *painoles*, of the wrong gender, from Latin *paenula*. The point of the cynic's criticisms is to show that Oulpianos is not a 'real' atticist; he lacks any sense of history or how to conduct a civilised conversation.⁶¹ These accusations were, to a point unfair: Oulpianos is cosmopolitan with connections to Eleusis⁶² and recollections of cultured travel in Egypt.⁶³ He even knows something of Roman history, recalling Marius' killing of some lethal 'gorgons' in Numidia, a recollection confirmed by the indigenous Roman Larensis' comment that the skins were still to be seen in the Temple of Heracles at Rome.⁶⁴

Cultural identity could not, therefore, simply be assumed and accepted by others without challenge. Aspirants to the high table of Hellenic culture had to earn their place, and for some, that task would be made harder by the alleged drawbacks of their origins. The location at Rome of Athenaeus' banquet reinforces that message; Oulpianos has uprooted himself from Tyre but, as a Syrian, he has no natural place among the elites, political or cultural in the capital, however cosmopolitan it might claim to be. Though nominally the president of the proceedings, he falls short; with the defensiveness of the parvenu, he sticks to what he knows in defiance of the diners' general respect for breadth of culture. For all his skill with words and recollection of their use, Oulpianos remains uncertain of his cultural roots; by the end of the dinner party, he is dead.⁶⁵

Conclusion

In the streets and bazaars of Tyre, the young Ulpian would have jostled with speakers of multiple languages, peoples with diverse cultures, histories and legal practices largely ignored by the dominant discourse of Hellenism. Unlike, say, Plutarch, Ulpian's early conditioning would have sowed the seeds of a sceptical view of the dominance of the 'two languages,' which underpinned

61 Ath. *Deip.* 3. 97d–f. Swain 1996: 49–51.

62 Ath. *Deip.* 9.406d; 407c.

63 Ath. *Deip.* 15.677e.

64 Ath. *Deip.* 221b–e (Oulpianos on the Gorgon); 5.221f (Larensis).

65 Ath. *Deip.* 15.686c (death). O. dies 'happily' after a short illness, to the grief of his friends. The word 'happily' (*eutychos*) could not have been used of the violent end of Ulpian the praetorian prefect.

the 'double vision' of the Graeco-Roman elites; he knew there was more to be said. Ulpian, like the emperors he served, was a new type for privileged Romans and Greeks to take account of. Ignoring the cultural equivalents of the *Deipnosophistae*, from whom, on the showing of Athenaeus, he could expect little sympathy, Ulpian concentrated instead on an alternative and wider public. This public, his accessible guides to Roman law would enfranchise, not only legally but culturally as well; the new citizens, too, had honour, and were entitled to respect.

Expertise in Roman law brought Ulpian to success and power in the imperial administration. It also enabled him to project an identity, which took him far from his Syrian roots. By being more 'Roman' than most Romans, Ulpian the lawyer could bypass suggestions that, as a Tyrian, he must somehow fall short as a 'Greek'. His, therefore, is a new kind of cultural space. A former outsider, he flaunts his status as an insider; as a legal adviser to emperors, he possesses knowledge of power—and powerful knowledge; in a Latin peppered with easy Greek and devoid of recondite allusions, he educates and thus empowers Caracalla's new Romans. As a product of the new Severan world order, he reveals the culmination of a process long in the making, the rebalancing of power between the *provinciales* and their governors, the periphery and the centre, the new *civitas Romana* and the old.

Greek History in a Roman Context: Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander*

Jesper Carlsen

Alexander the Great was one of the most popular historical and iconic figures in the Second Sophistic. Two surviving works, Plutarch's biography and Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander* in seven books, are among the most important literary sources for the life of the Macedonian king,¹ but the subject of this chapter is not the myth or reality of Alexander the Great. The focus of this chapter is a contextual reading of Arrian's work on Alexander, in order to discuss if or how it reflects a literary response to Roman power and institutions in the first half of second century CE. It explores the position of the Greek historian by looking not only at the four passages where he explicitly mentions Rome and the Romans in the *Anabasis of Alexander*, but it will also analyze two other episodes in the work that might be interpreted as implicit commentaries on the Roman Empire of Arrian's own time.

The dating of Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander* is of course an essential issue, when the purpose is an analysis of the text in the light of contemporary history, and the political career of Lucius Flavius Arrianus is, in broad outline, clear from his own literary works and epigraphical evidence.² He was probably born about 84 CE and originated from Nicomedia. His cultural background and education was entirely Greek. In his youth Arrian attended the lectures of the Stoic philosopher Epictetus at Nicopolis in Epirus before entering Roman public service. It is uncertain when Arrian became a senator, but he presumably held the proconsulship of Baetica before being appointed *consul suffectus* about 129 CE. He was governor in the important frontier-province Cappadocia for at least six years but retired shortly before the death of Hadrian in 138 CE. Apparently Arrian left the imperial administration after his retirement, but he

1 See e.g. Anderson 1976: 171; Zecchini 1984; Anderson 1989: 145; Zeitlin 2001: 196; Whitmarsh 2005: 68–70; Asirvatham 2010; Desideri 2010. For Plutarch see also Hamilton 1969 and Hammond 1993.

2 For the life of Arrian see Halfmann 1979: 146–7; Bosworth 1980–95: I 1–7, II 1–2; Stadter 1980: 1–18; Syme 1982a; Bosworth 1988: 16–25; Fein 1994: 174–80; Madsen 2009: 68–70, and Romm 2010: 417–20.

did not settle in his hometown or in Rome. Instead he established himself at Athens where he held the eponymous archonship of 145/6 CE, which is the last information we have about his life.³

The reputation of Arrian is not due to this impressive political and administrative career, although he was the first Greek Bithynian who entered the senate. It was his literary production, including the publications of Epictetus' lectures and a brief handbook on these that made Arrian a famous philosopher already in Antiquity. The younger contemporary Lucian describes Arrian as 'the pupil of Epictetus, a man among the first of the Romans, who consorted with culture (*paideia*) all his life'.⁴ Lucian's remark is from the introduction of his work on *Alexander the False Prophet*, where he makes a brief comparison of the Alexander of Abonoteichos and the Macedonian king. As a justification of his own work Lucian adds that even Arrian wrote a biography of a brigand, so the context indicates that Lucian is playing with a double vision of Greek and Roman cultures in his characterization of Arrian.⁵

Unfortunately only eight of Arrian's seventeen known works have survived. The most important of them, the *Anabasis of Alexander*, is our most completely preserved account of the Macedonian king. The inspiration from Xenophon's *Anabasis* is obvious, and in the first paragraph of his later work on hunting, *Cynegeticus*, Arrian himself stresses the affinity with Xenophon 'having the same name as he, and being of the same city, and having shared the same interests from youth—hunting, generalship and philosophy'.⁶ The epigraphical evidence does not confirm that Arrian actually possessed the surname Xenophon, but he was celebrated by others as the 'new Xenophon'.⁷

There is no exact reference in the seven books of the *Anabasis of Alexander* indicating when or where they were written. What Bosworth wrote more than fifteen years ago remains true: 'The absolute date of the Alexander history remains a stumbling block. Certainty is hardly attainable'.⁸ Three views dominate the debate. Bosworth himself holds the view that Arrian's history of Alexander is a relatively early work, written in the period of Hadrian's

3 Some of the controversial details of Arrian's life and work include the time of his promotion to the senate and his early military activities. They are, however, not crucial for the arguments in this chapter that concentrates on his literary career.

4 Lucian, *Alex.* 2. Translated by C.P. Jones. Brunt 1977: 31.

5 For Lucian's Alexander biography see Swain 1996: 324–8 and Whitmarsh 2005: 77–8.

6 Arr. *Cyn.* 1.4. Translated by M.M. Willcock.

7 See Ameling 1984; Bosworth 1993: 272–5, and Fein 1994:181–2 against Stadter 1980: 2–3.

8 Bosworth 1980–95: II 4.

accession and before Arrian became a senator and politician in Rome.⁹ But most scholars favour a later date for Arrian's history of Alexander, either to his middle years after his consulship¹⁰ or even later in Athens, perhaps to the first half of the 160s during the reign of Marcus Aurelius.¹¹

The crucial passage in the debate of the dating of the *Anabasis of Alexander* is the Second Preface in Book One, where Arrian emphasizes that his writings mean everything to him:

ἔνθεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀρμηθῆναι φημι ἐς τήνδε τὴν ξυγγραφὴν, οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἑμαυτὸν φανερά καταστήσειν ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. ὅστις δὲ ὦν ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἑμαυτοῦ γινώσκω, τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐδὲν δέομαι ἀναγράψαι, οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἄγνωστον ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἐστίν, οὐδὲ πατρίδα ἥτις μοί ἐστιν οὐδὲ γένος τὸ ἐμὸν, οὐδὲ εἰ δὴ τινα ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ ἑμαυτοῦ ἡρῶ. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἀναγράφω, ὅτι ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οἶδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσί τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο. καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἀπαξιῶ ἑμαυτὸν τῶν πρῶτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι, εἵπερ οὖν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις.

Wherefore I declare that I myself set out on this history, not judging myself unworthy to make Alexander's deeds known to men. And as to who I am that I make this judgement in my favour, I do not need to inscribe my name, for it is not at all unknown to men, nor what my native land is, nor my family, nor if I have held any office in my own land; but this I do inscribe, that my native land, family, and offices are this work and have been even from my youth. And for this reason I count myself not unworthy of the first place in Greek speech, just as I hold Alexander to have been in arms.¹²

The important question is which homeland, *πατρίς*, and which offices Arrian did not need to record to his readers? According to some scholars, it is without doubt Nicomedia and local offices,¹³ but Brunt's arguments for identifying Rome as the homeland of Arrian are much more convincing. Arrian stresses

9 Compare Bosworth 1980–95: I 9–12 and II 4–5. Bosworth 1988: 30 n. 72, but followed by Fein 1994: 183, and Sisti & Zambrini 2001–04: I LVIII: “in età ancora giovanile.” See Carlsen 1993: 51 n. 5, with references to critical reviews of Bosworth 1980 and 1988.

10 Stadter 1980: 179–87; Tonnet 1988: I 90; Hammond 1993: 317.

11 Bowie 1974: 193; Wirth 1974: 199–200.

12 Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.4–5. Translated by Moles 1985: 163. See also Bowie 1974: 193, and Swain 1996: 244, for slightly different translations; Gray 1990; Tonnet 1988: I 69–77.

13 Moles 1985: 168; Bosworth 1988: 36; Sisti & Zambrini 2001–04: I LVIII–LXI.

that his name is 'not at all unknown to men'. According to Brunt, 'in the context this means that he is celebrated for rank. How many of his readers would have known of a mere local magnate in Nicomedia? It is most natural to infer that he has an imperial renown for his position in the Roman state.'¹⁴ A date of the *Anabasis of Alexander* to the reign of the philhellene Hadrian or perhaps later should therefore be preferred as it also will be clear from the parallels analyzed later in this chapter.

Rome and Romans in the *Anabasis of Alexander*

Arrian speaks for the first time of the Romans in Book Three in connection with Alexander's conquest of Egypt. Here the Greek imperial author makes a brief remark based on his own experience on Roman administration of Egypt after 30 BCE:

καὶ Ῥωμαῖοί μοι δοκοῦσι παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρου μαθόντες ἐν φυλακῇ ἔχειν Αἴγυπτον καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐπὶ τῷδε ἐκπέμπειν ὑπαρχον Αἰγύπτου, ἀλλὰ τῶν εἰς τοὺς ἱππέας σφίσι ξυντελούντων.

The Romans, I think, learnt from Alexander to keep a watch on Egypt, and never to send anyone from the Senate as governor, but only those whom they class as Knights.¹⁵

Arrian is the only source that claims Greek influence on this Roman administrative practice, and his attempt to characterize Alexander as the role model for the Romans is impaired by the confession: 'I think'.

The second time Arrian mentions the Romans is in Book Five, when he talks about how Alexander the Great and his army crossed the river Indus. Arrian says that his two sources, Aristobolus and Ptolemy, do not describe it, but continue to discuss different ways of bridging rivers with the use of boats:

εἰ δὲ δὴ πλοίοις ἐξεύχθη ὁ πόρος, πότερα ξυντεθεῖσαι αἱ νῆες σχοίνοις καὶ κατὰ στοῖχον ὀρμισθεῖσαι ἐς τὸ ζεύγμα ἀπήρκεσαν, ὥς λέγει Ἡρόδοτος ζευχθῆναι τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, ἢ ὅτῳ τρόπῳ Ῥωμαίοις ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰστροῦ ποταμῷ ζεύγμα ποιεῖται

14 Brunt 1978–83: II 539; Moles 1985: 168: 'a relatively late dating.' See also Marincola 1989: 188–9 on the conventions of autobiographical remarks in Greek historiography.

15 Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.7. Texts and translations, unless otherwise stated, are taken from Brunt's Loeb edition. For the Roman governors of Egypt see Jördens 2009.

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Ῥήνῳ τῷ Κελτικῷ, καὶ τὸν Εὐφράτην καὶ τὸν Τίγρητα, ὁσάκις κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς ἀνάγκη, ἐγεφύρωσαν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἔχω ξυμβάλειν. καίτοι ταχυτάτη γε ὦν ἐγὼ οἶδα Ῥωμαίοις ἢ γεφύρωσις ἢ διὰ τῶν νεῶν γίγνεται, καὶ ταύτην ἐγὼ ἀφηγήσομαι ἐν τῷ παρόντι, ὅτι λόγου ἄξια.

But if the stream was spanned with boats, were they lashed together by ropes and then moored in line across so as to form the bridge, as Herodotus of Halicarnassus says the Hellespont was spanned, or was the method that which the Romans used to bridge the Ister and Celtic Rhine, or the Euphrates and Tigris, whenever they were obliged to do so? This too I cannot decide, yet the quickest way of bridging I know is the Roman use of boats, and I shall here describe it, for it merits description.¹⁶

The mention of Roman crossings of the Euphrates and Tigris is obviously an allusion to Trajan's eastern campaigns. The emperor bridged the Tigris in 116 CE, but Arrian does not elaborate on this aspect in his digression on Roman bridging methods. He claims knowledge about the technology of bridge construction, and the description is accurate. Roman technology is praised in this excursus that Bosworth rightly argued 'is deliberately superimposed as a counterpart of Herodotus' classic description of Xerxes' bridging of the Hellespont.'¹⁷

In Book Seven Arrian mentions Rome twice. The first time is in connection with an issue on which scholarly controversy never seems to end: Alexander's last plans, including his personal notebooks, the *Hypomnemata* which are only mentioned by Diodorus.¹⁸ Arrian records several different traditions for these plans, since he cannot determine the truth with certainty. He was only sure that Alexander the Great would not have stopped his conquests. Some of Arrian's sources record that the Macedonian king planned to invade Sicily and Southern Italy 'as he was already rather disturbed that Rome's fame was advancing to a great height.'¹⁹

More lengthy and interesting is the fourth and last time that Rome appears in the *Anabasis of Alexander*. The issue this time is the foreign embassies paying visits to the Macedonian king at Babylon:

16 Arr. *Anab.* 5.7.2–3. Bosworth 1980–95: II 254–9.

17 Bosworth 1980–95: II 254.

18 Diod. 18.4.1. See Sordi (1965) 2002: 155–162; Bosworth 1988: 185–211, and Carlsen 1993: 46, with references.

19 Arr. *Anab.* 7.1.3. Cf. Arr. *Anab.* 4.7.5: 'no matter if a man were to sail out right round Libya as well as Asia and subdue them, as Alexander actually thought of doing, or were to make Europe, with Asia and Libya, a third part of his empire.'

Ἄριστος δὲ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης τῶν τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀναγραφάντων καὶ Ῥωμαίους λέγουσιν ὅτι ἐπρέσβευσαν· καὶ ἐντυχόντα ταῖς πρεσβείαις Ἀλέξανδρον ὑπὲρ Ῥωμαίων τι τῆς ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα ἐσομένης δυνάμεως μαντεύσασθαι, τὸν τε κόσμον τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἰδόντα καὶ τὸ φιλόπονόν τε καὶ ἐλευθέριον καὶ περὶ τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἅμα διαπυνθανόμενον. καὶ τοῦτο οὔτε ὡς ἀτρεκές οὔτε ὡς ἄπιστον πάντῃ ἀνέγραψα· πλήν γε δὴ οὔτε τις Ῥωμαίων ὑπὲρ τῆς πρεσβείας ταύτης ὡς παρὰ Ἀλέξανδρον σταλείσης μνήμην τινὰ ἐποίησατο, οὔτε τῶν τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου γραψάντων, οἷς τισι μᾶλλον ἐγὼ ξυμφέρομαι, Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγου καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος· οὐδὲ τῷ Ῥωμαίων πολιτεύματι ἐπειοικός ἦν ἐλευθέρῳ δὴ τότε ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ὄντι, παρὰ βασιλέα ἀλλόφυλον ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐς τοσόνδε ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας πρεσβεῦσαι, οὔτε φόβου ἐξαναγκάζοντος οὔτε κατ' ἐλπίδα ὠφελείας, μίσει τε, εἴπερ τινὰς ἄλλους, τοῦ τυραννικοῦ γένους τε καὶ ὀνόματος κατεχομένους.

Aristus and Asclepiades among the historians of Alexander say that even the Romans sent envoys, and that when Alexander met their embassy he prognosticated something of their future power on observing their orderliness, industry and freedom, and at the same time investigating their constitution. This I have recorded as neither true nor wholly incredible, except that no Roman ever referred to this embassy sent to Alexander, nor did the historians of Alexander whom I prefer to follow, Ptolemy son of Lagus and Aristobulus; nor was it suitable for the Roman government, at a time when it enjoyed freedom in the highest degree, to send envoys to a foreign king, especially so far from their own home, without the compulsion of fear or the hope of advantage, given that no other people was so possessed by hatred of despotism and its very name.²⁰

The important question is not that raised by Arrian—whether the Roman embassy is a later invention or perhaps ‘an embellishment of a historical nucleus.’²¹ Litres of ink have been spilt in discussing this question but it remains impossible to solve with certainty.²² Yet it is worth stressing that Arrian prefers to follow not only Ptolemy and Aristobulus but also Roman historiography against two other Greek historians. He adds his own argument

20 Arr. *Anab.* 7.15.5–6. Brunt 1978–83: II 497–8; Bosworth 1988: 83–93; Zecchini 1984: 202.

21 Bosworth 1988: 87.

22 See Brunt 1978–83: II 497–8; Bosworth 1988: 83–93 with further literature; Hammond 1993: 299, and Sordi (1965) 2002: 163–170. E.g. Plin. *Nat.* 3.57 and Polyb. 2.12.7 seems to contradict Arrian, but note Walbank 1957, 166: ‘P. is thinking of political contacts, and this passage does not bear on the authenticity of the tradition of a fifth-century embassy to Greece.’

in favour of the implausibility of such an embassy because it was impossible that the freedom-loving Romans would 'send envoys to a foreign king, especially so far from their own home.' This description of Republican Romans contains historical commonplaces and generic traditions, describing them as organized, hard-working and free, but the reference to despotism of kings can be interpreted as either an implicit critique of the Macedonian king as a tyrant or a criticism of the recent Roman king, the emperor. Bosworth, however, has rather subtly argued for the opposite view that Hadrian with his alleged 'toleration of freedom could be represented as the polar opposite of Alexander the autocrat.'²³

The four passages where Arrian explicitly mentions Rome are very different. One is in praise of contemporary Roman building technology, and another makes Alexander the model for Roman imperial provincial administration. The last two passages concern Republican Rome, and modern scholars do not agree on the importance of these four quotations. On the very first page of his invaluable historical commentary on Arrian's history of Alexander, Bosworth inscribes a sense of cultural alienation and concludes that Arrian's 'background is wholly Greek; he addresses a Greek public and talks of Romans as alien, always qualifying them as *Ῥωμαῖοι*. It is Bithynia that he regards as his *patris*.'²⁴ On the other hand, Swain maintains that 'Arrian still finds room in the *Anabasis* to mention Romans (in the third person) several times. These passages reflect his own interests and indicate one potential audience.'²⁵ First it can be observed that Latin historians also, such as Livy and Velleius Paterculus denote Romans in the third person, but I believe there is more to the question of Rome in the *Anabasis of Alexander* if we take a further step. It is a truism—too often forgotten—that all historical works are written under the impact of contemporary problems. An obvious example comes from the texts of the Second Sophistic. One needs only to mention the famous debate in Cassius Dio's *Roman History* between Agrippa and Maecenas on the future of the Roman government. It has long been realised that it mostly reflects political issues of the Severan times and not a possible restoration of the Republic in 27 BCE.²⁶ It is certainly an

23 Bosworth 2007: 448.

24 Bosworth 1980–95: I 1. Also Bowie 1974: 194: 'he makes little concession to the present in his *Anabasis*.'

25 Swain 1996: 245. See also Tonnet 1988: I 85–90 for 'l'*Anabase* et l'histoire contemporaine d'Arrien.'

26 See Millar 1964: 102–18; Rich 1989: 98–101, and Swain 1996: 403–4.

overstatement to call Maecenas' speech 'the authentic voice of Dio',²⁷ but it contains both a defence of monarchy as the best rule and specific proposals to reforms of the present government.

Arrian wrote his history of Alexander the Great in an archaising Attic Greek, and the work was apparently addressed to the philhellene elite of the Roman Empire with interests in military operations.²⁸ It represents a dialogue between Greek and Roman cultures, and, accordingly, several passages may with varying obviousness be supposed to reflect the author's experience of Roman imperial power. Therefore, I now turn to two episodes from the *Anabasis of Alexander* to see how Arrian tends to construct Greek history in a Roman context and provides a double vision. The two case studies are both famous episodes: the introduction of *proskynesis* at the court of Alexander, and the murder of Cleitus the Black. Arrian comments on both cases and his general remarks on the divinity of the Macedonian king and flattery at the court may also be seen as observations on two important Roman institutions.²⁹

The Court of Alexander the Great or the Roman Emperor?

Both episodes touch on the relations between the ruler and intellectuals, and these passages may reflect a Greek literary response to Roman imperial power. In fact, the analysis will indicate that implicitly or by analogy, Arrian sometimes criticizes contemporary Roman institutions. The first example comes from the description of the introduction of the Persian act of *proskynesis* at the court of Alexander the Great. As is attested in other sources the experiment with *proskynesis* was met with opposition from the older generation of Greeks and Macedonians who associated it with divine honours.³⁰ The opposition was personified in Callisthenes, and Arrian's version of the incident includes

27 Cassius Dio 52.2–40. Reinhold 1988: 179.

28 Moles 1985: 165 argues that the *Anabasis of Alexander* is predominantly written for Greeks, but Alexander was also the theme of Quintus Curtius Rufus' Latin narrative. See Atkinson 2000 for a useful survey of the Alexander accounts of the Early Empire.

29 It has recently been argued that Arrian's remarks on Icarus who fell 'because he did not follow his father's injunctions and fly low near the ground, but was mad enough to fly high' (*Anab.* 7.20.5) has a Roman parallel: 'After Trajan died, his allegedly adoptive heir Hadrian declared his predecessor's Asian expedition a mistake—hence establishing a less eagerly expansionist persona for emperors.' Asirvatham 2010: 203–4. See also Bosworth 2007: 449.

30 Curt. 8.5.5–6.1; Plut. *Al.* 54.3. Fredericksmeyer 2003: 274–8. For the deification of Alexander and his 'auto-divinizzazione' see Cawkwell 1994; Troisi 2005 and Dreyer 2009 with further literature.

a speech of the court historian, in which he argues that *proskynesis* was a barbarian honour inappropriate for Greeks and Macedonians, and that worship of a living man was unnatural. As an appendix to the debate between the sophist Anaxarchus and Callisthenes, Arrian tells a story, in which at a small symposium the historian avoided *proskynesis*, but was detected and excluded from the king's inner circle. At this point, Arrian makes following personal comment:

καὶ τούτων ἐγὼ, ὅσα ἐς ὕβριν τε τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τὴν ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα καὶ ἐς σκαιότητα τὴν Καλλισθένους φέροντα, οὐδὲν οὐδαμῇ ἐπαινώ, ἀλλὰ τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν γὰρ κοσμίως τίθεσθαι ἐξαρκεῖν φημί, αὖξοντα ὡς ἀνυστὸν τὰ βασιλέως πράγματα ὅτῳ τις ξυνεῖναι οὐκ ἀπηξίωσεν. οὐκ οὐκ ἀπεικώτως δι' ἀπεχθείας γενέσθαι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Καλλισθένην τίθεμαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαίρῳ τε παρρησίᾳ καὶ ὑπερόγκῳ ἀβελτερίᾳ. ἐφ' ὅτῳ τεκμαίρομαι μὴ χαλεπῶς πιστευθῆναι τοὺς κατεπόντας Καλλισθένους, ὅτι μετέσχε τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς τῆς γενομένης Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐκ τῶν παίδων, τοὺς δέ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπήρεν αὐτὸς ἐς τὸ ἐπιβουλεύσαι.

In these incidents I do not at all approve either of Alexander's arrogance at the time or of Callisthenes' tactlessness, but in fact I think it enough for a man to show moderation in his own individual conduct, and that he should be ready to exalt royalty as far as practicable, once he has consented to attend on a king. So I think that Alexander's hostility to Callisthenes was not unreasonable in view of his untimely freedom of speech and arrogant folly, and on this account I infer that Callisthenes' detractors were readily believed that he had a part in the plot laid against Alexander by his pages, some of them even saying that Callisthenes had incited them to the plot.³¹

Arrian expressly blames Callisthenes for 'untimely freedom of speech and arrogant folly', and this harsh condemnation is very likely to represent the personal experience of a Greek senator who owed his advancement to Trajan and

31 Arr. *Anab.* 4.12.6. Arrian already accuses Callisthenes in the introduction to the debate: 'It is said that Callisthenes of Olynthus, a past pupil of Aristotle, and with something of the boor in his character, did not approve of this, and here I myself agree with Callisthenes; on the other hand I think Callisthenes went beyond reason, if the record is true, in declaring that Alexander and his exploits depended on him and his history; it was not he who had come to win fame from Alexander, but it would be his work to make Alexander renowned among men' (Arr. *Anab.* 4.10.1–2). See Bosworth 1988: 113–23 for an accurate analysis of Callisthenes' speech, and 1980–95: II 77–90 for the debate. Gray 1990: 183–5; Bosworth 1996: 109–12 puts it into a wider context, but see also Zambrini 2007: 219–20.

especially the ‘friend’ Hadrian.³² It has rightly been observed that the ‘remark about avoiding flattery fits such a context better than the episode he is narrating which involved insult rather than flattery.’³³ Arrian’s explicitly condemnation of Callisthenes indicates an encoded criticism of contemporary Roman courtly protocol, and it fits very well also with the concept of freedom of speech as we find it in Pliny the Younger’s *Panegyricus* with its focus on frankness and denial of flattery.³⁴

The second case study comes also from Book Four, but this time the subject is the murder of Cleitus the Black. This famous episode is also reproduced at length by Plutarch and in the vulgate tradition,³⁵ but—according to Arrian—the fatal quarrel between the two old brothers-in-arms began after some of the participants in a drinking bout ‘out of flattery to Alexander claimed that there was no comparison between Castor and Pollux and Alexander and Alexander’s achievements.’³⁶ The important thing in this connection is, however, Arrian’s conclusions on the guilt and blame of the murder, expressed twice:

καὶ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἀνιάσαι Ἀλέξανδρον λεχθέντα. οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἐπαινῶ τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ ἱκανὸν γὰρ εἶναι τίθεμαι ἐν τοιαύτῃ παροινίᾳ τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸν σιγῶντα ἔχειν μηδὲ τὰ αὐτὰ

Alexander was deeply hurt by his words. Nor do I approve of them; I think it enough, amid such drunkenness, for a man to keep his own views to himself without committing the same errors of flattery as the rest.³⁷

καὶ ἐγὼ Κλεῖτον μὲν τῆς ὕβρεως τῆς ἐς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν αὐτοῦ μεγαλωστί μέφομαι· Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ τῆς συμφορᾶς οἰκτεῖρω, ὅτι δυοῖν κακοῖν ἐν τῷ τότε ἡττημένον ἐπέδειξεν αὐτόν, ὅφ’ ὅτων δὴ καὶ τοῦ ἐτέρου οὐκ ἐπέοικεν ἄνδρα σωφρονούντα ἐξηττάσθαι, ὀργῆς τε καὶ παροινίας. ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖσδε αὖ ἐπαινῶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὅτι παραυτίκα ἔγνω σχέτλιον ἔργον ἐργασάμενος.

32 Fein 1994: 184–5, 217; Birley 1997: 4. But see also Brunt 1978–83: II 536: ‘It is likely, but not certain that his judgement on Callisthenes reflects the outlook of a senator.’ Hartmann 1907 focuses on Arrian’s three works written during the reign of Trajan: *Periplus of the Black Sea*, *Order of Battle against the Alani* and *Essay on Tactics*.

33 Romm 2010: 163. On Callisthenes in the literature of the Roman Republic and Early Empire see also Spencer 2009: 269–72.

34 Plin. *Pan.* 1.6. Bartsch 1994: 178–9 with discussion of Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch and Tacitus on flattery.

35 Plut. *Al.* 50.1–52.2; Curt. 8.1.20–2.12 with Baynham 1998: 185–90; Just. 12.6.1–16.

36 Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.3.

37 Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.5. Bosworth 1980–95: II 51–68.

I myself strongly blame Cleitus for his insolence (*hybris*) towards his king, and pity Alexander for his misfortune, since he then showed himself the slave of two vices, by neither of which is it fitting for a man of sense to overcome, namely anger and drunkenness. But for the sequel I commend Alexander, in that he immediately recognized the savagery of his action.³⁸

Arrian also speaks of Cleitus' 'drunken arrogance' and 'his insults' against Alexander.³⁹ It is thus Cleitus and his lack of tact that is to be blamed for the murder, and Arrian further stresses the king's grief and remorse after the death in order to create a defence of Alexander the Great.

