

# Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic

Elizabeth Rawson



Duckworth

First published in 1985 by  
Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.  
The Old Piano Factory  
43 Gloucester Crescent, London NW1

© 1985 by Elizabeth Rawson

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

ISBN 0 7156 1968 3

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Rawson, Elizabeth

Intellectual life in the late Roman Republic

1. Rome—Intellectual life

I. Title

937'.05            DG254.2

ISBN 0-7156-1968-3

Photoset in North Wales by  
Derek Doyle & Associates, Mold, Clwyd.  
Printed in Great Britain by  
Unwin Brothers Limited, Old Woking

# Contents

DG  
2542  
R33  
1985

Preface

vii

## Part I. Intellectual Life in Rome and Italy

1. Romans and Greeks: a closer acquaintanceship	3
2. Rome and the Italian Background	19
3. Patterns of Intellectual Life	38
4. Greek Writers and their Readers	54
5. Intellectuals in Rome I	66
6. Intellectuals in Rome II	84
7. Towards Public Patronage	100

## Part II. The *Artes*

8. <i>Grammatica</i> : the study of language	117
9. <i>Dialectica</i>	132
10. Rhetoric	143
11. The Mathematical Arts	156
12. Medicine	170
13. Architecture and Allied Subjects	185
14. Law	201
15. Historiography and Allied Subjects	215
16. Antiquarianism	233
17. Geography and Ethnography	250
18. <i>Grammatica</i> : 'the part dealing with writers'	267
19. Philosophy	282
20. Theology and the Arts of Divination	298
Conclusion	317
Bibliography	326
Index	337

X2551271

Indagatio ipsa rerum habet oblectationem  
si vero aliquid occurrit quod veri simile videatur,  
humanissima completur animus voluptate.

Cicero *Academica* 2. 127

## Preface

This book is perhaps an arbitrary one; no complete defence can be given for what it includes and what it leaves out. Above all, intellectual life in the Ciceronian Age without Cicero himself must be Hamlet without the Prince; but though his presence will be felt throughout the work, as the main source for the period and sometimes as a necessary point of reference, there is no direct confrontation with his great achievement. That has often been assessed. The same is true of Lucretius (materialistic Horatio to Cicero's Hamlet, perhaps); and the account of Varro, who was to Petrarck, after Cicero and Virgil, *il terzo gran lume Romano*, and indeed (with Cicero and in this case Lucretius) author of one of the three master-works of the recent age to his near-contemporary Vitruvius, could have approached completeness only after a lifetime's work. Since, however, Varro touches the intellectual interests of his time at almost every point, and since he is less well-known than his two great fellows, I have tried to deal with him. Many of Varro's works are undatable, and where he is concerned our temporal limit has to be his death in 27 B.C. (he is perhaps unlikely to have formulated radically new approaches in extreme old age). I have also strained chronology to include Vitruvius, who greatly improves the balance of the book in terms of subject matter – though it can be honestly argued that much of his material was put together in the early thirties if not the forties, though only published, with its dedication to Augustus, in the twenties. Diodorus Siculus is more easily accommodated; he started writing about 60 B.C., and published in the thirties. But in general I have not considered the important triumviral period in its own terms, or the younger authors who emerged then, though I have not been able to resist using Horace's *Satires*, primarily for social history, and some of the minor figures considered may in fact belong to this period.

Fundamentally the book is concerned with figures of the second rank, and with general patterns. We read Cicero and Lucretius; we also read Catullus, Caesar (though not the fragments of his *De Analogia*) and Sallust; but we tend to know far too little of the intellectual, as opposed to the political, background to these writers. The Romans of this period had just learnt that, if one wishes to write about a subject, one must begin by defining it. 'Intellectual life' is not altogether easy to define. I had a number of definite questions in mind as I worked, however. What were the basic opportunities and constraints in intellectual activity? For example, where were the books and other documents, and who could use them? How far could one do without written materials? Who were the men who pursued the different branches of study – from what backgrounds did they come and how were they financed? Which scholars were Greek, which Roman – and is there a strict dividing line? Which can be called professionals and which amateurs? What were the

relations between these different classes? The role of the many learned Greeks who worked in Rome is, it emerges, not altogether easy to decide. Furthermore, what sort of activity was there outside the city, in the rest of Italy, and how closely integrated was any of it with what went on in the capital? While the last and most important task is to discover what intellectual objectives were pursued, irrespective of the breadth of the audience which might be expected, it is also vital to see what that audience in any case might be. And what changes came about in the period of over half a century with which we are dealing? To answer these questions at all it is necessary at present to turn to a large number of specialised studies, mostly not in the English language. This book tries to draw the threads together and (to change the metaphor) to draw as full a general picture as our inadequate evidence allows.

With the procedures of formal education I have not on the whole concerned myself; they are discussed in a number of works in English. The *grammatici*, rhetors and philosophers, their place in society and their doctrines, come within our purview, the methods by which they taught the young do not, though I have felt it important to say something about the extent to which young Romans went abroad for advanced studies. I have of course eschewed the creative arts, though not the history and criticism of these. There are two parts to the book: the first is roughly social history, the second the history of ideas. The latter part has proved hard to organise, for a period of incomplete specialisation, in which the influence of certain disciplines is felt in a number of fields. It is here too that the gaps in our evidence are most damaging, and I have perhaps aggravated the problem by being very cautious in *Quellenkritik*; there is no space to argue about uncertainties. For example, the name of Posidonius occurs not infrequently, but less often than would once have been thought proper. Many authors and ideas will of course have been known in Rome, of which the surviving literature gives us no hint. In this part of the book I also inevitably enter a number of fields in which I do not feel fully competent. Not very much that is new will be found in what I have to say about them, though an attempt to cover a wide spectrum of subjects does lead to certain new perspectives, and possibly even to the solution of some old problems. There are arguments against, as well as for, having a subject treated by a board of specialists. Certainly a cultivated Roman of the time would have had some knowledge of all or almost all the subjects discussed.

At any event, though I hope that there may be a number of new suggestions at various points in the work, it is meant to be in part a synthesis and in part simply descriptive. Few readers will be familiar even in outline with all fields of intellectual activity at this time, and a broad introductory account may prove useful. Indeed, that there is a need for such a book seemed to me to be proved by the immense amount that I learnt as I was writing it. For example, I did not know, and I do not think that many of those who concern themselves with the history or literature of the late Republic (as opposed to students of Hellenistic philosophy or Greek medicine) know that there is a case for arguing that the most influential Greek thinker at work in Rome in the first century B.C. was the doctor Asclepiades of Bithynia, and that his

theories about the cause of disease were probably familiar to most educated men.

The historian must make generalisations; it is the condition of his understanding his material. But a historical generalisation means nothing, is totally empty, without the concrete details from which it emerges and to which it lends significance. There are a number of phrases that we use somewhat glibly when talking of the first century B.C. at Rome. What does 'Graeco-Roman civilisation' really mean? Or 'increasing orientalisation'? Or 'the dominating influence of Stoicism'? How far can 'the practical Roman mind' really be contrasted with a more abstract Greek cast of thought? The answers given often rest on too narrow a basis, most often a purely literary one, or on the work of the far from typical Cicero, who, though he was less learned in some ways than certain of his contemporaries, transcended many of their limitations. Perhaps some of the material in this book can help us to start building more securely.

Probably no one would now agree with Mommsen's brilliant delineation of the period, at the end of his *History of Rome*, as one of headlong intellectual and artistic decline; we do not estimate untouched purity of national language and thought so high as he did (nor do we think it ever existed in Rome), and increased experience and growing sophistication so low. But how far can we argue that the period genuinely marks an advance on what went before? How far did it hold promise for the future, or which of its achievements were not, in later antiquity, to be surpassed? Were the seeds of decline really already there? I do not claim to answer all these large questions; but we should begin, at least, seriously to ask them. In any case, it will, I hope, appear that if the last age of the Roman Republic in Italy was not one of the great periods in the history of western thought, it was certainly one of immense and varied activity, busy with tasks of real importance for contemporaries, and sometimes for the men of later ages as well.

My first obligation is to the patience of Professor H. Lloyd-Jones and my publisher, who commissioned this book as a contribution to the *Classical Life and Letters* series, and who, in spite of the delayed appearance and increased bulk of the manuscript, agreed to go ahead with its publication. Among those to whom I have turned for advice, I owe particular gratitude to Professor J.A. Crook, who read the chapter on Jurisprudence, and to Professor J.E.G. Zetzel and Dr N. Horsfall, who at different stages went through drafts of the whole work; the bibliographic learning of the last-named has been especially valuable. Dr M.T. Griffin was so very good as to look through the proofs. Dr D. Cooper and Frances White helped me to make the index by computer. The British School at Rome kindly gave me permission to use material first published in *PBSR* 1978. Finally I must express my debt to the many scholars whose works I read but was unable to record in the bibliography, and apologise for the numerous gaps, superficialities and no doubt downright errors which still remain in the book.



PART I  
Intellectual Life in  
Rome and Italy



## CHAPTER ONE

# Romans and Greeks: a closer acquaintanceship

The first great intellectual flowering at Rome came in the fifties and forties B.C. Two of the great works singled out by Vitruvius,<sup>1</sup> Cicero's *De Oratore* and Lucretius' scientific poem, were written in the earlier decade, and the third, Varro's *De Lingua Latina*, in the later. One of the causes, paradoxically enough, was the political uncertainty of the time. The ills of the Republic stimulated attempts to analyse what had gone wrong or to try to find a cure: by considering the proper training for the statesman and orator, as Cicero did, or by establishing what had been the institutions and outlook of the *maiores*, all-wise and all-virtuous as they were believed to have been, as Varro tried to do in his antiquarian works. Even Lucretius was inspired in part by revulsion from the political life of his day, as other Epicurean writers may have been. In the forties Caesar's dictatorship favoured learning and the arts, and indeed began to give Greek intellectuals Roman citizenship, but it drove Cicero and Varro, and probably others (including perhaps the budding philosopher Sextius), into private life and authorship. Cicero claims to have inspired others to write, and urges friends in his letters to do so; Varro undoubtedly had a similar influence.

But there was also by now a much closer knowledge and understanding of Greek intellectual standards and achievements than there had been at the start of the first century B.C. It will be worth trying to trace some of the changes that had taken place since Cicero's boyhood. We are fortunate that he seems, in dialogues set in the past, to have avoided anachronisms with care and made a serious attempt to evoke the intellectual as well as social *milieu* of his interlocutors – though naturally the precise views advanced in the conversation are not to be attributed to them. In the *De Oratore*, set in 91 B.C. when the author himself was a precocious fifteen, he gives us something of a cross-section of aristocratic life in this period, more especially in the circles around the distinguished orators L. Crassus and M. Antonius, to which his own family had access. We scarcely have so full a picture again until Cicero's letters grow frequent in the fifties, though a few of the other dialogues, notably the *Brutus*, help to fill the gap.<sup>2</sup> But of the intellectual atmosphere of the seventies and sixties we still know too little, though the historian and

All works cited without author's name are by Cicero.

<sup>1</sup> Vitruv. 9 praef. 17.

<sup>2</sup> As does the *De Natura Deorum* and Book 5 of the *De Finibus*.

orator Sisenna emerges as a significant figure.

The world of Cicero's youth strikes us, in comparison with that of his later years, as decidedly immature, in spite of the galloping hellenisation of poetry, the visual arts, the way of life of the rich, and to some extent formal education too, during the second century. The prejudice against Greek learning never died out completely in Rome, but it was probably stronger in the early first century than fifty years later, if only in some quarters. We know that Cicero's grandfather subscribed to it (though his father did not), like the great Marius. And Cicero represents both Antonius and Crassus as concealing their knowledge of things Greek, though this may be partly because they really had less than Cicero, for the purposes of his dialogue, wants to credit them with possessing. Pliny's account of the famous doctor Asclepiades of Bithynia, recently dead in 91 as the *De Oratore* shows, suggests that he was the first Greek doctor of eminence to work in Rome, and that there was suspicion of Greek medicine to be overcome, though he did become very successful.<sup>3</sup>

It is a world in which, among the Romans themselves, specialisation and professionalism are only beginning to develop. The participants in the *De Oratore* look back nostalgically to such all-purpose sages as Sex. Aelius Catus, M<sup>o</sup>. Manilius and Cato the Censor, none of them consulted only on legal questions.<sup>4</sup> Pliny tells us of a senator called perhaps Manilius who in 97 B.C. published the first account in Latin of the phoenix; he was famed for his various learning, but owed nothing to any teacher – one cannot imagine such a thing being possible fifty years later, or advertised if it was.<sup>5</sup> Opportunistic teachers also felt that they could cater to various needs in one person; Suetonius says that all the earlier *grammatici* in Rome taught rhetoric as well as literature (though it is true that occasionally the two professions were combined in Greece too), and shortly before 91 Q. Aurelius Opillus had felt himself competent to dispense first philosophy, next rhetoric and finally *grammatica*.<sup>6</sup>

A certain number of prominent Romans are attested in the nineties as having a serious interest in philosophy. Q. Aelius Tubero, Scipio Aemilianus' nephew and pupil of the great Stoic Panaetius, was still alive, like those other Stoics of the same vintage, Rutilius Rufus and Q. Scaevola Pontifex. The *De Oratore* suggests that Q. Lutatius Catulus, consul of 101 B.C., had read some philosophy; he wrote poetry and history (though his literary 'circle' is largely a fiction).<sup>7</sup> Sex. Pompeius, son of the man who governed Macedonia in about

<sup>3</sup> *NH* 26.12ff.; Cic. *De Or.* 1.62. For ethnic and date, see E. Rawson, *CQ* (1982) 358.

<sup>4</sup> *De Or.* 3.133.

<sup>5</sup> *NH* 10.4: ultimately from Euhemerus, as the reference to Panchaea shows – an author certainly known in second-century Rome. Manilius, Mamilius or Manlius was perhaps also responsible for a description of an inscription at Dodona and a statue at Tarentum, and perhaps wrote on antiquities at Rome: Schanz-Hosius 1.605.

<sup>6</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 4.6, 6.1 (Opillus' subjects suggest a gradual decline in his prestige, perhaps due to increasing competition). But Pliny is almost certainly wrong to hold that Asclepiades first taught rhetoric in Rome (see n. 3 above).

<sup>7</sup> All we can say is that Licinius, once C. Gracchus' amanuensis, a *litteratus homo*, was a

118 and brother of the consul of 89 (and so uncle of Pompey the Great) avoided public life almost entirely – remarkable in an aristocrat of his generation – devoting himself to Stoic ethical philosophy, geometry and law.<sup>8</sup> C. Velleius, probably the first to make Epicureanism respectable in a senator, is already mentioned in the *De Oratore*; so are the two Lucilii Balbi, brothers and keen Stoics.<sup>9</sup> The lawyers and orators are beginning to split off from each other, and become more professional. But we shall see that all the Latin prose literature produced in this period was to seem only a little later clumsy and imperfect.

In 91 Rome was still, to some extent, provincial. There was undoubtedly a big Greek-speaking community there – even in 168, when the Macedonians were expelled from the city on the outbreak of war, large numbers were involved. Many such Greeks would have been traders or craftsmen, though some were certainly teachers. Where the upper class was concerned, there were few political hostages in Rome at this period, and few exiles (since these tended to be *ipso facto* anti-Roman). Indeed it looks as if the Romans were not very clear about how to deal with exiles when they did get them, the legal rules governing them being obscure and unfamiliar.<sup>10</sup> In the generation after Polybius and Panaetius it seems that few Greek thinkers or scholars of comparable distinction even visited Rome. In the desperate last years of the second century the visitor from the East who made the greatest impression was Battaces of Pessinus, priest of the Great Mother, with his prophecies of much-needed victory, while the Syrian divineress Martha was a hit with Roman ladies, and even with Marius. Rome's attention was directed primarily to Africa and the West, and to internal troubles. It is true that the doctor-philosopher Asclepiades was or became very famous, and seems to have attracted pupils from a wide area. The geographer Artemidorus of Ephesus came briefly to Rome, as ambassador for his city, which was appealing against the violence of the *publicani* and wanted to recover some territory,<sup>11</sup> while Posidonius of Apamea (and later of Rhodes), who was to be recognised as the greatest philosopher and polymath of his age, may have first visited Rome at this time during his early travels in the West, and made connections there. But there is no real evidence that either of these transient

---

dependant of Catulus (not identical with the critic Porcius Licinus); and that Catulus bought the educated slave Daphnis, a teacher or scholarly assistant. He favoured the Greek poet Archias (as others including the unliterary Marius did) and the Latin one Furius Antias; and wrote verse himself. A political background to the circle cannot be proved, nor a rival nationalistic and *popularis* one connected with Marius and the *rhetores Latini*, *pace* E. Gabba, *Athenaeum* (1953) 259. *De Or.* 3.182 suggests that Catulus has read some Aristotle, *Ac. Pr.* 2.12 that he was capable of making objections to Philo; he also wrote memoirs, see pp. 92, 228.

<sup>8</sup> *Brutus* 175.

<sup>9</sup> *De Or.* 3.78; also Crassus' friend M. Vigellius, *quicum Panaetio vixit*.

<sup>10</sup> *De Or.* 1.177.

<sup>11</sup> His *akmè* is 104-100; Strabo C183 suggests he was in Gaul before Marius was. He could conceivably have lectured in Rome when there on an embassy, as the philosophers did in 155 and was occasionally done in Greek cities too.

visitors had much impact.

The Greek intellectuals settled in Rome appear to be minor figures. An insignificant pupil of Panaetius is recorded as visiting Rome.<sup>12</sup> The noble M. Pupius Piso, according to the *De Oratore*, had a philosopher staying in his villa at Tusculum in 91, but this was Staseas, from no further off than Naples, and a Peripatetic, of a school to some extent in eclipse at this time. Cicero shows that Staseas laid weight on the need for external and bodily goods for the happy life, and had a fluent flashiness – indeed a willingness to improvise on any subject suggested to him – that made him well-known in the Rome of his day; but that in the eighties it was realised that he was inferior in philosophic argument to the famous Academic Antiochus.<sup>13</sup> There is no evidence that, as is often thought, the Epicurean Phaedrus was in Rome in the nineties, teaching young Cicero.<sup>14</sup>

On the other hand, it does not seem that many young Roman gentlemen yet went to Athens (or elsewhere in the Greek world) for serious study; true, one T. Albuclius appears to have done so, but had to face a barrage of ridicule, preserved in the satirist Lucilius, for his Greek manners, and his Epicurean beliefs do not seem to have been regarded as suitable for a senator.<sup>15</sup> It was acceptable to listen to a few lectures while passing through Athens on public business (as one was almost bound to do *en route* for the East), unless the anecdotes in the *De Oratore* which show great men doing this are desperate inventions by Cicero to give his characters some excuse for the learning he has to make them show. He tells us for example that L. Crassus, as quaestor, listened to various philosophers in Athens – under pressure from the enthusiastic young M. Marcellus, who just might, it is true, have been living in Athens rather than travelling with Crassus. Cicero describes or imagines the great orator as reading Plato's *Gorgias* with Charmadas the Academic – not a very abstruse work; and says that he also studied oratory in Asia during his quaestorship there, thus very much in his spare time. Similarly, he tells us that M. Antonius had heard the fashionable rhetor Meneclis of Alabanda and his brother Hierocles when in Asia, doubtless when he was quaestor or pro-quaestor there, as we know he was in 113-112; and that stopping in Athens on his way to attack the pirates in 101 because the weather was bad, he heard Charmadas arguing with an Athenian public figure, Menedemus, who had protested about the philosophers' contempt for rhetoric.<sup>16</sup> There was

<sup>12</sup> Asclepiodotus of Nicaea, *Index Stoicorum* ed. Traversa LXXIII; possibly author of the surviving work on tactics. An anonymous pupil of Panaetius died in Rome, ib.

<sup>13</sup> *De Or.* 1.104; *De Fin.* 5.8 and 75. Otherwise all we know of him is that he believed the life of man to cover 12 (not the usual 10) periods of 7 years; this is perhaps to be seen in the context of the discussion of happiness, only possible during a man's *akmé*, Censorinus 14.5, 10.

<sup>14</sup> *Ad F.* 13.1.2 and *De Fin.* 1.16 may refer to Cicero's time in Athens.

<sup>15</sup> Lucilius 2.88ff. Marx; Cic. *Brutus* 131: *fuit autem Athenis adulescens*.