The position of Arrian is perhaps not surprising, but he continues commenting on the ruler's duties and criticizes strongly Anaxarchus for his flattery after the murder of Cleitus:

ταῦτα εἰπόντα παραμυθήσασθαι μὲν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν τῷ τότε, κακὸν δὲ μέγα, ὡς ἐγὼ φημι, ἐξεργάσασθαι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ μείζον ἔτι ἢ ὅτῳ τότε ξυνείχετο, εἴπερ οὖν σοφὸς ἀνδρὸς τήνδε ἔγνω τὴν δόξαν, ὡς οὐ τὰ δίκαια ἄρα χρὴ σπουδῇ ἐπιλεγόμενον πράττειν τὸν βασιλέα, ἀλλὰ ὅ τι ἂν καὶ ὅπως οὖν ἐκ βασιλεύως πραχθῇ, τοῦτο δίκαιον νομίζειν.

These words are said to have consoled Alexander for the time, but I say that he did Alexander even greater harm than the affliction he then suffered from, if indeed he gave this opinion as that of a sage, that the duty of the king is not to act justly after earnest consideration, but that anything done by a king in any form is to be accounted just.⁴⁰

This is one of the few passages in the *Anabasis of Alexander* where Arrian is close to characterizing his hero as a despot. The question is whether these paragraphs also reflect the Greek senator's personal experience of imperial power or it is perhaps even a critical, but indirect portrait of Hadrian. It has been argued that the relations between the emperor and Greek intellectuals deteriorated towards the end of his reign. Some sources such as Fronto and *Historia Augusta* indicate that Hadrian changed his attitude towards Greek Sophists and some of them were exiled or executed.⁴¹

38 Arr. *Anab.* 4.9.1–2.

39 Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.7. Bosworth 1996: 100–5.

40 Arr. *Anab.* 4.9.8. Bosworth 1996: 104–5.

41 For references and examples see Bowersock 1969: 50–3; Stertz 1993: 618–9; Birley 1997: 281–2, but note also the scepticism in Bowie 1997.

The context of the two case studies is the 'great digression' in the middle of the *Anabasis of Alexander*, where Arrian breaks off the chronological sequence and relates three independent episodes where the Macedonian king's behaviour could be criticized. The first episode is the murder of Cleitus; then comes the introduction of the *proskynesis* and finally the pages' conspiracy with the death of Callisthenes.⁴² Already in Antiquity, these misdeeds were interpreted as examples of the corruption of power. Alexander's claim to be son of a deity, the orientalising at the court and his excessive drinking, together with the uncontrolled anger were popular themes in the Latin historians of the Early Empire such as Livy and Tacitus.⁴³ These vices illustrated the moral decline of the Macedonian king after the conquest of Persia, and Seneca even calls Alexander a madman (*vesanus*) and stresses his *crudelitas* several times.⁴⁴ This tradition in Roman literature of Alexander the Tyrant depicts the Macedonian king with striking correlations between his bad moral qualities and infamous, young Roman emperors such as Caligula, Nero and Domitian.⁴⁵

Arrian defends the Macedonian king against all these criticisms at the very end of the *Anabasis of Alexander*. He excuses not only the 'misdeeds due to haste or anger', but also his barbarian practices, Persian dress, deification and drinking bouts. Arrian emphasizes in his defence the youth of Alexander and 'his unbroken good fortune, and the fact that it is men who seek to please and not to act for the best who are and will be the associates of kings, exercising an evil influence.'⁴⁶ The problem remains as to Arrian's view of the intellectuals' behaviour at the court. We have already seen that he criticizes the ill effects of flattery, but the literary representation of Callisthenes is ambiguous. Alexander's court historian said the right things about cult to a living king, but in his criticism of Callisthenes Arrian stresses that untimely freedom of speech and overt opposition should be avoided by the intellectual, who should remain moderate in his own life and avoid the extremes. Several scholars have discussed whether this middle path may be reminiscent of Epictetan thought, but there is no doubt that Arrian is in agreement with Tacitus who in his short eulogy of M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 6 CE) prefers to walk between

42 Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.1–14.4. See Brunt 1978–83: I 532–44 for the sources to these chapters, and Bosworth 1980–95: II 45–101.

43 Livy, 9.17.17–18.5; Tac. *Ann.* 2.73.

44 Sen. *Ben.* 2.16; *Clem.* 1.25; *de ira.* 3.17.1–3; See Isager 1993: 81–2 for further references.

45 See Zecchini 1984 and Spencer 2009 with further examples.

46 Arr. *Anab.* 7.29.1. Bosworth 1988: 135–56.

sheer obstinacy and disgraceful servility.⁴⁷ In other words, Arrian's criticism of Callisthenes confirms the conventional moral outlook of the imperial senatorial elite.

Epilogue

Arrian is a complex and remarkable figure who has rightly been described as a man divided between two cultures or 'deux mondes' as Vidal-Naquet first formulated it.⁴⁸ Arrian was as part of a parallel or complementary culture that combines affinity for classical Greek culture and education with engagement in Roman society and politics.⁴⁹ He was at the same time 'Staatsmann und Philosoph',⁵⁰ and his literary works are mostly concerned with the Eastern Mediterranean. They reveal a fascination with military operations worthy of a Roman consul and commander. This is most obvious in two short works, *Order of Battle against the Alans* and *Essay on Tactics*, written when he was governor of Cappadocia. The latter work combines an account of Hellenistic tactics with actual Roman military operations under Arrian's command.⁵¹ It has also been rightly observed that 'there is no trace of nostalgia or longing for better days in his historical works',⁵² and the *Anabasis of Alexander* focuses only on the Macedonian king as general and as man.

47 Tac. *Ann.* 4.20.3: 'whether it is by fate and the chance of birth that, as is the case with all other things, princes incline toward some men and are affronted at others; or whether there is something in our own policies which permits us to proceed between sheer truculence and grotesque compliance along a path cleared of ambition and peril.' Translation by Woodman. Stadter 1980: 109–110; Brunt 1978–83: II 541–2; Bosworth 1988: 150–3.

48 Vidal-Naquet 1984. Stadter 1980: ch. 9: 'Between two cultures.' Bosworth 1993: 226: 'Astride two worlds: Arrian's life and work.' Madsen 2009: 119: 'a Roman authority and a nostalgic Greek.'

49 See now Whitmarsh 2010. Bowie 2002: 191: 'though things must still have seemed different to many members of the Greek city élites, here were men for whom, as for Hadrian, the question 'Are you Roman or Greek?' would have been one to which it was impossible to give a simple answer.'

50 Fein 1994: 180. Also Stadter 1980: 168: 'His Greek heritage and his philosophical training were an integral part of his life, neither suppressed nor given undue primacy.'

51 Stadter 1980: 179; Bosworth 1993.

52 Stadter 1980: 167. See also Bosworth 1993: 227: 'The contemporary Arrian is also very much in the background. There are occasional references to his own days, and the moral attitudes evinced are very much those of the second century AD, but the focus of interest is inevitably the person and the age of Alexander.'

Arrian mentions Rome and the Romans only four times in his Alexander history and in very different contexts. Most significantly is the long description and praise of the Roman army's method of bridging rivers with the use of boats and the discussion of a possible Roman embassy to Alexander.⁵³ The latter's reference to despotism of kings could be a contemporary allusion, but the explicit references to Arrian's own experiences are few and scattered. Yet a close reading of two episodes from the great digression in Book Four with examples of the Macedonian king's lack of self-control and orientalising suggest that the *Anabasis of Alexander* also contains more encoded discourse about contemporary kingship. With Callisthenes as his spokesman Arrian argues elaborately against cult to living rulers, but at the same time Arrian blames the Macedonian historian for his boastfulness and warns against flattery. The analysis does not help to cut the Gordian knot of the dating of Arrian's Alexander history. It shows, however, that Arrian balances between explicit and implicit commentaries on Rome, so the *Anabasis of Alexander* is not only Greek history written in a Roman context; it is also an example of a double vision integrating different identities.

53 Arr. *Anab.* 5.7.2–6.1; 7.15.5–6.

Herodian on Greek and Roman Failings

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen

Ancient historians resemble limited companies in that their market values fluctuate for reasons that are not always obvious. Long before the present financial crisis, that of Herodian was on a downward trend. Once his rating had been excellent: Photios, writing in the ninth century, thought that Herodian was ‘inferior to few in the good qualities of an historian’.¹ In the sixteenth century, Herodian was being read and translated² and as late as the eighteenth, Edward Gibbon paid him the equivocal compliment of being ‘an elegant historian’.³ By the second half of the twentieth century, however, Herodian’s *History from the time of Marcus Aurelius* had come to be reckoned a junk asset, ‘a farrago of clichés’ ... ‘stock *formulae* learned at school’ ... ‘quite unlike the brief, factual account of Dio’⁴ ... ‘mehr eine Art historischen Romans als ein Geschichtswerk’.⁵ The author himself was judged to be an indifferent stylist, a careless historian, an uninspired compiler of banalities, a *Mann ohne Eigenschaften*. Within the last two decades, Herodian’s reputation has improved somewhat, but he is still largely considered a ‘historian of last resort’ to be consulted only where all other sources fall silent.

While Herodian is not entirely without merits as a historiographer, he was obviously no Thucydides, nor a Tacitus, not even a Dio Cassius. The purpose of this paper, then, is not to rehabilitate Herodian as an historian but to examine him from the perspective of this volume, that is, as a Greek intellectual living and writing within the Roman Empire. For Herodian was Greek, at least in the Roman sense of the word: a person hailing from one of the Greek-speaking eastern provinces of the Empire. He wrote in Greek; he was well versed in Greek literature; he took Greek historians as his models. But he was also Roman in the sense of being a citizen of the Roman Empire, pursuing a career in what he calls the ‘imperial and public service’⁶ and in his *History*,

1 Photios, *Bibl.* 99.

2 Zimmermann 1999b: 120–1.

3 Gibbon 1776/1894, vol. 1: 100.

4 Bird 1976.

5 Alföldy 1971a: 431.

6 Her. 1.2.5.

he sometimes underscores his own *Romanitas* with a pedantic-didactic excursus on some aspect of Italian geography customs or religion.⁷

The Eastern Roman Empire was a large area. We should like to know from which province or city he hailed, but all the information we have about Herodian's origins is what can be gleaned from his *History*, and that is not much.⁸ There is nothing to suggest that he was a native of Greece proper, i.e., the Roman province of Achaëa. Alexandria and Antioch have been proposed as his native city, but Herodian does not take much of an interest in Alexandrian events save for Caracalla's massacre of the citizens in the winter of 215/16⁹ and while he seems to know his way around Antioch, he is not too well informed about the geography of Mesopotamia.¹⁰ His recurrent references to the 'quick-witted' Levantines,¹¹ too, seem to reflect the view of an outsider.

Western Anatolia has been proposed as his homeland, given Herodian's mention of Byzantium, Chalcedon, Nicomedia, Nicaea, Cyzicus and Ilium, ancient Troy,¹² but the first four of these cities are located on the overland route used by the emperor and his entourage when going to or coming from the East, while Troy would be known to even the least educated Greek. Cyzicus is mentioned only once, as the site of a decisive battle between Niger's forces and the Severans, and his account of the conflict reveals Herodian's knowledge of Bithynian geography to be rather limited.¹³ As in the case of Antioch, Herodian's familiarity with the Bithynian cities and their history may be derived from his travels in the imperial entourage.

Whatever the precise nature of his Greek roots, Herodian was also Roman. That, too, has a wide range of meanings—socially as well as geographically. Dio Cassius in the course of his *History* drops many hints to remind us that he was a member of the Senate: Herodian does not, and probably was not. He may have been an equestrian: he shows some sympathy for Macrinus, the first equestrian to attain the purple.¹⁴ He may even have been an imperial freedman: while he condemns the activities of some freedmen, he criticizes them as individuals,

7 E.g., Her. 1.10.5–11.5 (the cult of Cybele at Rome), 2.11.8 (the Alps), 4.2 (deification of emperors).

8 Whittaker 1969: xxv–xxvi; Alföldy 1971b: 219–25.

9 Her. 4.9.3–6.

10 Below, n. 31.

11 2.7.9, 2.10.7, 3.11.8.

12 Whittaker 1969: xxvii; Alföldy 1971b: 223–4; Zimmermann 1999a: 302–4.

13 Below, p. 231.

14 Her. 4.12–15; compare Cassius Dio who stresses Macrinus' humble origins while downplaying his legal training (Cass. Dio, 79.11) and the even more negative thumbnail portrait by Aurelius Victor (22.1), echoed by the *Historia Augusta* (*Macrinus*, 2.1).

not as a class. He is critical of emperors such as Commodus and Caracalla, who have reached the throne by virtue of birth rather than ability while his hero, Marcus Aurelius, is praised for selecting sons-in-law on the basis of 'good character and moderate lifestyle' rather than noble birth or inherited wealth.¹⁵

Herodian's ideal society, then, appears to be one where able men, irrespective of their geographical or family background, can make a career for themselves—provided they perform their tasks capably, mind their business and do not let themselves be led astray by excessive ambition.¹⁶ It is a petit-bourgeois vision that would naturally be attractive to new men from the provinces, such as Herodian himself; but it is also a very Roman idea, echoing the advice of Horace, himself an equestrian: enjoy the quiet life and be content in your social position.¹⁷

That vision, however, was far from contemporary reality. As Herodian points out in the prooemium to his *History*, the death of Marcus Aurelius had marked the beginning of a period unparalleled in Roman imperial history for its sequence of πολέμων ἐμφυλίων τε καὶ ξένων τύχας ποικίλας ἐθνῶν τε κινήσεις καὶ πόλεων ἀλώσεις τῶν τε ἐν τῇ ἡμεδαπῇ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς βαρβάροις, γῆς τε σεισμούς καὶ ἀέρων φθοράς τυράννων τε καὶ βασιλέων. . .¹⁸ ('varied fortunes of war at home and abroad, disturbances among the peoples, destruction of cities in our own and in many barbarian territories, earthquakes and plagues, tyrants and kings. . .').¹⁹ an age of extremes, the very antithesis of Horatian *mediocritas*.

The Impressionistic Historian

Time and again, Herodian has been compared to his near-contemporary Dio Cassius, and invariably to the latter's advantage.²⁰ Dio Cassius had been born into an influential Bithynian family. His father was in turn governor of Lycia-Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Dalmatia, while Dio himself governed first Africa, then Dalmatia and finally the important frontier province of Pannonia Superior.²¹

15 Her. 1.2.2.

16 Cf. Her. 1.9.1 on Perennius' immoderate ambition leading him to plot against Commodus and 8.8.4 on the rival ambitions of Maximus and Balbinus leading to their destruction.

17 E.g., Hor. *Odes* 2.10.2; *Epodes*, 4.4.

18 The Greek text follows Lucarini's edition 2005.

19 Her. 1.1.4; echoed, with variations, at 3.7.7–8.

20 The extent to which Herodian's account is derived from that of Dio Cassius, or vice versa, is a large and complex problem beyond the scope of this paper. For a summary of the main positions, Kolb 1972 and Sidebottom 1998.

21 Cass. Dio, 49.36.4; on the Cassii, Bekker-Nielsen 2008: 109–14; Madsen 2009: 67.

By contrast, there is nothing to suggest that Herodian had any profound experience, or indeed understanding, of the larger imperial picture—provincial administration or frontier policy—nor, as far as we can tell, of military affairs.²²

Dio Cassius conceived his *oeuvre* in the grand tradition of Herodotus and Thucydides. Like the former, he views history in a long-term perspective (commencing his narrative with the arrival of Aeneas in Italy) and takes an interest in ethnography and geography. In common with Thucydides, he adopts a critical approach to his sources while retaining the right to invent speeches ‘appropriate to the occasion’ and place them in the mouths of historical characters.

Though Herodian limits himself to contemporary history, his approach has some points in common with that of Dio Cassius. His—admittedly somewhat superficial—interest in ethnic characteristics is reminiscent of Herodotus. The space he allows women as historical actors in their own right, on the other hand, is unusual viewed against the background of Graeco-Roman historiography.²³ Marasco, uncharitably but no doubt correctly, sees this as an expression of Herodian’s ‘gusto per il patetico ed il drammatico’²⁴ and it may well be that Herodian has modelled some of his characters on the female protagonists of classical Greek tragedy (with which, as an educated Greek, he would naturally be familiar). For the rest, Herodian emulates Thucydides in the fictitious speeches and in the programmatic opening statements that he shall not accept secondhand information (*historia*) unless it can be verified and attested²⁵ and that his narrative shall be based on what he himself has seen and heard.²⁶ Unfortunately for Herodian’s reputation, both his talent as a speechwriter and his critical acumen fall short of Dio Cassius’. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that in their re-enactment of past events, Herodian is often the more skilful of the two. The following is Dio’s brief narrative of Caracalla’s death in the Syrian desert:

τῇ ὀγδόῃ τοῦ Ἀπριλίου ἐξορμήσαντά τε αὐτὸν ἐξ Ἑδέσσης ἐς Κάρρας, καὶ κατελθόντα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου ὅπως ἀποπατήσει, προσελθὼν ὁ Μαρτιάλιος ὡς γε εἰπεῖν τι θεόμενος ἐπάταξε ξιφιδίῳ μικρῷ. καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν αὐτίκα ἀπέφυγε, καὶ διέλαθεν ἂν εἰ τὸ ξίφος ἀπερρίφει· νῦν δὲ γνωρισθεὶς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τινος τῶν Σκυθῶν τῶν σὺν Ἀντωνίνῳ ὄντων κατηκοντίσθη. ἐκείνον δὲ . . . οἱ χιλιάρχοι ὡς καὶ βοηθοῦντες κατέσφαξαν.

22 Roques 1990: 65.

23 Kuhn-Chen 2002: 323.

24 Marasco 1998: 2907.

25 Her. 1.1.3.

26 Her. 1.2.5.

On the eighth of April, when the emperor had set out from Edessa for Carrhae and had dismounted from his horse to ease himself, Martialis approached as though desiring to say something to him and struck him with a small dagger. Martialis immediately fled and would have escaped detection, had he thrown away his sword; but, as it was, the weapon led to his being recognized by one of the Scythians in attendance upon Antoninus, and he was struck down with a javelin. As for Antoninus . . . , the tribunes [Nemesianus and Apollinaris, co-conspirators of Macrinus], pretending to come to his rescue, slew him.²⁷

This is Herodian's version in the fourth book of the *History*:

τὸν Ἀντωνίνον, διατρίβοντα ἐν Κάρραις τῆς Μεσοποταμίας, προελθεῖν τῆς βασιλείας†²⁸ ἀπελθεῖν τε εἰς τὸν νεῶν τῆς σελήνης, ἣν μάλιστα οἱ ἐπιχώριοι σέβουσιν. ἀφειστήκει δὲ τῆς πόλεως ὁ νεὼς πολὺ, ὥς ὁδοιπορίας χρῆζειν. σὺν ἱππεῦσιν οὖν ὀλίγοις, ἵνα δὴ μὴ πάντα τὸν στρατὸν σκύλη, τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν ἐποιεῖτο . . .

Caracalla, while staying at Carrhae in Mesopotamia, left the imperial camp²⁹ to go to the temple of Selene, whom the people of the region venerate very much. The temple is located so far from the city that a proper journey [i.e. with an escort and entourage] was required. Not wishing to leave the camp unguarded, he took only a few horsemen with him . . .³⁰

Unlike Dio Cassius, Herodian takes his time to build up suspense: the reader already senses that Caracalla's decision to go on a long journey with only a few companions may prove fatal.³¹ On another level, this passage may be read as an overture to book five of the *History*, where misplaced veneration for an oriental deity will have disastrous consequences not only for the next member of the dynasty, Elagabalus, but for the whole empire. Where Dio has a complex

²⁷ Cass. Dio, 79.5, trans. E.H. Cary, *LCL*.

²⁸ Lucarini's conjecture. Stavenhagen: βασιλείου <αὐλῆς>, Whittaker: στρατοπεδείας.

²⁹ Or imperial residence, if Lucarini's conjecture is accepted (see preceding note).

³⁰ Her. 4.13.2–3.

³¹ In reality the temple of the lunar deity was not far from Carrhae: the 'long' (and presumably fictitious) journey has been inserted to explain the absence of the army, Roques 1990: 259 n. 91; Kolb 1972: 123. Müller 1996: 326 argues that the *Historia Augusta* (Caracalla, 6) supports Herodian's version as against that of Cassius Dio, but this argument cuts both ways, since the following chapter (Caracalla, 7) of the *HA* gives Cassius Dio's version of events.

storyline involving three assassins (leaving the reader in doubt who actually killed the emperor) Herodian reduces the plot to a showdown between two opponents, Caracalla and Martialis:

κατὰ δὲ μέσῃν ὁδὸν ἐπειχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς γαστροῦ, ἀποστήναί τε πάντας
κελεύσας, ἀνεχώρει σὺν ἐνὶ ὑπηρέτῃ ἀποσκευασόμενος τὰ ἐνοχλοῦντα.
πάντες τοῖνυν ἀπεστράφησαν καὶ ὡς πορρωτάτῳ ἀπῆσαν, τιμὴν καὶ αἰδῶ τῷ
γινόμενῳ νέμοντες. ὁ δὲ Μαρτιάλιος τοὺς καιροὺς πάντας παραφυλάττων,
ιδῶν τε αὐτὸν μεμονωμένον, ὡς δὴ κληθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ νεύματι, ἐρῶν τι ἢ
ἀκουσόμενος, προστρέχει, ἐπιστάς τε αὐτῷ τὰς ἐσθῆτας τῶν μηρῶν καθέλκοντι,
ἀπεστραμμένον παῖει ξιφιδίῳ, ὃ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔφερε λανθάνων. καιρίου δὲ τῆς
πληγῆς ἐπὶ τῆς κατακλείδος γενομένης ἀπροσδοκήτως τε καὶ ἀφυλάκτως
ὁ Ἀντωνίνος ἀνῆρέθη. πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ <ἐμ>πληθήσας ἵππῳ ἔφυγεν ὁ
Μαρτιάλιος. Γερμανοὶ δὲ ἵππεις... διώξαντες τὸν Μαρτιάλιον κατηκόντισαν.

When about midway, he was afflicted by a pain in the stomach, ordered the whole column to dismount and went away with a single attendant to relieve himself. So everyone turned their faces and removed themselves as far as possible, of respect for the emperor and shame at what was taking place. Waiting for his chance, Martialis observed the emperor being alone. As though he had been summoned by a nod to tell or to be told something, he ran towards Antoninus and stood over him while he was drawing his clothes over his thighs; then he stabbed him with a dagger which he had concealed in his hand while the emperor's back was turned. Entering below the clavicle, the blow was fatal. So the emperor died without warning and without a guard. After he fell, Martialis jumped on a horse and fled. But the German horsemen... pursued Martialis and struck him down with their javelins.³²

The image of the emperor caught with his pants down may be closer to Aristophanes than to Aeschylus, but there is no denying that Herodian's technique creates effective historical tableaux:³³ compact, self-contained

32 Her. 4.13.4–6.

33 E.g., Her. 1.9.3–5 ('man dressed as a philosopher' warns Commodus of a plot); 2.1.1–2 (Commodus' body being smuggled out of the palace); 3.14.6–7 (British fighters up to their waists in mud), 4.1.5 (doors of the palace being blocked up to separate Caracalla's quarters from Geta's); 5.6.7 (Elagabalus running backwards in full ceremonial dress); 7.10.6–9 (Pupienus plays a trick on the Roman mob).

narratives backed by visual images,³⁴ rather like episodes in a modern TV sitcom. As in many sitcoms, however, the overall storyline is weak. Whereas Herodian generally succeeds in showing us *what* happens and *how*, he is less successful at explaining *why* it took place or the ways in which events are interlinked. Nor does he take much interest in psychology, apart from some unoriginal observations about the value of *paideia* and the negative effects of bad company. He is generally content to explain the actions of his characters either in terms of simple, one-dimensional emotions such as envy or greed, or by placing his protagonist in an impossible dilemma (another favourite device of modern sitcom scriptwriters).

The Greek Malady

As an educated Greek of the late second century, Herodian was familiar not only with the literature of the Classical period but also with the leading writers of the Second Sophistic, such as Dio Chrysostom. In fact, quite a few of Herodian's ideas seem to be derived from the golden-mouthed rhetorician of Prusa. For instance, in the third book of his *History*, Herodian recounts the battle of Nicaea during the civil war between Severus and Pescennius Niger:

ὥς δὲ διέδραμε<ν ἡ> φήμη τῆς Σεβήρου νίκης, εὐθὺς ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκεῖνοις στάσις καὶ διάφορος γνώμη ἐνέπεσε ταῖς πόλεσιν, οὐχ οὕτως τῇ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμοῦντας βασιλέας ἀπεχθεία τινὶ ἢ εὐνοίᾳ ὥς ζήλῳ καὶ ἔριδι τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλας φθόνῳ τε καὶ †καθαίρεσει† τῶν ὁμοφύλων. ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο πάθος Ἑλλήνων, οἱ πρὸς ἀλλήλους στασιάζοντες αἰεὶ καὶ τοὺς ὑπερέχειν δοκούντας καθαίρειν θέλοντες ἐτρύχωσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐκείνων γηράσαντα καὶ περὶ ἀλλήλοις συντριβέντα Μακεδόσιν εὐάλωτα καὶ Ῥωμαίοις δοῦλα γεγένηται· τὸ δὲ πάθος τοῦτο τοῦ ζήλου καὶ φθόνου μετέλθεν εἰς τὰς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀκμαζούσας πόλεις. κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὴν Βιθυνίαν εὐθὺς μετὰ τὰ ἐν Κυζίκῳ Νικομηδεῖς μὲν Σεβήρῳ προσέθεντο καὶ πρέσβεις ἔπεμπον, τὴν τε στρατιὰν ὑποδεχόμενοι καὶ πάντα παρέξουσιν ὑπισχνούμενοι, Νικαεῖς δὲ τῷ πρὸς

34 Herodian mentions that Severus had his Parthian 'battles and victories' (3.9.12) painted; it may be one such painting, rather than a barrack-room anecdote, that inspired Herodian's description of the insect-filled missiles used by the defenders of Hatra (3.9.5). Similarly, the pictures that Maximinus commissioned after his German victory (7.2.8) could have provided material for Herodian's description of the German landscape (7.2.3–6). The description of Severus' dream in 2.9.5–6 may be derived from the 'large bronze image' (*eikôn megistê chalkou pepoiêmenê*) that Herodian saw in the Roman forum.

Νικομηδέας μίσει τάναντία ἐφρόνουν καὶ τὸν στρατὸν τοῦ Νίγρου ὑπεδέχοντο, εἴ τέ τινες ἐκ τῶν φυγόντων κατέφευγον πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ τοὺς πεμφθέντας ὑπὸ τοῦ Νίγρου φρουρεῖν Βιθυνίαν. ἐκατέρωθεν οὖν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ὡς ἀπὸ στρατοπέδων ὁρμώμενοι συνέβαλον ἀλλήλοις

When the news of Severus' victory [at Cyzicus in 193] spread, it immediately led to an outbreak of strife (*stasis*) and disagreement in the cities of all those provinces, not so much out of enmity or goodwill towards one of the warring emperors, rather from rivalry, envy and mutual hatred and for the destruction of their fellow-men. This is an old affliction (*pathos*) of the Greeks: to be in discord (*stasiazein*) with one another and trying to bring down a rival who seems to have grown too powerful: Greece was worn out by this. As they grew older and weaker while crushing one another, they were easily enslaved by the Macedonians and the Romans. The same *pathos* of rivalry and hatred has been passed on to the cities that have flourished up to our times. In Bithynia, immediately after the events of Cyzicus, the city of Nicomedia went over to Severus and sent him envoys, receiving his army and promising to go along with him. The people of Nicaea by contrast, because of their hatred of Nicomedia, chose the other side, receiving Niger's army and any fugitives fleeing in their direction as well as the soldiers sent by Niger to hold Bithynia. Rushing out from each of these two cities, as from army camps, the forces clashed with one another.³⁵

Here again, Herodian succeeds in creating an evocative tableau which the reader can readily visualize: the two fortified cities confronting one another 'like army camps' from which the soldiers sally forth to join battle. Unfortunately, his scenography is incompatible with geographical reality. Niger's forces were approaching Nicaea from the west and according to Dio Cassius,³⁶ the fighting took place on the southern shore of lake Ascanius between Nicaea and Cius. Nicomedia lay fifty miles distant on the opposite side of the lake and beyond the mountains, two days' march from the battlefield.

Herodian's analysis of the irrational jealousy of the Nicaeans leading them into the fatal alliance with Niger is likewise at variance with the facts as he himself presents them. If Nicomedia indeed 'went over to' Severus 'immediately after' the battle of Cyzicus, they must obviously have been on the side of Niger until then; and there is no suggestion that Nicaea had ever been on the side of

35 Her. 3.2.7–10.

36 Cass. Dio, 75.6.4.

Severus. From Herodian's narrative, the two rivals were on the *same* side until news of the Severan victory at Cyzicus arrived, prompting the Nicomedians to shift their allegiance to the victor. Had the Nicaeans wanted to follow their example, it was hardly their dislike of the Nicomedians that prevented them from doing so, rather the impending arrival of Niger's army.

A close parallel to this passage is found in the thirty-eighth ('Nicomedian') oration of Dio Chrysostom. To a Greek historian searching for sources on Nicomedia's past, the address to the Nicomedians, reckoned among the best of Dio's orations, would naturally come to mind. Its theme is the futility of inter-city rivalry, and in chapters 37–38, Dio sums up:

κατεγνώκασι δὲ ὑμῶν ἄνοιαν δημοσίᾳ, καὶ χρώνται καθάπερ τοῖς παιδίοις ὑμῖν, οἷς πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῶν μεγίστων προτείνεται τὰ μικρότατα· κάκεῖνα διὰ τὴν ἄνοιαν τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς μεγάλων καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὰ ἐλάχιστα ἡδονὴν χαίρει τῷ μηδενί·

...

τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα, ἐφ' οἷς μέγα φρονεῖτε, παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς ὀρθῶς ἐννοουμένοις διαπτύεται, μάλιστα δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις γέλωτα κινεῖ καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ἔτι ὑβριστικώτερον Ἑλληνικὰ ἀμαρτήματα. καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀμαρτήματα, ἄνδρες Νικομηδεῖς, ἀληθῶς, ἀλλ' οὐχ Ἑλληνικά, εἰ μὴ κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο Ἑλληνικὰ φήσει τις αὐτὰ εἶναι, καθ' ὅσον ἐκεῖνοι δόξης ἀντεποιήσαντό ποτε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι.

Yet by their public acts [the Romans] have branded you as a pack of fools, yes, they treat you just like children, for we often offer children the most trivial things in place of things of greatest worth; moreover, those children, in their ignorance of what is truly valuable and in their pleasure over what is of least account, delight in what is a mere nothing . . .

In truth such marks of distinction, on which you plume yourselves, not only are objects of utter contempt in the eyes of all persons of discernment, but especially in Rome they excite laughter and, what is still more humiliating, are called 'Greek failings!' And failings they are indeed, men of Nicomedia, though not Greek, unless someone will claim that in this special particular they are Greek, namely, that those Greeks of old, both Athenians and Spartans, once laid counterclaims to glory.³⁷

The points in common between Dio and Herodian are obvious. The differences are, however, equally telling. According to Dio Chrysostom, it is the *Romans*

37 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 38.37–38, trans. H.L. Crosby, *LCL*.

who have coined the expression 'Greek failings'. Herodian, in his eagerness to be Roman (as one of this volume's editors might express it) takes the point of view attributed to the Romans and makes it his own. Dio uses the word *hamártêma*, a 'failing' in the sense of a fault or disability; in its place Herodian has *pathos*, suggesting an affliction or an illness.³⁸ Herodian stresses the timeless nature of the 'Greek malady' that has infested the Greek states since classical times and led to their enslavement first by Macedonia, then by Rome. Dio, on the other hand, emphasizes the contrast between the Classical period when Athenians and Spartans fought over real, tangible and important prizes such as tribute and empire, and their squabbles over meaningless titles in his own day.³⁹

Dio's oration centres on *homonoia*, 'civil concord'. Its opposite is *stasis* which can mean either 'revolution', 'civil unrest' or 'sudden changes of régime', but always with strong negative connotations. The horror of *stasis* was part of the Classical Greek philosophical tradition: Socrates described a good citizen as one who 'puts an end to *stasis*'⁴⁰ and Aristotle a good constitution as *astasis-kos*, 'free from *stasis*'.⁴¹ The history of Hellas amply demonstrated the negative consequences of *stasis*: as both Herodian and Dio Chrysostom take pains to point out, internal strife and disunity had cost the Greek city-states their independence. In his own time, Dio says, internal dissension and inter-city rivalries had placed the cities of Bithynia at the mercy of the provincial governor.⁴²

Tyrants and Kings

Romans of course had their failings as well. If urban rivalry was a Greek weakness, the deplorable habit of murdering emperors seems a typically Roman one. From the reign of Nerva to that of Marcus, the choice of an emperor's successor had been based on merit, ability and family connections. Once the adoptive succession had been abandoned, a series of emperors and usurpers followed, only one of whom died a natural death. It is this chaotic succession of 'varying fortunes, disturbances and destructions' that Herodian set out to describe in his *History*.⁴³

38 On the 'Greek malady' in general, Heller 2006: 13–16.

39 Dio Chrys. *Or.* 38.2; also 34.48–51.

40 Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.6.14.

41 Aristotle, *Politics* 1296a7.

42 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 38.36.

43 Her., 1.1.4.

Now history, as the great R.G. Collingwood has taught us, comes in several kinds. One is what Collingwood dismissively termed ‘scissors and paste-history’, where the historian is merely ‘repeating statements that other people have made before him’,⁴⁴ ‘playing patience with things we already know’.⁴⁵ The other is true history, ‘re-enactment of past experience’ in the historian’s own mind.⁴⁶ The distinction between these two kinds of history springs from Collingwood’s division of events into on the one hand ‘mere events’ or phenomena that can be observed only from the ‘outside’, and on the other hand historical events, which have both an outside (an action as seen by the observer) and an inside (the thoughts and motives of the actor).⁴⁷

Clearly, a good deal of Herodian’s historical narrative falls into the scissors-and-paste category, entirely consistent with the methodology laid out in his prooemium.⁴⁸ Even when attempting to re-enact past events, Herodian often contents himself with recreating the outside of the event—not without some success—while ignoring its underlying motives or causes. We have already noted the use of historical tableaux and circumstantial detail (much of it no doubt invented) to underscore a significant point in the narrative. It is in the nature of tableaux, however, that they provide few insights into the minds of the historical personae, and even fewer into that of the historian himself. For these, we must look elsewhere, to the passages where Herodian makes a conscious attempt to relive the emotions of the protagonist and place words ‘appropriate to the occasion’ in his, more rarely her, mouth.

All told, there are some thirty passages in *oratio recta* in the whole of Herodian’s history: one is a letter, while the remainder are divided about equally between dialogue and formal oratory.⁴⁹ Since composing words ‘fitting to the occasion’ was a hallmark of the historian’s craft, it is unlikely that a self-respecting historiographer would have cribbed his speeches from the works of another. It is equally unlikely that the orations are based on transcripts of actual speeches as they are clearly all by the same hand, drawing their arguments from a common pool of aphorisms and banalities, some of which recur in the narrative itself or in other *oratio recta* passages. For instance,

44 Collingwood 1946: 274.

45 Collingwood 1946: 9.

46 Collingwood 1946: 282.

47 Collingwood 1946: 215–16.

48 Her. 1.1.3; 1.2.5.

49 The passages in *oratio recta* are not evenly distributed throughout the *History*, and nearly all the informal dialogue is found in books I–III. There are five formal speeches in book II, two each in books I, IV and VIII, one each in books III, VI and VII, and none in book V.

when Pescennius Niger is speaking to his troops and the populace of Antioch, he uses the same opening and the same rhetorical themes as Macrinus when addressing the Senate in writing two decades later.⁵⁰

While not much of a testimony to their author's literary originality, Herodian's *oratio recta* passages may be taken as 'original' in the sense of having been composed by the historian himself—using Thucydides, Sallust or Tacitus as models—and consciously or unconsciously voicing the concerns and hopes of their author. They may thus provide some important clues to Herodian's view of the imperial office and of those who held it during his time.

Here again, the intellectual debt to Dio Chrysostom is evident. Herodian would naturally be familiar with Dio's *Orations on kingship* composed c. 100 CE and addressed to Trajan. Herodian's reference to 'tyrants and kings' in his prooemium⁵¹ and the contraposition of tyranny and kingship in the first paragraph of book VII echo the first *Oration on kingship* where Dio, after a detailed enumeration of the virtues of the good ruler or king (*basileus*)⁵² gives his readers a variation of the classic tale of 'Heracles at the crossroads' in which the hero is asked to choose between two women, in Dio's version personifying not vice and virtue, but tyranny and kingship.⁵³

Herodian demands 'Heracleian' virtues of his emperors. Severus combines the kingly virtue of courage with the tyrant's love of money.⁵⁴ Caracalla earns the respect of his soldiers by sharing their simple food and hard work: 'it deserves to be admired', writes Herodian, 'how despite his small stature he could carry heavy loads thanks to exercise (*askêsis*)'.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, subsequent events reveal that Caracalla lacks Heracleian self-control: his austere military lifestyle soon turns into hybristic posturing, leading to popular derision and a disastrous confrontation with the youth of Alexandria.⁵⁶ While Maximinus Thrax is criticized for lack of *paideia*,⁵⁷ Herodian acknowledges his

50 Her. 2.8.2–5, cf. 5.1.2–8.

51 Her. 1.2.4.

52 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.11–41; on Dio's image of the ideal prince, see also Ventrella 2011: 194–7.

53 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.70–83; the original version is attributed to Prodicus of Ceos, a contemporary of Socrates (Apollonius, *vs* 482). The same theme is taken up by Dio's admirer Synesius, *On kingship* 6 (= 1061 B).

54 Her. 3.8.7.

55 Her. 4.7.7. Compare Dio Chrys., *Or.* 28, an encomium on the athlete Melancomas that may have been intended as a *Fürstenspiegel* for the emperor-designate Titus (Ventrella 2011), esp. 28.7; also *Or.* 6.12–13 on the frugal eating habits of Dio's philosopher-hero Diogenes.

56 Her. 4.8.1–4.9.7.

57 Her. 7.1.2–3.

bravery in battle.⁵⁸ The *paideia* of his opponent Gordian is beyond dispute, but Gordian's lack of Heracleian qualities reveals him to be no true *basileus*, but a mere image (*eikôn*) of one.⁵⁹

These distinctive features of the Dionian conception of kingship are brought more clearly out in a comparison with the panegyric addressed to Trajan by Pliny the younger and delivered a year or two before Dio's *Orations on kingship*. Himself a senator, Pliny takes pains to stress the close relationship of emperor and Senate.⁶⁰ The new emperor, in contrast to some of his predecessors,⁶¹ respects the laws and is bound by them: *non est princeps supra leges, sed leges supra principem*.⁶² To Dio, on the other hand, the *basileus* is above the laws of men. He may respect them if he wishes, but is not bound nor protected by them;⁶³ he is subject only to the laws of Zeus.⁶⁴ His primary relation is not to the Senate but to a smaller circle of associates and advisors to whom he is linked by bonds of *philia*.⁶⁵ Whereas Pliny's emperor rules within a framework laid down by laws and custom, a chief magistrate in the Roman tradition, the actions of Dio's ideal ruler are guided by interpersonal relationships: trust, loyalty and respect for the elders.⁶⁶

Murderous Habits

In their discussions of kingship, neither Pliny the younger nor Dio Chrysostom touch on the sensitive subject of tyrannicide. Trajan knew well enough, and would not want to be reminded, that his path to the throne had been opened by the murder of Domitian in 96 CE. Both Pliny and Dio chose, no doubt wisely, to sidestep the problem whether violence against an unjust ruler could be ethically defensible.

For Herodian, there was no avoiding the question. Most rulers in his *History* had come to a violent end and in more than a few cases, their murder had seemed justified to the eyes of contemporaries. The quandary in which

58 Her. 7.2.6–7.

59 Her. 7.9.9–10; compare Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.78, where Tyranny is 'simulating and copying' Kingship.

60 Pliny, *Pan.* 78.3; see above, Chapter Four.

61 Pliny, *Pan.* 11.5.

62 Pliny, *Pan.* 65.1: 'The ruler is not above the law, but the laws are above the ruler'.

63 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.43, 3.10, 3.88.

64 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.38, 1.45.

65 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.30–32, 3.86–9.

66 Cf. Dio Chrys., *Or.* 49.7–8, 57.6–9.

Herodian found himself was not, however, merely an ethical one. A historian condoning tyrannicide on general principles might catch the suspicious eye of the emperor or his praetorian prefect, but condemning regicide under any circumstances might be seen as questioning the legitimacy of the reigning emperor. The safest course of action was to deal with each case on its own merits and as far as possible let the characters speak for themselves in *oratio recta*. Indeed, more than half of the set speeches in the *History* are related to imperial murders that either have already taken place or are being planned. The arguments brought forward in justification can be grouped under four headings:

Self-preservation. The protagonist is placed in a dilemma where (s)he must either kill the ruler or be killed.

Violation of the norms of philia. By his disloyalty or ingratitude, the victim has broken the bonds of friendship. He is no longer protected by the rules of *philia* but on the contrary open to the legitimate revenge of his former *philoï*.

Blaming the victim. Due to his vices or weaknesses, the emperor is unworthy of his office and/or unable to exercise it in the best interest of his subjects.

Ex post legitimization. The usurper is acknowledged as emperor by the Senate or the army, implicitly condoning the murder of his predecessor.

Several of these elements can be combined, and all four are brought into play in connection with the first imperial murder in the *History*. A death list drawn up by Commodus is taken from his rooms by a small boy and ends up in the hands of the imperial concubine Marcia. She reads it and finds herself heading the list together with the praetorian prefect Q. Aemilius Laetus and the chamberlain Eclectus. To save themselves, the trio arranges for Commodus to be killed⁶⁷ and Pertinax to take his place. To win a reluctant Pertinax for their cause, Laetus explains how Commodus suffered the fate he had intended for his friends.⁶⁸ When addressing the praetorian rank and file, Laetus uses another argument: the emperor's death was due to his unhealthy lifestyle and 'no one but himself is to blame for his death'.⁶⁹ Next morning, Pertinax is acclaimed emperor by the Senate.⁷⁰

67 Her. 1.17.1–11. The story closely resembles an anecdote about the death of Domitian reported by Cass. Dio, 67.15.3–4; see Kolb 1972: 38–9.

68 Her. 2.1.9–10.

69 Her. 2.2.6.

70 Her. 2.3.4.

In his acceptance speech to the senators, Pertinax concludes with the hope that the new reign shall be ‘an aristocracy, not a tyranny’.⁷¹ The praetorian troops, however, prefer the old tyranny to the new order⁷² and some of them gain entry to the palace with the intention of killing the emperor. Herodian approvingly notes how Pertinax does not yield to his instinct for self-preservation and run away, but meets the soldiers face to face and makes a short speech at sword’s point before he is killed.⁷³

In the second and third books of the *History*, the sequence is reversed. The speakers—Pescennius Niger and Septimius Severus—are not justifying tyrannicide after the fact but enlisting support for the conflict that lies ahead. In Antioch, where Pescennius Niger is addressing the Syrian populace and army,⁷⁴ the main argument is legitimacy. The ‘Roman people, whom the gods have given power over all things, even the imperial office (*basileia*)’ are clamouring for Pescennius to come and save themselves and the empire.⁷⁵ The speech is enthusiastically received by the crowd and Pescennius is proclaimed emperor. He subsequently fails to exploit the opportunity that fate has offered him and is eventually killed, ‘a fair penalty’, according to Herodian, ‘for his slowness and procrastination’.⁷⁶

Severus, in his turn, asks his troops to support *his* bid for the empire. He opens with a short outline of recent history along the same lines as Herodian’s prooemium, then announces his intention to avenge the murder of Pertinax, displace Julianus, who does not have the support of the people, and punish the disloyal praetorians.⁷⁷ The soldiers approve his plan and proclaim him emperor. After the death of Niger, Severus prepares for the showdown with Albinus and once more addresses his army, explaining how the ungrateful Albinus has violated the rules of *philia* by breaking oaths and promises.⁷⁸ He goes on to argue that Albinus is now a threat to Severus and that although ‘it is unjust to undertake evil actions, it is also unmanly not to defend oneself’: he and his soldiers are morally obliged to fight in their own defence.⁷⁹

71 Her. 2.3.5–11.

72 Her. 2.5.1–3.

73 Her. 2.5.5–8.

74 Her. 2.8.2–5.

75 Her. 2.8.4.

76 Her. 3.4.7.

77 Her. 2.10.2–9.

78 Her. 3.6.1–3.

79 Her. 3.6.4, probably inspired by Thucydides, 1.120.3.

On the morning following the death of Geta, Caracalla attempts to justify his actions in a speech before the Senate. The argument placed in his mouth by Herodian is that of self-defence: his brother, so it is alleged, attacked him with a sword and Caracalla killed Geta while trying to defend himself.⁸⁰ From Herodian's previous narrative, the reader knows this claim is untrue, and the speech thus serves to condemn Caracalla in our eyes.

The story of Caracalla's successor, the equestrian Macrinus, once again turns on the theme of self-preservation. By accident, a letter to the emperor denouncing Macrinus ends up in the latter's hands. Realizing that either he himself or Caracalla must die, Macrinus arranges for the assassination.⁸¹ As Caracalla lies dead, Macrinus is acclaimed as emperor and then addresses first his troops in a speech; then the Senate, by letter.

The address to the troops⁸² is terse and to the point: after a short, hypocritical praise of Caracalla's 'important and noble achievements', Macrinus passes directly to the problem at hand, the imminent battle against the Parthians. The keywords are loyalty, glory and a conventional contraposition of Roman discipline and barbarian disorder. It evokes a Heraclean, austere, matter-of-fact image of Macrinus that is strangely inconsistent with what Herodian otherwise has to tell us about Macrinus' relaxed lifestyle. On the other hand, it shares some elements with the oration attributed to the young Alexander Severus in book VI.⁸³ Both are stereotypical commander's speeches, possibly going back to a common model.

The letter, on the other hand, has a number of unusual features. Although Herodian purports to reproduce a written text, Macrinus employs the verb *makrêgorein*, which is more often used of oral communication.⁸⁴ A formal promise that the new regime shall be an aristocracy is immediately followed by an impassioned attack on the inherited privileges of the patricians (*eupatrides*): 'No one should count me unworthy or think that I have risen from the equestrian order to this position by a mere fluke. What is the advantage of noble birth, if it is not accompanied by integrity and decent behaviour to one's fellow-men? ... What did you gain from Commodus' noble birth (*eugeneia*) or Antoninus' succeeding to his father's power?'⁸⁵

80 Her. 4.5.2–7.

81 Her. 4.12.6–4.13.2.

82 Her. 4.14.4–8.

83 Her. 6.3.3–7.

84 Her. 5.1.2.

85 Her. 5.1.5–6.

Macrinus' asserts that his rule shall be 'an *aristokratia* rather than a *basileia*'.⁸⁶ The contraposition of just and unjust forms of government is a well-worn rhetorical *topos* that can be found in the accession speech of Pertinax (aristocracy versus tyranny),⁸⁷ in Severus' post-accession address to the Senate,⁸⁸ in the biography of Alexander Severus (aristocracy vs. tyranny)⁸⁹ and that of Maximinus Thrax (kingship vs. tyranny).⁹⁰ Only in the letter of Macrinus, however, do we find *basileia* on the negative side of the equation. To Herodian, *basileia* and *aristokratia* were not mutually exclusive: in book VI, he approvingly notes that under the rule of Alexander, 'the nature of the kingship changed from a hybistic tyranny to an aristocracy'.⁹¹ The contraposition of aristocracy and kingship is not a Greek, but a distinctively Roman one: *res publica* as opposed to *regnum*.

Though most commentators assume that the entire letter of Macrinus was fabricated by Herodian in the same manner as the other passages in *oratio recta*,⁹² another view is that it incorporates parts of an authentic dispatch to the Senate.⁹³ (Elsewhere in his history, Herodian refers to letters from the emperors⁹⁴ that he may have consulted in the senatorial archives, and Dio Cassius mentions letters from Macrinus being read in the Senate.)⁹⁵ On this theory, the opening lines of the letter will have been composed by Herodian (as suggested by the close similarities with the speech of Niger in book II),⁹⁶ while the passages highlighting the military and diplomatic victories over the Parthians are taken from an authentic dispatch, written in Latin and concluding with a programmatic statement that the rule of Macrinus should not be a *regnum* (in Greek, *basileia*).⁹⁷ From here, Herodian once again takes over to

86 Her. 5.1.4.

87 Her. 2.3.10.

88 Her. 2.14.3 (reported in *oratio obliqua*).

89 Her. 6.1.2.

90 Her. 7.1.1.

91 Her. 6.1.2; on this passage, also Roques 1990: 44–5.

92 Zimmermann 1999a: 215–16.

93 Marasco 1996: 189.

94 Her. 2.12.3 (Julianus), 3.9.12 (Severus), 7.6.3 (Gordian).

95 Cass. Dio, 79.16.4–5.

96 Her. 2.8.2.

97 Cf. Whittaker, *ad loc.* The standard gloss for *res publica* would be *dēmokratia* but this is rarely used by Herodian and then only in an historical sense (= the period of the Roman republic); Roques 1990: 44.

develop the familiar theme that noble birth is not in itself a guarantee of good and moderate rule.⁹⁸

Although acknowledging the positive sides of Macrinus' brief reign,⁹⁹ Herodian condemns his love of luxury and fine clothes¹⁰⁰—typical 'tyrannical' vices¹⁰¹—and for failing to follow up his initial successes. Thanks to the machinations of Julia Maesa, her teenage grandson Elagabalus soon assumes the purple. Since neither he nor his cousin, co-regent and eventual successor Alexander Severus had come to the throne with a predecessor's blood on their hands and both had a dynastic claim to the purple, there is no need for post-accession speeches justifying their actions. In fact there is only one piece of formal oratory in books V–VII: a speech given by Alexander Severus to his soldiers.¹⁰² Though the emperor opens by apologizing for the 'unexpected' content of his speech, the remainder is an off-the-shelf battle exhortation stressing the obligation to defend oneself against aggression and the superior discipline of Roman troops, garnished with familiar Herodianic apophthegms.

In the following pages, Herodian devotes a good deal of space to the campaigns of Alexander and the growing disaffection of his soldiers, who eventually decide to replace him with an emperor of their own choice, the semi-barbarian trooper Maximinus, a man of Heracleian courage and strength.¹⁰³ In a typically Herodianic tableau, his fellow-soldiers offer Maximinus the purple at the point of the sword, threatening to kill him if he does not comply (though Herodian notes that the proceedings may have been choreographed by Maximinus himself).¹⁰⁴ Alexander is deserted by his troops and killed as soon as the army has acclaimed the new emperor.¹⁰⁵

The drama of Maximinus' elevation at sword's point now repeats itself in a different setting and with another cast. In Africa, a group of young men conspire to kill the unpopular imperial procurator. Once the deed is done, they realize that their only way to avoid retribution at the hands of Maximinus is to induce their provincial governor, Gordian, to seize the throne. They seek out the governor in his palace; at first he refuses, but then a young man 'noted for his high birth and rhetorical ability' gives a short impromptu speech offering

98 Her. 5.1.5–6, cf. 1.2.2.

99 Her. 5.2.1–2.

100 Her. 5.2.4; 5.4.2.

101 Dio Chrys., *Or.* 1.79–83.

102 Her. 6.3.3–7.

103 Her. 6.8.2–4.

104 Her. 6.8.5–6.

105 Her. 6.9.5–8.

Gordian the choice between proclaiming himself emperor and being killed on the spot.¹⁰⁶ Thus the usurpation of Gordian, like that of Maximinus, can be justified as an act of self-preservation.

Previously Herodian has told us how Maximinus, born of a barbarian mother among peasants and shepherds, lacked proper education and *paideia*.¹⁰⁷ Now Maximinus makes a speech rallying support against Gordian. To account for the unexpected fluency of the uncultured Thracian shepherd, Herodian informs us that the oration had been written for Maximinus 'by some of his advisers' and that Maximinus merely 'read it out' (*élexe*).¹⁰⁸

The speech does not address the familiar theme of legitimate self-defence against a usurper. Instead, Maximinus contraposes military discipline and civilian disorder: the forces of Gordian and his allies are of no significance, while the decadent and egotistical senators naturally prefer the old and compliant Gordian to the well-ordered (*kosmios*) régime of Maximinus.¹⁰⁹ Thus, for once, there is no attempt to justify violence by any of the four arguments we have encountered earlier. The absence of justification and his vilification of the Senate reinforce our mental image of Maximinus as a barbarian warlord lacking respect for Roman tradition and the eternal laws of the gods. Instead of legitimizing the murder of an opponent, the speech prepares the stage for the speaker's death at the hands of his own soldiers. This takes place at Aquileia where his troops, exasperated by a long siege without any prospect of victory, decapitate their commander and send his severed head to Rome: τοιοῦτῳ μὲν δὴ τέλει ὁ Μαξιμῖνος καὶ ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐχρήσαντο, δίκας πονηρᾶς ἀρχῆς ὑποσχόντες ('So Maximinus and his son died, punished for their disgraceful rule') is the comment of Herodian, by way of justifying the murders.¹¹⁰

In his place, the Senate elects two emperors from its own ranks, Pupienus Maximus and Balbinus. The last of the speeches in Herodian's *History* is set in Aquileia, where Pupienus is addressing the ex-mutineers, the former soldiers of Maximinus:

ὅσον μὲν ὑμᾶς ὤνησε μεταγνόντας τε καὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίων φρονήσαντας, πείρα μεμαθήκατε, ἀντὶ πολέμου μὲν εἰρήνην ἔχοντες, πρὸς θεοὺς, οὓς ὁμωμόκατε, καὶ νῦν φυλάσσοντες τὸν στρατιωτικὸν ὄρκον, ὅς ἐστι τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς

¹⁰⁶ Her. 7.5.5–6.

¹⁰⁷ Her. 6.8.1; 7.1.2.

¹⁰⁸ Her. 7.8.3.; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.3 on Nero's accession speech, written by Seneca.

¹⁰⁹ Her. 7.8.7.

¹¹⁰ Her. 8.5.9.

σεμνὸν μυστήριον. χρὴ δ' ὑμᾶς καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ διὰ παντὸς τούτων ἀπολαύειν, τὰ πιστὰ τηροῦντας Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ συγκλήτῳ καὶ αὐτοκράτορσιν ἡμῖν.

You have learned the value of changing your mind and joining the Roman cause. Instead of war, you are at peace with the gods that you swore by, and you now stand by your military oath, the sacred secret of the Roman Empire. In the future you shall enjoy all these benefits, keeping your promise to the Roman people, the Senate and to us, the emperors.¹¹¹

The new emperor is essentially saying 'what you did was not a bad thing, but don't make a habit of it'. Pupienus legitimizes the death of his predecessor by reference to the authority of the Senate and people: Maximinus was a public enemy and deserved to die. He then passes to a general praise of Rome, a promise of order, security and peace under the combined rule of the two new emperors and the Senate; thus the speech closing book VIII forms a counterpart to the letter introducing book V and the rosy description of Alexander Severus' rule at the beginning of book VI.

The golden age described by Pupienus was, however, not to be: within a month, he and his colleague would both be dead. Though Herodian stresses that their deaths were undeserved,¹¹² he is not above blaming the victims for their fate: due to their rival ambitions and mutual distrust, they fail to summon the loyal German bodyguard in time to prevent their torture and death at the hands of the illoyal praetorians.¹¹³ With the accession of the boy-emperor Gordian III, the sixty years covered by Herodian come to an end.

Conclusions

The starting point of this brief analysis was that Herodian's passages in *oratio recta* might offer an insight into the mindset of their author. While our re-reading of his *History* has failed to secure Herodian a place among the great political thinkers of Antiquity, his persistent focus on justifying the murder of an imperial predecessor or rival suggests that Herodian was not entirely at ease with the idea of an autocracy tempered by assassination.

Did he have any alternative to offer? Although his chronicle of the empire's woes opens with the accession of Commodus and the rule of Elagabalus'

¹¹¹ Her. 8.7.4.

¹¹² Her. 8.8.8.

¹¹³ Her. 8.8.5–6.

adopted son, Alexander Severus, is described in positive terms at the beginning of book VI, Herodian never explicitly advocates a return to the adoptive succession—which would be tantamount to admitting that his philosophical ruler-hero of book I, Marcus Aurelius, was to blame for the disasters befalling Rome after his death.

Aristokratia is mentioned a number of times, invariably in a positive sense, but never clearly defined. When the young Alexander Severus became sole ruler after the death of Elagabalus, the women of the court established a ruling council of sixteen senators,¹¹⁴ apparently selected by the Senate itself,¹¹⁵ without whose approval no action could be taken. We are further told that ‘the people, the soldiers and the Senate’ confirmed this transition ‘from a hybriatic tyranny to an aristocracy’.

On the basis of this passage, *aristokratia* may be interpreted as a régime ‘in which the emperor loyally and respectfully shares the government with the Senate’.¹¹⁶ It is, however, dangerous to generalize from special circumstances: the new emperor was only thirteen years old. Nor is it obvious that Herodian conceived of Alexander Severus as a Plinian emperor, *pariter princeps et consul*,¹¹⁷ rather than as a Dionian *basileus* consulting his *philoï* for advice.¹¹⁸

In the biographies of Pupienus Maximus and Balbinus which conclude Herodian’s work, senatorial co-rule is shown up in an unfavourable light. Following hallowed Roman traditions, two colleagues are elected, ‘sharing the power so that it would not revert to a tyranny in the hands of one man’.¹¹⁹ The Senate is in full control, the proceedings are in complete accordance with the traditions of the *maiores*—yet the new regime lasts only ninety-nine days before it is brought to destruction through the rival ambitions of the emperors.¹²⁰

Elsewhere, *aristokratia* is described only in very general terms. The accession speech of Pertinax in book II concludes with the promise to replace tyranny with aristocracy, described as ‘prudent and moderate government’.¹²¹ Severus promises no more on his accession when announcing the beginning

114 Her. 6.1.2.

115 Her. 7.1.3.

116 de Blois 1998: 3423.

117 Pliny, *Pan.* 78.3.

118 Cf. Her. 7.1.3, where the senatorial advisors are included in the category of Alexander’s *philoï*.

119 Her. 7.10.2.

120 Her. 8.8.4–5.

121 Her. 2.3.9–10.

of a new *aristokratia*: a just government under the rule of law—but not a word about sharing power with the Senate.¹²² Macrinus, in his promise of peace and *aristokratia*, likewise makes no specific offer of senatorial co-rule.¹²³ In so far as *aristokratia* denotes any actual form of government, it is not the co-rule of Senate and *princeps* described for us by Pliny, but the Dionian vision of the good *basileus* advised by his wise and loyal *philoi*.¹²⁴

That a gradually shifting balance of power between Senate and monarch was one of the key trends in the history of the Roman Empire is evident to modern historians; it was evident to Tacitus and Dio Cassius—but not to Herodian, too blinkered by his impressionistic approach to be capable of analyzing the march of history in terms of anything but personal emotions and loyalties. Even where social or economic factors are brought into the analysis, they are immediately translated back into personal terms: the landowners of North Africa are driven to desperation by excessive taxation—explained, not by the sorry state of the empire's finances, but by the procurator's desire to ingratiate himself with the emperor.¹²⁵

Despite Herodian's assertion in his prooemium, the imperial murder rate was not much higher during his own lifetime than under the early empire, 14–72 CE. Several of those deaths were passed over dispassionately (some might say cynically) by the Latin historians, Tacitus and Suetonius. In the Roman view, murder within the imperial household and armed conflict are on different levels: while a civil war can never be a *bellum iustum*, the elimination of an imperial rival is sometimes excusable on political grounds.¹²⁶ To Herodian with his Greek horror of *stasis*, the killing of an emperor belongs in the same category as civil war and needs to be justified by the same arguments¹²⁷—the most frequent being that of self-defence: taking the life of another to save one's own. Indeed, one cannot help wondering whether Herodian's focus on self-preservation reflects his personal experience of dilemmas where he, too, chose to sacrifice another and save his own skin. But given how little we know of Herodian's own life, that question is likely to remain unanswered.