<sup>16</sup> *De Or.* 1.47, 57, 2.95, 1.82; also that Q. Metellus L.f. had as an *adulescens* heard the great Carneades, then an old man, in Athens – *per multas dies* does not suggest that Metellus was living there; and that Q. Scaevola Augur discussed rhetoric with Apollonius (not Molon but a predecessor?) when in Rhodes as praetor (3.68, 1.75). Menedemus is undoubtedly one of the important Athenians of this name attested in this period, not a rhetor as often supposed: E. Rawson, *Athenaeum* (1985, forthcoming).

also the famous story of L. Gellius, who as proconsul in 93 arrived at Athens on his way to the East and offered to mediate between the warring philosophical schools to prevent them wasting their lives in argument. By the time Cicero told it this was a well-known joke, and even if not strictly true must have been regarded as credible for its period. A generation later a proconsul would hardly have so exposed himself.<sup>17</sup>

Plutarch would undoubtedly have told us if Sulla or Lucullus had studied in Greece, and Cicero probably would have done so if Hortensius, L. Crassus' successor as the leading orator in Rome, had; though Hortensius' first speeches were for Asian clients, and his style floridly 'Asiatic' and indeed Meneclean, so his is perhaps a doubtful case. Exiles, certainly, were beginning to console themselves with Greek study; Albucius returned to Athens on his condemnation for extortion, and a few years later the great Metellus Numidicus retired temporarily to Rhodes and philosophy; Posidonius was now teaching there. Rutilius Rufus went to Smyrna, though there was some ostentation in returning to the province he was alleged to have plundered; he was accompanied by Aurelius Opillus. But the first young Roman of the senatorial class whom we know to have followed Albucius to Athens was C. Aurelius Cotta, who appears in the *De Oratore* as a promising orator, and who, if we may believe the *De Natura Deorum*, heard Philo the Academic and Zeno the Epicurean at Athens; we know Philo left Athens in 88, and probably never returned.<sup>18</sup> Varro, though born as early as 116, may not have gone to Athens till the late eighties at the earliest; we are told that he heard Antiochus, who was probably not prominent till this time.<sup>19</sup>

The Mithridatic Wars, from Sulla to Pompey, proved in many respects a turning point. Greek scholars and teachers – like Greek libraries – were swept in the turmoil to Rome or Italy. Among them were distinguished men. Philo, head of the Academy, came as a refugee and lectured in Rome; Cicero listened to him 'with incredible zeal', as did three others he mentions, of whom we know not even, for certain, their names. Philo's pupil Antiochus probably did not accompany him, but may have come to Rome a little later as an envoy.<sup>20</sup> Apollonius Molon, the famous rhetor, came on possibly two embassies from Rhodes, and it was probably as a result that he subsequently had a number of Roman pupils.<sup>21</sup> Ambassadors would make many acquaintances among prominent Romans; they often had to stay months to

<sup>17</sup> E. Badian, *AJAH* (1976) 126 thinks the context is that of Athenian political quarrels, not philosophy, but Cicero (*De Leg.* 1.53) says he got the tale from Phaedrus, and it was always held to refer to philosophic issues and was *a multis saepe derisum*. (Perhaps Gellius meant it as a joke.)

<sup>18</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 1.59.

<sup>19</sup> *Ac. Post.* 1.12; cf. C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (repr. 1961) 225. Visits abroad by professional poets, Terence and Accius, did take place earlier, and Lucilius' *Satires*, which sometimes treat of philosophers, might suggest he knew Athens.

<sup>20</sup> *Ac. Post.* 2.11: P. and C. Selius, Tetrilius Rogus. It has been suggested that one of the Selli is the pedant mentioned with Varro and perhaps Tarquitiu in *Catalepton* 5, but all the names here are corrupt. J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (1978) ch. 1; *Index Academicorum*, ed. Mekler, XXXIV 36 (restored).

<sup>21</sup> *Brutus* 307 and 312 are however sometimes thought to refer to the same visit; if so Cicero is very inaccurate.

get their business done, and collected support by, for example, attending the *levées* of great men; if well-known intellectuals, as they sometimes were, they might even give lectures. We are told that Molon was the first envoy to address the Senate directly in Greek; though Cicero tells us that there was usually someone in the Senate who demanded an interpreter, even rather later.<sup>22</sup>

Posidonius was also at this time an envoy from Rhodes. It was perhaps as a consequence of this visit rather than his earlier one that the characters in the *De Natura Deorum*, set in the seventies, can all be described as his friends – Velleius, C. Cotta and L. Balbus, with Cicero himself, though only Balbus was a true Stoic and we cannot be sure that any of them except Cicero had studied with the great man.<sup>23</sup> Fragments of Posidonius' histories and other works suggest that he also had ties with the Marcelli and Junii Bruti.<sup>24</sup> Strabo further tells us that the famous rhetor Xenocles of Adramyttium made a speech before the Senate on behalf of Asia when that province was accused of 'Mithridatising', a speech that perhaps influenced the development of rhetoric at Rome and especially that of Hortensius (unless he had visited Asia himself). Strabo also records that the elder Diodorus of Sardis, another rhetor, 'often' pleaded the cause of Asia to the Romans in the Mithridatic period, though he does not say explicitly that it was in Rome that he did so.<sup>25</sup> In fact young Strabo's own arrival in Rome, in or shortly before 44, may have been in part a delayed effect of the Mithridatic Wars, in which members of his family, holding high office under the king of Pontus, had shown a tendency to pro-Roman treachery, and had made useful contacts with Roman generals, notably Lucullus.<sup>26</sup>

Of the prisoners taken in this war, who subsequently taught or studied in Rome, much will be said in the course of this book. They included three major figures, the *grammaticus* known as the elder Tyrannio, the scholar Alexander called Polyhistor from his wide learning, and Parthenius, who was poet as well as *grammaticus*. It has also been suggested that Hypsicrates of Amisus, a *grammaticus* and author of a history that certainly dealt with the Mithridatic Wars, was a captive of this period rather than of the civil wars of the forties, and that this is also true of Domitius Callistratus, who wrote a history of Heraclea and probably a work on Samothrace, but it is uncertain if either of them worked in Rome.<sup>27</sup> Though he must have been very young when he lost his liberty, the man later to be a well-known Latin *grammaticus* under the name of Ateius Philologus was probably taken at Sulla's sack of

<sup>22</sup> Val. Max. 2.2.3 (which indicates that Molon at this point had already taught Romans); *De Fin.* 5.89.

<sup>23</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 1.123; Cicero, 1.6 (probably when in Rhodes).

<sup>24</sup> Posidonius, *Fragments* ed. Edelstein and Kidd, T1a, F256. The Marcellus who urged L. Crassus to attend lectures, perhaps the aedile of 91, may be relevant; M. Brutus, the philosophically minded tyrannicide, is perhaps too late.

<sup>25</sup> Strabo C614, 628. (But one hardly wants to change *Meneclium* to *Xenoclium* in *Brutus* 326 on the grounds of Strabo's reference.)

<sup>26</sup> Strabo 10.C478, 11.C499, 12.C557.

<sup>27</sup> *FGH* no. 190, no. 433.

Athens. Pompey may have brought the *grammaticus* Curtius Nicias home with him in 62 from Cos, though perhaps not as a captive; he certainly brought his adviser and historian Theophanes of Mytilene, a friend not a prisoner.

Conversely, Cicero's friend Atticus, who was to be a considerable figure in the cultural life of his time, settled in Athens when, in the eighties, Greece proper became quiet, largely so that he might avoid the disturbed conditions at home; his friend Saufeius lived in Athens for many years from love of philosophy (we know that he and his brother set up a statue to the Epicurean Phaedrus, and were themselves given statues by the Athenians).<sup>28</sup> Many other Romans, including a large number of senatorial rank, spent long years in the Greek East either as soldiers or as exiles; the latter, since the enfranchisement of Italy in the early eighties, could no longer stay in allied towns in the peninsula, but had to go further afield. (It may be recalled that normally members of the Senate, unlike those of lower status, may have needed permission and a 'free embassy' to leave Italy, and, probably, could not own estates abroad, though this rule was beginning to be circumvented.<sup>29</sup>) And after 67 the defeat of the pirates meant that the sea was safer than it had been for decades. Wealthy travellers, of course, on whatever type of business, stayed for the most part not in hotels, but with local notables; it was not so easy to isolate oneself from the life of a foreign country as it is for the modern tourist, though it would be implausible to picture more than the rare Roman traveller poring over his host's books or questioning him about the cultural life of his city, or doing the same things when his *hospes* came to stay with him in Rome.

Young Romans now began to flock to the East. Cicero and Caesar, leaders perhaps of a still newish fashion, went there when fully adult – Cicero in 79, after he had won some reputation in the courts, for further study with Apollonius Molon in Rhodes; but he stopped for some time at Athens, with his younger brother and his cousin L. Cicero. We find him there with M. Pupius Piso (older than himself; now disillusioned with Staseas of Naples?) and perhaps Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, later the great lawyer, who was certainly with him at Rhodes. At Athens he studied rhetoric as well as philosophy, in the latter subject hearing the Academic Antiochus and probably his brother Aristus, and, with Atticus, the Epicureans Phaedrus and Zeno.<sup>30</sup> The party went on to Asia, where M. Cicero at least worked with various rhetors, including Xenocles, and then to Rhodes, where he listened to the philosopher

<sup>28</sup> A.E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia* (1949) 96. Saufeius appears in Cicero's letters as a facile writer, bound to send Atticus a *consolatio* on the death of his grandmother, *Ad A.* 1.3.1. A fragment of a Saufeius in Serv. *Aen.* 1.6 on cave-dwellers in early Latium has suggested an Epicurean account of human development, but a historical or antiquarian work is a possibility.

<sup>29</sup> E. Rawson, *Studies in Roman Property* ed. M.I. Finley (1976) 85.

<sup>30</sup> *Brutus* 315; *De Fin.* 1.16, 5.1ff.; *Brutus* 151; *TD* 3.38. At Athens Cicero learnt rhetoric with one Demetrius of Cyme. Plutarch describes Nigidius Figulus as Cicero's companion in philosophy, but this may be based simply on Cicero's later 'Carneadean' discussions with Nigidius, *Cic. Tim.* 1.1. A reference to Nigidius returning *e Graecia* might merely refer to the legateship in Asia probably attested by *Cic. Tim.* 1.2. But this learned man is likely to have studied abroad.

Posidonius as well as the rhetor Molon. He was away two years. Caesar set off to Rhodes in 75, at the age of twenty-five – after his first military service and his first appearance in court – to work with Molon (he seems to have had little interest in philosophy); he was soon distracted by Mithridates' invasion. Both men are said to have wanted to leave Rome for political reasons, but it is not clear whether this is true.<sup>31</sup> A couple of other members of the senatorial class are also known to have been pupils of Apollonius Molon in these years.<sup>32</sup> After his death and that of Posidonius (the latter not till about 50) Rhodes may have been less attractive, though Posidonius' school was carried on by his grandson Jason. Some tours were generally educational without being strictly scholastic. The younger Cato, after holding a military tribunate in Macedonia, went on a tour of the Near East on foot, as graphically described by Plutarch, who attributes to him a desire to study the manners and military strength of the provinces, and visit a client prince who was a family friend. He got as far as Syria.<sup>33</sup>

In the next generation the Grand Tour was perhaps almost obligatory for young men of the upper class. In the *Tusculans* Cicero assumes that his anonymous pupil will have studied at Athens (and heard Dionysius the Stoic there).<sup>34</sup> M. Brutus worked there with two rhetors, and with Aristus, who had succeeded his brother Antiochus as the leading Academic. Returning after the Ides of March Brutus heard an even less distinguished Academic, Theomnestus, and Cratippus, the more satisfactory Peripatetic. He had also as a young man studied rhetoric at Rhodes.<sup>35</sup> Cassius, according to a rhetorical passage in Appian, had lived longer at Rhodes, where he studied 'literature' in the school of one Archelaus, than he had in Rome.<sup>36</sup> Those with Epicurean sympathies, wrote Cicero in the fifties, cross the seas 'to study or see the sights'.<sup>37</sup> Antony worked on rhetoric in Greece, or perhaps really Asia (for his style was considered 'Asiatic'), and also, according to Plutarch, on military science.<sup>38</sup> The poet Cinna showed in his *Propemptikon* that the young Asinius Pollio went to Greece at this time, whether for independent study or informally attached to the staff of a magistrate. This last was a way of combining sightseeing with some administrative experience (and, it might be hoped, financial profit) and possibly some regular study; Catullus finally left his governor to 'see the famous cities of Asia'.<sup>39</sup> Such positions had of

<sup>31</sup> Plut. *Cic.* 3.4, Suet. *DJ* 2.4.

<sup>32</sup> *Brutus* 245, T. Manlius Torquatus, who was gifted but died before his consulship; *Ad A.* 2.1.9, Cato's imitator Favonius, too strict a Stoic to profit.

<sup>33</sup> Plut. *Cato Min.* 9, 12.

<sup>34</sup> *TD* 2.26. Nothing is known of this Dionysius.

<sup>35</sup> The rhetors, Pammenes, *longe eloquentissimus Graeciae*, and also Aristus, *Brutus* 332; philosophers in 44, Plut. *Brut.* 24: Theomnestus of Naucratis was an over-rhetorical lecturer. Rhodes, *De Vir. Ill.* 82, perhaps under Empylus of Rhodes, later with Brutus in Rome (Quint. 10.6.4 on Empylus' fine memory, apparently dependent on an artificial memory-system).

<sup>36</sup> Appian *BC* 4.67; cf. Plut. *Brut.* 40.2. There was a rhetorical *technē* by an Archelaus of uncertain date. Cassius became an Epicurean, and Cicero's letters to him contain philosophical jokes, *Ad F.* 15.16-18 esp.

<sup>37</sup> *De Rep.* 1.3.6.

<sup>38</sup> Plut. *Ant.* 2.4.

<sup>39</sup> Catullus 46.6.

course existed for some time, but after the Mithridatic Wars there were more provinces in the Greek East, and governors probably had bigger entourages. Even young Marcus and young Quintus accompanied Cicero to Cilicia in 51, though they were too young for administrative responsibility or higher education, being in the charge of a freedman *grammaticus* as tutor; but Cicero was anxious that they should at least see Rhodes.<sup>40</sup> Later, when young Marcus was at Athens as a student, there was a plan that he should visit Asia while Trebonius was governor there, in the company of Cratippus the Peripatetic, so that he could both sightsee and study.<sup>41</sup>

In imagining the students' lives we can perhaps take hints from Aulus Gellius' description of his time in Athens, two hundred years later, with its dining clubs and the informal discussions in the houses of learned Greeks.<sup>42</sup> In Cicero's time, as has recently been argued with some force, the Academy and Lyceum, as educational institutions, had disappeared, casualties of the Mithridatic Wars and of Sulla's sack of Athens, or of internal decay and the rival attractions of centres of learning beyond the Aegean. Certainly the Lyceum grove and the Academy were damaged in the eighties, though the latter was still used for some purposes. But Antiochus, the leading Academic of the subsequent period, and reviver as he felt himself of the 'Old Academy', after the divergence into Scepticism, seems to have taught at the Ptolemaeum, a gymnasium within the walls. Cicero's famous imaginative sketch of his time in Athens in the 70s suggests that there was no other Academic lecturing then. The Academy itself is deserted, at least in the afternoon, and Cicero and his friends make a special expedition to visit it; they clearly do not go regularly to lectures there. Antiochus' brother and in some sense successor, Aristus, seems to have lived on the Acropolis, where Cicero stayed with him in 50. The ephebic inscriptions no longer mention lectures in the Academy or Lyceum, and the break in the Peripatetic succession at the latter place seems clear too; Cicero apparently heard no Peripatetic lecturer in the 70s, and Cratippus, though sometimes seen by modern scholars as head of the Lyceum in the forties, was apparently ready to take off to Asia at short notice with young Cicero.<sup>43</sup> And the removal of Apellicon's library to Italy transferred much of the serious study of Aristotle, as we shall see, to that country. The Stoa perhaps (though Cicero does not mention Stoic lecturers during his early visit) and certainly the Garden, preserved their identity; Cicero went with Atticus to hear Zeno the Epicurean scholar, and Atticus' beloved teacher Phaedrus.

Antiochus left Athens again in the late seventies to attend on Lucullus, and his brother Aristus, though an agreeable man, was no great mind. In 50, passing through and staying with the latter, Cicero remarked that philosophy in Athens was in a bad way. After the Civil War he perhaps tried to do

<sup>40</sup> *Ad A.* 6.7.2, 8.4.

<sup>41</sup> *Ad F.* 12.16.2.

<sup>42</sup> *NA* 1.2, 7.13 etc.

<sup>43</sup> J. Glucker, op. cit. in n. 20; J.P. Lynch, *Aristotle's School* (1972). But D. Sedley, *Phronesis* (1981) 67 notes that L. Cicero seems to think there might be lectures on Carneades (*De Fin.* 5.6), and believes Philo or Charmadas might still be Academic scholar.

something about it; he persuaded Caesar to give Roman citizenship to Cratippus, who had left Aristus for the Peripatetics and Athens for Mytilene, and got the Areopagus to pass decrees in his honour and invite him to settle in Athens.<sup>44</sup> Cratippus did return, and this may have led to a new wave of students from Rome. Unfortunately Marcus is silent in his letters home about his Roman fellow-students, preferring to give the impression that he is mixing solely with serious Greek pupils of Cratippus and with Athenian aristocrats, though his father had known of several young nobles from Rome who would be in Athens at the same time as Marcus.<sup>45</sup> In 44, however, Brutus was able to recruit a number of students for his forces, Marcus himself and the young Horace included. Shortly before this, Trebonius had written to Cicero that Marcus was the most popular and most devoted to his studies of all the students in Athens; he was no doubt thinking only of the Romans, and there must have been a fair number.<sup>46</sup>

It is a pity that we do not know how many Roman students of humbler background studied alongside the more intellectually promising sprigs of the aristocracy; Horace's father, a mere freedman and not a rich one, was clearly exceptionally determined to have the best for his promising son (who joined the Epicureans).<sup>47</sup> It is obvious that Roman men of affairs, *negotiatores*, in the Aegean area, if they valued other pursuits than the good old Roman one of making money, might easily get their sons an education locally. We know from inscriptions honouring the Athenian ephebes that a handful of young 'Romans' (many no doubt from various parts of southern Italy rather than the capital) were attached to this institution each year from the later second century, and it is usually argued that they originate from families settled at Delos and elsewhere. Roman boys also occasionally occur in the ephebeia of other Greek towns. At Athens at least, the ephebeia was now more gymnastic than military in the training it provided, but a bow was made to culture. The ephebes of 123/2, for example, are praised for 'sitting through the lectures of Zenodotus at the Ptolemaeum and the Lyceum and also all the other philosophers in the Lyceum and the Academy throughout the year', and there is in later years occasional mention also of lectures by rhetors and *grammatici* and (apparently) special speakers.<sup>48</sup> The class of each year had by law, or so it seems, to add a hundred volumes to the library of the Ptolemaeum. But the eighteen-year-olds of the ephebeia cannot have had much time for intellectual matters; apart from the skills of the gymnasium they will mainly have acquired an intimate knowledge of Athenian festivals, in which they took an important part. The grander, and often older, students from Italy will not have been tempted to tie themselves down to this routine, though the sons of foreign royalty occasionally did so.

<sup>44</sup> Plut. *Luc.* 42.2; Cic. *Ad A.* 5.10.5; Plut. *Cic.* 24.5.

<sup>45</sup> Teachers and students were now almost entirely non-Athenian, but the natives were still noteworthy for their elegant Greek (*De Or.* 3.43). This was obviously a reason for studying there. Among Marcus' contemporaries were a young Bibulus, a Torquatus Acidinus (possibly Horace's friend Torquatus) and a Messalla (perhaps the later famous Messalla Corvinus, cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.21 on his philosophic interests), *Ad A.* 12.32.2, *Ad F.* 4.12.2.

<sup>46</sup> *Ad F.* 12.16.1-2.      <sup>47</sup> Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.43.

<sup>48</sup> IGI2 1006.19.

The sons of *negotiatores* had probably also had much of their more elementary education in Greek, though a regrettably corrupt passage of Suetonius perhaps once told us that a wealthy *equus*, Aeficius Calvinus (very likely the man who with his wife and daughter has left epigraphic traces in several parts of the Aegean world and may date from our period), hired a Roman *grammaticus* at a very high fee to teach somewhere in the region.<sup>49</sup> There were certainly some cultivated 'business' men; sculpture, and perhaps literature, was occasionally patronised by them. Cicero mentions a certain T. Manlius, 'a *negotiator* at Thespieae', as not without culture; young Pinnius, who was owed money by the Nicaeans, was *mirè studiosus et eruditus* (he was perhaps based on Italy and may, later, have been the dedicatee, himself an author, of Varro's third book on agriculture). Above all, M'. Curius of Patrae in the Peloponnese, of whom both Cicero and Atticus were so fond, kind, amusing and civilised, finds his place here.<sup>50</sup> Atticus himself, who lent to Greek communities, and his friend Saufeius, whose family had been active at Delos, to some extent belong to this class; both lived much in Greece. Distinguished and cultured *equites* based in Italy might also do a certain amount of business in the provinces; the aristocratic Etruscan Caecina is an example.<sup>51</sup> And in the post-Sullan period *equites* who had passed into the Senate seem often to have preserved their old interests, whether this was strictly legal or not. At all events, the part of the real *negotiatores* in the development of Graeco-Roman civilisation should not be ignored, though it must not be exaggerated – Cicero thought most of them cared for nothing but money.<sup>52</sup> Many settled permanently in the East, but some will surely have come back to Italy after years spent in communities into which they had often been closely integrated, particularly after the sack of Delos by Mithridates' forces in 88 had ended the large concentration there. It is perhaps worth observing that few were permanently settled in Rhodes, but a good many at Athens, where numbers took the citizenship and held office (though Cicero claimed that this nullified their status as Romans).<sup>53</sup>

By the time that the Mithridatic Wars were over, then, the Greeks and the Romans had finally got to know each other. This did not mean to love each other: we need not here expand on, but should remember, the Roman tendency to find the Greeks fickle, frivolous and 'inept', by which they meant among other things given to theoretical discussions in and out of season;<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 3; E. Rawson, *LCM* (1979) 53, with comments in the following numbers.