122 Her. 2.14.3.

123 Her. 5.1.4.

124 Alföldy 1971a: 435–6; Kuhn-Chen 2002: 303–4.

125 Her. 7.4.2–3.

126 E.g., Tacitus on the death of Britannicus in 55 CE *cui plerique etiam hominum ignoscebant... insociabile regnum aestimantes*: 'which many people were inclined to forgive, considering that there could not be more than one ruler', *Ann.* 13.17.1. Cf. Suetonius' comments on the deaths of Agrippa Postumus (*Tib.* 22) and Galba (*Otho* 12).

127 Kuhn-Chen 2002: 334.

Images of Elite Community in Philostratus: Re-Reading the Preface to the *Lives of the Sophists*

Jason König

Introduction

The central topic of this volume is the relationship between Greek and Roman elite culture in the first to third centuries CE. Should we think in terms of a harmonious Greco-Roman elite by the late second and early third century CE, with Greeks closely integrated into the political classes? Or should we emphasize instead the continuing separateness of Greek and Roman elite identities in this period? Those questions are not new, of course: they have been key issues of debate within recent scholarship on the Greek culture of the Roman empire.¹ Nor is my answer in itself a completely innovative one: I want to emphasize, as others have before, the way in which the Greek literature of the first to third centuries holds these different characterisations of imperial elite culture in tension with each other, exploring and problematizing them, rather than simply endorsing or reflecting one or the other of them.²

My test case for this chapter is Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* (vs). What I aim to show here is that Philostratus presents us with a spectrum of different models for imagining the constitution of Hellenic elite culture, and for imagining the relationship between elite Greeks and elite Romans. The complexity and richness of Philostratus' treatment of those themes has not, in my view, been fully explored in the past. I look first at the work's preface, which emphasizes harmony and community between Philostratus and his addressee, one of the emperors Gordian (possibly dedicated to him before his accession).

1 Bowersock 1969 and Madsen 2009 tend to emphasize integration; Bowie 1974, Woolf 1994 and Swain 1996 tend to emphasize the continuing autonomy of at least some aspects of Greek identity and Greek literary culture. All of these studies of course acknowledge the complexity of the situation and offer a carefully nuanced and cautious picture, more so than my necessarily reductive summary here might suggest.

2 See esp. Whitmarsh 1998 and 2001, esp. 2–4 for reflections on the perils of any oversimplifying, generalising model of the relationship between Greek culture and Roman power, and on the importance of understanding the way in which individual texts explore and dramatize a range of different models of that relationship; and further discussion in König 2001 and 2005: 8–21.

From there I turn to Philostratus' portrayal of interaction between sophists and emperors. Some of those relationships do replicate the image of harmony between Greece and Rome, literature and politics which we find in the preface, but more often they introduce a note of inequality and incompatibility, even in the case of emperors who are apparently well disposed towards individual sophists and towards sophistic culture more generally. Finally I turn to the work's many descriptions of the audiences and student bodies addressed by the sophists. Here Rome for the most part disappears from view and what we find instead is a remarkable portrait of the self-enclosed, autonomous, uncompromisingly Hellenic character of sophistic culture. I focus in particular on Philostratus' uniquely obsessive interest in the idea of a quasi-Panhellenic audience for intellectual discourse. Those different strands, I argue, stand in tension with each other, provoking us as readers to assess their relative value and relative validity. That cultural equivocation is just one aspect of the thematic complexity of this difficult and provocative work. Throughout the *Lives of the Sophists*, Philostratus repeatedly uses the technique of juxtaposing images and judgements which at first sight seem to be internally contradictory, provoking his readers to judge between them. I have argued elsewhere, for example, that Philostratus presents us with a range of different images of the value of sophistic competitiveness in his biographies of the sophists, in a way which articulates a provocative sense of ambivalence, challenging his readers to extract a coherent view of that problem for themselves.³ We face a similar challenge in trying to extract from his work a coherent vision of what Greco-Roman elite interaction is and what it should be. The preface, far from being an inert appendage tacked on to the beginning of the work without any tight connection to what follows, as is sometimes assumed, plays a crucial role in articulating that challenge.⁴

Gordian and Philostratus: The Preface

The first few sentences of the *vs* offer us an idealised image of the compatibility of literary learning with political commitment. A great deal of scholarly energy has gone into identifying Philostratus' addressee in this passage (more

³ König 2010.

⁴ Cf. J. König 2009 for the related argument that we should be more ready to see the prose prefaces of the Roman Empire as artful and provocative vehicles for authorial self-representation, and more alert to the way in which they manipulate common prefatory motifs with just as much ingenuity as Greek and Latin verse; and cf. Janson 1964 for an earlier attempt to map out prefatory motifs for Latin prose.

on that problem below), but that enquiry seems to have drowned out any interest in the passage's cultural and literary significance, which have rarely been discussed. It is a remarkable opening:⁵

To the most illustrious consul, Antonius Gordianus, from Flavius Philostratus (ΤΩΙ ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΩΙ ΥΠΙΑΤΩΙ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΩΙ ΓΟΡΔΙΑΝΩΙ ΦΛΑΩΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ). I have written up for you into two books those who pursued philosophy but were viewed as sophists, and also those who were called sophists correctly, knowing that your family is connected with the profession, and that you trace your ancestry back to the sophist Herodes (γινώσκων μὲν, ὅτι καὶ γένος ἐστί σοι πρὸς τὴν τέχνην ἐς Ἡρώδη τὴν σοφιστὴν ἀναφέροντι), and also remembering the things we gave our attention to at Antioch on the subject of the sophists, in the temple of Daphnaean Apollo (μεμνήμενος δὲ καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν σπουδασθέντων ποτὲ ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ σοφιστῶν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Δαφναίου ἱερῷ) (VS 479)

Even the dedicatory sentence at the beginning—standing as if at the beginning of a letter—projects a striking image of harmony between speaker and addressee. Gordian's important position in the Roman political world is immediately underlined in the first three words ('to the most illustrious consul' or 'consular').⁶ The pairing of their names—using the Roman *nomina*, Antonius and Flavius,⁷ which signal Roman citizen status—offers a visual image, through juxtaposition on the page, of their intimacy, united by their status as fellow members of the Roman Empire's elite.

The sentence following then makes clear a second and more profound connection between them, that is their shared interest in Greek literary culture, and it does so in a way which assures us of their intellectual and social intimacy. It is a common motif of prefatory dedications in the prose writing of the Roman Empire to claim that one is writing at the request of or for the benefit of friends.⁸ One particularly important parallel for this passage comes

5 All quotations follow the text of Civiletti 2002; all translations are my own.

6 For ὑπατος meaning 'consular' as well as 'consul', see, among others, Barnes 1968: 587, Bowersock 1969: 7, Civiletti 2002: 357.

7 Cf. Puech 2002: 377–81 (numbers 200 and 201) for two inscriptions which similarly attest to the *nomen* 'Flavius' for Philostratus; also Flinterman 1995: 15–18 for discussion of these inscriptions together with other evidence for Philostratus' career and family position (esp. 17, n. 76 on his family's Roman citizenship); and Bowie 2009: 19–20.

8 See J. König 2009, focusing especially on the motif of writing on request in scientific and technical writing.

from the opening pages of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (1.3), where Philostratus tells us that he was a member of the 'circle' of the empress Julia Domna, that she was an admirer of rhetoric ('for she praised and eagerly followed all kinds of rhetorical speeches'), and that she asked him to write up an account of Apollonius, using the documents left by Apollonius' companion Damis.⁹ Also common is the related claim to be writing up a record of shared conversations from the past. Here the best parallels are from Plutarch.¹⁰ His *Quaestiones Convivales* (QC), for example, is dedicated to the powerful Roman politician Sosius Senecio (whose origin was probably from the west of the empire, unlike Philostratus' Gordian),¹¹ and records conversations from a range of symposia, at many of which Senecio himself (along with other Roman guests) was present:¹² 'and since you thought that it was necessary for us to gather together from the learned conversations held, with table and wine cup, in various places both amongst you in Rome and amongst us in Greece those which are suitable, applying myself to that task I have sent you now three of the books, each containing ten *quaestiones*, and I will send the rest soon, if these seem not entirely unworthy of the Muses and of Dionysus' (Plutarch, QC pr. 1, 612e). Senecio, like the Gordian of the *vs* preface, is shown to have an active interest in Greek literature and Greek philosophy, pursued side-by-side with his political commitments. Philostratus' use of all these motifs thus helps to reassure his readers that the friendship with Gordian is a genuine one, and so to avoid the impression of an overly formal, opportunistic dedication to a powerful politician.

The Plutarchan atmosphere of Philostratus' preface is also enhanced by the reference to conversations in the sanctuary of Apollo at Antioch. A number of Plutarch's dialogues take place within sanctuary or festival contexts, most famously in his dialogues set in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi.¹³ For

9 See Whitmarsh 2007: 32–4, among many others, including a summary of previous debate on the character of the 'circle' of Julia Domna; the consensus is increasingly that this was not a formal group, but the point remains that Julia Domna is being presented here, like the addressee of the *vs*, as someone with a devotion to Greek letters, and intimate with Philostratus.

10 For another parallel, see Plutarch, *On the Bravery of Women* 242f.

11 On Sosius Senecio (also the dedicatee of Plutarch's *Lives*) and his likely western origin, see Swain 1996: 426–7.

12 On Roman guests participating in and learning Greek styles of conversation in the QC, see Swain 1990: 129–31.

13 *The E at Delphi* (where the conversation takes place near to the temple of Apollo: 385b), *Oracles at Delphi No Longer Given in Verse* and *The Obsolescence of Oracles*; and see also further below on festival settings in the Plutarch's QC.

Plutarch, Delphi is a place for leisured and sociable exploration of Greek cultural traditions. In presenting us with a similar venue for conversation (though not necessarily with any conscious allusion to Plutarch), Philostratus once again stresses the intimacy of his relationship with Gordian, and their shared commitment to Hellenic culture. The reference to the sanctuary at Antioch also recalls Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* (VA) 1.16, which is almost certainly an earlier work. In that passage, Apollonius denounces the Antiochenes for their misuse of the temple of Apollo: 'seeing that the temple was beautiful but that there was no serious pursuit (σπουδήν) taking place in it, and that it was full of people who were semi-barbarian and uncultivated (ἡμούσους)'. In the preface to the VS we see Philostratus and Gordian behaving very differently, talking seriously (σπουδασθέντων: 'the things we gave our attention to', or more literally 'were serious about', or 'studied'), unlike the Antiochenes, about Greek literary culture in this ancient place. For anyone who is familiar with Philostratus' earlier work, the conversation between Philostratus and Gordian thus wins implicit approval, as an appropriately cultivated, Hellenic activity.

Finally, Philostratus also refers to Gordian's ancestry. This is a debated passage: it is not completely clear whether this is a reference to a family relationship with Herodes Atticus, or to intellectual descent.¹⁴ Nor is the precise identity of the Gordian Philostratus addresses here at all clear.¹⁵ He is most often identified as Gordian I, addressed possibly just before he took office as emperor, in his eighties, in 238 CE.¹⁶ If that identification is right it means that Philostratus is addressing someone a decade or two older than himself. Some commentators have argued—on the basis of this passage—that Gordian I himself studied with Herodes Atticus in his youth;¹⁷ if that were right, it would mean that the man Philostratus is addressing represents in person a living link with one of the great sophists of the second century. Others have argued that Philostratus is addressing Gordian I's son, Gordian II.¹⁸ It could even be the young Gordian III: if so, the work is likely to have been dedicated to him while he was emperor, just before he was murdered in 244 CE at the tender age of nineteen.¹⁹ If that last identification is right we should presumably imagine

14 For summary of debate, see Civiletti 2002: 358 and Jones 2002: 761 for convincing arguments in favour of seeing this as a reference to a family relationship.

15 For summary of debate, see Civiletti 2002: 357.

16 See (among others) Bowersock 1969: 6–8; Nutton 1970; Avotins 1978: 242–7; Anderson 1986: 297–8; Flinterman 1995: 26–7; Billault 2000: 29–30.

17 See esp. Nutton 1970.

18 See Barnes 1968; Griffin 1971: 278–9.

19 See Jones 2002.

almost a teacher-pupil relationship between Philostratus and this young member of the imperial family. It is not possible to be certain (and Philostratus may even be aware that the identity of this particular Gordian may not be clear to some of his readers). Whichever of these interpretations is right, however, the important point is that the addressee of the *Lives of the Sophists* is likely to be descended from an eastern, Greek-speaking family: the family of the Gordiani seems to have been Greek in origin, from Asia Minor.²⁰ That may in itself be one of the reasons why Gordian is so well suited to be praised here: whether or not he is already emperor at the time of publication, his eastern origins and (presumably) Greek education make him an ideal emblem for the possibility of harmony between the Roman political elite and the sophistic culture of the east. The reference to descent (of whatever kind) from Herodes Atticus enhances that impression still further. Once again, in other words, it is clear that Gordian's interest in the subject of the work is more than just a superficial, detached example of patronage; rather, he is closely integrated into the literary elite of the Greek east.

These opening lines are followed by a passage which justifies, in two long sentences, Philostratus' decision not to record the names of the fathers of all the sophists he writes about, except in very exceptional circumstances, on the grounds that he is more interested in their achievements. There is no space here for detailed discussion of those sentences, except to say that they key into the earlier mention of Herodes Atticus, enhancing the complimentary quality of that mention of Gordian's ancestry: if we assume that Gordian is related by family to Herodes Atticus then we can take that relationship as one of the rare examples of blood descent which is so marvellous as to be worth relating; if we assume that he is descended intellectually from Herodes then we can take that mention as a manifestation of the principle that educational attainment is more important than family ancestry.

More important for now are the final lines: 'This work, best of proconsuls (ἄριστε ἀνθυπάτων), will also lighten the burdens of your mind, like the cup of Helen with its Egyptian drugs. Farewell, leader of the Muses (ἔρρωσο Μουσηγέτα)'. Here once again there is a remarkable impression of the immersion of a politically committed figure into the streams of Hellenic literary culture. The claim about lightening the cares of office is here presented in a particularly artful form, for we see the process of lightening enacted almost within the movement of the sentence: Gordian is himself transformed from 'best of proconsuls', used as a vocative at the beginning of the sentence, and closely resembling the opening of the preface, examined already above, where

20 See Birley 1966: 59–60; Barnes 1968: 593; Bowersock 1969: 8.

he is 'most distinguished of consulars', into 'Leader of the Muses', another vocative, drowning out those earlier ones, and standing as the very final word of the preface. The epithet Μουσηγέτας, used regularly for Apollo,²¹ stands as an extravagant compliment to Gordian, painting his leadership of the Muses as a cultural equivalent of his political prominence. It is also particularly appropriate, given that the conversation on which the work is based took place in a sanctuary of Apollo. Moreover it enhances the sense of contrast, for anyone familiar with that earlier passage, with the uncultivated (ἄμουςους) Antiochenes of VA 1.16. Philostratus entices Gordian, by remembering the past, temporarily to forget the present, and temporarily to throw off his political identity in favour of a very different persona, imbued by the influence of the god Apollo. Here, in other words—for all their compatibility, embodied in Gordian himself and in his relationship with Philostratus—Greek literary culture does at least temporarily drown out the political world in these final words of the preface.

Sophists and Emperors

Some of the images of interaction between sophists and emperors in what follows come close to matching the harmony of the preface. Many others, however, fall short. Even in the case of emperors who are well-disposed towards the sophists, tensions and misunderstandings frequently arise. This variation should come as no great surprise: Philostratus deals in turn with a large number of different sophists, and different emperors, and it is hardly surprising that the relationships between them are not homogeneous. Moreover, it is commonplace, in texts which depict Greek intellectuals addressing Roman rulers, to juxtapose conflicting models of the relationship between Greek intellect and Roman power, mentioning rulers who pay attention to Greek wisdom alongside others who do not. The implication is that praise of any ruler is always provisional: he must model his behaviour on the philosophically inclined rulers of the past, but is never allowed to forget the negative paradigms which he risks falling into if he fails to do that. Dio's *Kingship Orations* are a classic example of that kind of provisional, conditional praise.²² Nevertheless, the complexity and variety of Philostratus' use of those techniques is exceptional, covering as it does a very wide spectrum of different possibilities for Greco-Roman interaction.

21 E.g., see Plato, *Laws* 653d, where Apollo Mousêgetês is said to be one of the gods who relieves the cares of humans during festivals.

22 See Moles 1990; Whitmarsh 2001: 200–216 and 2005: 60–3.

There is space here only for brief illustration (the interaction between sophists and emperors has anyway been much discussed in recent scholarship, unlike the topics of the previous section and the one following).²³ The first thing to say is that at least some of Philostratus' sophists are represented as having a very modern approach to living in harmony with Rome's emperors and with the Roman political world more generally. The most obvious example is Herodes Atticus, who is in a sense the great star of Philostratus' work, and repeatedly defended by him. His commitment to traditionally Greek models of rhetoric and community—summed up in his involvement in Panhellenic speechmaking, discussed in more detail in the section following—is combined with full involvement in Roman politics, not least in his holding of the office of consul.²⁴ In that sense he is very much like his 'descendant' Gordian in the preface. His ability to look in two directions at once, both to past and present, to east and west, is summed up in the very opening lines of Book 2 which suggest that his own cultural flexibility is in part inherited from his family: 'The sophist Herodes was descended on his father's side from ancestors who twice held the consulship,²⁵ and who also stretched back to the Aiakids, who were once made allies by Greece against Persia' (2.1, 545). Philostratus goes on to mention specifically Miltiades and his son Cimon, both of whom claimed descent from the mythical Aeacus, and both of whom won great victories against the Persians in the fifth century. Herodes also has the ear of successive emperors: most famously he even gets away with speaking plainly to Marcus Aurelius (2.1, 561).²⁶ Even in Herodes' case, admittedly, his relationships with the emperors, and indeed with his fellow Greeks, do not always go smoothly, above all because he clashes with his fellow Athenians, despite his extravagant benefactions to them.²⁷ Nevertheless, his ability to straddle two worlds is presented largely in positive terms.

When we turn to the emperors of the *vs*, we see that some do a very good job of engaging on equal and even quite intimate terms with the sophists.²⁸

23 E.g., see Bowersock 1969: 43–58; Bowie 1982; Flinterman 1995: 38–45; Swain 1996: 396–400; Whitmarsh 1998.

24 For another example of a sophist serving as consul, see Antipater 2.24, 607.

25 Other sophists from consular families, or with consular descendants: Aristocles 2.3, 567; Antiochus 2.4, 568; Rufus 2.17, 597.

26 For another good example, see 2.1, 548 where Herodes shows his influence over Hadrian.

27 See esp. 2.1, 549–51 for benefactions to Athens; 559–61 for conflict.

28 Bowersock 1969: 43–58, Anderson 1986: 51–3 and 1993: 30–35, Flinterman 1995, 38–45 and Swain 1996: 396–400 (esp. 399, stating that Philostratus concentrates 'on what is good in the relationship between ruled and ruler, on successes rather than failure'), all focus on Philostratus' tendency to stress the positives in sophist-emperor relationships,

The *VA*, similarly, has plenty of positive images of the relationship between Greek intellectual and Roman ruler, for example in Apollonius' positive relationship with Vespasian (and indeed Philostratus' with Julia Domna), standing in tension with his much more fraught interaction with the tyrant Domitian.²⁹ Nevertheless, even the most praiseworthy and philhellenic of Philostratus' emperors often find it difficult to maintain the image of cultured and equal engagement without any notes of dissonance. Marcus Aurelius, for example, comes closest to matching the kind of respectful attitude towards sophistic culture which is ascribed to Gordian in the preface.³⁰ Moreover, he gives us some of the only scenes in the whole work where we see Romans listening to sophistic declamation as an ordinary member of the audience, or even submitting to something resembling sophistic education. For example, in *VS* 2.7, 577, we hear that the sophist Hermogenes had such a prodigious reputation at the age of the fifteen that 'the emperor Marcus (Μάρκῳ βασιλεῖ)' conceived a 'desire for hearing him' (ἔρωτα ἀκροάσεως); having made the journey to one of Hermogenes' declamations he ' marvelled at Hermogenes' extemporization' and gave him gifts. In 2.1, 557, we hear similarly that 'the emperor Marcus (ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ Μάρκος)' took a great interest in (ἐσπούδαζε) the Boiotian philosopher Sextus, spending a lot of time with him and waiting at his door (θαμίζων αὐτῷ καὶ φοιτῶν ἐπὶ θύρας). The detail about waiting at Sextus' door, the traditional act of an inferior attending on his patron, underlines Marcus' desire to throw off the dignity of his office and devote himself to Greek learning as any private citizen would. That passage is followed, however, by an anecdote which throws doubt on the value of Marcus' activity here. On one occasion, Philostratus tells us, he was met on the way out by a notoriously caustic man called Lucius, who asked him what he was doing there:

καὶ ὁ Μάρκος 'καλὸν' ἔφη 'καὶ γηράσκοντι τὸ μαθάνειν· εἶμι δὴ πρὸς Σέξτον τὸν φιλόσοφον μαθησόμενος, ἃ οὐπω οἶδα.' καὶ ὁ Λούκιος ἐξάρας τὴν χεῖρα ἐς τὸν οὐρανὸν 'ὦ Ζεῦ', ἔφη 'ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς γηράσκων ἤδη δέλτον ἐξαψάμενος ἐς διδασκάλου φοιτᾷ, ὁ δὲ ἐμὸς βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἀπέθανεν.

emphasizing the way in which he uses them to project an image of the widespread respect for sophistic skill.

29 There is no space here to go into depth on the *VA*; for extensive discussion, see Flinterman 1995: esp. 128–230.

30 See Flinterman 1995: 43–4.

And Marcus said, 'It is good to learn even when one is growing old; so I go to the philosopher Sextus in order to learn what I do not yet know'. And Lucius, raising his hand to the heavens, replied, 'O Zeus, the king of the Romans, who is already growing old, hangs a tablet around his neck and goes to school (ἐς διδασκάλου φοιτᾷ), whereas my king Alexander died at the age of thirty-two.

Lucius' response, though spoken in jest, suggests that there are problems with Marcus' role-playing as a student. It implies that his devotion to Sextus is a sign of the deficiency of his learning rather than the opposite, a sign that he has missed out the basic grounding of a Greek education. It also implies that Marcus cannot completely throw off his imperial superiority even if he wants to, since others will continue to expect from him the normal standards of grand imperial behaviour which he would prefer to put aside, and to see him, for all his efforts, as a Roman, different from 'us' the Greeks.

Hadrian, similarly, wins Philostratus' approval for his positive attitude to sophistry.³¹ However, he too sometimes struggles to replicate the easy intimacy which is ascribed to Gordian in the preface. In 1.8, 490, for example, we hear a story about Favorinus' attempts to wriggle out of his obligations to public service. Eventually he realises that the emperor Hadrian is going to oppose his attempt, and he jumps before he is pushed, making a speech in which he claims that his teacher Dio had appeared to him in a dream urging him to change his mind. Hadrian, we hear, didn't take this too seriously: 'The emperor had treated these matters as a pastime (διατριβήν), and used to divert his kingly anxieties by giving his attention to sophists and philosophers'. The Athenians, by contrast, took the conflict between them seriously, and took down a statue of Favorinus to show their disapproval of him. That whole incident is a good example of how the sophists frequently have to work very hard to paper over the inequalities of their relationship with the emperors, bluffing their way through in order to maintain the fiction of harmonious relations. The detail about Hadrian diverting himself with philosophers and sophists is hard to translate and to interpret. Some of its implications are clear, however: clearly Philostratus aims to give an impression of Hadrian's tolerance of Favorinus and others here—his relationship with them is basically good-natured, and any disagreement relatively superficial.³² At the same time, however, there surely is a suggestion that Hadrian may be toying with Favorinus, treating as trivial an incident which for Favorinus himself has serious implications, in a

31 See Flinterman 1995: 44.

32 In contrast with Cassius Dio epitome 69.3–4, who stresses Hadrian's hostility to Favorinus.

way which reminds us of the inequality of their relationship. The anecdote also suggests—as for Marcus Aurelius—that an emperor's desire for an easy-going relationship with the literary elite of the east may be hindered by the fact that others (here, the Athenians) misread that intention.

In the case of many of the text's other emperors, we move even further away from the relaxed intimacy of the preface. Most often the problem is one of misunderstanding rather than outright hostility. There is a repeated pattern in the work where Philostratus offers us images of Roman emperors engaging sympathetically with sophistic culture but then undercuts those images, showing how difficult they are to maintain.³³ That difficulty exists sometimes because the emperors in question fall short of full understanding of Greek *paideia*, and sometimes because they deliberately show their scorn for it in slightly arbitrary ways. Moreover, it is striking that Philostratus often chooses not to specify which emperor he is talking about, using phrases like 'the emperor' and nothing more. That effect surely enhances the sense that any emperor—whoever he might be—always risks lapsing into a problematic relationship with Greek *paideia*.

There is space here only for two examples. My first is from Philostratus' account of the sophist Philiscus, in 2.30, 622. Philiscus faces a lawsuit from the Heordaeans, having shirked his obligations to public services in their city. He therefore goes to Rome to seek protection from the emperor (in this case Caracalla, as Philostratus specifies—'this was Antoninus the son of the philosophical Julia'):³⁴ 'joining the geometers and philosophers who were close to Julia, he obtained from her, with the agreement of the emperor, the chair of rhetoric at Athens'. So far, so good. What we seem to have here is an image of a sophist on terms of intimacy with the imperial family. Some of Philostratus' readers would surely have known that he had himself claimed intimacy with Julia Domna and the other intellectuals who were close to her in *VA* 1.3, already discussed above. In what follows, however, that impression of intimacy unravels. Caracalla is irritated at the feeling of having been duped; he withdraws his support and sides with Philiscus' opponents, repeatedly interrupting him during his defence speech, criticising him for his clothing, his physical appearance and his effeminate delivery (2.30, 623). That anecdote

33 Cf. Flinterman 2004 (esp. 374–5 on the *vs*) for a survey of relationships between sophists and emperors in the Greek literature of the Roman Empire, arguing that sophists tend to avoid the free-speaking approach particularly associated with philosophers in their dealings with imperial addressees.

34 See Whitmarsh 2007: 30 for the argument that the Severan emperors had less interest in literary patronage than their second-century predecessors.

resonates with Joy Connolly's idea that sophistic excess and flamboyance were at odds with traditional Roman oratorical preferences.³⁵ Here, then, we seem to be getting an image of positive, healthy interaction between Greek and Roman elites, based on Roman understanding of and admiration for Greek rhetoric, only for that to be dashed. Even for those sophists who went most regularly on embassies, performance opportunities before the emperor must have been relatively rare,³⁶ hence perhaps their importance for Philostratus and for the sophists themselves. It is as if the rhythms of the text are echoing the hopes and disillusionments of the sophists themselves.

A little later, in 2.32, 626, we see a more positive response from Caracalla (in this case not named, but referred to simply as 'the emperor') to one of Philostratus' sophistic colleagues. Even this positive response, however, reveals Caracalla's ignorance and so exposes the precarious nature of any ideal of a shared intellectual elite culture in which the emperor can participate: we see him giving disproportionate and indiscriminate praise to the sophist Heliodorus during a speech delivered in Gaul. It is an odd moment. The onlookers mainly think that Heliodorus is being mocked, but it dawns on them eventually that Caracalla is not joking at all:

ἀναπηδήσας ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἄνδρα τε ὅϊον οὐπῶ ἔγνωκα, τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ καιρῶν εὕρημα' καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐκάλει τὸν Ἡλιόδωρον ἀνασείων τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὸν κόλπον τῆς χλαμύδος. κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν οὖν ἐνέπεσέ τις καὶ ἡμῖν ὀρμὴ γέλωτος οἰομένοις, ὅτι διαπτύοι αὐτόν.

The emperor leapt up and called Heliodorus 'a man such as I have never yet known; a great discovery of my own age' and other such things, shaking his hand and the fold of his cloak in approval. To begin with, in response, we were seized by a desire to laugh, thinking that the emperor was mocking him.

Later, however, they have to rethink, when the emperor bestows on him equestrian status. One of the things this scene demonstrates, of course, is the quasi-magical power of sophistry to captivate Roman listeners as well as Greek (more on that subject below). However, the image of intellectual harmony Caracalla attempts to construct, in playing the stereotyped role of appreciative listener, is subtly undermined when we learn that the emperor is an unreliable, disproportionate, eccentric interpreter of sophistic skill (a fact that is all the

35 Connolly 2001.

36 Whitmarsh 2005: 59.

more obvious when we hold up this scene against the encounter with Philiscus a few pages before). That makes the emperor very hard to interpret in turn. The whole scene is made all the more interesting by the fact that Philostratus, unusually for this text, seems to be offering an eye-witness account here: he laughs, with the others, at what he thinks is the emperor's joke. In other words we see Philostratus too trying to ingratiate himself, trying to forge a mutual bond with the emperor on the basis of shared appreciation of Greek oratory, but ultimately not quite succeeding.³⁷ Finally, the unreliable effects of the emperor's favour is also underlined by Philostratus' postscript: Heliodorus, he tells us (2.32, 627), was exiled after Caracalla's death; and then, having been released from exile, lived in retirement in Rome in relative obscurity ('neither greatly admired nor completely ignored'). Heliodorus' career is thus defined by this single moment of imperial favour, and by his subsequent life in the west of the empire, but these contacts with Rome are decidedly a mixed blessing, and seem incompatible with a conventionally successful sophistic career.