<sup>50</sup> *Ad F.* 13.22.1; 61, with Varro *RR* 3.1.10 (though Shackleton Bailey in his comment on the Cicero passage holds that Cicero's Pinnius is probably T., while Varro's is probably Q.); *Ad F.* 7.28.2, 30.1, 31.2, etc. Perhaps later, A. Mussius Aper was honoured for talent at Iasus *REG* (1893) 181.

<sup>51</sup> *Ad F.* 6.8.2.      <sup>52</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 1.1.15.

<sup>53</sup> *Pro Balb.* 30. Roman names are found among Athenian prytaneis at this period, see W.S. Meritt and J.S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora* XV, and J.S. Traill, *Hesperia* (1978) 213ff. Cic. *Ad M. Brut.* 1.6.3, a letter in Greek from a Cicereius to a Roman officer suggests a very hellenized *negotiator*, or son of a veteran settled in the East. Some of the Greek epigrammatists with Roman names and Eastern origins may date from our period, and note *BCH* (1892) 150, a poem by one Poplios at Delos for an Athenian.

<sup>54</sup> *De Or.* 2.20; cf. N. Petrochilis, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (1974).

nor should we forget the corruption and brutality of many Romans when abroad, which created much hatred, or that a number of Greek intellectuals supported Mithridates. Nor ought we to exaggerate the Romans' knowledge of Greek, though some acquaintance with the contemporary spoken language, and with the Homeric and Attic dialects used in the literature studied with the *grammaticus*, was probably fairly widespread.<sup>55</sup> But it is significant that neither the original conquests, nor the wars of the later second century, for all the influence that they did exert on Roman life and culture, apparently involved the bringing to Rome of half as many learned men as did the Mithridatic Wars. Nor did Ptolemy VIII's persecution of scholars in mid-second-century Egypt lead, as far as we know, to refugees settling in Rome, though we are told that 'he filled the islands and cities with grammarians, philosophers, geometers, musicians, painters, trainers, doctors and many other representatives of the arts (*technitai*) who were forced to teach from poverty', and that Alexandria thus gave both Greeks and barbarians Greek education.<sup>56</sup> We must remember the gaps in our evidence for the second century; but there is no indication that the barbarians were those of Italy rather than of the East. In the first century, however, the Romans were ready to search scholars out, promote and value them as (with a few rare exceptions) they had never done before.

How far the Lex Papia of 65 caused an interruption it is hard to say. This expelled from Rome all foreigners not resident in Italy, and was probably a political measure aimed at the inhabitants of Transpadane Gaul. But it seems to have been comprehensive: we know of one man with a Greek name who was explicitly made a (probably solitary) exception. Perhaps many Greek intellectuals managed to stay on in Rome by claiming Italian domicile, and those who were freedmen rather than *peregrini* were doubtless safe. We know of several later prosecutions under the law, with the defendants pleading that they held Roman citizenship, but after an initial clamp-down it may not have been generally applied.<sup>57</sup>

What effect the Mithridatic Wars had in extending the Roman horizon beyond the coasts of the Mediterranean we shall see in due course. But it is to be noted here that these wars extinguished several of the courts in which Greek literature and science had been patronised. First, Mithridates' own, in Pontus, which had been adorned by the polymath Metrodorus of Scepsis, who abandoned philosophy for rhetoric, the creation of an artificial memory-system, and anti-Roman historiography, and also by botanists, such as the distinguished Crateuas, and doctors, both of which classes catered to

<sup>55</sup> N. Horsfall, *Echos du Monde Antique/Classical News and Views* (1979) 85. *De Or.* 2.61 suggests the language of (many) poets might seem quite alien to those who could read the historians and orators, and at *TD* 5.116, at the end of our period, Cicero can still say in general terms *nostris Graecae fere nesciunt, nec Graeci Latine*, though surely more Romans learnt Greek than *vice versa*. (But *De Off.* 1.1. claims for himself, and hopes his son will attain, equal mastery of both tongues.)

<sup>56</sup> Athen. 4.184b-c, from Hellenistic sources. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* I, 252 denies that the Romans are included.

<sup>57</sup> *Pro Balb.*, esp. 52; *Pro Arch.* 10; *Ad A.* 4.18.4. Possibly Pliny *NH* 29.16 (expulsion of Greeks from Italy).

the king's own interests. Secondly, that of Bithynia, where a King Nicomedes, probably III (c.127-c.94) had at least been the dedicatee of a geographic writer,<sup>58</sup> who praises him as the one kingly king of his time. (Polybius had already complained that kings were growing niggardly; in fact, too much of their wealth was flowing into Roman coffers for them to be able to patronise learning generously.) Lastly, there now came to an end the Seleucid court in Syria, an area from which a remarkable number of intellectuals were to come to Rome in the first century B.C., either as slaves or of their own volition. Antioch, says Cicero, talking of the late second century, had formerly been full of learned men and liberal studies.<sup>59</sup> Now only its reputation for luxury was left.

The great cultural centre of Pergamum had lost its court earlier, on the death in 133 of its last king. Its library survived, and in the sixties was in the care of Athenodorus Cordylion, the Stoic, from Tarsus; but he was carried to Rome by Cato. There were other learned men in the area still: for example, a rhetor, Isidorus, who has blown the gaff to us on Athenodorus' habit of tampering with early Stoic texts. And the Peripatetic Cratippus was as we have seen a figure of note, though we hear of him teaching at Athens and Mytilene, not at home. The rhetorician Apollodorus left Pergamum for Rome, exactly when is uncertain.<sup>60</sup>

Egypt remained. The Museum had been broken up by Ptolemy VIII's persecution, though the great medical schools survived, and distinguished *grammatici* were soon at work again. Cicero in the *Academica* pictures Lucullus' visit in 87-6, and imagines him with Antiochus and his brother Aristus in discussion with the local philosophers, Antiochus' friend Heraclitus of Tyre, from the New Academy, and Dio of Alexandria, like Ariston of the same city a pupil of Antiochus' own. (Ariston, like Cratippus, was to turn to the Peripatetics.) Indeed, under the last two Ptolemaic rulers of any significance, Ptolemy XII Auletes and the famous Cleopatra, there was something of a revival of philosophy, primarily Academic; possibly attributable, so it has been suggested, to refugees from Mithridates' Athens. These were perhaps inclined to be suspicious of the Ptolemaic court as too pro-Roman<sup>61</sup> – at all events the murder of Dio in Rome in 56, when he was acting as ambassador for the Alexandrians, was probably at the instigation of Auletes.

The historian Diodorus says that some still think Alexandria the first city of the known world, in elegance, riches and luxury, as well as in population.<sup>62</sup> The Epicurean Philodemus links Rome and Alexandria as the two great capitals and power-centres of his time.<sup>63</sup> The latter was naturally also, as a result of the papyrus industry there, a focal point of the book trade. But

<sup>58</sup> Ps.-Scymnus, *GGM* I, 196. Nicomedes also had botanical interests.

<sup>59</sup> *Pro Arch.* 3.

<sup>60</sup> DL 7.34; *Tim.* 1; *Brutus* 250, *De Off.* 1.1, Plut. *Brut.* 24, *Cic.* 24; Strabo 13.C625, Quint. 3.1.17, Suet. *Aug.* 89, Ps.-Lucian *Macrob.* 23.

<sup>61</sup> *Cic. Ac. Pr.* 11ff.; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972) 485.

<sup>62</sup> Diod. Sic. 17.52. The free population alone was estimated at over 300,000, no doubt unreliably.

<sup>63</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 2.145 Sudh. *dynasteutikai poleis*, attracting some philosophers.

though there was commercial contact of various kinds, Romans do not seem to have visited Egypt for purposes of study, even though Alexandrian scholarship, and Greco-Egyptian religion and astrology, were filtering into Italy. The absence of ultimate Roman authority may be relevant. Egypt remained on the outskirts of the Roman consciousness, teasing and tempting. A few official visits occurred; in the late second century a Roman senator was given a tour up the Nile (plans were detailed on a papyrus rediscovered in a stuffed crocodile).<sup>64</sup> A little later Lucullus, Sulla's quaestor, strongly refused to go up to Memphis or elsewhere, since he had touched at Alexandria on duty, not as a tourist at leisure. Cicero confesses in 59, when there was a possibility of an ambassadorship, that he had long wanted to see both Alexandria and the rest of Egypt; Caesar perhaps took a trip up-river with Cleopatra, though this has been doubted.<sup>65</sup> There is little evidence for a settled community of Roman *negotiatores* in Alexandria, at least before the sack of Delos in 88, though there were certainly some who visited it and even went sightseeing in the far south, as graffiti show;<sup>66</sup> Roman financiers, led by the influential Rabirius Postumus, were more prominent in the great city after Ptolemy Auletes' return to his kingdom, deeply in their debt, in 57. And a garrison was left by Gabinius after his campaign in 55.

There was a story, doubted by Suetonius, that the Roman *grammaticus* M. Antonius Gniphos had studied in Alexandria: it at least reflects his intellectual interests. Diodorus Siculus visited the country, possibly in preparation for the early books of his history, but possibly with a Roman embassy (as an interpreter?).<sup>67</sup> But he was not a Roman, though he settled in Rome. It has been suggested that a certain T. Coponius, who had known the philosopher Dio at Alexandria, had worked with him there;<sup>68</sup> but this is quite uncertain, though the brothers Coponii, one a senator, were well-educated and linked to Dio by zeal for learning. Dio's other host in Rome, the historian Lucceius, cannot be connected with Alexandria at all.<sup>69</sup>

Ambassadors from Alexandria to Rome might have helped to give the Romans some awareness of what went on in the city, or even beyond it, and Auletes was in Rome with an entourage in the fifties, and his daughter Cleopatra in the forties. Cicero was in touch with one of her suite over unspecified literary matters.<sup>70</sup> By this time a few Alexandrian scholars were

<sup>64</sup> E. van't Dack, *Reizen, expedities en emigratie uit Italië naar Ptolemaïsch Egypte* (1980).

<sup>65</sup> Plut. *Luc.* 2.6; *Ad A.* 2.5; Suet. *DJ* 52.1 (he wanted to but his men would not follow).

<sup>66</sup> Van't Dack, op. cit. in n. 64. *OGIS* I 135 and *ILLRP* 343 suggest that at least until 88 Delos was often the base for *Italici* trading with Alexandria. *Pro Rab. Post.* 35 implies that few Romans had actually been there (but that it had influenced the Roman theatre).

<sup>67</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 7; in fact, his alleged master, Dionysius Scytobrachion, was not a *grammaticus* at all and probably much too early; perhaps Dionysius Thrax was originally meant (J.S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982) 90). DS 1.83.

<sup>68</sup> L.W. Daly, *AJP* (1950) 40. The Coponii might be *negotiatores* by origin; the name is not aristocratic.

<sup>69</sup> *Pro Cael.* 24, 51-5. Bibulus' two sons, murdered by Gabinius' men in Egypt while their father was governor in Syria in 51, were on military business.

<sup>70</sup> *Ad A.* 15.15.2; the doctor and writer Dioscurides Phacas had probably been one of Auletes' envoys to Rome, Caes. *BC* 3.109, Fraser op. cit. 372.

beginning to visit, or move to, Rome: the campaigns of Gabinius in 55 and Caesar in 48 seem to have been a turning-point, though it is possible that the important *grammaticus* Philoxenus came rather earlier. We know that Timagenes, who later wrote history, was brought from Egypt as a captive by Gabinius and purchased by Sulla's son Faustus.<sup>71</sup> The philosopher Areius and the astronomer Sosigenes probably came to Rome as protégés of Caesar, who is said to have listened to the philosophers in Alexandria.<sup>72</sup> According to one version, the Augustan scholar Hyginus was enslaved by Caesar there.<sup>73</sup> When and how L. Aelius Tubero came into contact with the Alexandrian philosopher Aenesidemus of Cnossus, who dedicated a work to him, is uncertain; it may have been after Cicero's death, as Cicero, who never mentions him, ought to have been interested in Aenesidemus' new form of Academic Scepticism.<sup>74</sup>

Apart from Egypt, there was little else: Parthia, not deeply hellenized, and indeed to some extent now in the grip of an anti-Hellenic reaction; Armenia, the same; also Cappadocia, which was unsettled, and whose king was desperately in debt when Cicero was there in 51; Commagene, again semi-oriental; Galatia, whose largely Gallic population will have hardly been literary, though Diophanes of Bithynia dedicated an agricultural work to its king Deiotarus; and it may be that the pro-Roman chronographer Castor of Rhodes was a connection of the king's. The princes of Numidia in Africa had some slight pretensions to culture; they had received books, probably Greek as well as Punic, from the libraries of Carthage on its destruction in 146, Micipsa had had philosophers at his court, and to Hiempsal (probably second of the name, in the early first century) were attributed works in Punic including mythical history of a Greek kind.<sup>75</sup>

It is true that, in spite of the ravages of war and piracy and the plague of indebtedness to Roman tax-farmers and money-lenders, there was a certain amount of wealth still in many of the Greek cities of Asia, as buildings and inscriptions attesting municipal benefactions show (new public buildings in Athens however were the result of Roman or royal benefactions). The cities had some tradition of patronising learning and the arts, by prizes at festivals, or salaried posts, for example for doctors and engineers. Rhodes, though her great wealth and naval power had vanished, had become a vital centre of learning; the schools of Tarsus were distinguished, though it seems not of a

<sup>71</sup> Philoxenus is possibly referred to in *Ad A.* 13.8: but at all events note the Suda and his work on the Latin language. (The notice that the considerably earlier Dionysius Thrax worked at Rome is almost certainly corrupt, Suda s.v. *Dionysius*.) Timagenes, *FGH* no. 88.

<sup>72</sup> Areius was perhaps teaching Caesar's great-nephew Octavius by 44; Sosigenes helped with the calendar reform, see below, p. 112. Caesar and the philosophers, Appian *BC* 2.89, Aelian *VH* 7.21 (Ariston is named).

<sup>73</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 20. J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom* (1979) 64 argues on chronological grounds that Diocles son of Artemidorus, known as the younger Tyrannio, was captured in the civil wars of Pompey and Caesar, not 'Caesar' and Antony, as the Suda states. He was from Phoenicia.

<sup>74</sup> Phot. *Bibl.* 212: *tôn ex Akadêmias tini sunairesiôtêi*.

<sup>75</sup> DS 34/5 35; Sall. *Jug.* 17.7.

calibre to attract Roman students (or maybe the latter preferred 'real Greeks' to hellenized orientals). But in spite of these flickering attractions, it is no wonder that so many Greek-speaking writers and intellectuals turned West. In the end, indeed, Rome even swallowed up those who were anti-Roman: after Actium there was nowhere for Timagenes to go (though as a freedman perhaps it would have been difficult for him to go anywhere).<sup>76</sup> There was little choice now for patriotic Greek intellectuals but to try to curry favour with Romans, and use it where they could to help their city of origin. And it was even possible to turn to Rome for an education, or rather to the Greeks now teaching there. Thus Themison of Laodicea must have come to study medicine under Asclepiades of Bithynia as early as the beginning of the century, and around 44 young Strabo arrived from the East and, whether this had been his original intention or not,<sup>77</sup> found himself studying philosophy.

<sup>76</sup> *Felicitati urbis inimicus*, Seneca *Ep.* 91.13. He told in his history stories reflecting ill on Roman nobles, and may have been one of those who annoyed Livy by arguing that Alexander could have defeated Rome. The Romans proved fairly tolerant of this gadfly in their midst.

<sup>77</sup> Strabo 12.C548, 14.C670.

## CHAPTER TWO

# Rome and the Italian Background

Intellectual developments in Rome must fundamentally be defined by reference to the Greek East and Greek culture, but it is also necessary to set Rome against the background of the Italian peninsula. In the first place, since intellectual activity was regarded by the upper class primarily as an ingredient of *otium*, or leisure – the time not spent on *negotia*, the care of one's property, clients and political advancement – and since this *otium* was from the later second century increasingly spent in villas outside Rome, in the hills or on the coast, we find that Campania in particular was the centre of a very lively intellectual life, in which imported and genuinely local characteristics must if possible be distinguished. Secondly, though the native traditions of the various pre-Roman civilisations of Italy were on the whole of little interest to the now dominant culture, there were a few exceptions to the rule, notably where Etruscan learning is concerned. Finally, while any evidence that shows the Greek cities of the south still looking overseas rather than to Rome helps in its very negativity to define the latter's position, the fact that so many Roman writers and scholars of all kinds came from central or northern Italy prompts one to ask how far studies primarily in Latin could be and were pursued in the country towns. (It is a well-known fact that none of the most famous, and few minor, Latin authors can be proved to have been born in Rome, and most certainly came from elsewhere.)

We may begin with a sketch of Italy as it was at the beginning of our period. Recent archaeological research has done much to reconstruct the culture of pre-Roman Italy, which often reached a high level, with more or less wide literacy and marked Greek influence. Scholars speak of a Graeco-Italian *koinê*, a common artistic language, with, for the earlier period, comparatively minor distinctions of style between different areas of central Italy at least. For us, archaeological evidence clearly has its limitations, and the language barriers are one reason why a complete intellectual *koinê* is hardly to be expected. When Cicero was born in 106, about a third of the peninsula was *ager Romanus*; rather more of it spoke Latin, since to the old cities of Latium proper, whose citizens had certain privileges at Rome, but which were theoretically still independent, we must add those of the colonies which had been given not citizen but Latin status (and drew their settlers mainly from Roman and old Latin sources). These towns helped to spread the use of the language. The other cities or peoples of Italy were allied to Rome. Some Etruscan was probably still spoken in Etruria, to judge by the mainly funerary inscriptions (not a very safe guide), perhaps especially in the more distant towns like Volaterrae, and by the peasants. This basically

non-Indo-European language was totally foreign to Latin speakers. Varieties of Oscan were still in use in the central highlands, the further parts of Campania, and the south; this, though related to Latin, would still seem incomprehensible, and employed an alphabet which, like the Etruscan, was usually written from right to left and was by no means identical with the Roman one, though like it it derived from an early Greek alphabet. There are official Oscan inscriptions dating into the first century B.C.,<sup>1</sup> and graffiti in Pompeii that are later still.

Other Italic languages, related to Oscan, such as Picene and Volscian, had perhaps died out by 100 B.C., and many areas had adopted Latin for public use. Cicero mentions a Marsian, and a man from the Picene area, as noteworthy orators in Latin before the enfranchisement of 89 B.C. (the latter at least published his speeches).<sup>2</sup> There had also been Indo-European tongues of Illyrian type, linked with some of those spoken beyond the Adriatic, such as Messapian, used in the heel of Italy. These too had perhaps gone by 100 B.C. In the north, in what was technically till Cicero's death the province of Cisalpine Gaul, Celtic and other languages probably survived in some areas in spite of heavy colonisation from Italy proper, but Venetic, an Italian language, had perhaps died out; its inscriptions stop in the later second century. In the far south, in what had once been Magna Graecia, some of the Greek colonies founded in the archaic period survived, and still spoke Greek: notably Tarentum (in spite of Roman colonists) in the heel of Italy, and Rhegium in the toe, while Neapolis, in less distant Campania, stuck determinedly to its Greek traditions, though its population was mixed.<sup>3</sup> Other Greek cities had been largely Oscanized, like Posidonia (now Paestum); Cumae, the nearest of these to Rome, took Latin as its official language early in the second century. But Greek, rather than Latin or Oscan, was probably still the *lingua franca* of parts of the peninsula.

In the second century B.C. the wealth of the new Empire flooded into Rome and made her the cultural capital of Italy. But earlier she had been outshone by the cities of Magna Graecia, Etruria and Campania. These all suffered in various ways when they lost their autonomy to Rome, in theory or in practice, in the fourth and third centuries, but they were not mere reflections of Rome and her culture.<sup>4</sup>

It is in Campania that Roman and local intellectual life seem most closely entwined. Here an Oscan invasion or infiltration had, several centuries

<sup>1</sup> The Oscan side of the Bantia inscription was thought to be later than the Latin one, considered Sullan in date by D. Adamesteanu and M. Torelli, *Arch. Class.* (1969) 1, but now pre-Sullan acc. M. Torelli, *Athen.* (1983) 252. Torelli believes that the translation of the law, probably a municipal charter, was done in Rome by Roman officials.

<sup>2</sup> *Brutus* 169. Marsic had perhaps long been a Latin patois, like Sabine, and there was clearly much Roman settlement in Picenum: Asculum, its chief town, was very Romanized by the outbreak of the Social War, when we see a Latin comedian performing to an audience there part of which was Roman (DS 37.12). Books, probably Greek and Latin, were part of the booty taken on its fall, Plut. *Pomp.* 4.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo 5.C253. Names in Neapolitan inscriptions are very mixed.

<sup>4</sup> The great Roman military roads of the second century will have been a factor for Romanization; new settlements often sprang up along them.

earlier, overwhelmed Etruscan domination and weakened Greek traditions. Strong Roman influence and settlement later led to much Latinization, especially in the northern parts, and the great city of Capua was destroyed as a political and cultural entity in the Hannibalic War. But the area was still nationally very mixed. Neapolis became, after the eighties B.C. and owing to harsh treatment from Sulla and economic competition from Puteoli, a quiet place, in which some Romans liked to spend their *otium* and might even be seen in Greek dress. It was perhaps already true, as it was under Augustus, that Greek teachers, and the elderly in general, often chose to retire there.<sup>5</sup> Puteoli, now a Roman colony, was by contrast a busy port, indeed Rome's main port, till Ostia was fully developed under the Empire; but it recalled its Greek origin as Dicaearchia, and in the late second century was so full of merchants of all races that the poet Lucilius could call it 'lesser Delos'.<sup>6</sup> After Pompey was ill in 50, it and other towns fêted his recovery in Greek fashion.<sup>7</sup> Here envoys from the East arrived, and might spend some time, as the philosopher Dio of Alexandria did in 57.<sup>8</sup>

Evidence suggests that there were many Greeks in various parts of Campania, whether old or new immigrants, quite apart from the slaves, who were numerous in what was a wealthy area: Campania was famous for fertility, and many of the Italian *negotiatores* who flooded over the East after the Roman conquest came, as their names and other evidence show, from this region. Some doubtless returned with their new wealth; others stayed in Italy, but carried on trade and other forms of business with the East. The richer townspeople in Campania lived prosperous and civilised lives in the late second century, as can be seen at Pompeii, though naturally most of the surviving archaeological evidence here, which suggests in particular a devotion to Greek drama, dates from the early imperial period; some amorous poetic graffiti in Latin are assigned to the earlier first century B.C., however, and seem to be signed by a local poet, one Loreius Tiburtinus (from Tibur?), who clearly had some knowledge of the traditions of the epigram.<sup>9</sup> It is easier to establish the general cultural level than to be precise on what may be thought strictly intellectual activities. Architects in the area were ahead of those in Rome in developing various forms of building, such as the Italian version of the Greek theatre (and it was probably here that the acoustic devices of reverberatory vessels that Vitruvius describes some Italian theatres as possessing were to be found).<sup>10</sup> Campanian architects were occasionally even called to work in the East, probably for their engineering skills; and

<sup>5</sup> Strabo 246C.

<sup>6</sup> 123 Marx.

<sup>7</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 57, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.86.

<sup>8</sup> Cic. *Pro Cael.* 23, with R.G. Austin *ad loc.*

<sup>9</sup> M. Gigante, *Civiltà delle forme letterarie in antica Pompei* (1979).

<sup>10</sup> Vitruv. 5.5.8, of Greek origin. The use of concrete must have been developed in Campania, where the famous *pozzolana* is found; and it is perhaps worth noting that c. 100 B.C. L. Sergius Orata invented *balneae pensiles*, heated from below, and artificially heated fishponds for properties on the Lucrine Lake – perhaps inspired by local volcanic phenomena. Agrippa's freedman architect, L. Cocceius Auctus, possibly trained in the area (there are Coccei at Beneventum), undertook great tunnelling and engineering works here in the thirties.

architects in Campania are attested epigraphically more often than elsewhere, perhaps a sign of high status.<sup>11</sup> Dramatic traditions were certainly strong, though the farces in Oscan, probably still sometimes acted even in Rome,<sup>12</sup> may not have been in written form; and it is perhaps unlikely that there were more sophisticated Oscan dramas, for Oscan inscriptions give no sign of the adoption of Greek dramatic metres for funerary purposes, as Latin ones do from the early second century.<sup>13</sup> But Greek (and soon Latin) tragedies and comedies were probably produced in various towns; a stone theatre, such as several places built themselves in the later second century, was not needed for farces<sup>14</sup> – though once built it might be used for recitations and other performances as well as drama. Campanians even wrote plays in Greek.<sup>15</sup> Drama, even farce, had a certain intellectual content; in particular, there were links with popular, and not so popular, philosophy – Blaisos of Capreae, who wrote Greek farces in the third or second century B.C., is described as a Pythagorean,<sup>16</sup> and there was much sententiousness in the Latin mimes of Publilius Syrus, who made his name in the mid-first century outside Rome in the first place, and quite possibly in Campania.<sup>17</sup>

Whatever the earlier role of Pythagoreanism, by the later second century Campanians had rejoined the main stream of Greek philosophy. Blossius of Cumae, a pupil of the Stoic Antipater, became disastrously involved in politics at Rome; we have met the slightly later Staseas of Naples, the Peripatetic, who must probably, to have earned this title, have studied at Athens like Blossius. Aeschines, also of Neapolis, settled at Athens as an Academic.<sup>18</sup> A passage of Philodemus talks of Stoics in, or from, Campania, ‘what was once Etruria’, and Sardinia.<sup>19</sup> It is not clear whether he is referring to natives or immigrants. But the Stoic Sosus of Ascalon died, and had probably been working, at Teanum Sidicinum, on the northern borders of Campania.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>11</sup> So perhaps D. Cossutius in the second century, so the brothers Stallii in the first, who rebuilt the Odeon at Athens: H.A. Thompson, *Hesperia* (1950) 31; *Ottava Misc. Greca e Lat.* (1982) 444 (à propos of a T. Safin(i)us Pollio of Capua); Numisius, *Ad Q.F.* 2.2.1, cf. *CIL* X 1443 (Herculaneum). Cocceius, see ch.6 n.23. Cluatius, *Ad A.* 12.18.1, 36.2, is an Oscan name.

<sup>12</sup> Strabo 5.C233; cf. Suet. *DJ* 39.1 and Aug. 43.1, ‘actors in all languages’. And *Ad F.* 7.1.3, *Graecos aut Oscos ludos* is neater if language is referred to in the second case as well as the first.

<sup>13</sup> We may have some Saturnians in the Paelignian dialect, perhaps from the first century B.C., when the Romans had given up this archaic metre: R.S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* (1897) I 216.

<sup>14</sup> It may sometimes have served for religious ceremonies or political gatherings.

<sup>15</sup> The Novius who won a prize for comedy at the Lenaea in Athens in the mid-second century B.C. from his name be Campanian: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2325.184.

<sup>16</sup> Lydus, *Mag.* 42W; the context suggests that the word should not be emended. Blaisos or Blaesius is grouped with the third-century Tarentine farce-writers Rhinthon and Skiras. Though he wrote in Doric, one of his titles, *Satourmos*, suggests Latin influence (Saturnus is the Latin, apparently not the Oscan, equivalent of Cronus), so activity in Campania rather than Tarentum is likely. Blaesius and Blasius are good Romanized Oscan names, for which Blaisos is an acceptable Greek version.

<sup>17</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 2.7.7.

<sup>18</sup> *De Orat.* 1.45; cf. DL 2.64 (Italian Neapolis?).

<sup>19</sup> W. Crönert, *Colotes und Menedemos* (1906) 66, from the end of Philodemus’ *On the Stoics*. Sardinia was a backward place, where Punic, and perhaps some Greek, was spoken alongside Latin (*ILLRP* 41, 158).

<sup>20</sup> *Index Stoicorum*, ed. A. Traversa (n.d.), col. LXXV; the remote Teanum Apulum will not be meant.

This was a substantial town, second only to Capua, but it is never attested as a fashionable place for villas of the Roman élite; Sosus will have been teaching primarily the local aristocracies.

But in the first century Campania, with its Greek traditions and its associations with *otium*, was chiefly notable for Epicureans. Suetonius tells us that M. Pompilius Andronicus, by birth a Syrian and by profession a *grammaticus*, was impelled by Epicurean leanings to give up his school in Rome and an unequal struggle against competitors there to live in poverty at Cumae and devote himself to writing.<sup>21</sup> One of the authors of Epicurean treatises in Latin, whom Cicero so despised, a certain Rabirius, probably came from a family at least closely connected with Campania, if not actually originating there.<sup>22</sup> But more important were Philodemus and Siro, the latter at any rate a teacher of Epicureanism. A fragmentary papyrus from Herculaneum connects him with Naples, as does the tradition on the life of his pupil, Virgil, who perhaps himself attests that he wrote the *Georgics* at Naples, and who is said to have inherited Siro's small property at Naples, or Nola.<sup>23</sup> (It is piquant that we happen to know that among the public buildings of Nola, where since Sulla there had been a colony of Roman veterans, there were *scholae* or lecture halls.)<sup>24</sup> Fragments of papyrus also mention Virgil's close friends Quinctilius and Varius, and just conceivably also himself, with Plotius (Tucca) or Horace. Plotius, Varius and Virgil seem to have been still in Campania at the time of Horace's journey to Brundisium.<sup>25</sup>

We do not know where Siro came from, or if he was dependent on a Roman patron. Philodemus of Gadara may have spent much time at the villa probably belonging to the Roman noble L. Calpurnius Piso, with whom Cicero attests his connexion, in Herculaneum; here remains of perhaps about thirty of his works have been found, with those of other Epicureans and some further philosophic material. One of his poems invites Piso to a 'simple cottage' (surely nearby, if it is more than a poetic cliché).<sup>26</sup> Philodemus had studied at Athens under his fellow-Syrian, Zeno of Sidon, whose lectures Cicero had heard. He learnt to know Piso in the seventies or even eighties;<sup>27</sup> and though he speaks of philosophers ultimately going home to teach and then retire, he like Siro probably remained in Italy. We should know little of him

<sup>21</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 8. He possibly turns up later in Naples, dining with Cicero's Epicurean friend Papius Paetus, *Ad F.* 9.16.7 (Demmel, ap. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (1976) 58).

<sup>22</sup> T.P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (1971) 255. The Epicurean master of the teacher Aurelius Opillus may have lived in Campania, or at least outside Rome, as Opillus seems to be an Oscan name (Suet. *Gramm.* 6).

<sup>23</sup> Virgil, *Georg.* 4 563ff., if genuine or well-informed; *Catal.* 8.

<sup>24</sup> *ILLRP* 116, the only epigraphic reference in our period; probably common, if not always used for their proper purpose.

<sup>25</sup> Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.40.

<sup>26</sup> *AP* 11.44: perhaps not presented by Piso, whose patronage is solicited rather than lauded in the poem. Cichorius, *RS* 297 tries to identify the four friends whom Philodemus invites to dine in *AP* 11.35, perhaps at the cottage: Artemidorus could be the 'sophist' (orator), son of Caesar's friend Theopompus of Cnidus, but the suggestion that Apolophanes is the freedman who was to be Sex. Pompeius' admiral is rash. Of Aristarchus and Athenagoras nothing is known.

<sup>27</sup> When Piso was *adulescens*, in *Pis.* 68.

were it not for the discoveries at Herculaneum of the eighteenth century – only a few elegant epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*, Cicero's not very fair sketch in the course of his invective against Piso, and a couple of brief references to his work by later authors.

It is sometimes thought, though this has been challenged, that the original association of Epicurus at Athens constituted a *thiasos*, like the religious groups which often organised funerary banquets, as the Epicureans after his death celebrated their founder's memory on the twentieth of each month, his birthday.<sup>28</sup> These parties were, from what we know of them in Athens in or soon after Epicurus' time, cheerful occasions, at which the house was decorated and there was as much drinking and laughter as serious philosophic discussion – though Philodemus does think that they provided an opportunity to inform oneself on Epicurus' views.<sup>29</sup> Cicero's repeated insistence that his Epicurean friends were personally admirable men, though he deplored their beliefs, suggests that the revels did not get out of hand, as they were suspected of doing. Portraits of Epicurus were everywhere, especially on the participants' rings.<sup>30</sup> Relations seem to have been egalitarian: Piso is addressed by Philodemus as 'comrade' in the context of one of the feasts.<sup>31</sup>

It is right then that Cicero should set the debate on the Epicurean view of the end of man, in the first two books of *De Finibus*, in his own villa at Cumae, and should end them with a reference to Siro and Philodemus. The rich Romans with Epicurean sympathies who had properties in Campania have been listed.<sup>32</sup> They include Cicero's friend Papirius Paetus, who had a house in Naples and is recorded as listening to an Epicurean lecturer.<sup>33</sup> He was not one of the aristocratic Papirii from Rome itself, and his family may have been long settled in the area. Cicero's correspondent Trebianus, who was a friend of Siro, had property near Puteoli and may have been of Oscan origin, as his name could suggest.<sup>34</sup>

We shall see in the next chapter that many of the greatest libraries outside the Greek East were not in Rome, but in the villas of the nobles, and that as a result many scholars, either wishing to work in them or to help their patrons make elegant use of their leisure, are found in close proximity; the great library brought by Sulla from Athens was probably at Cumae, and Cicero mentions for example the presence of the *grammaticus* Nicias of Cos, when writing from one of his Campanian villas.<sup>35</sup> It was not only discussions of

<sup>28</sup> D.M. Lewis, *CR* (1969) 272.

<sup>29</sup> Philod. *Rhet. Suppl.* LVII Sudh.

<sup>30</sup> *De Fin.* 5.1.3 (also on their cups).

<sup>31</sup> *AP* 11.44.

<sup>32</sup> J.H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (1970) 58: M. Fabius Gallus, owner with his brother of a farm near Herculaneum; Cassius, the Liberator, who became an Epicurean in the early forties, may have had a house in Naples. Hirtius, Pansa and the L. Torquati are found in the area (L. Torquatus is the Epicurean speaker in *De Fin.* 1).

<sup>33</sup> *Ad F.* 9.26: the lecturer is called Dio, perhaps really Siro, see Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*

<sup>34</sup> Trebius, possibly his name before adoption, is a good Oscan name. Or his family may come from Trebia (there are several places of the name).

<sup>35</sup> *Ad A.* 13.52.2. Other scholars than Siro and Philodemus may have had small estates in the

Epicureanism that he set in his own or his friends' properties here. But we may look for signs of indigenous activity. Cicero's friend M. Marius, who solaced his gout with his books near Pompeii, may have been of Campanian descent.<sup>36</sup> And we can identify a cultivated permanent resident of Naples in L. Manlius Sosis, born in Sicily but *adscriptus* at Naples before 89 (and so gaining Roman citizenship then). Though he kept up ties with Sicily, where his brother died in 45, he was by this time a member of the town council in Naples. Cicero recommends him to the governor of Sicily and says he has a taste for literature and learning. His name suggests a connection with the noble Manlii Torquati, who are attested in Campania; his first language was clearly Greek.<sup>37</sup> There was some interaction then on the social and intellectual plane between the local upper class and the great Roman landowners, though Cicero does not admit the former, or the professional philosophers, to his dialogues.

We must not exaggerate the local interest in philosophy. Most of the numerous businessmen will, as Cicero says of his Puteolan friend and agent Vestorius, have understood arithmetic better (though Atticus did press the untechnical *Tusculan Disputations* on Vestorius).<sup>38</sup> And the frivolous resort of Baiae pullulated not with learned men, but actors, musicians, and practitioners advising on the cures taken at the hot springs.

There is not much evidence at this date for anyone concerning themselves with the fascinating past history of Campania, though the rhetor Epidius did claim to be descended from a local divinity of that name at Nuceria, and here as elsewhere in Italy genealogies running back to gods or heroes of legend may imply aristocratic patronage of poets and show-orators, perhaps usually in Greek and perhaps often in the second century when communities were still independent.<sup>39</sup> But Cicero, for example, takes no interest whatsoever in the Volscians, though it is true that Arpinum had been Latinised, and given Roman citizenship, a century back. Much of what attention was given to Rome's Italian heritage was just that: where she could be shown to have borrowed – the insignia of magistrates from the Etruscans, armour and weapons from the Samnites, cults from the Sabines – that was worth recording; and where old customs extinct in Rome still subsisted elsewhere, that too was noted by the antiquarians. Varro, who claimed Sabine origin for

---

area; patrons often pensioned dependants by giving them such. Cicero's secretary Tiro bought a small place on which he probably lived after Cicero's death, busy with scholarly work: *Ad F.* 16.21.7.

<sup>36</sup> *Ad F.* 7.1: the name is common in S. Italy.

<sup>37</sup> *Ib.* 13.30.

<sup>38</sup> *Ad A.* 14.12.3, 15.4.3. For Vestorius' business affairs, J.H. D'Arms, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome* (1981) 49ff.

<sup>39</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 28: reckoned a god after throwing himself in the river Sarnus and reappearing horned like a bull. Genealogies, T.P. Wiseman in *Les 'Bourgeoisies' Municipales Italiennes aux I<sup>er</sup> et I<sup>er</sup> siècles av. J.-C.* (1983) 299; he also suggests that a Greek verse genre known only from much later sources, *emporika* or poems about trade, might have been written for Italian *negotiatores* (at home or abroad).

his family and had property at Reate in the area, had a special disquisition in his *De Vita Populi Romani* on *quid a quaque traxerint Romani gente per imitationem*.<sup>40</sup> He had some knowledge of the Sabine dialect, apparently in reality a bastard mixture of Oscan and Latin, and in the *De Lingua Latina* he used this knowledge; he did not sit down to study the Italian languages and their relationships for their own sake, though he is once able to observe that a Sabine word comes from Oscan. The legendary traditions of Sabine influence on Rome in the regal period had some basis in fact, and when he traces a Latin word to Sabine as part of his great etymological enquiry into the Latin language, he will often be right. Etruscan and other languages are occasionally adduced (and Greek very frequently); but it is unlikely that Varro knew more than a few words of Etruscan and Oscan. None of his works is specifically devoted to an Italian subject, but it is clear that if we had more of those works (and of those by other scholars, especially antiquarians, of his time) we should find much incidental information on things Italian. Varro's love for the Sabines went as far as supposing that the Samnites, and perhaps other Oscan-speaking peoples, were colonists sent out by them,<sup>41</sup> and that in their territory, more precisely at the *lacus Cutiliae* with its floating island, was the centre or 'navel' of Italy.<sup>42</sup> Late sources show that his work on religious antiquities, the *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, mentioned many divinities peculiar to different Italian towns, though again, probably in the general context of borrowings by Rome.<sup>43</sup>

Histories of the Social War, of which there were a number, seem to have treated the rebels with sympathy and must have said something of the peoples most heavily involved, given the tradition of mixing geography and ethnography with history; indeed it is clear that the most important such historian, Sisenna, did so.<sup>44</sup> But the annalistic tradition to which many historians belonged was very Romano-centric, and there is nothing in Latin to put beside the *Origines* of the elder Cato, who systematically reported material about the peoples and cities of Italy at a time when these were politically and linguistically mostly still distinct, but formed an important part of Rome's conquering armies. After the Social War it seems probable that many Italians were trying to assimilate as quickly as possible and to forget that they were not really Roman. It is significant that the one possible work on Italy as such is written by a Greek – Alexander Polyhistor may have produced a work entitled *Italika*, and there are certainly a number of fragments attributed to him that deal with Italian legendary history and origins.<sup>45</sup>

Meanwhile Latin spread fast, helped in some areas by the veteran colonies

<sup>40</sup> *De Vita PR* frags 37ff. Rip.

<sup>41</sup> Varro *De LL* 7.29.

<sup>42</sup> Pliny *NH* 3.109. The whole passage on the Sabine territory and its rivers and lakes, some noted for their beauty, may be Varronian.

<sup>43</sup> Varro *Ant. RD* frag. 33 Card.

<sup>44</sup> See E. Rawson, *CQ* (1979) 327.

<sup>45</sup> *FGH* no. 273 frags 20, 104?, 111? But these or some of them might come from his *Peri Rhomes*. Cf. also Isid. *Etym.* 9.2.88.

founded by Sulla, unpopular as these were with their neighbours. In the Augustan age and after, when Italy was genuinely united, and Augustus had stressed the Italian support that had helped to bring him to power, rewarding leading Italians with office, it was safer to recall ancient traditions. At the same time, Rome had become more self-confident in the face of Greek culture, the absorption of which had largely preoccupied her in the earlier first century B.C.

But the Romans of our period took much interest in, because they made use of, what was known as 'Etruscan learning', the *disciplina Etrusca*: the complex lore of haruspicy, or the art of divination from entrails, and of the interpretation of prodigies and especially of thunderbolts, of the proper rites for the division of land, the foundation of cities and so on; and of the doctrine of *saecula*, the different ages in the life of a people, and of the afterlife. All this was enshrined in books. Much of it was thought to derive from the prophecies of the divine child Tages, and other superhuman figures such as the nymph Vegoia. But individual human authors seem to have been remembered. The highly aristocratic Laris Pulena of Tarquinii probably records on his sarcophagus – even before listing the political and religious offices he held – that he had written books on haruspicy.<sup>46</sup> A much later Latin inscription from the same town records an anonymous haruspex of uncertain date who may have recorded part of the *disciplina* in verse, or more probably published ancient formulae (*carmina*).<sup>47</sup> A passage of Pliny suggests that the books could sometimes be illustrated, for example to help the priests recognise types of bird, and doubtless other portentous phenomena. By good fortune, we possess part of an Etruscan sacred book, written on linen (regarded by the Romans as a material used for ancient and sacred documents) at a late date, perhaps even Augustan; it seems to contain a ritual calendar.<sup>48</sup> More than that of Rome, Etruscan religion was a religion of the book, or books. But by now, at every sacrifice of the Roman state, a haruspex stood by the magistrate to interpret the victim's entrails. When serious portents were reported to the Roman Senate, haruspices from all over Etruria were summoned to the city.

It may be that the *ordo* of sixty haruspices known from the imperial period already existed in the late Republic, and was the body consulted by the Senate in crises. If so, the *ordo* will have been a focus for learning as well as piety, though not for Etruscan nationalism, for the *disciplina* was, from before the time of Sulla, apparently under the control of the Roman priestly board of *Xviri*, later *XVviri*. Indeed the *ordo* might have been set up in response to the decree of the Roman Senate, probably in the second century, which asserted the need to preserve the *disciplina* and ordered its study by boys of the Etruscan upper class. This seems to have been the view of the Emperor Claudius, an Etruscologist; but it is odd that Cicero does not mention the organisation in his speech 'On the Responses of the Haruspices', if there was

<sup>46</sup> *CIE* 5430 c. 200 B.C.? Cf. M. Pallottino, *The Etruscans* (1975) 219.