I should stress in conclusion that I do not intend to dispute the claim that Philostratus represents philhellenic emperors like Marcus and Hadrian in overwhelmingly positive terms. My aim is rather to draw attention to the fact that he also tends to introduce notes of dissonance into these positive representations. Emperors are more or less the only westerners the sophists encounter at any length in the *vs*, as we shall see further in the section following. Philostratus makes it clear that even the most well-disposed of them sometimes has trouble maintaining an entirely harmonious, equal relationship with their sophistic subjects. When we view it with these scenes in mind, the ideal of a unified Greco-Roman elite comes to look rather more precarious than the preface has initially suggested.

Sophists and Hellenes

In other respects, the sophistic culture Philostratus describes in the *vs* is even more blatantly incompatible with any such ideal. The unusual vehemence of Philostratus' advocacy of traditional Greek culture has often been noted.³⁸ He uses the terms 'Hellene' and 'Hellenic' with remarkable frequency. Certain aspects of his portrayal of Hellenism are new. Simon Swain, for example, has argued that Philostratus, in the *Life of Apollonius*, reacting in part to Christian forms of self-definition, is the first writer to define Hellenism 'primarily

37 See Whitmarsh 2007: 34 for some of the possible reasons for Philostratus' presence there.

38 See Follet 1991; Swain 1999; Elsner 2009: 17–18.

through a combination of religion and philosophy, rather than through the general cultural and political inheritance'.³⁹ He also argues in a later piece, with reference to the *vs*, that 'it is significant that for the first time in a pagan Greek text the word "Hellene" appears to be used so very frequently in a cultural-ideological sense, rather than a descriptive-ethnic one, and bears the meaning of an adherent of Hellenic culture and tradition rather than simply a "Greek"'.⁴⁰

What has been less often discussed is the way in which Philostratus' defence of Hellenism is articulated, in the *vs*, through some very distinctive representations of elite community. The most prominent elite community of all in the work is the community between sophists, who are frequently shown to recognise a kinship with each other even on first meeting. Philostratus also gives great weight to relationships between teacher and pupil.⁴¹ What I am particularly interested in here, however, simply because it has been so little studied, is the way in which Philostratus returns repeatedly to the notion of his sophists addressing a Greek audience—by which I mean not just individual Greek readers, but rather Panhellenic audiences made up of the assembled Greeks at festivals, or even audiences outside festival contexts which nevertheless seem to stand in for the assembled Greeks. In nearly all cases, Philostratus' portrayals of these imagined audiences strikingly exclude any mention of Roman listeners and Roman students.

That theme is not exclusive to the Roman Empire, of course. The evidence for philosophers and orators addressing the assembled Greeks at the Olympic and Pythian games goes back to the classical world. We have accounts from classical Greek literature of Lysias, Isocrates, Gorgias, Hippias and others addressing the Greeks at Olympia.⁴² In at least some cases, the intellectual prowess of the speaker is represented as an elevated equivalent of the other kinds of activity taking place at the festival or at the sanctuary.⁴³ The most famous surviving example is Isocrates' *Panegyricus* 1–2, composed as if delivered at Olympia, whether or not it actually was, which contrasts the uselessness of athletes with the much greater value of the kind of wisdom Isocrates himself embodies.

39 Swain 1999: 158.

40 Swain 2009: 35.

41 Cf. Schmitz 2009: 54–7 on the way in which Philostratus stresses his own close connection with some of the stars of the sophistic movement, and refers to scenes from his own student days.

42 See esp. Tell 2007 (revised and expanded version in 2011: 113–33).

43 Cf. Tarrant 2003 for sophists redirecting the focus of attention from physical to verbal competition.

Håkan Tell has argued similarly (albeit partly on the strength of Philostratus' account) that wise men in classical Greece 'through tapping into the repository of *sophia* that Delphi constituted and through aligning themselves with its authority, were seen as themselves being a conduit for a similar type of charismatic speech'.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, it is in imperial Greek literature that we find that theme treated most often. The literature of the Roman empire is full of anecdotes about the festive appearances of intellectuals from the archaic and classical period. Some accounts of that phenomenon are perhaps insufficiently sceptical about the fact that we rely quite heavily on late sources for our understanding of it.⁴⁵ It is also full of examples of individuals and groups trying to imitate and adapt that tradition for themselves in the present day. A good example is Dio Chrysostom, *Oration* 12 (delivered probably at the Olympics of 101 or 105 CE, apparently at the base of the great statue of Zeus by Pheidias), in which Dio rejects the sophistic model of flashy speech and personal appearance⁴⁶ and proclaims instead his unpretentious, philosophical identity. For a more irreverent version of that procedure we might turn to Lucian's *Peregrinus*, his scathing account of the death of the Cynic philosopher Peregrinus who burned himself to death at the Olympic games in the 160s. Lucian represents Peregrinus' speeches to the assembled audience, and indeed his final self-immolation, as an absurdly incompetent, attention-seeking version of traditional intellectual speech at the games.⁴⁷ Plutarch sets roughly a quarter of the 60 or so symposium conversations of his *QC* at festival banquets, including several at the Pythian and Isthmian games, with the implication that the skills of debate and analysis displayed by himself and his fellow guests are philosophical equivalents of the activities on display in the festivals' contests.⁴⁸

44 Tell 2007: 266.

45 E.g., Tell 2007 relies heavily on imperial sources—not just Philostratus, but also Diogenes Laertius, Aelian, Dio Chrysostom and others—for his fascinating and largely very convincing account, but without any explicit discussion of their reliability.

46 See Tell 2007: 255–6 on stories of eye-catching costumes ascribed to sophists at Olympia and Delphi in the classical period.

47 E.g., see *Peregrinus* 1 and 20, where Peregrinus is described addressing 'the Greeks'; also 32 for his speech in the middle of the games; and cf. Lucian, *Pseudologista* 5–6 for similarly mocking portrayal of a contemporary who fakes an 'extempore' sophistic speech at Olympia.

48 See J. König 2007: 62–8 and 2012: 81–8 for that argument, with reference among other sections to *QC* 8.4, where the dialogue opens with a messenger bringing a wreath into the symposium for the rhetor Herodes, as a gift from one of his pupils who has just won a victory in the encomium contest at the Isthmian festival; Herodes and the other guests

However, Philostratus goes much further than any of these authors. He refers to the idea of a Panhellenic audience with extraordinary frequency. He also innovates by using that image frequently outside specific festival settings: his sophists are repeatedly described as speaking to 'the Greeks' even when they are not performing at Olympia or Delphi or other equivalent venues. In other words, Philostratus takes on a pre-existing but relatively restricted idea of 'Hellenic identity' defined by festival attendance,⁴⁹ dating back to the classical period and much loved by his immediate predecessors in the first and second centuries CE, and he expands that to make it a metaphor for a much broader, and in many ways innovative ideal of cultural Hellenism linked with sophistic education.⁵⁰

The first strand in that process is a series of passages, early on in the *VS*, which characterise the sophistic voice as having a quasi-Delphic oracular power. In the very opening paragraph of the work, for example, immediately after the preface, Philostratus tells us that sophistry corresponds to 'the prophetic, oracular art' (*VS* 481), and quotes a pair of Delphic oracles with the suggestion that they are reminiscent of the utterances of sophists. The precise grounds of the resemblance are not clear,⁵¹ but Philostratus seems to have in mind the tone of quasi-divine confidence which is central to sophistic as well as oracular speech. Later we hear that Aeschines, who according to Philostratus was the founder of the Second Sophistic, was also the originator of the habit of 'speaking divinely', and 'improvised as if inspired by a god-given impulse' (1.18, 510). Later in the account of Polemo, in 1.25, 542, we hear that 'the style of Polemo's speeches is passionate and combative and piercingly echoing, like the Olympic trumpet', as well as being 'distinguished and inspired, as if delivered from a tripod' [i.e. as an oracle]. The wisdom literature of archaic and classical Greece regularly associated wise men with the Delphic oracle, as we have seen.⁵² Philostratus offers his readers a modernised version of that traditional assumption.

then proceed to display their own skills of sympotic/ philosophical speech-making; also König 2010: 280–83 for related discussion.

- 49 Bowie 1991: 184 notes that the word 'Hellene' is very rare in the inscriptions from Greek cities outside reference to victory in and organisation of Panhellenic festivals: that observation illustrates nicely how important the idea of the festival was in Greek culture as a way of defining Greekness.
- 50 There is a parallel for that in the observations of Nightingale 2004, who shows how Plato's vision of *theoria*, philosophical contemplation, is defined with reference to festive *theoria*.
- 51 See Civiletti 2002: 361–2 for detailed discussion.
- 52 See above, n.43.

The theme of festive speech, by contrast, is not immediately prominent, but it comes into view from 1.9 onwards, as soon as Philostratus moves on to the sophists proper, having dealt with those he categorises as sophist-philosophers like Dio Chrysostom and Favorinus. The man Philostratus presents as the first sophist is Gorgias; his brief account mentions Gorgias' Pythian and Olympic orations, and describes him as 'playing a conspicuous role in the festivals of the Greeks' (1.9, 493). A few pages later Philostratus refers to Hippias of Elis who 'used to charm Hellas at Olympia with his intricate and careful speeches' (1.11, 495–6), and Isocrates, whose Olympic oration is mentioned in 1.17, 505. These references are programmatic for what follows. Philostratus is keen to establish a link between the sophists of his own era and their classical predecessors who were so immersed in Panhellenic culture. One of the things they have in common is the fact that they have the same notional audience, an audience of the 'Greeks'.

The picture of sophists speaking 'to the Greeks' at festivals, and being involved in their funding and administration, recurs over and over again in Philostratus' portrayal of the sophists of his own age. There is space here only for a few examples. Several of these passages involve Herodes Atticus. For example, in *vs* 1.25, 539, from the life of Polemo, we hear of an incident where Herodes Atticus expresses his respect for Polemo's oratory: 'At the Olympic festival, when Greece acclaimed him [i.e. Herodes], calling out, "You are like Demosthenes", he replied: "If only I were like the Phrygian", meaning Polemo'. At 2.1, 557 one of Herodes' friends reminds him of a speech or speeches he had made at Olympia: 'I used to hear you praising the golden mean at Olympia to the Greeks'. Herodes Atticus was himself a benefactor at Isthmia and Delphi and Olympia, as well as many other Greek cities, as Philostratus makes clear, at 2.1, 551. He was also given charge of the Panathenaic festival in Athens, and built his famous stadium for it: Philostratus quotes him as saying 'I shall welcome you, Athenians, and those of the Greeks who attend and the athletes who compete, in a stadium of white marble' (2.1, 550). Similar details occur repeatedly in the other mini-biographies of the work. In 2.24, 607 we hear that Antipater 'used to recite to us Olympic and Panathenaic orations'. At 2.27, 616, Hippodromus of Thessaly twice presides over the Pythian games, with great magnificence. At 617, he is described giving advice to Philostratus of Lemnos about speaking at Olympia, and then modestly refusing a call by 'Hellas' to come forward and speak. And at 618, Philostratus tells us that Hippodromus 'did not neglect attendance at the festivals of the Greeks, but went to them regularly, both in order to declaim and so as not to be forgotten'. There are several striking parallels for these images of festive speech in the *Life of Apollonius*. In *VA* 8.15, for example, Philostratus describes Apollonius' second visit to Olympia:

‘An incessant and eager rumour took hold of the Hellenic world (τὸ Ἑλληνικόν) that the man was alive and that he had arrived at Olympia’; the rumour is confirmed, and Philostratus tells us that ‘Greece (ἡ Ἑλλάς) had never before come together in such a state of excitement as it did for him then’, listing audience members from Elis, Sparta, Corinth, Athens and a range of other locations on the Greek mainland. Here once again Philostratus offers us a vision of idealised Hellenic community united in admiration of an important intellectual figure and acting almost with one mind at one of the great Hellenic festivals.⁵³

Not only that, but Philostratus also repeatedly uses the image of addressing an assembled body of Greeks to describe sophistic speech-making and sophistic teacher-pupil relations even far removed from any festival context. The students and admirers of the sophists are often referred to as ‘Hellenes’ or ‘Hellenic’ or even ‘Hellas’.⁵⁴ In 1.25, 531, for example, Philostratus tells us that Polemo, by opening his school in Smyrna, made the city seem more populous, ‘since the youth flowed in from the mainlands and from the island, not an undisciplined rabble, but a select and pure Hellas (καθαρᾶς Ἑλλάδος)’. At 2.5, 571, similarly, Philostratus recounts the attempts made by the sophist Alexander to persuade Herodes Atticus to give a declamation: ‘hearing that Herodes was living in Marathon, and that all the youth were following him there, he wrote him a letter asking for Herodes’ Hellenes, and Herodes replied, “I will come myself, together with my Hellenes”’. Here, a small body of pupils stands not only for ‘the Athenian youth’ but also for the body of Greeks at the same time. The exclusiveness of Herodes’ audience of ‘Athenians’ and ‘Greeks’ is all the more remarkable given that we know from one other source—Aulus Gellius—that Herodes did give patronage to Roman students staying temporarily in Athens.⁵⁵

At times, bodies of students and admirers are also referred to as *to hellenikon* (the same word used in the passage from *VA* Book 8 just discussed). That odd and almost untranslatable phrase covers a range of meanings including ‘Greekness’, ‘Greek culture’ and ‘the Greeks’, and looks back ultimately to the Athenians’ famous argument about the need for Greek unity against Persia in

53 Cf. 8.19 for Apollonius addressing his audience at Olympias as Hellenic men (ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες).

54 See Follet 1991: 206–8 for brief discussion, emphasizing particularly the importance of correct use of the Greek language; also Whitmarsh 2005: 14–15, n. 35 for a list of examples from the *vs*.

55 See Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 1.2.1; that said, Philostratus also tells us that Herodes attracted ‘the youth from everywhere’, which may be an oblique reference to his cultural openness; see further below on cosmopolitan definitions of Hellenic identity in the *vs*.

Herodotus, *Histories* 8.144. At 2.3, 567, Aristocles is described as ‘gaining a good reputation, and having all *to hellenikon* in the region attached to him’. At 2.27, 617, Hippodromus wins a reputation as ‘father of *to hellenikon*’ for his mourning of the Cappadocian sophist Diodotus. In 2.10, 587 the sophist Hadrian of Tyre, holder of the chair of rhetoric in Athens, ‘whenever he had lectured went home again as an object of envy, escorted by *to hellenikon* from everywhere (τοῦ παντάχοθεν Ἑλληνικοῦ)’. He wins reverence, too, ‘by his sharing in Hellenic festivals’; and they (i.e. the Hellenic youth) feel towards him ‘as sons do to a father who is pleasant and gentle, and who maintains with them the Hellenic dance (τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν σκίρτημα)’. Later (588), when Hadrian is put on trial for murder we hear that his acquittal is secured in part by *to hellenikon*, who plead for him tearfully. Once again we have here an extraordinary image of the sophist surrounded at all times by an audience which somehow represents the whole of Greece.

Elsewhere in the *vs*, these descriptions of Greek audiences are reflected in more casual, passing references to the idea that the primary audience for the sophists’ careers were ‘Hellas’, ‘the Hellenes’ and so on, phrases which are sometimes no doubt intended to refer to specific bodies of students, but which also suggest that those students stand for the Greeks in general. There is space here for just a few examples: Philostratus tells us that Critias’ wisdom and his writings are ‘not much taken seriously by the Hellenes’ (ἦττον σπουδασθῆναι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν, 1.16, 502); that the Hellenes are to be reproached, because Marcus of Byzantium has not yet received the honour he deserves (1.24, 527–8); that ‘Hellas proclaimed’ (βρώσης . . . τῆς Ἑλλάδος) Herodes Atticus and called him one of the canon of ten Attic orators (2.1, 564); that the sophist Alexander has ‘not yet reached the full measure of his renown among the Hellenes’ (2.5, 574); that ‘Hellas is unjust to (Ἑλλας ἀδικεῖ) Chrestos of Byzantium, who was educated best of all the Hellenes by Herodes’ (2.11, 591); that Apollonius of Athens ‘was thought worthy of fame by the Hellenes (καθ’ Ἑλλήνας)’ (2.20, 600); that Soter, Sosus, Nicander and others were ‘playthings of the Hellenes’, rather than real sophists (2.23, 605), and so on. Philostratus takes that idea further in a remarkable passage from *VA* 1.34 where Apollonius tells his companion Damis that ‘for a wise man everything is Hellas’ (σοφῷ ἀνδρὶ Ἑλλὰς πάντα). This is not, as one might imagine in coming across this phrase out of context, a comment on Apollonius’ interest in ethnographic exploration of the overlaps between Greek and barbarian wisdom (although that is indeed an important theme of the rest of the work). Instead, what Apollonius means here, as he makes clear in the rest of the paragraph, is that the wise man will always live virtuously, as if he is exposed to the judging gaze of the Greeks, even when he is outside Greek territory. Moreover, Apollonius states that principle in conspicuously festive

terms: the wise man, he says, will reject the idea that 'it is a lesser thing to go astray in Babylon than at Athens or at the Olympic or Pythian festivals'; in just the same way one would expect an athlete to maintain his good condition even if he were competing in contests outside Greek territory, 'rather than among the Hellenes and in the stadia there'. The imagined community to which performances of wisdom and eloquence are directed is always, for Philostratus, a Greek community.

That said, it is also made clear in places that an audience of Greeks can include even those from outside the geographical centre of Greece, and that students from the edge of the Greek world can earn the label 'Hellenes' through their commitment to sophistic education. A good example is Philostratus' account of Scopelian: 'When Scopelian was lecturing in Smyrna, the fact that Ionians and Lydians and Carians and Maeonians and Aeolians all came together there, along with Hellenes from Mysia and Phrygia is not such an amazing thing (οὐπω μέγα), since Smyrna is next door to these races and conveniently situated for entry both by land and sea, but he also attracted Cappadocians and Assyrians, and he attracted Egyptians and Phoenicians, and the more distinguished of the Achaians, and the whole of the youth from Athens' (1.21, 518). Philostratus' account of the Lycian sophist Herakleides is very similar, including some very precise echoes of phrasing: 'The fact that the youth of Ionia and Lydia and Caria and Phrygia flocked together to Smyrna in order to be near to him is not such an amazing thing (οὐπω μέγα), since Smyrna is next door to all of these territories, but he also attracted *to hellenikon* from Europe, he attracted the youth of the east, and he attracted many Egyptians' (2.26, 613). In both these cases, Philostratus draws attention to the wide geographical range of the Hellenes who attach themselves to the sophists, including all of the Greek-speaking areas of the eastern Mediterranean, and even some place which are very much on the edge of what had traditionally been judged as Greek-speaking territory.

We have seen, then, that Philostratus is committed to an extraordinary degree to the idea of an idealised Greek audience for sophistic discourse.⁵⁶ Images of that imagined audience recur in the work with remarkable frequency. Given his willingness to admit the possibility of a very cosmopolitan version of Hellenism, one might expect Romans to be absorbed into it smoothly. In most of the work, however, Romans are absent. There are of course frequent references to particular sophists holding the chair at Rome, serving as imperial secretaries, or holding consulships, as we have seen already in the case of Herodes

56 Cf. Kemezis 2011 on the centrality of Athens to the geography of the text, and on the way in which Philostratus represents Rome as an intellectual colony of Athens.

Atticus. However, Philostratus never uses a Roman name for any of his sophists (in contrast with most other ancient, especially epigraphic records of their activity),⁵⁷ makes very little mention of the Roman friends of sophists,⁵⁸ and tends to avoid mentioning the Roman background of sophists from the west of the empire.⁵⁹ There is one obvious counter-example to that rule, in the figure of the sophist Aelian, who ‘was a Roman, but wrote Attic Greek (Ῥωμαῖος μὲν ἦν, ἡττίκιζε δέ)’ (2.31), but the note of paradox in that phrase, which comes from the very beginning of Philostratus’ account of him, suggests that Aelian is very much an exception.⁶⁰ There is also no mention of the presence of Roman students in the entourages of prominent sophists (even in a very cosmopolitan list like the one just quoted for Herakleides, and despite the fact that we know, from Aulus Gellius and others, that sizeable numbers of Romans travelled to the east to study).

There are admittedly a few passages where Philostratus describes the sophists speaking to a Roman audience, but in all of these cases he makes it very clear that this body of listeners is different in important ways from the notional Greek audience to which their words are usually addressed. For example in the section on Hadrian of Tyre, soon after the passage discussed above where Hadrian ‘shares the Greek festivals’ with the youth of Hellas, and dances ‘the Hellenic dance’ with them (587), Philostratus describes his impact on the inhabitants of Rome:

Κατασχών δὲ καὶ τὸν ἄνω θρόνον οὕτως τὴν Ῥώμην ἐς ἑαυτὸν ἐπέστρεψεν, ὥς καὶ τοῖς ἀξυνέτοις γλώττης Ἑλλάδος ἔρωτα παρασχεῖν ἀκροάσεως. ἡκροῶντο δὲ ὥσπερ εὐστομούσης ἀηδόνος, τὴν εὐγλωττίαν ἐκπεπληγμένοι καὶ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὸ εὐστροφον τοῦ φθέγματος καὶ τοὺς πεζῇ τε καὶ ξὺν ᾠδῇ ρυθμούς. ὁπότε οὖν σπουδάζοιεν περὶ τὰς ἐγκυκλίους θεάς, ὀρχηστῶν δὲ αὐταὶ τὸ ἐπίπαν, φανέντος ἂν περὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἀγγέλου ἐξανίσταντο μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς, ἐξανίσταντο δὲ τῶν δημοσίᾳ ἱππευόντων οὐχ οἱ τὰ Ἑλλήνων σπουδάζοντες μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅποσοι τὴν ἐτέραν γλώτταν ἐπαιδεύοντο ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ δρόμῳ ἐχώρου ἐς τὸ Ἀθήναιον ὁρμῆς μεστοὶ καὶ τοὺς βάδην πορευομένους κακίζοντες.

57 See Bowie 1974: 200 and 2007: 366 and 374–5 (noting the contrast with Philostratus naming of himself in the preface, discussed further in the final section below).

58 See Anderson 1986: 80–81; also 93, n. 20 on similar indifference in *VA*.

59 See Bowie 2007: 374 on Hordeonius Lollianus and Plancius Varus.

60 Cf. 1.8, 489 for the paradox (explicitly referred to as such) of Favorinus who ‘despite being a Gaul, spoke Greek’.

When he was appointed to the higher chair [sc. of rhetoric—i.e. in Rome], he turned Rome towards himself (‘Ρώμην ἐς ἑαυτὸν ἐπέστρεψεν) to such an extent that he inspired a desire to listen even in those who did not understand the language of Hellas (καὶ τοῖς ἀξυνέτοις γλώττης Ἑλλάδος). And they listened to him as to a sweet-singing nightingale, astonished by his fluency and by the modulation and flexibility of his voice, and his rhythms both in prose and in verse. And so whenever they were giving their attention (σπουδάζειν) to their day-to-day spectacles—these were usually performances of dancers—and a messenger announcing a declamation appeared on the stage, then all the members of the Senate would rise, and members of the equestrian order would rise, not only those who studied Greek subjects (οἱ τὰ Ἑλλήνων σπουδάζοντες) but also those who studied the other language in Rome, and they would go at a run to the Athenaeum, full of enthusiasm and insulting those who went at a walking pace’. (2.10, 589)

Clearly there is some acknowledgement here (in the reference to ‘those who studied Greek subjects’) that the inhabitants of Rome can access a Hellenic education, of the kind which elsewhere in the work can earn the label of ‘Hellene’ even for those from outside the traditional centres of the Greek-speaking world. In some respects, moreover, this scene implies a close link between Greek responses and Roman responses, both of which reflect the universal power of sophistic oratory: in both cases we see the listeners enchanted by sophistic oratory;⁶¹ in both cases we see whole populations rushing together in order to have contact with a great sophist (several of the passages discussed above use similar imagery, for example the accounts of Scopelian and Herakleides just mentioned); in both cases, sophistic declamation is represented as an elevated alternative to other kinds of spectacle. It is also clear, however, that the Roman audience is very different in some ways, and even (so Philostratus seems to hint) deficient. That is clear immediately from the reminder that some of these listeners do not understand what they are listening to;⁶² by contrast, the

61 The image of enchantment is used both for sophists talking to Greeks (e.g. Hippias in 1.11, 495–6) and for sophists talking to Romans (e.g. Dio Chrysostom in 1.7, 488, with Whitmarsh 2001: 242; Favorinus in 1.8, 491–2).

62 Both of the passages mentioned in the previous note also provide close parallels for this detail: 1.7, 488 on Dio Chrysostom (and see Whitmarsh 1998: 208–9 on the variety of possible interpretations for the phrase ‘those who did not understand Greek matters thoroughly’). Swain 1996: 397 argues that there is ‘nothing derogatory’ in this picture of Romans who do not understand the Greek language; that may well be right, but it does

audiences the sophists encounter in the east are depicted as evenly and unequivocally Hellenic. It is also clear from Philostratus' depiction of the Romans' leisure habits in this passage: for the Greeks, sophistic speech is a part of their traditional festivals; for the Romans, it interrupts much more frivolous pursuits—usually performances of dancers—which are described here as if for an audience who is unfamiliar with them. The use of the word *σπουδάζειν* to describe their enthusiasm for the dancers points up that contrast, given that it is a word applied so often in the work to learning or even lecturing—a very different type of 'giving attention'.

Philostratus thus offers a remarkable vision of sophistic oratory as a kind of festive speech, always implicitly addressed to a literary elite of fellow Hellenes. There is no consistent place within that audience for the elite of Rome. On the few occasions where we do see Romans as a body listening to sophistic declamation, Philostratus goes out of his way to emphasize their oddity by comparison with the usual audience of Greeks.

Conclusions: Re-Reading the Preface

In conclusion: I do not mean to deny that the *VS* presents a world where Romans respect Greek learning, and where Greek sophists have been closely integrated into the political elite. That has been the consensus of recent scholarship on this text, and rightly so. My aim is rather to suggest that we should not take the further step of seeing this as a work which straightforwardly reflects or endorses the idea of an increasingly harmonious and unified Greco-Roman elite, with shared outlooks on political and literary life (i.e. the main subject of this volume). When we look closely we see that Philostratus is (typically) not completely consistent in his approach to that idea; instead he explores it and problematizes it. The most optimistic version of that possibility comes in the work's preface, but it stands in tension with much of what follows, where Philostratus is much more inclined to hint at the precariousness of Greco-Roman harmony, or to retreat to a more exclusive model of Greekness—built in part around the traditional imagery of Panhellenic, festive community—which leaves very little room for Rome. Stated in general terms those conclusions are not, perhaps, particularly surprising, but it seems to me that the complexity of Philostratus' exploration of those issues has not usually been appreciated in any detail. In particular, I hope that this chapter has broken

not alter the fact that it paints the Roman audiences as very different from their Greek equivalents, which is the main point I aim to establish here.

some new ground in relation to these two specific issues: first, in enhancing our understanding of the complexity and artistry of the preface and of its relation with the rest of the work, in particular its difference from so much of what follows; and second in drawing out in more detail than others have before the importance of Panhellenic festival imagery as a foundation for Philostratus' conception of sophistic Hellenism.

That still leaves the problem of how exactly we should read any discrepancies between the preface and the rest of the text. We might view them as slightly double-edged and uncomplimentary, especially if we assume that Gordian is emperor at the time, and that the work as a whole is therefore part of the wider tradition already referred to of Greek intellectuals speaking to Roman emperors (and it is worth pointing out that there are parallels in Latin compilatory, technical literature too for complimentary portraits of imperial addressees which turn out to be complicated and undermined in the text which follows).⁶³ On that reading, even as he compliments Gordian, Philostratus reminds him of what can go wrong, through all of the dysfunctional emperor-sophist relationships in the rest of the work. Some of the images used in the preface are even replayed, with slightly less complimentary effect, within the main text, in ways which will be particularly obvious to a second-time reader. For example, Gordian is told by Philostratus that reading about sophists in this work will lighten the burdens of office; it is hard not to see a link with the anecdote of Hadrian's quarrel with Favorinus discussed above, where Hadrian 'diverts his kingly anxieties by giving his attention to sophists and philosophers' (1.8, 490). As some commentators have suggested, the link between these two passages potentially has positive implications: Gordian is equated with the philhellenic Hadrian.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the implication of inequality between Hadrian and Favorinus is hard to miss, as I have already argued, and the echo potentially introduces a note of dissonance into the carefully constructed harmony of the preface.

The dominant impression, however, is clearly complimentary, implying that Philostratus and Gordian are representatives of a new and special way of combining Greek and Roman elite identity. Particularly important in that respect is the very striking fact—generally not remarked on in recent discussions of Philostratus' narrating persona in the *vs*—that Philostratus in the preface at least in some respects distinguishes himself from the sophists of the rest

63 See A. König 2009 on Vitruvius; A. König 2007 on Frontinus.

64 Cf. Flinterman 1995: 44; Swain 1996: 397–8.

of the work.⁶⁵ That is not to deny that he has many similarities with them.⁶⁶ Philostratus was himself a sophist.⁶⁷ Several sections of the work make clear his close relationships with some of them, as pupil or relative. His own narrating voice also has some strongly sophistic features, particularly in its authoritative, didactic character, and in its slightly cryptic, riddling qualities. Not only that, but Philostratus was himself recognised with a statue at Olympia, a sign of his own involvement in the world of Panhellenic honour (although there is no particular evidence that the statue is a response to his speaking there).⁶⁸ Nevertheless there are also one or two some strikingly unsophistic features in Philostratus' self-portrayal at this point.⁶⁹ As we have seen, there is a tendency in the main body of the work to avoid mentioning the Roman friends of sophists and their Roman citizenship; the preface does both. In the main body of the work Philostratus never gives a Roman name for any of the sophists he writes about, but he is identified by his own Roman name Flavius Philostratus in the preface.⁷⁰ The sophists rely on oral performance, testing their virtuosic powers of recall before large crowds. Philostratus, by contrast, at least here, performs on paper, through his writing (ἀνέγραψα) and uses memory (μεμνήμενος) for leisurely recollection rather than sophistic display, in a way which suggests that he is, at least temporarily and for the purposes of this work, adopting a less rhetorical persona than he might have done in other circumstances. Most importantly, perhaps, given the focus of this chapter, Philostratus in the preface takes a very different approach to the concept of speech within the boundaries of sacred space. The sophists of the *vs* speak regularly in sanctuaries before the assembled Greeks, and act as if that is what they are doing (so Philostratus suggests) even when they are elsewhere. Philostratus and Gordian use the sanctuary of Daphnaean Apollo as a venue for a style of conversation which is no less Hellenic, but which is more reflective, less strident, more Plutarchan, more focused on equal dialogue than on eye-catching display, and so arguably more suited to the cosmopolitan world of the third century.