<sup>47</sup> M. Torelli, *Elogia Tarquiniensia* (1974) 111ff.

<sup>48</sup> *NH* 10.39, if *depicta* may be so taken. The 'linen book' of the Zagreb mummy, Pallottino, op. cit. in n. 46, 198; the calendar covers only part of the year.

one. Perhaps it was Augustan, and the Senate earlier simply had a list of accredited experts to call on. But if the now famous *elogia* of *harsupices* from Tarquinii do not, as their editor thinks, prove a pan-Etruscan *ordo* for the pre-Sullan period, they must at least attest a local organisation at Tarquinii, and at this level a fixed meeting place, archives, library and so on are more than probable.<sup>49</sup> Such colleges will have existed in many Etruscan towns; indeed there will have been colleges of priests all over Italy which may have preserved documents and books, though they will have been less learned than the Etruscans.<sup>50</sup> It is also just possible that the old Etruscan League survived, though in a religious form only, and provided some kind of support for the *disciplina*; but it may have been revived in imperial times after an interval.

It was members of the now Romanized Etruscan aristocracy who translated the *disciplina* into Latin in the first century, when it was clear that the Etruscan language was dying: men like Tarquinius Priscus, from a family that held office in Rome from the early first century, and the exceedingly distinguished Aulus Caecina, Cicero's friend, who had learnt the art from his father, but had also studied Latin rhetoric and Greek philosophy.<sup>51</sup> He came from a famous family of Volaterrae. Such men obviously still knew the language; indeed one of the latest Etruscan inscriptions, bilingual with Latin, records a *haruspex*.<sup>52</sup> Etruscan may now have been on the one hand a learned tongue, and on the other a peasant patois.

There were of course also humbler salaried *haruspices*, attached to magistrates in Rome and in country towns, and unofficial ones of low status who interpreted signs and sacrifices for private citizens at a fee. Their knowledge of the *disciplina* might, one supposes, be imperfect; we know too little about the way the art was handed on and how public the books were, though there were traditions of great experts teaching students from a wide area, and there was nothing secret, it seems, about the translations into Latin. The great aristocrats probably did not act as practical *haruspices* in Rome's service; but the exact status of the famous Spurinna, who gave Caesar dire warnings at the sacrifice of the Lupercalia, is uncertain – he bears a proud name, and Cicero regarded him in 43 as the leading expert in Rome.<sup>53</sup>

How much non-religious Etruscan literature there was is unclear. Varro once speaks of 'Tuscan histories', written in the eighth Etruscan age, i.e. not long before his own time, and probably translated into Latin, but it is in

<sup>49</sup> For all this see E. Rawson, *JRS* (1978) 132.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. the brotherhood attested in the Iguvine Tables, the latest of which may be early first century. The Umbrians spoke an Italic language, but had undergone Etruscan influence. *De Div.* 1.92 speaks of Umbrian systems of augury as extinct. *De Div.* 2.85, *Praenestinatorum monumenta* suggests some sort of probably religious literature at Praeneste telling the story of Num. Suffustius (discovery of the magic lots used in divination there).

<sup>51</sup> Tarquinius' date is uncertain, but he may be mentioned in *Catalepton* 5.3, and used by the Augustan Verrius Flaccus (*Festus* 340L). J. Heurgon, in *Varron. Grammaire Antique et Stylistique Latine* (1978) 101 thinks he is used at Varro *De RR* 1.40.5 (*haruspices* on trees struck by lightning) and is the Tarquenna of 1.2.27. For Caecina see op. cit. in n. 49.

<sup>52</sup> L. Cafatius, *ILLRP* 791. He also interpreted thunder.

<sup>53</sup> Op. cit. in n. 49.

connection with the doctrine of *saecula*, which was part of the *disciplina*, so the works may not have been lay ones, on the model of Greek historiography. The Etruscans had in earlier days had a reputation for being wise in herbs and drugs, while the hot springs in the area will also have encouraged some kind of medical activity; they had also been experts on drainage,<sup>54</sup> and on town-planning, a subject on which Vitruvius has some knowledge of their views.<sup>55</sup> But these traditions too may have formed part of the *disciplina*; in any event, they will now have appeared old-fashioned to the Romans, who knew Hellenistic medicine and engineering. Indeed the whole civilisation probably appeared old-fashioned, in part of course to its benefit among the traditionally-minded.

The religious books will certainly have held information on the past, such as prophecies made and portents announced at times of crisis, and the cities will surely have preserved copies of some important public documents from the independent period. The Latin inscriptions from Tarquinii already mentioned that record the careers of local worthies, especially members of the Spurinna family, suggest that in the first century A.D. something could be known, or concocted, about a fairly remote past, perhaps from family records. The great nobles were clearly at least as proud as their Roman counterparts, and may have been even more backward-looking.<sup>56</sup>

Varro also mentions an author of tragedies in Etruscan, whom he seems to have known.<sup>57</sup> Some think his works must have been closet dramas from the time when the language was all but extinct; others assume real dramatic activity in Etruria.<sup>58</sup> There can be little doubt that in the second century the region was in direct touch with the Greek East. New Hellenistic influences in art, for example need not all be filtered through Rome. Etruscans served in Rome's armies in the East, and some probably, like Cicero's friend Caecina later, had business affairs there (they could, in Asia Minor, pick up legendary connections, since this is the area from which Herodotus and others said they had originally come; legendary connections were often put to practical use). Etruria was fertile and prosperous; inscriptions show numerous slaves with Greek names, some of whom were surely Greek-speaking, and even Greek-educated. It has indeed been suggested, though it is hard to prove, that the *disciplina Etrusca* itself suffered some contamination in this period from

<sup>54</sup> Censorinus 17.6; at *Sat. Menipp.* 444 B. Varro mentions a *Tuscan aquilex* who can find water.

<sup>55</sup> Vitr. 1.7.1 knows, or knows about, Etruscan books dealing with the proper kind of site for temples of different deities, with the reasons for these. But the Romans had had long experience of laying out new colonial foundations and dividing up land for settlers: the surviving imperial literature of the land surveyers suggests more Hellenistic than Etruscan influence.

<sup>56</sup> Persius, himself from Volaterrae, later speaks of tracing an Etruscan genealogy back many generations, 3.28. Maecenas knew of ancestors on both sides who had commanded armies. Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.3-4.

<sup>57</sup> *De LL* 5.55, one Volnius.

<sup>58</sup> K. Bouke v.d. Meer, *Etruscan Urns from Volterra* (1978), the latest full study, finds precedents for the scenes from legends known to have been treated by Euripides and the Roman tragic poets in the Greek visual repertory, so that it is not necessary to postulate theatrical activity in Etruria. And visual motifs inspired by the theatre – masks, statuettes of actors, etc. – common in Campania, are rare in Etruria. There also seem to be no verse epitaphs in Greek poetic metres.

Stoicism. The Stoics in 'what was once Etruria' mentioned by Philodemus were perhaps active in Etruria proper, thus described because it had lost its independence.<sup>59</sup> The *disciplina* may also have been affected by astrology and other forms of magic becoming popular in the Hellenistic world; certainly Latin authors produce as Etruscan what is really a curious mish-mash – notably the famous, or notorious, Nigidius Figulus, who may just possibly be of Etruscan descent himself.<sup>60</sup> Several slaves called Zerapiu, the Etruscan equivalent of Serapion, are known, which suggests that they or their masters were interested in Egyptian religion.<sup>61</sup> The Etruscans may also long have been aware of the tradition going back to Aristoxenus of Tarentum, who himself had a Pythagorean background, that Pythagoras was a 'Tyrrhenian' from the Aegean, and so related to the Etruscans, or of the story in Aristotle that he visited Etruria, and they may have been interested in Pythagorean ideas as a result.<sup>62</sup>

Since Rome had been in close contact with Greece proper and the East, she had been inclined to despise the Greeks of Magna Graecia. One of their traditions was medical, though it had certainly been overtaken by the developments of Greek medical science further east, especially in Alexandria. The most famous and serious Greek doctors from Southern Italy in our period, led by the great Heracleides of Tarentum, seem to have studied and practised in the East; the Romans did know about Heracleides, as a passage of one of Varro's *Satires* shows.<sup>63</sup>

Much less up-to-date, probably, was the medical society at Velia (Elea), far to the south of Naples.<sup>64</sup> Here a series of statues from the first century A.D. has been found, proving that there was a cult there of Apollo Oulius, god of healing, mainly or entirely in the hands of a clan of Ouliadae. Several of the presidents – pholarchs, or leaders of the 'den' – who were commemorated by portrait sculptures, are specifically called doctors, and another inscription may

<sup>59</sup> Rather than, as Crönert (above, n. 19) held, in Rome.

<sup>60</sup> See p. 94.

<sup>61</sup> J. Heurgon, *Daily Life of the Etruscans* (1964) 67.

<sup>62</sup> Plut. *QC* 8.7-8 introduces an Etruscan of his own time who believes Pythagoras was educated in Etruria, where a Pythagorean way of life is followed. The other characters in the dialogue are sceptical. Where matters other than religion were concerned, the Romans tended to think the Etruscans decadent and luxurious. This is the picture in DS 5.40, probably using Posidonius, and Posidonius may have got it from Roman friends rather than direct observation. For Roman interest in Etruscan architecture and art, see pp. 189, 199ff.

<sup>63</sup> *Sat. Menipp.* 445 B. The prominent Empiric Lycus of Neapolis is variously dated c. 100 or c. 60 B.C.; where he worked is unknown. He wrote on Hippocrates and other subjects. There is no reason to suppose the surgeon Philoxenus was from an Italian city, though he is rather dubiously called Claudius Philoxenus (Fraser, op. cit. in Chapter 1, n. 61, 2.537, which would mean he was a Roman citizen). For practitioners of varying status in Italian towns see esp. *pro Clu.* on Larinum: they range from Cleophrantus, reputable and perhaps a free Greek, to a travelling quack and a murderous slave; also the inscriptions discussed below, p. 85.

<sup>64</sup> *PdelP* (1970), articles by G. Pugliese Caratelli, V. Nutton and others. Three of the pholarchs, all called Oulis, held office in the 280th, 379th and 446th years after it is not clear what. The second of these wears a toga, and it is perhaps optimistically thought that this ties him to the years shortly after 89 B.C. (the third cannot be later than some time in the first century A.D.).

refer to an *iatromantis*, or doctor-prophet. What may be surgical instruments were also found. The cult seems to have been continuously active for a long time, and must certainly have been so in our period. What the proportions of science and religion in it were (and at the several shrines of Asclepius in Magna Graecia) can hardly be said. But the Romans did regard Velia as a health resort in the second and first centuries: Aemilius Paullus, in poor health towards the end of his life, was sent here, and Horace was to think of spending the winter in Velia as an alternative to taking the cold-water treatment at Baiae under Augustus' doctor.<sup>65</sup> And it is probably significant that Cicero, on his way south in 44, mentions casually in a letter from Velia that he has borrowed the doctor Nicon's book on diet from Nicon's pupil Sex. Fadius. It is possible that Nicon was Nicon of Acragas, a follower of Asclepiades of Bithynia;<sup>66</sup> if so it is interesting to see up-to-date medical works available at Velia. (Cicero's letter also shows that Velia was now far from wholly Greek, and inscriptions reveal increasing numbers of non-Greek names.)

The 'den' seems to have looked back in some way to Parmenides, the philosopher who lived in Elea in the early fifth century, who is himself here called Ouliades and, in an inscription on a herm, *physicus* or scientist. Did it also look to Pythagoras as well as Parmenides, who was reputed a Pythagorean by training? It was possible to apply Pythagorean number-mysticism in medicine. Italy was full of Pythagoreans in the days of Magna Graecia, says Cicero, thinking of the dispersion of the sect in the fifth century and its extinction as a serious philosophical force in the fourth. But some knowledge of Pythagoras and his tenets must have survived in southern Italy, since it did so even in Rome. In fact, among the mass of writings of uncertain date and origin falsely ascribed to pupils and early followers of the master, there are a number written in an artificial and often archaising Doric dialect, and attributed to the great Tarentine Pythagorean Archytas, Plato's friend, and to other Tarentine or south Italian figures, which it is tempting to think were written in Tarentum or its sphere of influence; though some think a Hellenistic handbook on Greek dialects all that need be thought of to explain the language. These works are mostly derivative, rather literary essays on philosophical subjects usually of a general kind, influenced as it seems by late Hellenistic Academic and Peripatetic thought; they are often dated to the early or late first century B.C.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 39; Hor. *Epist.* 1.15.1.

<sup>66</sup> *Ad F.* 7.20.3, with Steph. Byz. s.v. Dyrrachion.

<sup>67</sup> H. Thesleff and W. Burkert in *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* XVIII (1971). Some think the works written in Augustan Rome, others, while bringing the date down to shortly before the Social War, to take account of polemic against Scepticism, probably inspired by Carneades and Charmadas, still place them in Tarentum, though it is hard to see why anyone would be writing on kingship, for example, there at this time. The nub of the controversy seems to be philosophical: do some of these works imply knowledge of Antiochus' revival of the 'Old Academy' and the renewed interest in Aristotle of the first century B.C.? The spurious correspondence of Plato and Archytas, in which Plato ascribes Trojan origin to the Lucanians and refers to Okkelos the Lucanian, perhaps indicates that this at least was written before the Lucanians were more or less wiped out in the eighties.

The authors of these works clearly looked to Greek philosophical sources, and they cannot be shown to have been read at Rome. Varro, however, was at least aware of Okkelos the Lucanian and other supposed Pythagorean authors, and pseudo-Archytan works on farming and engines were known respectively to him and to Vitruvius;<sup>68</sup> while Alexander Polyhistor, who worked in Rome, knew 'Pythagorean commentaries', which he may have found in Italy. None of these, however, unless perhaps the last, were sources for the revival of interest in Pythagoreanism in both Rome and the Greek East at this time,<sup>69</sup> and it seems impossible to know if this revival in its turn had any effect in southern Italy.

Tarentum, which had rebelled and been taken by Rome in the Hannibalic War, was impoverished in the second century, towards the end of which Roman settlers were planted there; it still had attractions, not least its site, and Pompey, forerunner of other Roman visitors, had a house there. It retained one statue group worth seeing. The young Cicero was once in Metapontum, it is not known why, and rushed off to see the house of Pythagoras. Rhegium was damaged by an earthquake shortly before the Social War. Heraclea had almost disappeared in the Augustan period, after an attempted Romanization documented for us by a municipal charter.<sup>70</sup> Cicero, speaking in the mid-fifties, says that the cities of Magna Graecia pursue Greek literature now less than they had done in his boyhood, when the poet from Syria, Archias, made a name there before going on to Rome, and received, among other marks of honour and prizes, the citizenship of Tarentum, Rhegium and Naples – one which, says Cicero with Roman scorn, they had paid even to actors.<sup>71</sup> Archias was undoubtedly doing a round of festivals; there were often competitions at these for undramatic, especially encomiastic, forms of poetry, and for oratory. The competitors might combine participation in the festival with giving a course of lectures on *grammatica* or rhetoric, and indeed the educational aspect of the festival itself was often recognised, and a poet might give extra recitations, perhaps in the gymnasium. Cicero also tells us that Archias was entertained in the Italiote cities by local people of education, and he may have composed to private commissions. The festival pattern, which also offered a few administrative jobs to literary men, has no counterpart in our period at Rome or, probably, elsewhere in Italy; though we must remember that there seem to have been no really important festivals in the now decayed cities of Magna Graecia.<sup>72</sup>

When, hesitantly, they sank their political identity in Rome's in 89, gifts of citizenship at least could not continue. Few worthies of the Ciceronian period come from these parts, except Pasiteles, the sculptor and writer on art, who was born in some unidentified Greek city of Italy.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Varro *RR* 1.1.8, Vitruvius 1.1.17, 7 *praef.* 14.

<sup>69</sup> See pp. 291ff.

<sup>70</sup> *Ad A.* 5.6.1; group by the sculptor Pythagoras, Varro *De LL* 5.31; *De Fin.* 5.4. *Obsequens* 54; *FIRA* 1.140.

<sup>71</sup> *Pro Arch* 5, 10.

<sup>72</sup> A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae* (1983) chs. 1-2.

<sup>73</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.40. Ingenious emendation has further made a Tarentine of Thyillus, of whom three epigrams survive in the Anthology, an acquaintance of Cicero's in Rome: T.P. Wiseman,

The tribes near these cities had been much influenced by them. Some towns actually claimed to be Greek foundations, and Horace tells us that the people of Canusium were bilingual (in Greek and Latin).<sup>74</sup> Aristoxenus in the fourth century had spoken of Lucanian, Peucetian and Messapian pupils of Pythagoras (as well as Roman ones), and Okkelos and the other non-Greek Pythagoreans of whom we hear had perhaps really existed. But in the late second century what we find is that two Samnites were pupils of Panaetius; one created a type of semi-serious verse, *spoudaioparodoi*, possibly for stage performance (and clearly in Greek); again the curious mixture of farce and philosophy.<sup>75</sup>

But much of southern Italy had suffered heavily at Rome's hands in and after the Hannibalic War; anti-Roman sentiment doubtless encouraged cultural Hellenizing, but also Roman repression, culminating in the Social War and then Sulla's near-annihilation of the Samnites. The great Roman ranches established in depopulated areas were rarely visited by their owners, though the younger Cato once planned a philosophic retreat on his,<sup>76</sup> and they played no role comparable to that of the villas nearer Rome. In the mountains, the native peoples were less civilised, and mainly noted for magic. Since this was a popular manifestation, the Roman scholars, who were so fascinated by the complex systems of sorcery and divination coming in from the East, largely ignored it; though Varro knew a very intelligent augur called Vettius, able to hold his own with any learned man, who was probably a Marsian (the tribe had been much Romanized).<sup>77</sup> Politics surely involved speech-making in all Oscan-speaking areas, and perhaps some influence from Greek rhetoric, but we have no idea if speeches were ever written or published, and the easiest kind of written Oscan literature to envisage is books of spells.<sup>78</sup> Some Oscan towns probably had youth organisations similar to and perhaps derived from the Greek *ephêbeia*; whether like these they included

*Cinna the Poet* (1974) 141. The author of the *Lament for Bion* was probably Greco-Italian – he speaks of his 'Ausonian plaints', 1.94 – and has been dated to the late second or the first century B.C. A Neapolitan, Agathocles, won the prize for epic in Boeotia in our period, *IG VII* 416 13 – perhaps our Neapolis.

<sup>74</sup> Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.30.

<sup>75</sup> *Index Stoicorum* col. LXXIV. Note that Panaetius' aristocratic Roman pupils do not count as real philosophers, unlike these obscure Samnites, Marcius and Nysius (Nypsus, Nympsius?). Were the latter's works perhaps performed in the late second century Campanian-style theatre at Pietrabbondante, the great religious centre in Samnium? Are they influenced by Cynicism? L. Robert, *Études Epigr. et Philol.*, *BEHE* 272 15 for a *magodos* competing in Greece with a name beginning Pop... in the early first century, who is probably South Italian.

<sup>76</sup> Plut. *Cato Min.* 20, he had to take books and philosophers with him.

<sup>77</sup> *Censorinus* 17.15. Clearly not, with this name, from the aristocratic Roman college. There were Marsian augurs, and Marsian Vettii, but the man has also been thought Etruscan.

<sup>78</sup> Horace's Canidia, *Epod.* 5 and 17 (cf. *Sat.* 1.9.29, a Sabellian hag) explicitly has Marsian, Paelignian and other 'Sabellian' or Oscan traditions behind her; the scholiasts say her model was a Neapolitan perfume-seller. She has books of spells, though perhaps we should imagine them as in Latin. Livy 10.38.6, for the fourth century B.C. speaks (fancifully) of an ancient linen book with directions for sacrifices used by a Samnite priest. But Cato *De Agric.* 151, reporting directions given for a cypress grove by Minius Percennius of Nola, has been thought to follow a written work, probably in Oscan.

some formal education is quite unknown.<sup>79</sup>

When Cicero said that in his boyhood the Greek cities studied literature more than they did later, he added that the same was true even of Latium; and he also remarks in the *De Oratore*, set in 91, that the Latins study letters more than the Romans do.<sup>80</sup> It is hard to recover the facts behind this at first sight surprising judgment; perhaps the upper class in the Latin towns, having fewer opportunities to make its mark on a world stage, was less fiercely involved in law, politics and warfare than the Roman aristocracy, while Latin towns were still proud of their formal independence, and some were nearer than Rome was to Campanian or Greek influence.<sup>81</sup> Perhaps Cicero is thinking primarily of the two learned brothers Valerii of Sora, a Latin colony near Arpinum, who were friends of his father. But in the *Brutus* he mentions a few outstanding orators from Latin or Latin-speaking towns, who represented their communities at Rome, before the Social War, and when, for the period after 89, he explicitly attaches a local origin to a speaker – Octavius of Reate, Accius of Pisaurum, Cominius of Spoletium – he may mean that in spite of activity at Rome they still had strong ties with these places.<sup>82</sup> The same might be the case with L. Tarutius of Firmum, the astrologer also known to Varro. Early in the first century a merchant called Octavius Herseus or Herrenus wrote a book on the cult of Hercules in his native Tibur; but he introduced the cult to Rome and may have been settled there.<sup>83</sup>

Cicero did not go to his native Arpinum for learned conversation; but an *eques* there who had cultivated interests is attested in his letters. And he had friends in various towns who are said to be well-educated, such as the Laenii of Brundisium. There were doubtless schools in all places of any size; Horace first went or could have gone to school in Venusia, and his teacher in Rome, Orbilius, had begun by teaching at Beneventum; we have epigraphic evidence of a schoolmaster at Capua (there is also evidence, literary and epigraphic, for doctors, some very serious, in many towns).<sup>84</sup> But for more advanced education, including rhetoric, many young men of the municipal aristocracies probably now went to Rome, not least because non-urban Latin was looked down on; the Latin of the learned Valerius of Sora was not pure.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>79</sup> M. Della Corte, *Iuventus* (1924) is somewhat fanciful on the Pompeian association. Suet. *Gramm.* 3 should not be emended to give a *grammaticus* teaching in Oscan; all his *grammatici* are Latin, and this one is teaching somewhere abroad.

<sup>80</sup> *De Or.* 3.43.

<sup>81</sup> Southern Latium, close to Campania, may have had independent theatrical traditions, issuing in the *togata*, a form of comedy in Latin dress. We should also like to know more of proud and prosperous Praeneste, whence at least one dramatic poet came: E. Rawson, *PBSR* (1985), forthcoming. The (public) library in the great sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur (A. Gell. 19.5.4, cf. 9.14.3) might go back to its foundation in the early first century B.C.; re-building does not seem attested. If so, public libraries, like stone theatres, occur in Latium before Rome. There was one at Dertona (Cisalpinia) by 22 B.C. *CIL* V 7376.

<sup>82</sup> *Brutus* 241, 271; but perhaps as mere *equites* they need distinguishing marks.

<sup>83</sup> *Macr. Sat.* 3.12.7.

<sup>84</sup> *Ad F.* 13.12; *Pro Sest.* 131; *Hor. Sat.* 1.6.72; Suet. *Gramm.* 9; *CIL* X 3969 with, for date, M. Frederiksen *PBSR* (1959) 80. Doctors, see p. 85.

<sup>85</sup> *De Or.* 3.43. Valerius seems, after the enfranchisement of Italy, to have entered public life in Rome. The subject of his work *Epopitides* (*Initiated Women*) is uncertain: religious?

Cisalpine Gaul, a fertile and prosperous area, where the cities had unusually large territories and probably a wealthy land-owning upper class (for whom the Sasernae wrote a work on farming), produced so impressive a list of writers and scholars at the time we are considering and just after it that one cannot doubt that the foundations of a good education could be laid there, and indeed Suetonius names three notable *grammatici* who taught in it, perhaps in our period.<sup>86</sup> Virgil certainly studied in Cremona and Mantua before coming south, though perhaps not philosophy. Catullus once excuses himself from writing verse when at home on the grounds that he has only one book-box with him; this may mean little, but it is certainly possible that the libraries of Transpadane gentlemen had not yet caught up with Alexandrian poetry. The somewhat deficient Greek of Livy, who was prevented by the Civil Wars from going early to Rome, perhaps suggests that in Venetic Patavium the language was not well taught, in spite of earlier trading ties with Greek states; and even his Latin was notoriously criticised as evocative of his distant birthplace.<sup>87</sup>

How well could, in fact, a reasonably well-off man in one of the more distant parts of Italy keep up with developments at Rome? Much might depend on whether one lived near an important road and perhaps put up travellers along it; also on whether one went, possibly at a patron's demand, to Rome at least for the elections in the summer. And it might also depend on whether any locals had made good in Rome but retained ties and property in their *patria*; there were still areas of Italy which had produced no senators, and perhaps few *equites* active in the capital. But written versions of speeches given in Rome, and political pamphlets, were probably promptly disseminated in the *municipia* (we know the latter were in Greece), in order to influence opinion.

Sicily, it could be argued, lies outside our scope. It was a province, and a primarily Greek-speaking one. But there was Roman settlement from the second century, which must explain Lucilius' expectation that he would find readers here, as well as in Cosentia, Bruttium and Tarentum in southern Italy.<sup>88</sup> The *Verrines* show that some prominent Greeks had received Roman citizenship by 70, though this was rare in other Greek-speaking provinces. Caesar's grant of Latin rights, and Antony's of citizenship in 44, do suggest

<sup>86</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 3: Octavius Teucer, Sescennius Iacchus and Oppius Chares, the last into a blind and helpless old age. Writers from the area include the Sasernae (probably); Cornelius Nepos; the Insubrian Gaul Catius the Epicurean; probably the *grammatici* Antonius Gnipho and Valerius Cato, certainly the rhetor Albucius Silus; the poets Catullus, Cinna, Furius Bibaculus and Cassius Parmensis and Catullus' butt in 95 and 36, Volusius, whose *Annales*, probably in verse, seem to have been written and published in Patavium; also the friend Caecilius who read his own poetry with marked effect to a girl in Novum Comum, 35.13. Add perhaps the brothers Vibii Visci, Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.51 and his scholiasts, perhaps from Brixia (cf. *CIL* V 4201); it now seems one was known to Cornelius Gallus, perhaps in the forties, *JRS* (1979) 125. Gallus himself was probably from Cisalpine Gaul, *pace* R. Syme, *Roman Papers* (1979) I. 47 (see n. 100 below). The lawyer Alfenus Varus was perhaps from Cremona (but see E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957) 89; alleged by Porphyrio of the *Alfenus vaser* of *Sat.* I.3.130).

<sup>87</sup> Jerome *Chron. ad Ol.* 180, 2 and 181.4; Cat. 68.36; Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.56, 8.1.3, the famous sneer of Pollio at Livy's *Patavinitas*. The distinguished doctor Themison saw a case at, and so perhaps worked for a time in, Mediolanum (see p. 176).

<sup>88</sup> *De Fin.* 1.7.

that it was almost felt by their time to be a part of the peninsula, as it was by the geographers who held that it had once been physically joined to Italy. Here, as there, Greek culture was in decline; Strabo lists abandoned sites in both areas. And Cicero tells us in a famous passage how Syracuse had once been the most civilised of cities, but in 75 B.C. had even forgotten the tomb of her great scientist Archimedes.<sup>89</sup> Doubtless she had never recovered from the great Roman sack of the late third century, when Archimedes' celestial globes, and possibly books, were, like works of art, carried to Rome. Rome was unlikely to encourage the Syracusan tradition of military engineering, or, for different reasons, the more theoretical aspects of Archimedes' legacy. A few students of philosophy came from, or taught in, Sicily, as the Herculaneum indices show.<sup>90</sup> We have lately learnt from an inscription that Tauromenium on the east coast had a public library (as most Greek cities did); this one listed the, or some of the, historians whose works it held, no doubt in honour of the town's greatest son, Timaeus. Unsurprisingly, Fabius Pictor's history of Rome in Greek is listed, with the works of various Greek authors.<sup>91</sup>

The historian Diodorus tells us that pastoral poetry was still fashionable in Sicily, though it is not clear if he means that it is still being written.<sup>92</sup> There are no signs of the very Sicilian genres of comedies and cookbooks, but Cicero is a witness to lampoons against a governor and a speech in pamphlet form by a victim of Verres which circulated widely. The Sicilians still had a reputation for acuteness.<sup>93</sup> Doctors came from Sicily – Nicon of Acragas and T. Aufidius Sikelos or Siculus were pupils of Asclepiades, though where they practised is not known; both wrote medical treatises.<sup>94</sup> The only surviving Sicilian author of our period is Diodorus, last of a long series of Sicilian historians; and there had probably been a gap, for Diodorus uses not a local source but the great Posidonius' history for the second-century slave wars in Sicily (Posidonius may have visited the island). Diodorus' decision to write a world history may have something to do with being born in an area with strong historiographical traditions, where Greeks and Romans (and earlier, Carthaginians) lived cheek by jowl, but which now had no independent history of its own. He still contrasts Greeks and barbarians, and it is not quite certain that he used Latin sources, though he claims to have learnt the language from settlers. But he chose to work on his history neither at home nor in a Greek centre of learning, but at Rome, where, he says, all the

<sup>89</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.64-6.

<sup>90</sup> Pupils of Antiochus include a man of uncertain name from Acragas, and one Menecrates of Lesbos who worked in Sicily for a time, *Index Academicorum* ed. Mekler, XXXIV 8. Cato in 49 met another Academic there (Plut. *Cat. Min* 57.2), Philostratus, a Syrian later Cleopatra's court philosopher (and perhaps Herod's). The Philodemus of uncertain date expelled from Himera because his impiety caused natural disasters (Aelian frag. 40 Hercher) sounds like a native and so not the Epicurean, who was from Syria. The Alexandrian grammarian Trypho wrote in our period on the dialects of Himera, Rhegium and Syracuse, but fieldwork is unlikely.

<sup>91</sup> G. Manganaro, *PdelP* (1974) 389.

<sup>92</sup> DS 4.84.3 (but possibly from an earlier source).

<sup>93</sup> *Verr.* 2.3.77, 5.81, 5.112; *TD* 1.15.

<sup>94</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. Dyrachion.

materials he needed could be found (including, one supposes, the Sicilian works with which, almost alone, he ventured outside the standard repertory). He does thus to some extent represent a fusing of Greek and Roman culture (there is not much on Carthage, apart from the Punic Wars; even to a Sicilian she was now of little interest). It is perhaps significant, too, that the one teacher who came to Rome from Sicily in this period, Antony's licensed jester the rhetor Sex. Clodius, rather unusually taught in both languages.<sup>95</sup> He was probably of Greek or hellenized native stock, enfranchised through one of the Claudii, patrons of the island.

Syracuse and other cities were still tourist attractions, largely because of the ancient works of art on the island – at least till Verres in the seventies took them away, as Cicero alleges. Their owners, he says, were like Greeks everywhere, immensely attached to their artistic possessions. The professional guides or 'mystagogues' of whom we hear were doubtless as ignorant as such persons usually were and are, and there is no evidence that scholarly works, serving in part as guidebooks, were produced here as they sometimes were elsewhere. It is a pity however that we do not know more of a Roman *eques* resident in Syracuse, probably early in the first century, whose name has only reached us as Publius. According to Diodorus not only was he an admirable adviser to a governor, but he had a great love of learning and patronised all those who professed the liberal or the fine arts, and made generous dedications.<sup>96</sup> But he could hardly revive the great traditions of Syracuse singlehanded.

Beyond Sicily we need hardly go. Cicero reveals that there were Latin-writing poets at Corduba in Spain, where there had been much Roman and Italian settlement by *negotiatores* and veterans.<sup>97</sup> It has been suggested that Egnatius, who wrote *De Rerum Natura* in verse, might come hence.<sup>98</sup> Greek as well as Latin education might be available; we know that the Greek *grammaticus* Asclepiades of Myrleia taught there.<sup>99</sup> From the province of Transalpine Gaul came the poet Varro Atacinus, sometimes thought even to be of native descent; it is probably too bold to bring that other poet Cornelius Gallus from the same area.<sup>100</sup> The day of the intellectual from the Latin-speaking provinces had barely dawned.

<sup>95</sup> Suet. *De Rhet.* 5. Very little later we find the critic Caecilius of Caleacte, of freedman, possibly Jewish, descent.

<sup>96</sup> DS 37.8 (the governor was probably L. Sempronius Asellio, c. 96 B.C.) from Posidonius.

<sup>97</sup> *Pro Arch.* 26.

<sup>98</sup> R. Syme, *Roman Papers* (1979) I 38 n. 1, cf. Skutsch *RE* Egnatius (3) 1905, 1993.

<sup>99</sup> Strabo 3.C157.

<sup>100</sup> R. Syme, op. cit. in n. 85; Gallus came from Forum Julii, and it is true that the place of this name in Gaul was more important than that in Cisalpine Gaul; but as Syme admits, it was not yet a *colonia* at the time of Gallus' birth. For the Stoic Fabius, from Narbo, Chapter 3, n. 50; the noble Fabii had a *clientela* in Gaul, and the philosopher might be a native enfranchised through one of these, or descended from a freedman of the family.

## CHAPTER THREE

# Patterns of Intellectual Life

Rome was an aristocratic society, with an aristocracy that had traditionally taken seriously only war, politics, the law-courts (in which political feuds were pursued or dependants protected), and the care of its estates. Intellectual skills came to be valued by it, but primarily in so far as they contributed to success in these activities. Otherwise they were relegated to periods of leisure, *otium*, which they might fill in a way which some thought valuable either in itself or as an alternative to less reputable pastimes, and which others still regarded as frivolous. Few members of the upper class were so revolutionary as to abandon themselves largely or entirely to study; this was easier for those of equestrian than of senatorial background (but even here not common).

Rome was also a society in which patronage, in the general sense of that term, was all-pervasive. A system of relationships based on reciprocal services between individuals of equal or unequal status held the society together (though it could not, naturally, prevent people often acting on impulse, by moral principle, or from other motives). Men of standing would repay those to whom they were obliged for defence in the courts, jobs in the army, favours for their own dependants, and so on, with political or financial support at need. A less important person might only be able to swell the great man's morning *salutatio*, or (if he did not have duties to too many different patrons) stay to attend his train when he went down to the Forum; or, if he had made the service of a single man something like his profession, he might remain at his disposal the entire day, and perhaps even help to amuse him at the dinner to which he might be bidden. The great, or some of them, divided their *amici* (the less polite word *cliens* was rarely used) into different grades, differentiated by varying rights of admission to their presence. It has been pointed out that, in a society in some ways little developed institutionally, 'friends' supplied services analogous to those of bankers, lawyers, hotel owners, insurers and others today.<sup>1</sup> We shall see in the next chapter how various intellectuals, or classes of intellectuals, fitted into this system.

Certainly there were hardly any independent or official institutions that formed a focus for intellectual activities. There were no centres of higher education and research, as the Athenian schools, passing property from scholar to scholar, had been, or such as the Museum of Alexandria, which was under royal patronage. There was no state-run training system (for the well-off) like the *ephêbeia*, no public salaries or special rewards for

<sup>1</sup> A.R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (1968) 32, quoted in R.P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (1982) 14.

individual teachers, doctors or engineers such as Greek cities often had, though these were in the imperial period to become common in the West too. There was no public patronage by means of competitions, often with cash prizes, for special skills at the great festivals, a Greek custom not introduced to Rome till the times of Nero and Domitian. There were not even public libraries, common in the Greek world, often in connection with the gymnasium and *ephêbeia*. There was certainly nothing like the Renaissance proliferation of Academies, which had so much influence on intellectual advance.

The only cultural institution at Rome not connected with a private patron – in a sense the only cultural institution at Rome – was the association of poets, scribes and actors which began to meet on the Aventine in the Temple of Minerva in the third century. It may not have survived long in that form, however. It is possible that the poets, or some of the poets, split off in the early second century to meet at Fulvius Nobilior's Temple of Hercules and the Muses – not apparently a Museum on the Alexandrian model, or even the site of a library, so far as we know – while actors, or some of them, came to form the *parasiti Apollinis*, thus leaving mainly the government scribes on the Aventine (though they too may have moved house). Meetings of the *collegium poetarum* are not heard of after the time of Accius, at latest the early first century, and an inscription in which an unknown freedman appears as *magister scribarum poetarum* suggests that the original institution had become unimportant by the late first century B.C. It has been thought that Maecius Tarpa, who chose the plays at Pompey's games in 55 and appears as a critic or censor of drama in Horace's work, had the official function of selecting plays for performance as president of the *collegium*. But Roman magistrates would surely not hand over this politically sensitive job to any but close adherents, and Maecius was probably simply a scholar interested in dramatic poetry. It is conceivable that the *collegium poetarum* at the Temple of Hercules had fallen into oblivion for semi-political reasons. Accius refused to rise there for an inferior poet, the patrician C. Julius Caesar Strabo. Such independence was perhaps not to be tolerated.<sup>2</sup>

Where and how then did intellectual activity take place? We must begin by saying something about books and libraries, though the field is a well-trodden one. The chief libraries were in the palaces and villas of the great nobles; Rome had to wait for a public library till Caesar planned, and his follower Asinius Pollio built, one. The contents of the libraries were often the spoils of the East. True, the greatest of all Greek libraries, said to have over half a million rolls, that of Alexandria, was still untouched, till it was at least partly destroyed by fire in 47, during Caesar's occupation of the city.<sup>3</sup> And that of Pergamum seems also to have been left undisturbed when so many Pergamene treasures were transported to Rome in the late second

<sup>2</sup> For a recent discussion, N.H. Horsfall, *BICS* (1976) 79; cf. E.J. Jory, *BICS* (1968) 125. Maecius, *Ad F.* 7.1.1, *Hor. Sat.* 1.10.38. He is possibly the Maecius who distinguished Terence from a less famous homonym, *GRF* p. 412.

<sup>3</sup> P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972) 334-5.

century; it was saved by being attached to a temple rather than being royal property. It may even have survived Antony's promise to give it to Cleopatra, for the many learned Pergamenes of the Imperial period probably still used it. If there was a break in the history of the Academy and Lyceum at Athens, as we saw there may have been, we do not know what happened to their books. But by a remarkable chain of events, an earlier Peripatetic library passed into Roman hands. Strabo in a famous passage tells the story, probably in rather over-dramatised form. The books belonging to Aristotle and Theophrastus, his successor, passed to the latter's heir, and to his descendants, private people in the Troad, who allowed the rolls to fall into a bad state. Finally they sold them off for a large sum, around 100 B.C., to a great collector, Apellicon of Teos, who lived in Athens (where he quite improperly got hold of old documents from the public archives). After the capture of Athens Sulla carried off the library to Rome, or probably, as we shall see, Campania. Here the scholar Tyrannio, by making friends with the librarian, was able to reorganise and catalogue it.<sup>4</sup> The effect of these developments on Aristotelian studies will be considered later.

According to a late source, the famous library of Lucullus was part of his booty from Pontus, though Plutarch might suggest that he 'got together' his 'carefully written' books over a period of time. Plutarch speaks of libraries in the plural, but the main one (or perhaps two, Greek and Latin books being kept separately) was certainly in Lucullus' luxurious villa at Tusculum; Cicero paints a picture of going there 'as I was accustomed to do', to consult some of Aristotle's works, and finding Cato already there, 'wallowing' in books on Stoicism. This was after Lucullus' death, but the library was probably still open to all, as Plutarch says it was in Lucullus' own time, like the colonnades and *scholasteria*, probably rooms for study or teaching, where learned Greeks spent their days, often in company with the owner himself. No wonder Cicero thought it a suitable place to set a philosophic dialogue.<sup>5</sup>

In this Cicero describes himself as having many books of his own, and we can trace collections in his various houses. Once he sends books to Tusculum, or will if the weather is fine (books were valuable objects), probably an addition to what is already there; Tiro will be making a catalogue. The importance of catalogues suggests that the number of books involved might be considerable, and perhaps that outsiders would use them; Cicero certainly often borrows books, from Atticus and others, and it may have been thought something of a duty to lend them. Rather surprisingly,

<sup>4</sup> Strabo 13.C609; cf. Plut. *Sulla* 26. H.B. Gottschalk, *Hermes* (1972) 314 points out that Athenaeus 3a has a story that Neleus sold the books to Ptolemy Philadelphus, and thinks Apellicon invented the Troadic provenance of his books (stolen from the Lyceum?). But Posidonius (frag. 253 E and K) does think Apellicon had bought Aristotle's library as well as many other books. At all events, the story from the time the books got to Italy will be true, as Strabo knew Tyrannio.

<sup>5</sup> Isidore 6.5.1; Plut. *Luc.* 42; *De Fin.* 3.2.7ff. The first great Greek library to come to Rome had been that of the kings of Macedon, carried off in 167 by Aemilius Paullus. In whose hands it now was we do not know, possibly in those of the Fabii and Scipiones, descendants of Paullus' two sons.

Cicero seems even to have kept his legal books, or some of them, at Tusculum; he looks up a point of law for his friend Trebatius there, while the *Topica* describes himself and Trebatius sitting in the library, where the latter comes across what is to him an exciting novelty, Aristotle's work of that name.<sup>6</sup>

Cicero had (or had had, the date is earlier) a collection of some value at his house in Antium on the coast. For, after his return from exile, he employed Tyrannio to reorganise it, with the aid of trained slaves of Atticus, who presumably did the menial glueing and labelling that Cicero mentions. He was delighted with the result: 'my house has so to speak acquired a mind.'<sup>7</sup> If at another point he writes from his place at Cumae that he is 'feeding on Faustus's books', this probably shows that the library inherited by Faustus Sulla and including, presumably, the books of Apellicon, was kept in the villa at or near Cumae to which his father had retired – as one would expect. Probably they had never been in Rome, but arrived from Athens by sea, conveniently, to Puteoli. It has been suggested that 'Faustus' books' were books Cicero had bought from their owner, who was badly in debt by the time of the Civil War in 49. We know he had to auction some of his possessions, but if the library of Apellicon had come into Cicero's hands we should surely be told of it.<sup>8</sup> Cicero also had books at Formiae (perhaps those once at the house in Antium, which he had sold), as a letter to Atticus in 49 shows.<sup>9</sup>

We do not know for which of his properties Q. Cicero intended the improved library that he was proposing in 54 to set up; he was rebuilding his house in Rome, where he certainly had some books, for an early letter of his brother's asks Atticus, then in Rome, to bring a work *de libris Quinti fratris*.<sup>10</sup> But Quintus was also rebuilding two villas near Arpinum, one with a palaestra which was perhaps, like Marcus Cicero's at his *Tusculanum*, for intellectual rather than gymnastic exercises. Varro, as he tells us himself, had a 'Museum' at his villa near Casinum, and, as Cicero tells us, did much of his writing there. It is often assumed that one of his *bibliothecae*, which were plundered in the proscriptions of the Triumvirate, was here – but in fact he had lost the villa (and perhaps the books, unless Caesar had them returned) to Antony years earlier. He probably also had a library at Tusculum, where he spent much time after the death of Pompey; Cicero, proposing a visit, perhaps to this place, mentions one. We should recall that Varro was a very rich man.<sup>11</sup> A friend of his, Pinnius, dedicatee of Book 2 of the *De Rebus Rusticis*, had a fine villa, its walls further adorned with Pinnius' own writings

<sup>6</sup> *Ad F.* 16.18, cf. 20; 7.22; *Top.* 1. *Ad F.* 13.77.3, 'my valuable library', where the slave Dionysius had worked and from which he had stolen many books.