65 Cf. König 2010: 288–90 for brief discussion along similar lines.

66 Anderson 1986: 77–96, Whitmarsh 2004, Campanile 2005 and Schmitz 2009 all stress the similarities.

67 See Bowie 2009.

68 *IVO* 476=SIG³ 878; and see n. 7, above, for Philostratus' career.

69 Whitmarsh 2004: 436 notes one aspect of this shift, pointing out that the detached tone of the preface immediately gives way to a more didactic, authoritarian persona.

70 Cf. n. 55, above.

Bibliography

- Aalders, G.J.D. (1986) 'Cassius Dio and the Greek world', *Mnemosyne* 39: 282–304.
- Adams, J.N. (2003a) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- . (2003b) 'Romanitas and the Latin Language', *CQ* 53: 184–205.
- . (2011) 'Late Latin' in J. Clackson (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford: 257–83.
- Ager, S.L. (2009) 'Roman Perspectives on Greek Diplomacy', in C. Eilers (ed.) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. Leiden and Boston: 15–43.
- Albertson, F. (2001) 'Zenodorus' Colossus of Nero', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 46: 95–118.
- Alcock, S.E. (1993) *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge.
- Alexander, L.C.A. (2006, pbk ed. 2007) *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. London.
- Alföldy, G. (1971a) 'Zeitgeschichte und Krisenempfindung bei Herodian', *Hermes* 99: 429–49.
- . (1971b) 'Herodians Person', *Anc. Soc.* 2: 204–33.
- Ameling, W. (1984) 'Lucius Flavius Arrianus Neos Xenophon', *EA* 4: 119–22.
- Anderson, G. (1976) *Lucian. Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*. Leiden.
- . (1986) *Philostratus. Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century AD*. London.
- . (1989) 'The *pepaideumenos* in action: Sophists and their outlook in the Early Empire', *ANRW* II.33.1: 79–208.
- . (1993) *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London.
- Ando, C. (2000) *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- . (2010) 'Imperial identities', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.) *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge: 17–45.
- Arafat, K.W. (1996) *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*. Cambridge.
- Ash, R. (1999) *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories*. London.
- . (2007) 'Victim and Voyeur: Rome as a Character in Tacitus' *Histories* 3', in D.H.J. Larmour & D. Spencer (eds.) *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford: 211–37.
- . (2010) 'The Great Escape: Tacitus on the Mutiny of the Usipi (*Agricola* 28)', in C.S. Kraus, J. Marincola & C. Pelling (eds.) *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts. Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*. Oxford: 275–93.
- . ed. (2012) *Tacitus. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford.

- . (2013) 'Tacitean Fusion: Tiberius the Satirist?', in T.D. Paphangelis, S.J. Harrison & S. Frangoulidis (eds.) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Trends in Classics (Supplementary Volume 20). Berlin: 433–47.
- Asirvatham, S.R. (2010) 'His son's father? Philip II in the Second Sophistic', in E. Carney & D. Ogden (eds.) *Philip II and Alexander the Great. Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*. Oxford: 193–204.
- Astin, A.E. (1978) *Cato the Censor*. Oxford.
- Atkinson, J. (2000) 'Originality and its limits in the Alexander sources of the Early Empire', in A.B. Bosworth & E.J. Baynham (eds.) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford: 307–25.
- Auliard, C. (2006) *La diplomatie romaine: l'autre instrument de la conquête: de la fondation à la fin des guerres samnites 753–290 av.J.-C.* Rennes.
- Austin, R.G. (1977) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*. Oxford.
- Avotins, I. (1978) 'The date and recipient of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*', *Hermes* 106: 242–7.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. (1979) *Romans and Aliens*. London.
- Barclay, J.M.G. (2005) 'The Emperor Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome', in J. Edmonson, S. Mason, & J. Rives (eds.) *Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 315–32.
- Barnes, T.D. (1968) 'Philostratus and Gordian', *Latomus* 27: 581–97.
- . (1977) 'The Fragments of Tacitus' *Histories*', *CP* 72: 224–31.
- . (2005) 'The Sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus', in J. Edmonson, S. Mason, & J. Rives (eds.) *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 129–44.
- Bartsch, S. (1994) *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Harvard. [pp. 101–25 reprinted in Ash (2012); 119–154, reprinted in Rees (2012)].
- Baynham, E. (1998) *Alexander the Great: The Unique History of Quintus Rufus*. Ann Arbor.
- Beard, M. (2003) 'The Triumph of Flavius Josephus', in A.J. Boyle & W.J. Dominik (eds.) *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: 543–58.
- . (2007) *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge MA and London.
- Beck, D. (2007) 'Ecphrasis, Interpretation, and Audience in *Aeneid* 1 and *Odyssey* 8', *AJP* 128: 533–49.
- Becker, A.S. (1990) 'The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Homeric Description', *AJP* 111: 139–53.
- . (1992) 'Reading Poetry Through a Distant Lens: Ekphrasis, Ancient Greek Rhetoricians, and the Pseudo-Hesiod Shield of Herakles', *AJP* 113: 5–24.
- . (1995) *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis*. Lanham MD.

- Bekker-Nielsen, T. (2008) *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia: The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos* (Black Sea Studies, 7). Aarhus.
- Bergmann, M. (1998) *Die Strahlen der Herrscher: Theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz.
- Betz, A. (1952). 'Ein neues Fragment der *lex Lauriacensis*', *JöAI* 39: 133–138.
- Bilde, P. (1988) *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome*. Sheffield.
- Billault, A. (2000) *L'Univers de Philostrate*. Brussels.
- Bird, H.W. (1976) 'Herodian: Some Additional Considerations', *CB* 52: 83–86.
- Birley, A.R. (1966) 'The origin of Gordian I', in Jarrett, M.G. (ed.) *Britain and Rome: Essays presented to Eric Birley on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Kendal: 56–60.
- . (1997) *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*. London.
- . (2000) 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus', *Hist.* 49: 230–47.
- Birley, E. (1969) 'Septimius Severus and the Roman Army', in *Epigraphische Studien* 8. Dusseldorf: 63–82.
- Bleicken, J. (1962) 'Der politische Standpunkt Dios gedenuber der Monarchie: Die Rede des Maecenas Buch 52.14–40', *Hermes* 90: 444–67.
- Bloch, R.S. (2002) *Antike Vorstellungen vom Judentum (Historia Einzelschriften 160)*. Stuttgart.
- Blois, L. de. (1998) 'Emperor and empire in the works of Greek speaking authors of the third century AD', *ANRW* II.34.4: 3391–443.
- Blumenthal, C. (2011) 'Augustus' Erlass und Gottes Macht: Überlegungen zur Charakterisierung der Augustusfigur und ihrer erzählstrategischen Funktion in der lukanischen Erzählung', *NTS* 57, 01: 1–30.
- Boatwright, M.T. (2000) *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Princeton.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1980–95) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* (1–2 vols.). Oxford.
- . (1988) *From Arrian to Alexander. Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford.
- . (1993) 'Arrian and Rome: the minor works', *ANRW* II.34.1: 226–75.
- . (1996) *Alexander and the East. The Tragedy of Triumph*. Oxford.
- . (2007) 'Arrian, Alexander, and the pursuit of glory', in J. Marincola (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography II*. Oxford: 447–453.
- Bowersock, G.W. (1965) *Augustus and the Greek world*. Oxford.
- . (1969) *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- . (1993) 'Tacitus and the Province of Asia', in T.J. Luce & A.J. Woodman (eds.) *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*. Princeton NJ: 3–10.
- Bowie, E.L. (1974) 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', in M. Finley (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Society*, London: 166–209 (originally published in *Past and Present* 46 (1970): 3–41).
- . (1982) 'The importance of sophists', *YCS* 27: 29–60.

- . (1991) 'Hellenes and Hellenism in writers of the early second sophistic', in S. Saïd (ed.) *Hellenismos Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Leiden: 183–204.
- . (1997) 'Hadrian, Favorinus, and Plutarch', in J. Mossmann (ed.) *Plutarch and his Intellectual World. Essays on Plutarch*, Swansea: 1–15.
- . (2002) 'Hadrian and Greek Poetry', in E.N. Ostenfeld (ed.) *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*. Aarhus: 172–97.
- . (2005) 'Les animaux dans le *Daphnis and Chloé* de Longus', in B. Poudéron (ed.) *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance*, de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée. Lyon: 75–85.
- . (2007) 'The Hellenic past of the Philostratean sophist', in P. Desideri, S. Rod & A.M. Biraschi (eds.) *Costruzione del passato storico nella cultura antica*. Alexandria: 357–77.
- . (2009) 'Philostratus: the life of a sophist', in E. Bowie & J. Elsner (eds.) *Philostratus*. Cambridge: 19–32.
- . (2011) 'Men from Mytilene', in T. Schmitz & N. Wiater (eds.) *The struggle for identity. Greeks and their past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart: 49–63.
- . (2013) 'Libraries for the Caesars', in J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: 237–260.
- Braund, D. (2000). 'Learning, Luxury and Empire: Athenaeus' Roman Patron', in D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.) *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter: 3–22.
- Braund, D. & J. Wilkins eds. (2000). *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter.
- Brennan, T.C. (2009) 'Embassies Gone Wrong: Roman Diplomacy in the Constantinian *Excerpta de Legationibus*', in C. Eilers (ed.) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. Leiden: 171–91.
- Brilliant, R. (1999) "Let the Trumpets Roar!" *The Roman Triumph*, in B. Bergmann & C. Kondoleon (eds.) *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. Washington and New Haven: 221–9.
- Briscoe, J. (1973) *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI–XXXIII*. Oxford.
- . (1981) *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXIV–XXXVII*. Oxford.
- . (2008) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38–40*. Oxford.
- . (2013) 'Some Misunderstandings of Polybius in Livy', in B.J. Gibson & T.E.H. Harrison (eds.) *Polybius and His World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford: 117–24.
- Brunt, P.A. (1977) 'From Epictetus to Arrian', *Athenaeum* 55: 19–48.
- . (1978–83) *Arrian: History of Alexander and Indica I–II*, with tr. and comm. V 1–2. Cambridge MA.
- Buckland, W.W. (1966) *A Textbook of Roman Law* 3rd ed by Peter Stein. Cambridge.

- Cadbury, H. (1921) 'The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface', *The Expositor* 21: 431–41.
- Campanile, D. (1994) *I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia (I sec.a.C–IIIsec.d.C)*. Pisa.
- . (2005) 'Il sofista allo specchio: Filostrato nelle *Vitae Sophistarum*', *Studi Ellenistici* 16: 275–88.
- Campbell, D.B. (1988) 'Dating the Siege of Masada', *ZPE* 73: 156–8.
- Campbell, J.B. (1984) *The Emperor and the Roman Army: 31 BC–AD 235*. Oxford.
- Canali de Rossi, F. (1997) *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma in età repubblicana*. (Studi pubblicati dall'istituto italiano per la storia antica, 63). Rome.
- . (2000) *Le ambascerie romane ad gentes in età regia e repubblicana*. Rome.
- . (2007) *Le relazioni diplomatiche di Roma. Volume II: Dall'intervento in Sicilia fino alla invasione annibalica (264–216 a.C.)*. Rome.
- . (2009) "Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma": omissioni, errori, novità e studi recenti', *Veleia* 26: 13–46.
- Carlsen, J. (1993) 'Alexander the Great (1970–1990)', in J. Carlsen, B. Due & O.S. Due (eds.) *Alexander the Great. Reality and Myth* (ARID Suppl. 20). Rome: 41–52.
- Cartledge, P.A. & A.J.S. Spawforth, (2002) *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities*, second edition. London.
- Cassidy, R.J. (1978) *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*. Maryknoll.
- . (1987) *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll.
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1994) 'The deification of Alexander the Great: a note', in I. Worthington (ed.) *Ventures into Greek History*. Oxford: 293–306.
- Champion, C.B. (2004) *Cultural Politics in Polybius' Histories*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Chapman, H.H. (2000) "A Myth for the World": Early Christian Reception of Cannibalism in Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 6.199–219', in *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta GA: 359–78.
- . (2005) 'Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*', in J. Edmonson, S. Mason, & J. Rives (eds.) *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 289–313.
- . (2009) 'What Josephus Sees: The Temple of Peace and the Jerusalem Temple as Spectacle in Text and Art', *Phoenix* 63: 107–30.
- Cheesman, G.L. (1914) *The auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*. Oxford.
- Chilver, G.E.F. & G.B. Townend. (1985) *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus Histories IV and V*. Oxford.
- Civiletti, M. (2002) *Filostrato, Vite dei Sofisti*. Milan.
- Coarelli, F. (1968) 'La Porta Trionfale e la Via dei Trionfi', *D. Arch.* 2: 55–103.
- Cohen, S.J.D. (1979) *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden.
- . (1982) 'Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains, and the Credibility of Josephus', *JJS* 33: 385–405.
- Coleman, K.M. (1988) *Statius Silvae IV*. Oxford.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1946) *The Idea of History*. Oxford.

- Connolly, J. (2001) 'Reclaiming the Theatrical in the second sophistic', *Helios* 28: 75–96.
- Cotton, H. (1989) 'The Date of the Fall of Masada: The Evidence of the Masada Papyri', *ZPE* 78: 159–62.
- Cribiore, R. (2001) *Gymnastics of the mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton.
- Crook, J.A. (1955) *Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge.
- Crook, J.G. (2010) *Roman Attitudes Toward the Christians: From Claudius to Hadrian*. Tübingen.
- Culpepper Stroup, S. (2007) 'Greek Rhetoric Meets Rome; Expansion, Resistance and Acculturation', in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.) *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. London: 23–37.
- Curran, J. (2005) '"The Long Hesitation": Some Reflections on the Romans in Judaea', *G&R* 52: 70–98.
- Curty, O. (1989) 'L'historiographie hellénistique et l'inscription n° 37 des *Inscripfen von Priene*', in M. Piérary & O. Curty (eds.) *Historia Testis: Mélanges d'épigraphie, d'histoire ancienne et de philologie offerts à Tadeusz Zawadzki*, Seges n.s. 7. Fribourg: 21–35.
- Daly, L.W. (1950) 'Roman Study Abroad', *AJP* 71: 40–58.
- Day, J. (1942) *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*. New York.
- Dean, L.R. (1916) *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions*. Princeton N.J.
- Deane, S.N. (1918). 'Greek in Pliny's letters', *Classical Weekly* 12: 41–54.
- Demougin, S. (1999) 'L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure. Histoire d'une romanisation', in S. Demougin, H. Devijver, & M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds.) *L'Ordre Équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (II^e siècle av.J.-C.–III^e siècle apr.J.-C.) Actes du colloque international (Bruxelles-Leuven, 5–7 octobre 1995)*. Rome: 579–612.
- Desideri, P. (1978). *Dione di Prusa: un intellettuale greco nell'Impero Romano*. Messina.
- . (2010) 'Il mito di Alessandro in Plutarco e Dione', *Studi ellenistici* 23: 19–31.
- Devijver, H. (1976–1993) *Prosopographia militarium equestrum quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum* 5 vols. Leuven.
- . (1986) 'Equestrian officers from the East' in P. Freeman & D. Kennedy (eds.) *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of a Colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986*. (Brit. Inst. of Archaeol. at Ankara Monogr. 8) (BAR Intern. Ser. 297(i)): 109–225.
- . (1989) *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army*. Leiden.
- Devillers, O. (2003) *Tacite et les sources des Annales: enquêtes sur la méthode historique*, Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques 36. Louvain and Paris.
- Devreker, J. (1980) 'La composition du sénat romain sous les Flaviens', in W. Eck, H. Galsterer & H. Woiff (eds.) *Studien zur Antiken Sozialgeschichte: Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff*, Köln: 257–68.

- . (1982) 'Les orientaux au Sénat romain d'Auguste à Trajan', *Latomus* 41: 492–516.
- Dobson B. (1978) *Die Primipilares. Entwicklung und Bedeutung, Laufbahnen und Persönlichkeiten eines römischen Offiziersranges*. Cologne, Bonn.
- Dolby, N. (2004). 'Encountering an American Self: Study Abroad and National Identity', *Comparative Education review* 48.2: 150–73.
- . (2007) 'Reflections on Nation: American Undergraduates and Education Abroad', *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11: 141–156.
- Dörner, F.K. (1952) *Bericht über eine Reise in Bithynie, Ausgeführt im Jahre 1948 im Auftrage der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Vienna.
- Downing, F.G. (1988) *Christ and the Cynics*. Sheffield.
- Dreyer, B. (2009) 'Heroes, cults, and divinity' in W. Heckel & L.A. Tritle (eds.) *Alexander the Great. A New History*. Oxford: 218–234.
- Drijvers, H.J.W. (1977) 'Hatra, Palmyra und Edessa. Die Städte der syrisch-mesopotamischen Wüste in politischer, kulturgeschichtlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung', *ANRW* ii 8: 799–906.
- Dubuisson, M. (1992) 'Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron. Extension et qualité du bilinguisme', *Annales E.S.C.* 47: 187–206.
- Dupertuis, R. & T. Penner eds. (2012) *Reading Acts in the Second Century*. London.
- Durry, M. (1938) *Pline le Jeune. Panégyrique de Trajan*. Paris.
- Echols, E.C. (1961) *Herodian of Antioch's History of the Roman Empire: from the Death of Marcus Aurelius to the Accession of Gordian III* (translation). Berkeley CA.
- Eck, W. (1970) *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter*. Munich.
- . (2000) 'Emperor, Senate and Magistrates', in A. Bowman, P. Garnsey & D. Rathbone (eds.) *The High Empire AD 70–192 CAH*. Cambridge: 214–37.
- . (2009) 'Diplomacy as Part of the administrative Process in the Roman empire', in C. Eilers (ed.) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. Leiden: 193–207.
- Eckstein, A. (1990) 'Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration', *Cl. Ant.* 9: 175–208.
- Edwards, R. (2008) 'Hunting for Boars with Pliny and Tacitus', *Cl. Ant.* 27: 35–58.
- Eilers, C. ed. (2009) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World* (Mnemos. Supplement 304). Leiden.
- Elsner, J. ed. (1996) *Art and Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- . (2009) 'A protean corpus', in E. Bowie and J. Elsner (eds.) *Philostratus*. Oxford: 3–18.
- Errington, R.M. (1969) *Philopoemen*. Oxford.
- . (1998) 'Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic', in P. Kneissl and V. Losemann (eds.) *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Darmstadt: 140–157.
- Erskine, A. (2001) *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.

- Favro, D. (1994) 'The Street Triumphant: The Urban Impact of Roman Triumphal Parades', in Z. Çelik, D. Favro, & R. Ingersoll (eds.) *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*. Berkeley: 151–64.
- Fears, J.R. (1977) *Princeps a Diis Electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*. Rome.
- Fein, S. (1994) *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den litterati*. Stuttgart.
- Fenno, J. (2005) '“A Great Wave Against the Stream”: Water Imagery in Iliadic Battle Scenes', *AJP* 126: 475–504.
- Flaig, E. (2010) 'How the Emperor Nero lost acceptance in Rome', in B. Ewald & C. Noreña (eds.) *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*. Cambridge: 275–88.
- Flinterman, J.J. (1995) *Power, Paideia & Pythagoreanism*. Amsterdam.
- . (2004) 'Sophists and emperors: a reconnaissance of sophistic attitudes', in B. Borg (ed.) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin: 359–76.
- Flower, R. (2013) *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*. Cambridge.
- Follet, S. (1991) 'Divers aspects de l'hellénisme chez Philostrate', in S. Saïd (ed.) *Hellenismos Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Leiden: 205–15.
- Fontanella, F. (2008) 'The Encomium on Rome as a Response to Polybius' Doubts About the Roman Empire', in W.V. Harris & B. Holmes (eds.) *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods*. Leiden: 203–16.
- Forni G. (1953) *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano*. Milan.
- . (1974) 'Estrazione etnica e sociale delle soldati delle legioni nei tre primi secoli dell' impero', *ANRW* 2.1: 339–391.
- Fowler, D.P. (1991) 'Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis', *JRS* 81: 25–35.
- Fredericksmeyer, E. (2003) 'Alexander's religion and divinity', in J. Roisman (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*. Leiden: 253–78.
- French D.H. (1983) 'Recruitment in Asia Minor for the Legio III Scythica', in S. Mitchell (ed.) *Armies and frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia. Proceedings of a Colloquium held at University College, Swansea in April 1981*. (Brit. Inst. of Archaeol. at Ankara Monogr. 5, BAR Intern. Ser. 156): 47–59.
- Friedländer, L. *Roman Life and Manners under the early Empire* Vols. 1–4. Trans. L. Magnus. London and New York. 1928.
- Galimberti Biffino, G. (2007) 'Pline et la culture grecque', in Y. Perrin (ed.) *Neronia VII. Rome, l'Italie et la Grèce*. Brussels: 285–301.
- Gallivan, P.A. (1973) 'Nero's Liberation of Greece', *Hermes* 101: 230–4.
- Gamberini, F. (1983) *Stylistic Theory and Practice in Pliny the Younger*. Hildesheim.
- Garnsey, P. (1967). 'Adultery Trials and the Survival of the Quaestiones in the Severan Age', *JRS* 57: 56–60.
- Gibbon, E. (1776/1894) *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Chandos Classics). London.

- Gibson, B.J. (2011) 'Contemporary contexts', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge: 104–24.
- Gibson, B.J. & Harrison, T.E.H. (2013) 'F.W. Walbank, Polybius, and the Decline of Greece', in B.J. Gibson & T.E.H. Harrison (eds.) *Polybius and His World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford: 1–35.
- Gibson, B.J. & Rees, R.D. eds. (2013) *Pliny the Younger in Late Antiquity* (*Arethusa* 46.2 Special Edition 2013).
- Gibson, R.K. & Morello, R. (2012) *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger. An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Gibson, R.K. and Morrison, A.D. (2007) 'Introduction: What is a Letter?', in R. Morello & A.D. Morrison (eds.) *Ancient Letters. Classical & Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: 1–16.
- Ginsburg, J. (1981) *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus*. Salem NH.
- Gleason, M. (2001) 'Mutilated Messengers: Body Language in Josephus', in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: 50–85.
- Goldhill, S. (2007) 'What is Ekphrasis For?', *CP* 102: 1–19.
- . (2010) 'What is local Identity? The Politics of Cultural Mapping', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.) *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge: 46–68.
- Goodman, M. (2005) 'The Fiscus Judaicus and Gentile Attitudes to Judaism in Flavian Rome', in J. Edmonson, S. Mason & J. Rives (eds.) *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 167–77.
- . (2007) *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. London.
- Goodyear, F.R.D. (1981) *The Annals of Tacitus: Books 1–6. Volume II: Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2*. Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (2005) 'Virgil's Sibyl and the Many Mouths Cliché (*Aeneid* 6.625–7)', *CQ* 55: 170–82.
- Gowing, A.M. (2005) *Empire and Memory: the Representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture*. Cambridge.
- Gray, V.J. (1990) 'The moral interpretation of the 'Second Preface' to Arrian's *Anabasis*', *JHS* 110: 180–86.
- Griffin, M.T. (1971) Review of Bowersock (1969), *JRS* 61: 278–80.
- . (1990) 'Claudius in Tacitus', *CQ* 40: 482–501.
- . (1996) *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*, 2nd paperback edition. London.
- Gruen, E. (1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Habicht, C. (1985) *Pausanias: Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- . (1997) 'Roman citizens in Athens (228–31 B.C.)', in M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff (eds.) *The Romanization of Athens*. Oxford: 9–17.

- . (2001/2002) 'Zum Gesandtschaftsverkehr griechischer Gemeinden mit römischen Instanzen während der Kaiserzeit', *Archaiognosia* 11: 11–27.
- Haensch, R. (1993) 'Ein procurator der Provinz Arabia und die angeblichen Beinamen Aurelia Antoniniana von Gerasa', *ZPE* 95: 163–178.
- Halfmann, H. (1979) *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Göttingen.
- . (1982) *Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches vom 1.–3. Jahrhundert (Asia, Pontus-Bithynia, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia)*, *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* 11: 603–650.
- . (2001) *Städtebau und Bauherren im römischen Kleinasien: ein Vergleich zwischen Pergamon und Ephesos*, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen Beiheft* 43. Tübingen (translated as *Éphèse et Pergame. Urbanisme et commanditaires en Asie Mineure romaine. Scripta Antiqua* 11. Bordeaux, 2004).
- Hamilton, J.R. (1969) *Plutarch Alexander: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Hammond, M. (1938) 'Pliny the Younger's views on government', *HSCP* 49: 115–40.
- . (1957) 'The composition of the Senate, A.D. 68–235', *JRS* 47: 74–81.
- Hammond, N.G.L. (1993) *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, P.R. (1985) 'Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Shield of Achilles', *JHS* 105: 11–31.
- Hardinghaus, B. (1932) *Tacitus und das Griechentum*. Diss. Munster.
- Hartmann, K. (1907) *Flavius Arrianus und Kaiser Hadrian*. Augsburg.
- Hata, G. (1975–6) 'Is the Greek Version of Josephus' *Jewish War* a Translation or a Rewriting of the First Version?', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 66: 89–108.
- Hekster, O. (2005) 'Propagating Power: Hercules as an example of second-century emperors', in L. Rawlings and H. Bowden (eds.) *Herakles and Hercules. Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*. Swansea: 205–21.
- Heller, A. (2006) *Les bêtises des grecs: conflits et rivalités entre cités d'Asie et de Bithynie à l'époque romaine, 129 a. C.-235 p. C.* Bordeaux.
- Henderson, J. (2002) *Pliny's statue: the letters, self-portraiture and classical art*. Exeter.
- . (2011) 'Down the Pan: historical exemplarity in the *Panegyricus*', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge: 142–73.
- Hendricks, H. (1996) *The Third Gospel for the Third World. Vol. 1: Preface and Infancy Narrative (L. 1:1–2:52)*. Collegeville Minnesota.
- Herrmann, P. (1989) 'Rom und die Asylie griechischer Heiligtümer: Eine Urkunde des Dictators Caesar aus Sardeis', *Chiron* 19: 127–64.
- Hickson, F.V. (1992) 'Augustus Triumphator: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Propaganda of Augustus', *Latomus* 50: 124–38.
- Hinds, S. (1985) 'Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1', *PCPS* 31: 13–32.

- Höistad, R. (1948) *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*. Uppsala.
- Holford-Strevens, L. (2003). *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. Oxford.
- Honoré, T. (2002) *Ulpian, Pioneer of Human Rights*. 2nd edition. Oxford.
- Horsfall, N. (1979) 'doctus sermones utriusque linguae?', *EMC* 23: 79–95.
- Horsley, R.A. (1989) *The Liberation of Christmas: The Infancy Narratives in Social Context*. New York.
- . (2011) *Jesus and the Powers: Conflict, Covenant, and the Hope of the Poor*. Minneapolis.
- Hostein, A. (2012) *La cité et l'empereur. Les Eduens dans l'Empire romain d'après les Panégyriques latins*. Paris.
- Howley, J.A. (2013) 'Why Read the Jurists? Aulus Gellius on Reading Across Disciplines', in P. du Plessis (ed.) *New Frontiers. Law and Society in the Roman World*. Edinburgh: 9–30.
- Hubbard, T.K. (1992) 'Nature and Art in the Shield of Achilles', *Arion* 2: 16–41.
- Hutton, W. (2005) *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (*Greek Culture in the Roman World*). Cambridge.
- . (2008) 'The Disaster of Roman Rule: Pausanias 8.27.1', *CQ* 58: 622–37.
- Innes, D.C. (2011) 'The *Panegyricus* and rhetorical theory', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge: 67–84.
- Isager, J. (1993) 'Alexander the Great in Roman literature from Pompey to Vespasian', in J. Carlsen, B. Due & O.S. Due (eds.) *Alexander the Great. Reality and Myth* (*ARID Suppl.* 20). Rome: 75–84.
- . (2009) 'Destruction and depopulation of cities in Pausanias. Nikopolis, Aetolia, and Epirus' *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* VI: 201–15.
- Itgenshorst, T. (2004) 'Augustus und der republikanische Triumph: Triumphalfasten und *summi viri*-Galerie als Instrumente der imperialen Machtsicherung', *Hermes* 132: 436–58.
- Jacob, C., tr. A. Papaconstantinou, (2013) *The Web of Athenaeus* (*Centre for Hellenic Studies* 61). Washington D.C.
- Janson, T. (1964) *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm.
- Johnson, L.T. (1991) *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville Minnesota.
- Johnson, W.A. (2010). *Readers and reading culture in the high Roman Empire: a study of elite communities*. Oxford.
- Jones, B.W. (1996). *Suetonius. Domitian*. London.
- Jones, C.P. (1970) 'A Leading Family of Roman Thespieae', *HSCPh* 74: 223–55.
- . (1971) 'The Levy at Thespieae under Marcus Aurelius', *GRBS* 12: 45–48.
- . (1978) *The Roman world of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . (1990) 'The *Rhodian Oration* ascribed to Aelius Aristides', *CQ* 40: 514–522.