<sup>7</sup> *Ad A.* 4.8.2.

<sup>8</sup> *Ad A.* 4.10.1. Lucian *The Ignorant Book-collector* 4 refers to 'the books Sulla sent from Athens to Italy', but Plutarch and Strabo (above n. 4) do mention Rome. None of them is very good evidence.

<sup>9</sup> *Ad A.* 9.10.2.

<sup>10</sup> *Ad A.* 2.3.4.

<sup>11</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 3.1.3; Varro *RR* 3.5.9; *Phil.* 2.104-5; *Ad F.* 9.4.

(of which we know nothing); this implies a library.<sup>12</sup> We need hardly recall the philosophical library of the 'Villa of the Pisones' at Herculaneum, where the remains of about 1800 rolls have been found. It was a smallish, square, room with bookcases round the walls and a table in the middle at which to work.

There were of course some libraries at Rome – that of Atticus for example, and Vitruvius is thinking of a great town house when he gives directions for designing one (it is to look East to get the morning light and avoid bookworms and the damp that makes books go mouldy, and it is to be very magnificent).<sup>13</sup> But the most famous collections seem to be outside the city. One would think it inconvenient to have them scattered through Latium and Campania; the pattern of intellectual life must have altered considerably when, with Pollio and soon Augustus, the great public institutions in the Atrium Libertatis, and then on the Palatine and in the Temple of Pax, were set up. One problem will have been that the archives of the Senate, noble families and priestly colleges, the basis of much antiquarian and indeed linguistic research, were naturally in Rome; Cicero, at Tusculum, has to ask Atticus or his staff to look up old *senatus consulta* for him.<sup>14</sup> However, the new public libraries, run by the Emperor's slaves and freedmen, were to exercise a certain official censorship. Some books were not in them – Caesar's *juvenilia*, Ovid's erotic works. But privately these often continued to circulate, and libraries in country houses continued to cater to learned *otium*.

The only professional scholar at Rome of whose library we know anything is Tyrannio, whom Strabo called, *à propos* of his services in Sulla's library, a 'lover of books'; his work in Cicero's library at Antium bears this out. He is said to have had 30,000 rolls, but this is perhaps a conventional number. The fact that, unusually, he made a good deal of money from his teaching is obviously relevant.<sup>15</sup>

The production and sale of books in Rome was undeveloped. We know the names of no booksellers before Horace's Sosii; though Cicero refers to a bookshop (or copyists' workshop) near the Forum, where of course the well-off would pass it, and Catullus speaks of buying up from the *librarium scriinia* the works of various bad poets.<sup>16</sup> But when Q. Cicero, who was making money in Gaul, proposed to improve his collection of Greek books by additions and changes, and to purchase Latin ones, his brother wrote that it was very hard to buy decent copies, and he had no one to make them – but he would talk to Tyrannio and give orders to Chrysippus (a freedman of his own, with some education). Later he reported that Tyrannio was being dilatory; he would

<sup>12</sup> Varro *RR* 3.1.10 (cf. *Ad F.* 13.61.1 and p. 13). Note also *De Or.* 2.60: Antonius reads when at Misenum, having little time at Rome.

<sup>13</sup> *Ad A.* 12.14.3; *Vitr.* 6.4.1, 5.2.

<sup>14</sup> *Ad A.* 13.33.3 (possibly a published collection).

<sup>15</sup> Suda s.v. Tyrannion (this probably refers to Rome, not Amisus, where Tyrannio had earlier taught). Libraries in Rome, A.J. Marshall, *Phoenix* (1976) 252.

<sup>16</sup> Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.2, 2.3.345; *Phil.* 2.21; *Cat.* 14.17; in 55.4 he seeks a friend *omnibus libellis*, thought by some to mean bookshops (so recently T.P. Wiseman, *PBSR* (1980) 6; but *Asc.* 33C does not necessarily imply bookshops near the Forum, and is perhaps referring to official documents). Others take Catullus to mean advertisements or notices.

speak to Chrysippus, but it was a difficult business and needed care. 'I know this by experience, for I get nowhere with all my enthusiasm. For Latin books I don't know where to turn, they are so badly made and sold with so many mistakes in them. But I will do what can be done.'<sup>17</sup> (Of course a good library would be predominantly Greek; Cicero is amazed by the number of Greek books there are, 'often saying the same things'.)<sup>18</sup>

There is other evidence for problems with the quality of book-production. Varro in the *De Lingua Latina* breaks off a technical discussion on the ground that the copyist will never be able to reproduce it correctly.<sup>19</sup> The Greek historian Diodorus Siculus, who worked in Rome, complained of pirating book-sellers who disseminated inaccurate or partial copies of his work before it was published; he tried to defend himself by giving a list of contents. Strabo observed that when Tyrannio was working on the library of Apellicon the librarian also gave permission for booksellers to copy the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, which they did badly, though partly because the MSS were in poor condition. But the booksellers had failed to check their versions against the originals, as happens at Alexandria as well as Rome.<sup>20</sup> This does at least show that serious Greek books were being produced commercially in Rome, at least by the thirties or twenties.

But it is hardly surprising that booksellers were often by-passed, especially by those who owned skilled slaves. In 46, writing about his recent *Orator* to Q. Cornificius, Cicero says that he will give the book to *tui*, 'your people', to copy; not that the book can be obtained from Atticus' 'publishing firm', which was fairly certainly not organised on a commercial basis large enough to deserve the name, or possibly on any commercial basis at all. One notes that Balbus and Caerellia took their own copies of the *De Finibus* from the manuscript, though this was in Atticus' hands; and these actions count, to Cicero, as 'publication' (*edere*). And it is in Cicero's household, apparently, that presentation copies of the *De Finibus*, for Brutus, and the *Academica*, for Varro, are made. True, Atticus will lose by the recasting of the *Academica*, but this would be so even if he were merely having a few good copies made as gifts or to lend for further copying. As has been pointed out, Cicero thinks that a correction can be made in copies that have left Atticus' workshop, as well as in those still in his hands, so the former must be few in number and their location known.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 3.4.5 (contrast *venalia* and *confici*, the two ways of getting books); 5.6. Chrysippus was perhaps Cicero's librarian; he also looked after, perhaps taught, young Marcus in 50 but abandoned his post.

<sup>18</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.1.5.

<sup>19</sup> *De LL* 8.51. The elder Pliny was to lament that copyists distort botanical illustrations, and was rightly suspicious of numbers, which tended to vary in different copies of the same work, and of possible omissions.

<sup>20</sup> *DS* 40.8; Strabo loc. cit. in n. 4.

<sup>21</sup> *Ad F.* 12.17.2, *Ad A.* 13.13.1; cf. 21a, 23.2. We must not imagine anything on the scale of Regulus' thousand copies of the eulogy of his son, to be sent all over Italy and to the provinces (*Plin. Ep.* 4.7.2). See for a sceptical view R. Sommer, *Hermes* (1926) 389. It is thus easy to imagine how M. Antonius' *libellus* on rhetoric and Cicero's speech *In Curionem* were 'published' against their authors' wills. When a speaker in *Hort.* 8 asks for the *index tragicorum* in a library, *ut sumam qui forte mihi desunt*, is he planning to copy, or have copied, rather than just to read?

If this is so even in the forties, it will not surprise us that in the eighties several Romans with philosophic interests are described as copying out from his manuscript the new work of the philosopher Philo, and that in 59 Cicero borrowed from Atticus the geographic poem of Alexander of Ephesus, and had it copied. He also bought Serapio's geographical work through, but not from, Atticus – the only reference to an individual purchase in the letters.<sup>22</sup> Foreign travel might help one to acquire Greek books: the poet Cinna seems to have found a good copy of the astronomical poet Aratus in the East, which he presented to a friend (not that Aratus was unknown in Rome).<sup>23</sup> However, if the book trade at Rome was still undeveloped, so perhaps was that in forgeries of supposedly remarkable provenance which may have been rampant under the Empire.<sup>24</sup>

At all events it is clear that a great many books were available to a patient and able-bodied student based on Rome and with useful connexions with those who owned villas in Rome and Campania. This is plain from, above all, the learned compilations of Parthenius, who used obscure Hellenistic historians and poets, and Alexander Polyhistor, who followed a wide range of ethnographic and historical sources. And, though ancient references are notoriously not always first hand, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing the first books of the *Roman Antiquities* shortly after our period, probably did consult the many Greek and Roman authorities on the early history of Italy that he mentions. Vitruvius even remarks that readers can pursue their special interests, if they wish, in the works of the numerous Greek mathematicians and scientists that he lists, and Varro tells his wife that she can do the same with various Greek works on agriculture; though literary convention might be involved in these cases, and the extent of Vitruvius' Greek reading is uncertain.<sup>25</sup> But we meet no complaints in the surviving literature that a particular book is impossible to track down. Some difficulty in getting hold of books may however be reflected in a lawyer's *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea of a right of access to documents, based on advantage, by supposing that a student of any subject might try to enforce a sight of someone else's books on the grounds that this was 'to his interest'.<sup>26</sup>

We can say nothing about what books cost, though for other periods prices seem to have been fairly moderate. The mind boggles at what a copy of Varro's *Imagines*, with seven hundred portraits in it, was worth; yet Pliny suggests that copies were widely dispersed.<sup>27</sup> Many illustrations however were severely practical diagrams, like those once in Vitruvius' work; historical and ethnographical works do not seem to have included maps.

<sup>22</sup> *Ad A.* 2.4.1, 22.7.

<sup>23</sup> Cinna, *FPL* frag. 11.

<sup>24</sup> J. Zetzel, *HSCP* (1973) 225: works supposedly in the hands of well-known first-century B.C. *grammatici*, and *a fortiori* in those of Atticus and Nepos, are suspicious; it can be objected that such men would not have written, perhaps not even corrected, copies themselves. (But the collectors must have thought they would.)

<sup>25</sup> *Vitr.* 9.8.1, *Varro RR* 1.1.7.

<sup>26</sup> Alfenus Varus, 66 *Lenel*.

<sup>27</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.11.

Certainly books were not the extravagantly illuminated, almost magical objects they often became in the Middle Ages. But one factor that probably made them comparatively dear was the cost of papyrus. This was often cleaned and re-used: Trebatius wrote to Cicero on a palimpsest, though to be twitted for his *parsimonia*; Catullus and his circle, not poor men, generally used the same material, though the bad poet Suffenas had got his book up regardless of expense. And perhaps papyrus was sometimes in short supply: to ensure frequent letters from Atticus, Cicero, before he left for Cilicia, gave him a couple of hundred sheets, and we may be sure that it was not expense that would deter his wealthy friend.<sup>28</sup> Expense and shortage of papyrus may possibly have discouraged the taking of notes and the making of more than one or two drafts, though of course wax or wooden tablets might to some extent be used for these purposes. Young Marcus Cicero's lecture notes were probably taken down on tablets, and the copyist he wanted, to have them written out, would have had to transfer them to papyrus.<sup>29</sup> The introduction to Rome of shorthand comes just into our period, and the association of the system that proved most popular with the name of Cicero's literary amanuensis Tiro suggests that it could be used for literary and scholarly purposes as well as correspondence and business affairs.<sup>30</sup> At all events, slave and freedman assistants were used by all the better-off writers. No wonder we hear of large numbers of slaves trained in letters by Atticus and M. Crassus, in the latter case at least as a commercial proposition. These ancillary figures in intellectual life must not be forgotten, anonymous as all are save a few of the readers and secretaries of Cicero and his friends.<sup>31</sup>

Who read the books that reposed in the libraries or were on sale in the shops? Obviously the scholars and writers, professional or amateur, Greek or Roman, of whom there was a larger number than is sometimes supposed; many are known from a single chance reference, and many whose date is uncertain may come in our period. Cicero's letters further suggest that a certain number of the people he recommends to friends or otherwise mentions had cultivated interests – it is a matter he seems to notice wherever possible. But we have too little evidence about reading habits even in the upper class. Legal works, unsurprisingly in this society, were more popular than philosophic writing in Latin; Caelius wanted Cicero to dedicate something didactic to him – possibly on oratory? – as it would circulate well.<sup>32</sup> This is perhaps a testament to Roman earnestness. Agricultural treatises might be

<sup>28</sup> *Ad F.* 7.18.2; *Cat.* 22; *Ad A.* 5.4.4.

<sup>29</sup> *Ad F.* 16.21.8. J. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (1968) ch. 7. The elder Pliny had excerpts taken down on tablets and then transferred to a roll (note the double risk of error); he also made notes on the margins of books he read (or had read to him).

<sup>30</sup> We have Greek treatises on shorthand surviving on papyrus, and Latin ones from the Middle Ages. The system was confusing, each sign having several meanings, depending on context. See H.J.M. Milne, *Greek Shorthand Manuals* (1934).

<sup>31</sup> Including L. Crassus' *scriptor et lector* Diphilus, whom Cicero had probably known as a boy (*De Or.* 1.136), and M. Marius' reader Protogenes (*Ad F.* 7.1.3). *ILLRP* 795 records a *libr(arius)*, but whether private or commercial is unknown. *Quint.* 10.1.28 says Seneca was sometimes misled by research assistants.

<sup>32</sup> *De Fin.* 1.12 (*vendibilia* probably not to be taken literally); *Ad F.* 8.3.3.

read by a good many landowners, but the dedicatees of Varro's *De Re Rustica* are, apart from his wife, one Turranius Niger, perhaps from Cisalpine Gaul, who is sometimes thought to have written on the subject himself, and may be the D. Turranius noted as adept in polite learning by Cicero, and also Pinnius, himself an author. Not ordinary country gentlemen, then, and both the author, who makes some errors, and the dedicatees (or readers?), who need to have technical terms explained, seem a little remote from reality. But the *De Re Rustica* may not be entirely typical of the agricultural works of the time.

Those in public life would think it necessary to read a certain amount of history, though Cicero was shocked by the ignorance of some nobles, even where their own ancestors were concerned; and where history shaded into mythography, it was clearly regarded as enjoyable light reading which made few claims to be regarded as true. Vitruvius singles history out as holding the reader by the expectation of novelties in the narrative. Perhaps a fair number of Romans could say, as Cicero makes the orator M. Antonius say, at the beginning of the century, that he sometimes looks at Greek orators and historians, but cannot understand the philosophers and poets.<sup>33</sup> There is evidence that the works of Xenophon were often well-thumbed, and that if a Roman gentleman read no other political thought, he read the *Cyropaideia*, and probably also knew the *Oeconomicus*, which Cicero translated in youth, and perhaps the *Memorabilia* (the easiest way to learn something about Socrates). Xenophon's simple Greek, and sensible, practical outlook, may have been an attraction. (But Cicero assumes in 60 B.C. that two run-of-the-mill governors will know nothing of Xenophon's *Cyropaideia* or *Agesilaus*.)<sup>34</sup>

How many women of the upper class read at all extensively cannot be determined, though the education of a few can be documented. The somewhat mysterious Sempromnia of Sallust's *Catilinarian War* had studied Greek and Latin literature and wrote verse (as well as committing crimes of virile daring and dancing better than a virtuous woman need).<sup>35</sup> Her only function is to illustrate Roman corruption, so there should have been a few others like her. Literature would of course be the basis of a girl's education, as of a boy's, but few girls probably progressed beyond the *grammaticus*' tuition. Pompey's daughter was taught her Homer, and recited a remarkably unfortunate passage to her father on his return from the East.<sup>36</sup> Cicero called Tullia *doctissima* in the *Consolatio* he wrote after her death, and the sympathy between father and daughter, with his remark that she is very like him, suggests she could enter into some of his interests.<sup>37</sup> The tutor of Atticus' daughter was his freedman, the distinguished *grammaticus* Caecilius Epirota,

<sup>33</sup> Vitr. 5 *praef.* 1. *De Or.* 2.61.

<sup>34</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 1.2.7.

<sup>35</sup> Sall. *BC* 25; wife of D. Junius Brutus, cos. 77. Münzer, *PW* IIA (1923) 1446 thought her daughter of C. Gracchus; R. Syme, *Sallust* (1964) 134 makes her father a Tuditanus and herself aunt to the formidable, but not as far as we know intellectual, Fulvia (the wife of Clodius, Curio and Antony).

<sup>36</sup> Plut. *Q. Conv.* 9.1.3. It began 'You have returned from battle: would you had died there'.

<sup>37</sup> *Consol. frag.* ap. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 1.15.20; *Ad Q.F.* 1.3.3. It might be significant that she

who had to be dismissed for making love to her. But these were all daughters of unusual men, even Pompey having a profound respect for learning. His last wife, the daughter of Metellus Scipio (who shocked Cicero with his ignorance of family history) stands alone in her interest in mathematics, music and philosophy – and was charming and quite unaffected, says Plutarch.<sup>38</sup>

Law and rhetoric were vocational subjects, only for the men, though a few portentous women are said to have represented themselves in court, and the daughter of the orator Hortensius had picked up enough rhetoric, or inherited enough ability, to make a decent speech to the Triumvirs when they tried to put a special tax on women; speaker and occasion were exceptional. Philosophy (and so mathematics) was in fact less unwomanly. One of the speakers in Cicero's *Hortensius* contrasts his mother, *mulier sapiens*, with his more superstitious grandmother.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps a slight taste of philosophy may have begun to seem a safeguard against female credulity. But we do not know what Cicero's elderly friend Caerellia, perhaps a neighbour of his in the country, made of the not very easy *De Finibus* when she got her unauthorised copy of it; or the ageing and unattractive lady of Horace's eighth *Epode*, who seems to have claimed the status of a *matrona*, of the *libelli Stoici* which lay on her silk cushions.

Certainly we hear of no girl working seriously with a well-known philosopher, let alone studying in Athens, as a very few had done in Plato's day.<sup>40</sup> Most married very young (though strictly Suetonius implies that Attica was having lessons after her marriage), and they did not under the Republic travel abroad with husbands who were usually technically on active service. But many will have spoken some Greek, if only to manage their households; and Varro's wife Fundania is expected to be able to read a long list of Greek authorities on agriculture if she so wishes. She is, it may be noted, the only woman we know to have had a work dedicated to her in this period. The only genuine authoress seems to be Cornificia, sister to the poet and soldier Q. Cornificius; her epigrams survived to Suetonius' time.<sup>41</sup> The only attested patronesses of learned men come just before or just after our period.<sup>42</sup> If Roman nobles felt themselves the equals of Hellenistic kings,

seems once to have intervened on behalf of Atticus' learned freedman Dionysius, her brother's tutor, *Ad A.* 10.2.2. *Hor. Sat.* 1.10.91 unkindly implies that some literary men of his day were only fit to teach girls.

<sup>38</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 16; Plut. *Pomp.* 55.

<sup>39</sup> *Hort.* frag. 48 Grilli. The heroine of the so-called *Laudatio Turiae* is praised for piety without superstition, but seems to come from a rich but unintellectual milieu.

<sup>40</sup> There is no evidence that Octavia went to lectures in Athens in 39/8 with Antony, as has been carelessly assumed. But it is not inconceivable.

<sup>41</sup> Jerome *Chron.* for 41 B.C. The extant work of Sulpicia, from the Augustan age, suggests that female verse was not likely to be very learned. The idea that Clodia, the wife of Metellus Nepos (probably not Catullus' Lesbia), wrote plays rests on the fragile basis of a couple of jokes in Cicero, *Pro Cael.* 64 and *Pro Sest.* 116. Nor is it very clear that Lesbia herself, as the addressee of learned verse, need be *docta* herself. Augustus' wife Livia knew Greek, as a surviving letter to her, with other evidence, suggests; but she had, unusually for an aristocratic woman, lived in Greece, during the proscriptions (Suet. *Ti.* 6, *Claud.* 4).