- . (2002) 'Philostratus and the Gordiani', *Mediterraneo Antico* 5: 759–767.
- . (2005) 'Culture in the careers of eastern senators', in W. Eck & M. Heil (eds.) *Senatores Populi Romani: Realität und mediale Repräsentation einer Führungsschicht*. Stuttgart: 263–70.
- . (2007) 'Juristes romains dans l'orient grec.' *CRAI* 151: 1331–1359.
- Jördens, A. (2009) *Statthalterliche Verwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Studien zum praefectus Aegypti*. Stuttgart.
- Jory, E.J. (1981) 'The literary evidence for the beginnings of imperial pantomime', *BICS* 28: 147–61.
- Just, A.A. (2003) (ed.) *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament III Luke*. Downers Grove.
- Kaimio, J. (1979) *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki.
- Kaizer, T. (2007) 'Religion in the Roman East', in J. Rüpke (ed.) *A Companion to Roman Religion*. Oxford: 446–56.
- Karrer, M. (1991) *Der Gesalbte: Die Grundlagen des Christustitels*. *FRLANT* 151 Göttingen.
- Kelly, B. (2010) 'Tacitus, Germanicus and the Kings of Egypt (Tac. *Ann.* 2.59–61)', *CQ* 60: 221–37.
- Kemezis, A. (2011) 'Narrative of cultural geography in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*' in T. Schmidt and P. Fleury (eds.) *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times: Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*. Toronto: 3–22.
- Kennedy, D.L. ed. (1996) *The Roman army in the East*. Ann Arbor.
- Kennell, N.M. (1995) *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta*. Chapel Hill.
- Kinman, B. (1993) 'Luke's Exoneration of John the Baptist', *JThS* 44: 595–98.
- Kirbihler, F. (2003) *Les notables d'Éphèse: essai d'histoire sociale (133 av. J.-C.–262 apr. J.-C.)*. Diss., Université de Tours.
- Klauck, H.-J. (2000) *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: the World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Edinburgh.
- Koehn, C. (2007) *Krieg—Diplomatie—Ideologie: Zur Aussenpolitik hellenistischer Mittelstaaten* (Historia Einzelschriften 195). Stuttgart.
- Koestermann, E. (1963–1968) *Cornelius Tacitus: Annalen*. Heidelberg.
- Kolb, F. (1972) *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der Historia Augusta*. Antiquitas, IV.9. Bonn.
- König, A. (2007) 'Knowledge and power in Frontinus' *De Aquis*', in J. König and T. Whitmarsh (eds.) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman World*. Cambridge: 177–205.
- . (2009) 'From architect to emperor: Vitruvius and his addressee in the *De Architectura*', in L. Taub & A. Doody (eds.) *Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing*. Trier: 31–52.
- König, J. (2001) 'Favorinus' *Corinthian Oration* in its Corinthian context', *PCPS* 47: 141–71.

- . (2005) *Athletics and Literature in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- . (2007) 'Fragmentation and coherence in Plutarch's *Sympotic Questions*', in J. König and T. Whitmarsh (eds.) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman World*: 43–68.
- . (2009) 'Conventions of prefatory self-representation in Galen's *On the Order of My Own Books*', in C. Gill, T. Whitmarsh & J. Wilkins (eds.) *Galen and the World of Knowledge*. Cambridge: 35–58.
- . (2010) 'Competitiveness and anti-competitiveness in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*', in N. Fisher & H. van Wees, (eds.) *Competition in the Ancient World*, Swansea: 279–300.
- . (2012) *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Culture*, Cambridge.
- König, J. & T. Whitmarsh eds. (2007) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Kuhn-Chen, B. (2002) *Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert n.Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian*. Frankfurt.
- Künzl, E. (1988). *Der römische Triumph: Siegesfeiern im antiken Rom*. Munich.
- Laet, S.J. de (1941) *De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat gedurende de eerste eeuw van het Principaat (28 vóór Chr.–68 na Chr.)*. Antwerp and the Hague.
- Laird, A. (1993) 'Sounding out Ekphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64', *JRS* 83: 18–30.
- Lang, M. (2008) *Die Kunst christlichen Lebens. Rezeptionsästhetische Studien zum lukianischen Paulusbild. Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 29 (Gebundene Ausgabe)*. Leipzig.
- . (2011) 'The Christian and the Roman Self. The Lukan Paul and a Roman Reading', in C.K. Rothschild & T.W. Thompson (eds.), with the assistance of R.S. Kinney, *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*. Tübingen: 151–173.
- Le Bohec, Y. (2000) *The Imperial Roman Army*. London.
- Leach, E.W. (1990) 'The politics of self-presentation: Pliny's *Letters* and Roman portrait sculpture.' *Cl. Ant.* 9: 14–39.
- Leoni, T. (2007) '"Against Caesar's Wishes": Flavius Josephus as a Source for the Burning of the Temple', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 58: 39–51.
- Levene, D.S. (2006) 'History, Metahistory, and Audience Response in Livy 45', *Cl. Ant.* 25: 73–108.
- . (2010a) *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford.
- . (2010b) 'Warfare in the *Annals*', in A.J. Woodman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*. Cambridge: 225–38.
- Levick, B.M. (1967) *Roman colonies in southern Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- . (1978) 'Antiquarian or Revolutionary? Claudius Caesar's Conception of His Principate', *AJPh* 99: 79–105.

- . (1999) *Vespasian*. London.
- Lucarini, C.L. (2005) *Herodianus, Regnum post Marcum* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). Munich.
- Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*. Cambridge.
- MacDonald, D.R. (2003) *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*. New Haven.
- Madsen J.M. (2006) 'Intellectual resistance to Roman Hegemony and its representativity', in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.) *Rome and the Black Sea Region* (Black Sea Studies, 8). Aarhus: 63–84.
- . (2009) *Eager to be Roman: Greek Response to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. London.
- Magie, D. (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the Third Century after Christ*, V 1–2. Princeton.
- Maguinness, W.S. (1933) 'Locutions and formulae of the Latin Panegyrists', *Hermathena* 48: 117–38 (reprinted in Rees 2012).
- Makin, E. (1921) 'The Triumphal Route, with Particular Reference to the Flavian Triumph', *JRS* 11: 25–36.
- Malherbe, A.J. (1985/6) "'Not in a Corner": Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26', *The Second Century* 5/4: 193–210.
- Mann, J.C. (1983) *Legionary recruitment and veteran settlement during the principate* (edited for publication by M.M. Roxan). London.
- Marasco, G. (1996) 'L'idéologie impériale de Macrin', *REA* 98: 187–95.
- . (1998) 'Erodiano e la crisi dell'impero', *ANRW* II.34.4: 2837–927.
- Marchesi, I. (2008) *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A poetics of allusion in the private correspondence*. Cambridge.
- Maricq, A. (1957) 'Classica et orientalia. 2. Les dernières années de Hatra: l'alliance romaine', *Syria* 34: 286–96.
- Marincola, J.M. (1989) 'Some suggestions on the proem and 'Second Preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*.' *JHS* 109: 186–89.
- . (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge.
- Marrou, H.I. (1982) *A history of education in antiquity*, trans. George Lamb. Wisconsin.
- Martin, R.H & A.J. Woodman (1989) *Tacitus. Annals Book IV*. Cambridge.
- Martin, F. ed. (2006) *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament V Acts*. Downers Grove.
- Mason, S. (2003) *Josephus and the New Testament Second Edition*. Peabody.
- . (2005) 'Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus', in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, S. & J. Rives (eds.) *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 243–88.
- Mathisen, R. (2009) 'Provinciales, Gentiles and Marriages between Romans and Barbarians in the Late Roman Empire', *JRS* 99: 140–55.

- Matthews, J. (2010) *Roman Perspectives: Studies in the social, political and cultural history of the First to Fifth Centuries*, Swansea.
- Mayer, R. (2001) *Tacitus. Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Cambridge.
- McLynn, N. (2005) 'Disciplines of Discipleship in Late Antique Education: Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen', in K.F. Pollmann and M. Vessey (eds.) *Augustine and the Disciplines: From Cassiacum to Confessions*. Oxford: 28–48.
- Mellor, R. (1975) ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. *The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (Hypomnemata, Heft 42). Göttingen.
- Mennen, I. (2011) *Power and Status in The Roman Empire, AD 293–284*. Leiden.
- Méthy, N. (2007) *Les Letters de Pline le Jeune. Une Representation de l'Homme*. Paris.
- Millar, F.G.B. (1964) *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
- . (1977, 1992²) *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)*. London.
- . (1986) 'A New Approach to the Roman Jurists', Review discussion, *JRS* 76: 272–80.
- . (1988) 'Government and Diplomacy in the Roman Empire during the First Three Centuries', *International History Review* 10: 345–77.
- . (1993) *The Roman Near East 31 BC–AD 337*. Cambridge MA.
- . (2005) 'Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome', in J. Edmonson, S. Mason, & J. Rives (eds.), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: 101–2.
- Miller, J.F. (2000) 'Triumphus in Palatio', *AJP* 121: 409–22.
- Miller, S.S. (2001) 'Josephus on the Cities of Galilee: Factions, Rivalries and Alliances in the First Jewish Revolt', *Historia* 50: 453–67.
- Mitchell, S. (1974) 'The Plancii in Asia Minor', *JRS* 64: 27–39.
- . (1987) 'Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces', *HSCPh* 91: 333–65.
- . (1993) *Anatolia: Land men and the Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I: The Celts in Anatolia and the impact of Roman rule*. Oxford.
- . (1994) 'Notes on military recruitment from the eastern Roman provinces', in E. Dabrowa (ed.), *The Roman and Byzantine Army in the East*. Krakow: 141–8.
- . (1995) *Anatolia: Land men and the Gods in Asia Minor. Volume II: The rise of The Church*. Oxford.
- Moles, J.L. (1985) 'The interpretation of the 'Second Preface' in Arrian's *Anabasis*', *JHS* 105: 162–68.
- . (1990) 'The *Kingship Orations* of Dio Chrysostom', *PLLS* 6: 297–375.
- . (1998) 'Cry Freedom: Tacitus *Annals* 4.32–35', *HISTOS* 2: 95–184.
- . (2005) 'The thirteenth oration of Dio Chrysostom: Complexity and Simplicity, Rhetoric and Moralism, Literature and Life', *JHS* 125: 112–38.
- . (2006a) 'Cynic influence upon first-century Judaism and early Christianity?', in B. McGing & J. Mossman, (eds.) *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea): 89–116.

- . (2006b) 'Jesus and Dionysus in *The Acts of the Apostles* and Early Christianity', *Hermathena* 180: 65–104.
- . (2011a) 'Jesus the Healer in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and Early Christianity', *Histos* 5: 117–82.
- . (2011b) 'Luke's Preface: The Greek Decree, Classical Historiography and Christian Redefinitions', *NTS* 57: 1–22.
- . (2013) 'Time and Space Travel in Luke-Acts', in R. Dupertuis & T. Penner (eds.) *Reading Acts in the Second Century*. Sheffield: 101–22.
- Momigliano, A. (1992) 'From the Pagan to the Christian Sibyl: Prophecy as History of religion', in A. Momigliano, *Nono contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome): 725–44.
- Moore, J.M. (1965) *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius*. Cambridge.
- Mordine, M. (2010) 'Sine Me, Liber, Ibis: The Poet, the Book and the Reader in *Tristia* 1.1', *CQ* 60: 524–44.
- Moreno Soldevila, R. (2010) *Plinio el Joven. Panegírico de Trajano*. Madrid.
- Morford, M.P.O. (1991) 'How Tacitus defined Liberty', *ANRW* II.33.5: 3420–49.
- . (1992) 'iubes esse liberos: Pliny's *Panegyricus* and liberty', *AJP* 113: 575–93 (reprinted in Rees 2012).
- Morton Braund, S. (1998) 'Praise and protreptic in early imperial panegyric', in M. Whitby (ed.) *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (*Mnemosyne Supplements* 183) 53–76 (reprinted in Rees 2012).
- . (2009) *Seneca. De Clementia*. Oxford.
- Müller, F.L. (1996) *Herodian: Geschichte des Kaisertums nach Marc Aurel*. Stuttgart.
- Murgia, C. (1980) 'The date of Tacitus' *Dialogus*', *HSCP* 84: 99–125.
- Newby, Z. (2005) *Greek Athletics in the Roman World. Victory and Virtue*. Oxford.
- van Nijf, O. (1999) 'Athletics, festivals and Greek identity in the Roman east', *PCPhS* 45: 176–97.
- . (2005) 'Aristos hellenon: succès sportif et identité grecque dans la Grèce romaine', *Metis* N.S. 3: 271–294.
- Noreña, C. (2003) 'Medium and Message in Vespasian's *Templum Pacis*', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 48: 25–43.
- . (2011a) 'Self-fashioning in the *Panegyricus*', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World* Cambridge: 29–44.
- . (2011b) *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power*, Cambridge.
- Nutton, V. (1970) 'Herodes and Gordian', *Latomus* 29: 719–28.
- Oakley, S.P. (2009) 'Res Olim dissociabiles: Emperors, Senators and Liberty', in A.J. Woodman (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*. Cambridge: 184–194.
- Oliver J.H. (1953) *The Ruling Power: A study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century After Christ Through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides* (The American Philosophical Society). Philadelphia.

- Opelt, I. (1998) 'Furcht und Schrecken bei Herodian', *ANRW* II.34.4: 2928–52.
- Östenberg, I. (2009) *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*. Oxford.
- Parker, H.M.D. (1928, repr. 1958). *The Roman Legions*. Oxford.
- Paul, G.M. (1993) 'The Presentation of Titus in the *Jewish War* of Josephus: Two Aspects', *Phoenix* 47: 56–66.
- Pearcy, L. (1994) 'The Personification of the Text and Augustan Poetics in *Epistles* 1.20', *CQ* 87: 457–64.
- Pelling, C.B.R. (1993) 'Tacitus and Germanicus', in T.J. Luce & A.J. Woodman (eds.) *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*. Princeton: 59–85.
- Penner, T. & R. Dupertuis eds. (forthcoming), *Reading Acts in the Second Century*. London.
- Pernot, L. (2008) 'Aelius Aristides and Rome', in W.V. Harris and B. Holmes (eds.) *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods*. Leiden: 175–201.
- Perutelli, A. (1978) 'L'inversione speculare. Per una retorica dell'ecphrasis', *MD* 1: 87–98.
- Pervo, R. (1987) *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia.
- Petrocheilos, N. (1974) *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*. Athens.
- Pflaum, H.-G. (1960–1961) *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut Empire romain*, I–IV. Bruxelles.
- . (1982) *Supplément aux Carrières procuratoriennes équestres*. Paris.
- Plassart, A. (1932) 'Une levée de volontaires Thespiens sous Marc-Aurèle', in *Mélanges Gustave Glotz* vol. 2, Paris: 731–8.
- Plummer, A. (1913) *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Edinburgh.
- Preston, R. (2001) 'Roman questions, Greeks answers: Plutarch and the construction of identity', in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: 86–119.
- Pretzler, M. (2007) *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (Classical Literature and Society Series). London.
- Price, S.R.F. (1984) *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- Puech, B. (2002) *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque Impériale*. Paris.
- Purcell, N. (1995) 'Literate Games: Roman Urban Society and the Game of Alea', *Past & Present* 147: 3–37.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1998) *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven and London.
- Quinn, J.C. (2013) 'Imagining the Imperial Mediterranean', in B.J. Gibson & T.E.H. Harrison (eds.) *Polybius and His World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford: 337–52.
- Radice, B. (1968) 'Pliny and the *Panegyricus*', *G&R* 15: 166–72 (reprinted in Rees 2012).
- Rajak, T. (1973) 'Justus of Tiberias', *CQ* 23: 345–68.

- . (1983) *Josephus*. London.
- Rambaud, A. (1870) *L'empire grec au dixième siècle: Constantin Porphyrogénète*. Paris.
- Rawson, E. (1985) *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London.
- Redondo, J. (2000) 'The Greek Literary Language of the Hebrew Historian Josephus', *Hermes* 128: 420–34.
- Rees, R.D. (2001) 'To be and not to be: Pliny's Paradoxical Trajan', *BICS* 45: 149–68.
- . (2007) 'Letters of recommendation and the rhetoric of praise', in A. Morrison & R. Morello (eds.) *Ancient Letters. Classical and late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: 149–68.
- . (2010) 'Words of praise', *Millennium* 7: 9–28.
- . (2011a) 'Afterwords of praise', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge 2011: 175–88.
- . (2011b) 'The whole truth? *laudationes* in the courtroom', in C. Smith and R. Covino (eds.) *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*. Swansea: 83–98.
- . ed. (2012) *Latin Panegyric. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford.
- . (2013) 'Pacatus the poet doing Plinian prose', in Gibson and Rees (eds.) *Pliny the Younger in Late Antiquity. Arethusa* 46.2: 136–48.
- Reinhold, M. (1988) *From Republic to Principate. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49–52 (36–29 B.C.)*. Atlanta.
- Rémy, B. (1988) *Les fastes sénatoriaux des provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C.–284 ap. J.-C.) Pont-Bithynie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Lycie-Pamphylie et Cilicie*. Istanbul-Paris.
- . (1991) 'La place de la légion III Augusta dans la carrière des sénateurs affectés dans les provinces romaines d'Asie Mineure au haut empire', *AntAfr* 27: 69–73.
- Reynolds, J. (1959) 'Four inscriptions from Roman Cyrene', *JRS* 49: 95–101.
- Rich, J.W. (1989) 'Dio on Augustus', in A. Cameron (ed.) *History as Text. The Writing of Ancient History*. London: 87–110.
- . (1996) 'The Origins of the Second Punic War', in T.J. Cornell, B. Rankov, & P. Sabin (eds.) *The Second Punic War: A Reappraisal*, *BICS Suppl. series* 67. London: 1–37.
- Richardson, J.S. (2012) *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: The Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the empire*. Edinburgh.
- Rigsby, K.A. (1996) *Asyilia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Robert, L. (1929) 'Recherches épigraphiques, I. "Ἀριστος Ἑλλήνων"', *REA* 31: 13–20 and 225–6 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* 2): 758–67.
- . (1977) 'La titulature de Nicée et de Nicomédie: la gloire et la haine', *HSCPh* 81: 1–39.
- . (1978) 'Documents d'Asie Mineure', *BCH* 102: 395–543.

- Robert, L. and J. Robert (1954) *La Carie. Histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques*. Paris.
- Roche, P. (ed.) (2011a) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- . (2011b) 'Pliny's thanksgiving', in P. Roche (ed.) *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*. Cambridge: 1–28.
- Rochette, B. (1997) *Le Latin dans le monde grec*. Brussels.
- . (2011a) 'Le biliguisme et la politique linguistique des empereurs romains sous le principat' in J.B. Torres Guerra (ed.) *Utroque sermone nostro. Bilingüismo Social y Literario en el Imperio de Roma. Social and literary bilingualism in the Roman Empire*. Pamplona: 13–27.
- . (2011b) 'Language policies in the Republic and Empire', in J. Clackson (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford: 549–63.
- Rogers, G. (1991). *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos. Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London.
- Romm, J. (2010) ed. *The Landmark Arrian. The Campaigns of Alexander*. New York.
- Rönning, C. (2007). *Herrscherpanegyrik unter Trajan und Konstantin. Studien zur symbolischen Kommunikation in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Tübingen.
- Roques, D. (1990) *Herodien, Histoire des Empéreur romains: De Marc-Aurèle à Gordien III (180 ap. J.-C.–238 ap. J.-C.)*, traduit et commenté, postface de Luciano Canfora. Paris.
- . (1994) 'Le vocabulaire politique d'Herodien', *Ktéma* 15: 35–71.
- Rosand, D. (1990) 'Ekphrasis and the Generation of Images', *Arion* 1: 61–105.
- Rossi, A. (2010) 'Ab Vrbe Condita: Roman History on the Shield of Aeneas', in B.W. Breed, C. Damon, & A. Rossi (eds.) *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars*. Oxford: 145–56.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I. (1957) *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Rowe, C.K. (2009) *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. Oxford.
- Rudd, N. (1986) *Themes in Roman Satire*. London.
- Russell, A. (2012). 'Aemilius Paullus Sees Greece: Travel, Vision, and Power in Polybius', in C. Smith & L.M. Yarrow (eds.) *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*. Oxford: 152–67.
- Saïd, S. ed. (1991) *Hellenismos: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité Grecque*. Leiden.
- Sailor, D. (2008) *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*. Cambridge.
- Salmeri, G. (2000) 'Dio, Rome and the Civic Life of Asia Minor', in S. Swain (ed.) *Dio Chrysostom, Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*. Oxford: 53–92.
- Salomies, O. (1975) 'Die Herkunft der senatorischen Tineii', *ZPE* 60: 199–202.
- Sandnes, K.O. (1993) 'Paul and Socrates: The Aim of Paul's Areopagus Speech', *JSNT* 50: 13–26.

- Santoro L'hoir, F. (2006) *Tragedy, Rhetoric, and the Historiography of Tacitus' Annals*. Ann Arbor.
- Schmitz, T. (1997). *Bildung und Macht* (Zetemata 97). Munich.
- . (2009) 'Narrator and audience in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*', in E. Bowie & J. Elsner (eds.) *Philostratus*. Oxford: 49–68.
- Schwartz, S. (1986) 'The Composition and Publication of Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* Book 7', *HThR* 79: 373–86.
- Scully, S. (2003) 'Reading the Shield of Achilles: Terror, Anger, Delight', *HSCP* 101: 29–47.
- Seaford, R. (2006) *Dionysos*. London.
- Seelentag, G. (2004) *Taten und Tugenden Traians*. Stuttgart.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. (1966) *The Letters of Pliny. A Social and Historical Commentary*. Oxford.
- . (1967) *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*. Cambridge.
- . (1978) *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial period* (Hypomnemata Heft 51). Göttingen.
- Shochat Y. (1979–80) 'Recruitment to the legio II Parthica', *SCI* 5: 245–249.
- Shorrock, R. (2010) *The Myth of Paganism*. London.
- Sidebottom, H. (1998) 'Herodian's Historical Methods and Understanding', *ANRW* II.34.4: 2775–836.
- Sisti, F. & A. Zambrini eds. (2001–04) *Arriano: Anabasi di Alessandro I–II*. Milan.
- Slater, W.J. (1976) 'Symposium at Sea', *HSCPh* 80: 161–170.
- Sleeman, M. (2009) *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts*. Cambridge.
- Sordi, M. (1965) 'Alessandro e i Romani', *RIL* 99: 435–462, reprinted in M. Sordi *Scritti di storia romana* 2002. Milano: 153–170.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. (1996) 'Roman Corinth: the formation of a colonial elite', in *Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Finnish Institute and the Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Athens 7–9 September 1993: 167–182.
- Spencer, D. (2009) 'Roman Alexanders: epistemology and identity', in W. Heckel & L.A. Tritle (eds.) *Alexander the Great. A New History*. Oxford: 251–274.
- Stadter, P.A. (1980) *Arrian of Nicomedia*. Chapel Hill.
- Stavenhagen, K. (1922) *Herodiani ab excessu divi Marci libri octo* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). Leipzig.
- Sterling, G.E. (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden.
- Stern, M. (1987) 'Josephus and the Roman Empire as Reflected in the Jewish War', in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.) *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Leiden: 71–80.
- Stertz, S.A. (1993) 'Semper in omnibus varius: the Emperor Hadrian and intellectuals', *ANRW* II.34.1: 612–28.
- Still, J.I. (1923) *Paul on Trial: A New Reading of the History in the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles*. London.

- Streeter, B.L. (1930) *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London.
- Syme, R. (1938) review of Durry *JRS* 28: 217–24.
- . (1946) review of A. Stein, *Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien*, *JRS* 36: 159–168.
- . (1958) *Tacitus 1–2*. Oxford.
- . (1960) ‘Pliny’s less successful friends’, *Historia*. 9: 362–79.
- . (1968) ‘People in Pliny’, *JRS* 58: 135–51.
- . (1982a) ‘The Career of Arrian’, *HSCP* 86: 181–211 (Reprinted in *Roman Papers IV*. Oxford: 21–49).
- . (1982b) ‘Greeks Invading the Roman Government’ The Seventh Stephen J. Brademas, Sr. lecture (Hellenic College Press). Brookline Ma: 1–30 (Reprinted in *Roman Papers IV*. Oxford: 1–20).
- . (1985a) ‘Correspondents of Pliny’ *Historia*. 34: 324–59.
- . (1985b), ‘Hadrian as Philhellene. Neglected aspects’ in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/3*: 341–362 Reprinted in *Roman Papers V*. Oxford: 546–562).
- . (1987) ‘Antonine Government and Governing Class’, *Scienze della Antichità* 1: 624–641. (Reprinted in *Roman Papers V*. Oxford: 668–88).
- . (1999) *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans, 80 B.C.–A.D. 14* (ed. A.R. Birley). Exeter.
- Swain, S.C.R. (1988) ‘Plutarch’s *Philopoemen* and *Flaminius*’, *ICS* 13: 335–47.
- . (1990) ‘Hellenic culture and the Roman heroes of Plutarch’, *JHS* 110: 126–45.
- . (1996) *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford.
- . (1999) ‘Defending Hellenism: Philostratus’ In *Honour of Apollonius*, in M.J. Edwards, M. Goodman & S.R.F. Price (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: 157–96.
- . (2004) ‘Bilingualism and biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto and Gellius’, in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds.) *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford: 3–40.
- . (2009) ‘Culture and nature in Philostratus’, in E. Bowie & J. Elsner (eds.) *Philostratus*. Cambridge: 33–46.
- Talbert, C.H. (1974) *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula.
- Talbert, R.J.A. (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome*. Princeton.
- Tannehill, R.C. (1986/1990) *The Narrative unity of Luke-Acts: a Literary Interpretation*; 2 vols. Philadelphia.
- Taplin, O.P. (1980) ‘The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*’, *G&R* 27: 1–21.
- Tarrant, H. (2003) ‘Athletics, competition and the intellectual’, in D.J. Phillips & D. Pritchard (eds.) *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, Swansea: 353–65.
- Tell, H. (2007) ‘Sages at the games: intellectual display and dissemination of wisdom in ancient Greece’, *Cl. Ant.* 26: 249–75.

- . (2011) *Plato's Counterfeit Sophists*. Cambridge MA.
- Thomas, M.L. (2004) '(Re)locating Domitian's Horse of Glory: The *Equus Domitiani* and Flavian Urban Design', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 49: 21–46.
- Tomlin, R.S.O. (1991) 'Inscriptions from Roman Britain', *Britannia* 22: 221–311.
- Tonnet, H. (1988) *Recherches sur Arrien. Sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes* V. 1–2. Amsterdam.
- Torregaray Pagola, E. (2009) '*Legatorum facta*: la ejemplaridad de los embajadores romanos', *Veleia* 26: 126–52.
- Torres Guerra J.B. (2011) '*Imperialis diglossia*', in J.B. Torres Guerra (ed.) *Utrouque sermone nostro. Bilingüismo Social y Literario en el Imperio de Roma. Social and literary bilingualism in the Roman Empire*. Pamplona: 7–10.
- Tränkle, H. (1977) *Livius und Polybios*. Basel.
- Troisi, F.F. (2005) 'La divinizzazione di Alessandro Magno. Testimonianze epigraphiche', *Epigraphica* 67: 23–34.
- Venini, P. (1952) 'Le parole greche nell'epistolario di Plinio', *RIL* 85: 259–69.
- Ventrella, G. (2011) 'Mélancomas et Titus au Gymnase de la Vertu: Dion Chrysostome (Or. 28) et la *Paideia* du Prince', *C & M* 62: 185–206.
- Ventrux, O. (2013) *Les élites politiques et sociales de Pergame. Recherches sur les couches dirigeantes d'une ancienne capitale royale à l'époque romaine (133 av. J.-C.–284 apr. J.-C.)*. Diss., Université de Nantes.
- Versnel, H. S. (1970) *Triumphus*. Leiden.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1984) 'Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes', in *Histoire D'Alexandre: L'anabase d'Alexandre le Grand et L'Inde traduit du grec par Pierre Savinel suivi de Flavius Arrien Entre Deux Mondes par P.Vidal-Naquet*. Paris: 309–94.
- Walaskay, P.W. (1983) '*And So We Came to Rome*': *The Political Perspective of St Luke* (Cambridge).
- Walbank, F.W. (1944) 'The causes of Greek decline', *JHS* 64: 10–20.
- . (1957–1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. Oxford.
- . (1975) 'Sympleke: Its Role in Polybius' Histories', *YCS* 24: 197–212.
- . (1995) 'Polybius and Josephus', in C. Schubert & K. Brodersen (eds.), *Rom und der Griechische Osten*. Stuttgart: 273–85.
- Wallace, R. & Williams, W. eds. (1993) *The Acts of the Apostles: A Companion*. London.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1983) *Suetonius*. London.
- Walton, C.S. (1929) 'Oriental senators in the service of Rome: a study of imperial policy down to the death of Marcus Aurelius', *JRS* 19: 38–66.
- Ward, J.S. (2007) 'Roman Greek: Latinisms in the Greek of Flavius Josephus', *CQ* 57: 632–49.
- Wardle, D. (2011) 'The blame game: an aspect of handling military defeat in the early principate', *Hermes* 139: 42–50.

- Warmington, B. (1969) *Nero. Reality and Legend*. London.
- Warren, L.B. (1970) 'Roman Triumphs and Etruscan Kings: The Changing Face of the Triumph', *JRS* 60: 49–66.
- Weiss, J. (1897) *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen.
- Watts, E.J. (2006) *City and school in late antique Athens and Alexandria*. Berkeley.
- White, P. (2009). 'Bookshops in the Literary Culture of Rome', in W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (eds.) *Ancient Literacies*. Oxford: 268–287.
- Whitmarsh, T. (1998) 'Reading power in Roman Greece: the *paideia* of Dio Chrysostom', in Y.L. Too & N. Livingstone (eds.) *Pedagogy and Power*. Cambridge: 192–213.
- . (2001) *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
- . (2004) 'Philostratus', in I. de Jong, R. Nünlist & A. Bowie (eds.) *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden: 423–39.
- . (2005) *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford.
- . (2007) 'Prose literature and the Severan dynasty', in S. Swain, S. Harrison, & J. Elsner, (eds.) *Severan Culture*. Cambridge: 29–51.
- . ed. (2010) *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge.
- . (2010) 'Thinking local', in *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, (ed.) T. Whitmarsh. Cambridge: 1–16.
- Whittaker, C.R. (1969) *Herodian: with an English Translation I–II* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA.
- Whitton, C. (2012), "Let us tread our path together". Tacitus and the Younger Pliny', in V. Pagán (ed.) *A Companion to Tacitus*. Oxford: 345–68.
- . (2013) *Pliny the Younger. Epistles Book II*. Cambridge.
- Wilkins, J. (2000). 'Dialogue and Comedy: the Structure of the Deipnosophistae', in D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.) *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter: 23–37.
- Williams, K. (2012) 'Tacitus' Senatorial Embassies of 69 CE', in V. Pagán (ed.) *A Companion to Tacitus*. Oxford: 212–36.
- Williams, M. (1998) 'The Structure of the Jewish Community in Rome', in M. Goodman (ed.) *Jews in a Greco-Roman World*. Oxford: 215–28.
- Wirszubski, C.H. (1950) *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome During the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge.
- Wirth, G. (1974) 'Arrian und Trajan—Versuch einer Gegenwartsdeutung', *StudClas* 16: 169–209.
- Woodman, A.J. (1983) *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative* (2.41–93). Cambridge.
- . (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. Beckenham.

- . (1998) *Tacitus Reviewed*. Oxford.
- . (2008, second edition) (tr.) *Tacitus: The Annals*. Indianapolis and Cambridge.
- . (2009) 'Tacitus and the contemporary scene' in A.J. Woodman (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to Tacitus* Cambridge: 31–43.
- . (2012) *From Poetry to History: Selected Papers* (Oxford).
- . (forthcoming) 'Tacitus and Germanicus: Monuments and Models'.
- Woodman, A.J. & Martin, R.H. (1996) *The Annals of Tacitus Book 3*. Cambridge.
- Woolf, G. (1994) 'Becoming Roman, staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East', *PCPS* 40: 116–43.
- . (1998) *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilisation in Gaul*. Cambridge.
- . (2003) 'City of Letters', in C. Edwards & G. Woolf (eds.) *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge: 203–221.
- . (2006) 'Playing games with Greeks: one Roman on Greekness', in D. Konstan and S. Saïd (eds.) *Greeks on Greekness: Viewing the Greek Past Under the Roman Empire*, Cambridge: 162–178.
- Woytek, E. (2006) 'Der *Panegyricus* des Plinius: Sein Verhältnis zum *Dialogus* und den *Historiae* des Tacitus und seine absolute Datierung', *WS* 119: 115–56.
- Wüst, E. 'Pantomimus', *RE* 18.3.833–69.
- Yamazaki-Ransom, K. (2010) *The Roman Empire in Luke's narrative*. London.
- Yavetz, Z. (1975) 'Reflections on Titus and Josephus', *GRBS* 16: 411–32.
- Zambrini, A. (2007) 'The Historians of Alexander the Great', in J. Marincola (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography I*. Oxford: 210–20.
- Zecchini, G. (1984) 'Alessandro Magno nella cultura dell'età antonina', in M. Sordi (ed.) *Alessandro Magno tra storia e mito*. Milan: 195–212.
- . (2005) 'Ambasciate e ambasciatori in Polibio', in E.P. Torregaray & J. Santos Yanguas (eds.) *Diplomacia y autorepresentación en la Roma antigua*. Vitoria: 11–23.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (2001) 'Visions and revisions of Homer', in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: 195–266.
- Ziethen, G. (1994) *Gesandte vor Kaiser und Senat. Studien zum römischen Gesandtschaftswesen zwischen 30 v. Chr. und 117 n. Chr.* Pharos: Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike, 2. St Katharinen.
- Zimmermann, M. (1999a) *Kaiser und Ereignis. Studien zum Geschichtswerk Herodians* (Vestigia, 52). Munich.
- . (1999b) 'Herodians Konstruktion der Geschichte und sein Blick auf das stadtrömische Volk', in M. Zimmermann (ed.) *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr. Kolloquium zu Ehren von Karl-Ernst Petzold (Juni 1998) anlässlich seines 80. Geburtstags* (Historia Einzelschriften, 127): Stuttgart: 119–44.

- . (1999c) 'Enkomion und Historiographie: Entwicklungslinien der kaiserzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung vom 1. bis zum frühen 3. Jh. n. Chr.', in M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr: Kolloquium zu Ehren von Karl-Ernst Petzold (Juni 1998) anlässlich seines 80. Geburtstags* (Historia Einzelschriften, 127). Stuttgart: 17–56.

Index

- Aburnius Severus, L. 49
Aburnius Torquatus, L. 50
Aburnius Tuscianus, L. 50
Achaëa 37, 42, 44–45, 48, 51–52, 52n, 53,
56–57, 61, 63, 124, 133, 138–139, 225
Achilles 60
Acmoneia 46–47, 49, 55, 68n, 69
Actium 44
Aëacus 253
Aëgina 176, 182
Aelian (sophist) 266
Aelianus 26, 26n
Aemilius Paullus 127n, 128, 128n
Aemilius Pius, M. 46
Aeneas 100, 104, 140n, 141
Aeschines 110, 261
Aeschylus 229
Aesculapius 131
Africa 10, 40, 54, 64
Agelus of Naupactus 125
Agricola 3, 5, 26, 27n, 140n
Agrippa 23–24, 30n
Agrippina 135
Albinus 238
Alexander the Great 15, 43, 178–179,
210–223
Alexander of Seleucia 58–59
Alexander Severus 10, 239–241, 244
Alexandria 47, 61, 77, 225, 235
Alexandria Troas 46, 49, 55, 65–66, 66n, 69,
75–76
Alfius Olympiacus, M. 67n
Amblada 66, 66n
Amaseia 65–66, 66n, 67, 67n
Amastris 66, 66n, 67, 67n
Ameilius Iuncus, L. 77
Ananias 91
Anatolia 225
Anazarbus in Cilicia 68
Ancyra 66, 66n, 67, 67n
Anicius Maximus, P. 74
Anicius Maximus, P. f. Ser. Maximus 74
Annas 86
Antigonus cos. Suff. C. 225 CE 53, 53n
Antigonus II Gonatas 138n
Antioch 225, 235, 238, 248–250, 252
Antioch ad Daphne 65, 65n
Antioch ad Hippium 68, 68n
Antioch ad Pisidiam 55, 67, 67n, 69–71, 74,
78
Antiochus III Doson 130, 138n, 141
Antipas 94, 98, 103n
Antiphon 59
Antonius Albus, L. 72, 78
Antoninus Flamma 55, 69
Antoninus Pius 32, 35, 50, 195, 239
Antonius Polemo, M. 48, 128, 138
Antonius Zeno, L. 46–47
Antony 128, 131n, 138, 139
Apamea in Bithynia 56, 58, 71
Apamea on Orontes 76
Apamea in Syria 68
Aphrodisias 74, 78, 131
Apollo 18n, 31, 248–250, 252, 270
Apollonius 34, 35, 249–250, 254, 264
Apollonius of Naucratis 53
Apuleius 151n, 166
Aquileia 242
Arabia 45, 67, 68, 68n
Aratus from Sicyon 62
Arca Caesarea 10
Ares 59
Arethusa 68, 68n
Argos 127
Aristides 13, 33, 34n, 36, 39, 51n, 58, 59–60,
60n, 61
Aristocles 264
Aristonicus 131
Aristophanes 229
Aristotle 21, 171, 178–179, 233
Armenia 45n
Arrian 1–3, 5–7, 9, 15, 52, 59, 78, 210–223
Arrius Antoninus 109
Arruntius Caludianus, M. 56, 73
Artabazus 57
Artemidorus 121
Artemis 97
Articuleius 9
Asia, the province 8, 23, 42, 45, 48, 51n, 54,
55–57, 59, 61, 78, 124, 128, 132n, 133, 135, 141

- Asia Minor 40, 42, 56, 63, 63n, 66–67, 68, 70,
 72–73, 75–76, 125, 135n
 Asopus 62n
 Aspendus 67, 67n
 Assyria 45
 Ateius Capito 201
 Athenaeus 202, 206–209
 Athens 15, 32, 32n, 52, 61, 67, 73, 75, 127, 127n,
 232, 163–192, 211, 262–265
 Atidius Geminus 139
 Attaleia 55, 69–70, 72, 72n, 77
 Atticus 173–174, 181
 Augustine 6
 Augustus, Octavian 17, 23–24, 26, 26n,
 28–30, 30n, 32, 37, 39, 45–46, 52, 86–88, 92,
 128, 131–132, 144n, 151, 159, 201
 Aulus Gellius 9, 15, 163–192, 263, 266
 Auranitis 68

 Baetica 9, 57, 61
 Balbinus 242, 244
 Balbura 68, 68n
 Barnabas 89, 93–94
 Batilus of Alexandria 115
 Berenice 97–98, 100
 Beroea 66n
 Berytus (Beirut) 57, 66, 71–72, 193–194
 Bethlehem 87–88, 100
 Bithynia 1, 51n, 54, 196
 Bosphorus 142
 Britain 3, 49, 51, 60
 Brundisium 168
 Brutus 188–189
 Byzantium 59, 142, 225

 Caclouma 67, 67n
 Caecilia Tertulla 55
 Caecilius Metellus, Q. 127
 Caesar 32, 131–132, 138
 Caesarea 66
 Caesarea in Algeria 10
 Caiaphas 86
 Calgacus 4
 Caligula (Gaius) 17, 18n, 25, 25n, 29, 32n,
 47, 221
 Callicrates 137, 137n
 Callinus 41
 Calliopolis 68n

 Calpurnius Longus, L. 70
 Calpurnius Rufus, M. 55, 69, 78
 Campania 53
 Camurius Iustus, T. 46
 Capernaum 89
 Cappadocia 1, 5, 45n, 48–50, 56
 Caracalla 10, 18n, 25, 25n, 35, 35n, 42–44, 53,
 53n, 194, 197–199, 209, 225, 235 256–258,
 226, 227–229, 239
 Caria 49, 50
 Caristianus Iulianus, C. 74
 Caristianus Fronto, C. 55, 70, 74
 Caristianus Paulinus, C. 74
 Carthage 125
 Cassius Dio 10, 13, 18n, 23–26, 26n, 28–30,
 30n, 31, 37, 53, 146n, 216, 217n, 224, 226–227,
 231, 240, 245, 255n
 Cassius Petraeus, L. 62
 [Ca]tilius Longus 56, 58, 71
 Catilius Severus Iulianus Reginus, L. 51n, 75
 Catullus 178
 Celsus 201, 203
 Chaereas 44
 Chaeremonianus of Tralles 62
 Chaeronea 62n
 Chalcedon 142, 225
 Chalcis 67, 67n
 Chariton 44
 Chrysippus 205
 Cicero 9, 15, 112n, 117, 150n, 163, 164–166,
 173–175, 180–183, 189, 192, 196–197, 199n
 Cilicia 45, 54, 67, 196, 199n
 Cimon 253
 Claudiopropolis 67, 68n
 Claudius 5, 7–9, 17, 30, 46–47, 128, 128n,
 141–142
 Claudius Balbillus, Ti 46, 46n
 Claudius Charidemus Philometor, Ti 49
 Claudius Chionis 48
 Claudius Democrates, Ti 46–47
 Claudius Herodes, Ti 73
 Claudius Philostratus 48
 Claudius Polycrates, Ti 62
 Claudius Priscus, Ti 48
 Claudius Sacerdos Iulianus 72
 Claudius Severus, C. 75
 Claudius Tuendianus Magnus, Ti 49
 Commagene 75

- Commodus 10, 17, 25, 28–29, 60, 226, 229n,
 237, 239, 243
 Conana 66, 66n
 Corinth 17, 32, 52, 61, 68n, 90, 127, 182–183, 263
 Cormasa 66n
 Cornelius the centurion 89, 93
 Cornelius Pulcher, Cn. 52–53, 61–62
 Cornelius Scipio, L. 130, 132, 136
 Cos 46–47, 126, 135, 141–142
 Crassus, L. 116, 180, 188
 Cratippus 173–175
 Cremutius Cordus 139
 Crete 44, 55
 Crimea 1
 Critias 264
 Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus, L. 60
 Curiatus Marternus 112
 Cusinius Messalinus, L. 49
 Cyprus 45
 Cyrene 44, 55, 69, 75
 Cyrus 131
 Cytheion 62n
 Cyzicus 225, 231–232
- Dacia 50, 57
 Damascus 83
 Damon 114n
 Danube 58
 Daphnis 52
 Dareius 58
 Decius 99
 Delphi 52, 249–250, 260–262
 Demetrius the silversmith 97
 Demosthenes 110, 171, 205, 262
 Diana Limnatis 137
 Dias of Ephesus 59, 67, 71
 Dido 193
 Dio of Prusa (Chrysostom) 11–13, 16, 17, 18,
 20–23, 25–26, 30, 35–37, 58, 59, 104, 110,
 219n, 230, 232–233, 235–236, 252, 260, 262,
 267n
 Diocletian 99
 Diodorus Siculus 146, 214
 Dionysias in the Fayûm 6
 Dionysus 93, 103
 Domitian 10, 16–17, 18, 18n, 20, 22–23, 26–30,
 36, 56, 59, 99–100, 110–111, 114–115, 115n, 116,
 116n, 117–121, 148n, 121–123, 254
- Domitius Heron, T. 51n
 Domitius Iulianus, P. 51n
 Domitius Philippus 53n
 Domitius Proculus, L. 51
 Drusus 129n, 140n
- Edessa 228
 Egnatius Quartus, L. 49
 Egypt 45, 48, 51, 51n, 52, 61
 Elagabalus 29, 228, 241, 243–244
 Elegeia 60
 Eleusis 208
 Elis 262
 Ennius 151n
 Ephesus 45–46, 48–49, 55–56, 97, 130, 197,
 199
 Epictetus 61, 167, 179n, 210–211, 221
 Epidaurus 57, 61
 Epirus 52, 61
 Eumenia 46–47
 Euphrates 109
 Euripides 81
 Europa 193
 Etruria 136–137
- Favorinus 255, 262, 266n, 267n, 269
 Felix the governor 97
 Festus the governor 97, 99–100
 Flamininus 127
 Flavius Philinus, T. 62, 62n
 Flavius Varus Hermocrates, T. 48
 Frontinus 119
 Fronto 9, 122, 220
- Gadara 67, 67n
 Gaius (jurist) 195
 Gaius Gracchus 116–117
 Galatia 45, 56
 Galba 129n
 Galilee 86
 Gallienus 45
 Gallio proconsul of Achaëa 96, 98
 Gaul 61
 Gavius Balbus, P. 49
 Gergithus 136
 Germania Superior 48–49, 65
 Germanicus 127n, 128, 128n
 Germany 52

- Geta 239, 35n
 Glycon 60
 Gordian/s 235–236, 241–243, 246, 247–255, 269
 Gorgias 259, 262
 Greece 8, 13, 17, 23, 26, 31–32, 32n, 37, 43, 59, 61, 63n, 80, 109, 111, 125, 127, 127n, 139n
 Gytheion 62n
- Hadrian 1, 1n–2, 5, 9–10, 25–26, 32, 37, 37n, 44, 57, 61, 108–109, 126n 201, 203, 210, 213, 216, 219, 220, 255, 258, 269
 Hadrian of Tyre 264, 266
 Hadrian Pulcher 52
 Heliodorus 257–258
 Heliopolis 67, 67n
 Helvidius 26, 26n
 Heraclea Lyncestis 65
 Heraclea ad Salbacum 49–50
 Herculaneum 61–62
 Hercules/Heraclēs 10, 44, 91, 113
 Hermocrates of Phocaea 59
 Hermogenes 254
 Herod 86
 Herod Agrippa I. 90, 93, 96–98, 100
 Herodes Atticus 167–168, 191, 248, 250–251, 253, 262–266
 Herodian 15, 43, 224–245
 Herodotus 41, 83, 87, 104, 172, 213–214, 227, 264
 [Ps.] Hesiod 155n, 157
 Hierapolis in Phrygia 66n, 67, 67n, 68, 68n
 Hippias 259, 262, 267n
 Hippodromus 262, 264
Historia Augusta 220
 Homer 21, 151, 156–159, 161–162, 205
 Horace 149n, 150n, 166, 226
 Hordeonius Lollianus, P. 59
- Iconium 66, 66n
 Ignotus 70
 Ilium 136, 225
 Illyricum (upper) 65
 Isauria 68
 Isinda 65–66
 Isocrates 59, 110, 259, 262
 Israel 81, 88
 Italy 30
- Iulius Agrippa, C. 76
 Iulius Alexander Berenicianus, C. 76
 Iulius Alexander, C. 54, 73
 Iulius Alexander Capito, Ti 48
 Iulius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, C. 54, 75
 Iulius Aquilla Polemaeanus, Ti 75
 Iulius Bassus, C. 57, 71
 Iulius, C. 74
 Iulius Candidus, Ti 77
 Iulius Candidus Caecilius Simplex, Ti 77
 Iulius Candidus Marius Celsus, Ti 56, 70
 Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus, Ti 46–47, 56, 64, 71
 Iulius Cornutus Tertullus, C. 72
 Iulius Epigoni, C. 46–47
 Iulius Eurycles, C. 52
 Iulius Eurycles L. Vibullius 57, 61, 74
 Iulius Fronto, C. 76
 Iulius Frugi, Ti 76
 Iulius Iulianus Alexander, Ti 77
 Iulius Maior Pythodorus, Sex 54, 57, 77
 Iulius Marinus Caecilius Simplex 57, 71–72
 Iunius Montanus, Ti 55, 69
 Iulius Nabus, C. 76
 Iulius Paullus 72
 Iulius Procleianus, L. 71
 Iulius Quadratus Bassus, C. 54, 56, 56n, 64, 73
 Iulius Quadratus, C. Antius A. 56, 56n, 71
 Iulius Spartiacus, C. 51–52
- Jacob 85
 Jason 101
 Jerusalem 79, 86, 89, 92, 94, 97, 99, 145, 147–148, 150, 152–162
 Jesus 79, 81–83, 85–96, 98–104
 John 86, 88–90
 Joseph 88
 Josephus 15, 146–162
 Judaea 45, 67, 76–77, 86, 100, 102, 145
 Julia Domna 34, 200, 249, 254, 256
 Julianus 201, 203
 Julius of the Augustan Cohort 87–88
 Julius the humane 90
 Julius Genitor 121
 Jupiter 85, 111

- Justinian 201n
- Kadmos 193
- Laconia 137n
- Laodicea 46–47
- Laranda 65–66, 66n
- Lasthenes of Apamea 58
- Lebanon 10
- Leonidas 44, 92
- Lepcis Magna 10, 193
- Liris Valley 53
- Livia 55
- Livy 83–84, 87, 125, 125n, 127–128, 128n, 130, 134, 136–138, 141, 143, 186, 216, 221
- Lucian 60, 116n, 211, 260
- Lucilius Capito 135
- Lucius 254–255
- Lucius Verus 42, 61
- Luke 14, 79–82, 84, 87–88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 101, 103–104
- Lycia 45, 50, 54–56
- Lydda 104
- Lyon 10
- Lysanias of Abilene 86
- Lysias 110, 259
- Lystra 93
- Macedonia 44, 51, 52n, 53, 53n, 56, 65–66, 67, 67n
- Macrinus 10, 225, 235, 239, 241, 245
- Macrobius 151n
- Maecenas 23–24, 26, 29, 116
- Magnesia 46–47, 49, 130–131
- Malius Reginus, L. 46
- Malta 90
- Manlius Vulso 142
- Mantineia 62n
- Marathon 263
- Marcian 204–205
- Marcus Celer, L. 77
- Marcus Aurelius 10, 30, 35, 42, 42n, 43–44, 50, 59, 60–61, 212, 226, 233, 244, 252, 254–256, 258
- Mardonius 62
- Marius 208
- Martial 119
- Martialis 228–229
- Mary 88, 100
- Masada 145n
- Massilia 140n
- Mauretania Tingitana 50
- Maximinus Thrax 235, 240–242
- Meander valley 57
- Megalopolis 13
- Meherdates 128
- Memmius Regulus 52n
- Memmius Theocles, P. 52, 52n
- Menander Rhetor 114n
- Menemachus of Sardis 62
- Meniscus 129n
- Mesopotamia 45
- Messene, Messenia 137–139, 141
- Mestrius P.F. Maecianus 66
- Miletus 48, 55, 68, 68n, 70
- Miltiades 253
- Mithridates 127, 188
- Mnesibulus of Elatea 43
- Moesia Inferior 57, 67
- Moesia Superior 49, 52n, 55–56, 66–67
- Mopsuestia 67n
- Mummius 139n
- Mylias 66, 66n
- Mytilene 57, 76
- Nabataea 68, 68n
- Naples 53
- Narbonensis 56
- Naupactus 125
- Nero 10, 17, 25, 30, 32n, 37, 44, 52, 80n, 87, 90, 93, 99–100, 103, 109, 111, 116, 118–119, 127, 151n, 161, 221
- Nerva 25–28, 30, 48, 114, 148n, 233
- Nicaea 51, 60, 66, 126n, 135n, 225, 231–232
- Nicomedia 1, 9, 51, 51n, 67, 67n, 68, 68n, 78, 126n, 135n, 210, 212–213, 225, 231
- Nicopolis 17, 52, 65–66, 66n, 67
- Ninica 65
- Numa 206
- Nysa 57, 77
- Olympia 259, 261–263, 270
- Otho 27, 129n
- ‘Oulpianos’ 202, 206–208
- Ovid 149n, 166

- Pacatus Drepanius 108, 108n, 118
 Palestine 94
 Pallantium 32
 Palmyra 68, 68n
 Pamphylia 50, 54–56
 Pannonia Inferior 50, 66, 68n
 Pannonia Superior 49, 66
 Pantikapaion 1
 Papinianus 204
 Parthia 128n
 Patrai 17
 Paul 79, 80n, 81, 83–84, 86–91, 93, 95–104
 Paulus Socraticus 100
 Pausanias 13, 13n, 17, 32, 32n, 33, 37, 37n,
 180n, 183n, 193n
 Pelagonia 65–66, 66n
 Peloponnese 137
 Peregrinus 260
 Pergamum 46, 56, 67, 71, 73, 76, 131, 197
 Perge 55, 70, 72, 72n, 74
 Perpenna 131
 Perseus 137
 Persia 253, 263
 Persius 151n
 Pertinax 237–238, 240, 244
 Pescennius Niger 193n, 225, 230–232, 235,
 238, 240
 Pessinus 66, 66n, 67, 67n
 Peter 89, 91, 93, 104
 Phazemon 66, 66n
 Philadelphia 67, 67n
 Philip the Great 59
 Philip II 138
 Philip V 125, 128, 130, 136
 Philippi 65–67, 89, 96
 Philippus 52
 Philiscus 35, 256
 Philiscus of Thessaly 53n
 Philostratus 13n, 15, 17, 33–37, 51n, 58–59,
 59n, 246–270
 Phocaea 48
 Photios 224
 Phraates 128n
 Phrygia 56, 71
 Pilades of Cilicia 115
 Pinarius, Q. 46
 Pinthias 114n
 Piso, Gn. 127–128
 Plancius Varus, M. 55, 70, 73
 Plato 41, 170, 175, 177–178, 205, 252n
 Pliny the Elder 147–148, 215n
 Pliny the Younger 4, 9, 14, 16n, 18–20, 20n,
 21–22, 25–30, 37, 57, 105, 105n, 106, 106n,
 107, 107n, 108, 108n, 110–122, 122n, 123,
 196–197, 199, 219, 236, 244–245
 Plutarch 13, 13n, 17, 31–33, 36–37, 52–53, 58,
 61–62, 81, 127, 164–166, 175, 177, 187–190,
 208, 210, 219, 249–250, 260, 270
 Polemaeanus 48
 Polemo 261–263
 Polybius 14, 39, 124–125, 128n, 125n, 126–127,
 137, 143, 147, 215n
 Pompeiopolis 75
 Pompeius Hermippus, Cn. 48
 Pompeius Macer, Q. 55, 69
 Pompeius Marcrinus Theophanes, M.
 57, 76
 Pompey the Great 55, 188–189, 143
 Pontius Pilate 86, 93–94
 Pontus 66, 67, 67n
 Pontus et Bithynia 5, 35n, 45, 51, 67
 Porcius Cato, M. 130–137
 Priene 138n
 Priscus 108
 Prusa 16, 22, 68n
 Prusias ad Hypium 51, 51n
 Publius the hospitable 90
 Pupienus 229n, 242–244

 Quinctilius, Sex 75–76
 Quintilian 8, 108, 110n, 121

 Raetia 51
 Rhodes 39, 60, 126
 Rhoeteum 136
 Rome 2–3, 10–11, 13, 30, 33, 36, 38, 43, 48, 53,
 60, 69, 78, 79–80, 80n, 81, 83–84, 86–88, 91,
 99–102, 104–106, 109–112, 116, 124–126, 128,
 131, 136–140, 140n, 142–143, 170, 178
 Athenaeus' banquet at 206–208
 Chair at 265–267
 Fire at 156
 Heliodorus at 258
 Parilia 207
 Praise of 243
 Triumph at 144–151, 153–159, 161–162

- Romulus 206
 Rutilius Rufus, R. 140
- Sabinus 206
 Sallust 235
 Sallustius Rufus, M. 74, 78
 Samos 49, 138n
 Sanhedrin 97
 Sapphira 91
 Sardis, (Sardes) 46, 48, 56, 68n, 71, 75, 78, 136–137
 Saul 89, 95, 100
 Scopelian 265, 267
 Scupi 67, 67n
 Sebaste in Phrygia 66, 66n
 Sebastopolis 66, 66n
 Sedatius Severianus, M. 60–61
 Sedatus 60
 Sempronius Rufus 110
 Seneca 9, 30, 81, 151n, 221
 Septimius Severus 10, 28, 193, 194, 200, 205, 230–232, 235, 238, 240, 244–245
 Sergius Paullus, L. 69, 70
 Sergius Paulus 89, 91, 97, 100
 Servenius Cornutus 55, 69
 Servilius Isauricus 131
 Sestius Pollio, P. 75
 Severus Alexander 194
 Sextus 254–255
 Sharon 104
 Sidon 90
 Silas 89, 96
 Silius Italicus 151n
 Simeon 88
 Simonides 40
 Sinope 66, 66n
 Smyrna 33n, 60, 136–137, 263, 265
 Socrates 233
 Sophocles 182
 Sosius Senecio 249
 Spain 5, 10, 51, 108, 135n
 Sparta 42, 52, 61, 62n, 63, 74, 141, 232, 263
 Statius 119
 Stephen the martyr 99
 Statilius Apollinarius, T. 50
 Statilius Attalus, T. 50
 Statilius Crito, T. 50
 Statilius Frontonianus, T. 50
- Statilius Solon, T. 50
 Stratonicea 130–131
 Stertinius Maximus, C. 47
 Stertinius, Q. 46
 Stertinius, Xenophon, C. 46
 Stobi 66, 66n, 67, 67n
 Suessa Aurunca 53, 53n
 Suetonius 7–8, 10, 26–27, 30–31, 111, 121, 134, 186n, 245
 Sulla 32n, 130, 132, 137, 188
 Sulpicius Severus 160
 Syria 45, 47–49, 54, 56–57, 61–62, 67–68, 68n, 70, 72, 193, 200
- Tacitus 1, 4–5, 15, 16n, 26–27, 27n, 28, 30, 37, 54, 112, 116, 118, 124, 126, 126n, 127, 127n, 128, 128n, 129–132, 132n, 133–138, 139n, 140, 140n, 141–143, 156, 158n, 160–161, 197n, 219n, 221, 222n, 224, 235, 245
 Tarentum 68n
 Taurus 170–173, 175, 185, 187, 190
 Tavium in Galatia 65, 65n
 Temenothyrae 49
 Terentius Junior 109
 Tertullus 101
 Theodosius 108, 114n, 118
 Theophanes of Mytilene 47n, 55, 69
 Theophilus 82, 84, 89
 Theophrastus 205
 Thespiae 42, 62
 Thessalonica 101
 Thessalonice 65, 67
 Thrace 40–41
 Thucydides 41, 43, 83, 101, 104, 224, 227, 235, 238n
 Tiberius 7, 27–28, 47–48, 86, 128, 128n, 129n, 131, 132n, 134–135, 135n, 139, 140n
 Timocrates 49
 Tiro 174, 177
 Titius Aristo 203
 Titius Justus the God-fearer 90
 Titus 148n, 149, 153, 157, 159
 Trachonitis 68, 68n, 86
 Trajan 5, 9–10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 19n, 20, 20n, 21–23, 25–30, 35–37, 48, 50, 52, 99, 105–107, 107n, 108, 110, 112–122, 196–197, 214, 218, 236
 Trapezus 1–3, 5
 Trebonius 174

- Tripolis Phoenicia 71, 77
 Troy 136
 Tyre 15, 90, 193, 200, 203, 208–209
 Tyrtæus 41

 Ulpian 15, 193–209
 Umbricius 119

 Valerius Flaccus 151n
 Valerius Maximus 8
 Valerius Messalla 48
 Valerius Naso 137
 Varro 177, 184n, 186
 Vedio Antoninus, P. 49
 Velleius Paterculus 151–152, 216
 Venus 131, 139, 139n
 Vespasian 13, 17, 25, 26–27, 27n, 32n, 34–35,
 37, 46–47, 56, 58, 121, 145–146, 148, 149, 159,
 254

 Vibius Salutaris, C. 46
 Vibius Severus 105, 106n, 109
 Vienne 111
 Vipstanus Messalla 112, 114, 116
 Virgil 148, 150n, 151n, 152, 153n, 156n, 158–159
 Vitellius 148n
 Voconius Romanus 105n, 107, 107n, 108
 Volcaci Moschus 140
 Vonones 128

 Xanthus in Lycia 56, 73
 Xenophon 1, 6, 41, 47, 205, 211, 233n, 141
 Xerxes 59, 214

 Zacchæus the tax collector 89
 Zama 130
 Zeugma 61
 Zeus 20–21
 Zonaras 140n