<sup>42</sup> Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, and possibly Octavia, Augustus' sister, who helped Vitruvius to a job, *Vitr.* 1. *praef.* 2.

their wives rarely took on the role of queens, who had sometimes patronised literature or learning. In spite of their comparative legal and social freedom, women are inconspicuous in intellectual life. About all that can be said is that they concerned themselves with their sons' education, as mothers in classical Athens at all events are not recorded as doing. Great ladies like the mothers of Caesar and Octavian appear in this role, and Vitruvius was grateful to both his parents for his education.<sup>43</sup> Middle-class girls perhaps sometimes went to school to learn their letters, as Livy's obviously anachronistic story of the fifth-century Verginia has suggested.<sup>44</sup> Courtesans might sometimes be accomplished, but familiarity with erotic verse hardly qualifies them for our austere pages.<sup>45</sup> They were often of Greek background, but the fact that the Romans were unable to contract valid marriages with foreign women meant that wives could not, as has been the case in many societies, act as transmitters of a higher culture.<sup>46</sup>

Other possible readers, with some education (but like the women, not a rhetorical one), may be sought among freedmen, not specially trained for literary jobs but trying to rise in the world, and perhaps *scribae* and others among the few bureaucrats. Two men later well-known as *grammatici* had held jobs in the civil service, Orbilius, a student of literature from boyhood, as *apparitor* to the magistrates at Beneventum, and Sulla's freedman Epicadus to his master in his capacity as augur.<sup>47</sup> When Varro is made to object to Cicero, in the *Academica*, that anyone who wishes can read philosophy in Greek, Cicero denies it (though in fact his philosophic works were aimed largely at young men likely to enter politics, who would almost all know some Greek). Atticus pressed the *Tusculans* on the businessman Vestorius, who had no philosophic training and whose Greek was likely to be of the commercial variety. The philosophy in Varro's own *Menippean Satires* had been for the *minus docti*, though perhaps for the upper class.<sup>48</sup> But Cicero remarks that poor

<sup>43</sup> Vitr. 6. praef. 4.

<sup>44</sup> Livy 3.44. The young woman on the stele of Furius Philocalus from Capua (p. 75) is, unlike the boy, probably a relation not a pupil. But girls went to school in many Greek cities, sometimes with boys (of course at a elementary level).

<sup>45</sup> A poem of Philodemus complains that the famous Flora (once Pompey's mistress) is ignorant of Greek love-poetry, *AP* 5.132. Volumnia Cytheris has been given intelligent interests on insufficient grounds: if Cicero once said Antony might have borrowed some wit of her, it is only because she acted in mime. The fact that she was also the poet Gallus' mistress and is dubiously said to have recited Virgil's *Eclogues* in a theatre also proves little. Martial later did expect *faciles puellae* to read his verse.

The only woman known to have made a living in late Republican Rome by an art other than those of love and the stage is the portrait painter Iaia of Cyzicus, Pliny *NH* 35.147 – the name is uncertain.

<sup>46</sup> Women have often excelled in memoirs and fiction, but autobiography in Rome was political and military, and there was little true fiction, though some Greek romances may have been in circulation and attracted female readers; they are below the notice of our sources. Varro's *Menippean Satires* had fictional elements but were obviously not aimed at a female readership; the *Milesian Tales* of Sisenna may date from the Triumviral period and not be written by the historian and orator, see E. Rawson *CQ* (1979) 327. The connection of most forms of narrative with rhetoric or historiography will have proved discouraging to women.

<sup>47</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 9 and 12.

<sup>48</sup> *Acad.* 1.2.4, 3.10; *De Fin.* 1.10; *Ad A.* 14.12.3, 14.1, 15.4.3 (but a joke is involved).

works on Epicureanism in Latin by Catius, an Insubrian Gaul from Northern Italy, and by Amafinius and Rabirius, had spread widely in Italy, and there were now 'far from learned Epicureans in every village' (probably in fact small landowners?). Cassius, in a letter, countered with *rustici Stoici*, who would make Catius look like an Athenian.<sup>49</sup> These must be Latin-speaking, preferably Latin-writing, people whom Cicero could well disdain to mention when discussing the absence of philosophical literature in Latin before his own works came out. In fact, the Stoic writer Fabius, described by Horace's scholiasts as an *eques* from Narbo in Gaul who fought for Pompey in the Civil War, could easily have been already writing, if not Horace's other Stoic butts in his *Satires*, Stertinius and the poet Crispinus.<sup>50</sup>

Cornelius Nepos undoubtedly wrote his brief *Lives*, which were published in the thirties, in a simple and far from elegant style, and without much research, for a semi-educated public defined as the *vulgus*, prone to *satietas* and suffering from *ignorantia*, and explicitly stated to lack any knowledge of Greek literature. He expects it to be surprised to learn that in classical Greece women did not go out to dinner with their husbands, that musicians, actors and athletes were treated with respect, that Cimon could marry his half-sister, Cretan youths be praised for the number of their male lovers, and Spartan widows hired to go out to parties.<sup>51</sup> Biography was regarded as a less serious genre than history, but perhaps in assessing Nepos' choice of subject we should note Cicero's remark that men of humble position, even artisans, are interested in history.<sup>52</sup> Nepos' work was in sixteen volumes or more, however, and hardly to be bought by many such men; he may have been aiming at an intermediate class.

Nepos moved in educated circles and claimed learning, though he seems to have been phenomenally inaccurate. The partly educated surface as writers in the clumsy narrators of Caesar's African and Spanish wars, with their few poor attempts at rhetorical or literary gestures. The first of them had certainly read some history, and had conventional ideas of what historiography should be like. Neither was in Caesar's counsels, and so not likely to be of high rank. One can well imagine that many far from learned persons, including veterans from all over Italy, were anxious to read of Caesar's campaigns. The lucid simplicity of his own *Commentaries* was probably a matter of principle (and was admired by the best judges), while in theory *commentarii* were written for professional historians to elaborate; but Caesar may also have been appealing over the head of the aristocracy in Rome to a wider audience. The fact that he is particularly concerned to praise individual centurions, and the troops in general (though he can single out higher officers) might be significant.

One might have expected translations from the Greek to have been produced for these unlearned readers, as they were when knowledge of that

<sup>49</sup> *Ad F.* 15.16 and 19. Amafinius could be followed by the *indocti*, *Acad.* 1.2.6; even the *mediocriter docti* know the tenets of Epicurus, *Tusc. Disp.* 2.7.

<sup>50</sup> Fabius, *Hor. Sat.* 1.1.14, 2.134; Stertinius, 2.3.33, 296; cf. *Ep.* 1.12.20 – Ps.-Acro indeed thinks he wrote 220 books, in verse. Crispinus, *Sat.* 1.1.120, 3.139, 4.14, 2.7.45.

<sup>51</sup> Nepos, *Prologus* 1-5, *Pelopidas* 1.

<sup>52</sup> *De Fin.* 5.52. But of course it is of no practical use to them, as it is to public men, he says.

language declined in late antiquity. But there was little close translation made; there were one or two versions of epic, which may possibly have been produced for those who could not read the original, but on the whole translation was regarded as a linguistic and stylistic exercise. For a short time, a rhetorical training was open to the Greekless, but hardly the penniless, in Plotius' school of Latin rhetoric, closed by the censors of 92. The driver in Varro's *Menippean Satires* who has picked up a tumid and vulgar rhetorical style from Plotius has perhaps had his lowly position exaggerated, and one does not quite know what Cicero means when he describes speakers in Rome as 'obscure upstarts'.<sup>53</sup>

How far down the social scale one has to go before reaching those to whom books were almost wholly inaccessible it is hard to say. They could be borrowed and copied, if one had leisure and could write fluently, and a second-hand market there must have been; Horace mentions damaged books being exported to Africa and Spain, and rolls damaged easily. Literacy of a sort was probably fairly widespread in Rome and many towns, though our evidence for this period is limited. At Rome the secret ballot meant that voters had to write the names of candidates for office; for legislation and trials before the people, an ability to make out the single letters denoting passage or rejection, condemnation or absolution, would suffice. The secret ballot may have been used in at least some country towns too.<sup>54</sup> For a slightly later period the graffiti of the humble, and the evidence for outdoor elementary schools, are suggestive, but so is the fact that a majority of the clients of the Pompeian business man L. Caecilius Jucundus wrote badly or (especially the women) not at all.<sup>55</sup> Notices of all kinds were stuck up, however, floats labelled at triumphs, programmes sold at entertainments, and troops subjected to propaganda by leaflet, though ordinary soldiers were probably often illiterate peasants.<sup>56</sup> Many slaves could, or were taught to, read (though the evidence of comedy is tricky to evaluate). Varro insists on literacy for a slave bailiff, who must read lists, and for a chief herdsman, who must have maxims excerpted from Mago's agricultural writings, and keep notes on veterinary treatment. The bailiff or tenant-farmer was probably also urged to use written agricultural calendars, linking expected weather and jobs to be done to astronomical phenomena; Pliny later says it is difficult to get rustics to study astronomy, but it must be attempted.<sup>57</sup> Various kinds of technical handbook for craftsmen have been postulated, and papyri on, for example, dyes and dyeing have been recovered in Egypt; but it has also been argued that crafts were handed on orally from father to son, master or foreman to slave, and written documents rare. Many other more or less literate people probably never read a real book, the lowest forms of which were perhaps the jokebooks mentioned by Plautus, anthologies of apothegms or

<sup>53</sup> Varro *Sat. Menip.* 257B; *Brutus* 242: *ignoti homines et repentini*.

<sup>54</sup> It failed to get through in Arpinum, *De Leg.* 3.36.

<sup>55</sup> G. Cavallo, in *Alfabetismo e cultura scritta nella storia della società italiana*, *Atti del seminario Perugia* 1977.

<sup>56</sup> Suet. *DJ* 37.2, Pliny *NH* 7.98, *Phil.* 2.9, Appian *BC* 3.44, Dio 43.5.

<sup>57</sup> Varro *De RR* 1.17.4, 2.5.18. Pliny *NH* 18.206. *De Rep.* 5.5 seems to contrast the *vilicus* with the *dispensator*, who *litteras scit*.

passages of verse, astrological and magical texts, and doubtless the other forms of popular literature known from other areas and other periods.<sup>58</sup>

But a great deal of activity that might be called intellectual was not dependent on books at all. If Varro wrote one work *De Bibliothecis*, in which he described the materials and manufacture of books, and almost certainly the history of great libraries in the Greek world and in Rome, with perhaps discussion of the best way to organise them,<sup>59</sup> he also wrote *De Lectionibus*, on readings and lectures. Roman civilisation, even at this advanced stage, was more oral than ours is. The well-off, as we saw, were frequently read aloud to by slave *anagnostae* or readers; one of the main functions of scholars dependent on great men was simply to help their patrons study literature, especially Greek literature, in a world where there were not yet any Greek-Latin or Latin-Greek dictionaries, and not all glossaries of obscure, dialect or technical words were sufficiently well-arranged to be easily consulted.<sup>60</sup> A scholar was expected to be a walking dictionary, indeed a walking encyclopaedia, for quotations and information of all sorts were, as is well known, difficult to check in rolls, even if the right works were available. The first Latin work to boast an 'index' was by Valerius Soranus,<sup>61</sup> early in the first century, and it will have consisted, like Pliny's, merely in a list of contents, *capita rerum*, perhaps at the start. Chapter-headings in the work itself may not have existed, columns and lines were not numbered; there were no footnotes, and in many genres reference, or at least frequent reference, to one's sources was deemed inelegant.

Naturally the *anagnostae* did not always read to the master of the house alone, but might do so to a group of his friends as well. Readings were a recognised form of entertainment at dinner parties, the only kind that Atticus ever presented. As is well-known, he gave some of Cicero's works a send-off by having selected portions read at such occasions; doubtless they fulfilled Varro's demand that what is read at dinner should be both useful and agreeable.<sup>62</sup> Lectures on a larger scale, perhaps open to the public in general, were a feature of the Hellenistic world, and Rome had heard famous lectures in the second century, from Crates of Mallus, the Pergamene scholar, when he found himself detained in Rome by a broken leg in, probably, 168, and from the 'philosophic embassy' in 155. It is difficult to draw a distinction between these and the courses given by *grammatici* or other teachers, sometimes described as drawing crowds of people, obviously adults; Cicero,

<sup>58</sup> Plautus *Stich.* 400, 454, *Persa* 392. *Auct. ad Her* 4.4.7 notes that making collections of axioms from Ennius' plays, or of messenger speeches from those of Pacuvius, requires only moderate education. Anthologies were used in the Greek world for educational purposes: cf. Cat. 14, *Sulla litterator*, an elementary teacher, is imagined as giving Calvus a *libellus* that seems to be an anthology of bad Latin poets (a *novum et repertum* thing, however). The anthology of maxims from the mime-writer Publilius Syrus seems to have been made after his death. Religious texts: Augustus had 2000 books of prophecies, *libri fatidici*, burned, Suet. *Aug.* 31.1.

<sup>59</sup> *GRF* pp. 312-14 collects passages certainly or probably from this work. Around 100 B.C. Artemo of Cassandreia had written on how to collect books, Athen. 12.575e.

<sup>60</sup> The so-called Hermeneumata Pseudo-Dositheana are not earlier than the third century A.D. On lack of, or inadequate, alphabetisation see below, p. 141.

<sup>61</sup> Pliny. *NH praef.* 33 (in his *Epoptides* or *Initiated Women*, of uncertain content).

<sup>62</sup> Nepos *Att.* 14; *Ad A.* 16.2.6; Varro *Sat. Menip.* 340B.

as praetor, in 66 attended those given by Antonius Gniphio in the afternoon, when public business had finished.<sup>63</sup> Perhaps less formally didactic were the lectures that, it is virtually certain, the doctor Asclepiades of Bithynia, whom Cicero regarded as a representative of epideictic or show oratory, gave in Rome, probably in order to make himself known after his arrival. Since Cicero says that Asclepiades was more eloquent than others of his calling, perhaps there were rival speakers on medicine in Rome, and certainly *akroaseis* by doctors were not rare in the East, though some severe members of the profession despised them. In the East, again, historians often read their works in public.<sup>64</sup> It is clear that in Rome public recitation by authors did not begin, as used to be thought, with Asinius Pollio at the very end of our period, though possibly he was the first senator, or the first orator, to join the throng.<sup>65</sup> Horace shows that by the early thirties poets might recite in the Forum or in the Baths, to whoever would listen, and it has been suggested that theatres and public colonnades, with their *scholae* and *exedrae*, may have been used.<sup>66</sup> No special auditoria had yet been built in Rome, however, though Vitruvius' note that orators need big halls in their houses for meetings might reflect the fashion initiated by Pollio and imply recitations as well as gatherings of clients for the levée. But we ought not to exaggerate the role played by lectures and readings in Rome before this time, for Cicero's letters hardly refer to them; what may have been a reading at Atticus' house of Tyrannio's book on Greek accents could have been a very small private affair.<sup>67</sup>

Women would hardly be present at the Baths or in the Forum, and even later the younger Pliny's wife lurked behind a curtain when her husband read his works,<sup>68</sup> though it is hard to suppose women did not assist at domestic readings on occasion. And they did go to the theatre in Rome, doubtless if they wished even to the plays in Greek which seem to have been produced fairly often. Poor men with serious interests might sometimes gain access by patronage to lectures or readings in great houses as well as more public places, though one doubts if Lucretius was a humble person who had gained all his education this way.<sup>69</sup> In addition, the main amusements of the ancient world included listening to speeches, including legal ones, and to plays. Cicero in his orations certainly took account of a *corona* by bystanders, less well-educated even than the ordinary senator or *eques* on the jury; for this he gave in the *Pro Murena*, as he later explained, a very simplified picture of

<sup>63</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 2, popularity of Vargunteius' readings of Ennius in the later second century; Gniphio, *ib.* 7.4-5. Perhaps a fee was necessary for these.

<sup>64</sup> *De Or.* 1.62; cf. *CQ* (1982) 358. A. Momigliano, *The American Scholar* (1978) 193.

<sup>65</sup> *Sen. Controv.* 4. *praef.* 2. The audience was invited.

<sup>66</sup> *Hor. Sat.* 1.4.73-6, *coramve quibuslibet* (*In Pis.* 71, Philodemus' poems *et lecta et audita*, perhaps at private readings). T.P. Wiseman, in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, ed. B.K. Gold (1982) 28. He notes that Varro in the *Satires* (517B) talks of a smart lecture audience, *bellorum hominum*; probably but not certainly in contemporary Rome (perhaps the seventies). *Ad A.* 15.17.2 only proves Cicero was familiar with the idea.

<sup>67</sup> *Vitr.* 6.5.2; *Ad A.* 12.6.2.

<sup>68</sup> Pliny, *Epp.* 4.19; but cf. 5.17.5?

<sup>69</sup> Wiseman, *op. cit.* in n. 66.

Stoicism.<sup>70</sup> Drama – comedy and farce as well as tragedy – apart from familiarising its audience with Greek mythology and occasionally Roman history had, as we saw, always had contacts with popular philosophy. Cicero, who like most of our sources is contemptuous of popular culture, once mentions with disdain a mime about ‘symposia of poets and philosophers’, in which, with striking anachronism, Euripides and Menander, Socrates and Epicurus, all appeared together, and notes that the audience, as ignorant as the author, applauded it loudly.<sup>71</sup> Other known titles of comedies and mimes point in the same general direction, while a fragment of the mime-writer Laberius mentions Democritus, another the Cynic *haeresis* or sect, and Pythagoreanism, which had been a favourite theme in fifth- and fourth-century Greek comedy, seems to be mocked in several works.<sup>72</sup> This sort of thing was probably fairly new in the first century at Rome; the Greek background of Plautus’ audience includes hardly any definite knowledge of philosophers.

Cynics, of course, had often devoted themselves to haranguing the poor. We hear nothing of these in Rome, and in fact they are barely attested in the first century B.C. in the Greek world, though there was to be a revival later. It is in spite of this sometimes supposed that Horace’s Stoics, the loquacious Fabius, Stertinius and Crispinus, are Cynics in all but name, and ‘street-preachers’ in the late forties and thirties. But there is no firm evidence for this, even if Stertinius is imagined as at hand in the street to stop the art-dealer Damasippus throwing himself into the Tiber. All three, to judge by the scholiasts, were at least primarily writers, while Fabius Maximus, possibly of Gallic descent, was an *eques*, Stertinius perhaps from the wealthy family of *negotiatores* of that name attested at Delos (he might have had an education at Athens), and Crispinus was a poet.<sup>73</sup>

None the less it is clear that even illiteracy would be no bar to some sorts of quasi-intellectual activity.<sup>74</sup> Greek (of a kind) might be picked up, in Rome and some other towns at least, from Greek-speaking residents or slaves. Much could further be learnt, especially with the aid of custodians, from public monuments – about the history of art, political and military events, and mythology (if all perhaps often in garbled form). Indeed Cicero says that the poor can enjoy statues and paintings as well as the rich, since there are so many in public places at Rome.<sup>75</sup> And if it is true, as many historians hold, that there was much underemployment, urban as well as rural, in the Roman economy, many poor men would have leisure for listening and argument.

<sup>70</sup> *De Fin.* 4.74.

<sup>71</sup> *Pro Gall.* frag. 2. Pucc. But perhaps the anachronism was part of the joke, for some at least.

<sup>72</sup> D. Laberius frags. 72, 36, 17, *Inc. Fab.* 21; Turpilius frag. 144 Ribbeck. Note Pomponius’ *Attellana Philosophia* and possibly the mime called *Faba*, the Bean.

In a verse fragment of Varro, *Sat. Menipp.* 218B, someone urges the audience in a theatre to listen to him, so that they may return home instructed; possibly a lecture or recitation rather than a play is involved.

<sup>73</sup> Above n. 50. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.33 does seem to show a philosopher in a crowd, but it is not clear if he is addressing it. Stertinius, *ILLRP* 750.

<sup>74</sup> There were popular story-tellers, including fabulists, in the streets (perhaps not attested by *Pro Cael.* 71, but surely behind Pliny, *Epp.* 2.20.1: A. Scobie, *Rh. Mus.* (1979).

<sup>75</sup> *In Verr.* 2.4.126.

## CHAPTER FOUR

# Greek Writers and their Readers

We have asked what Romans read books. Let us now consider the question of readership from a different point of view. Whom did the Greeks writing in Rome expect or intend to read their works, and in particular were they to be Greeks or Romans? This is a matter of some moment for our judgment of the civilisation which we call Graeco-Roman.

It is true that we have seen the Romans studying with and learning from the Greeks increasingly as our period advances. But this general conclusion needs further analysis. Did the Romans learn from everything that the Greeks produced? It has been suggested by distinguished scholars that much of the energy of Greek writers in general was, at this time, concentrated on teaching and serving their Roman masters, and on adapting Greek *paideia* to their needs.<sup>1</sup> The increasing economic dependence of Greek writers on Rome is undeniable. But it seems improbable that, especially in the late second century, writers who never went to Rome as far as we know, like the rhetorician Hermagoras of Temnos, or who probably went only briefly, as Panaetius the Stoic did (though in his case apparently more than once), and in whose time few or no Romans yet studied in Greek areas, should have tailored their doctrines extensively to meet Roman tastes. Even the rather later Philo of Larissa, head of the Academy, is hardly likely to have taken to teaching rhetoric as well as philosophy simply because the Romans found rhetoric more useful; he undoubtedly did so because of the position he took in the age-old Greek quarrel about the rival claims of the two subjects to educate the young, and he was pretty clearly teaching rhetoric before he came to Rome, at a time when he probably had no Roman pupils.<sup>2</sup> Posidonius' modified version of Stoicism has been seen, like that of Panaetius, as worked out for aristocratic Roman friends, whose preoccupation with politics and war meant that they could not aim at becoming full-blown Stoic sages. But, quite apart from the fact that the scientific and mathematical works of these two men were clearly not influenced by any thought of Roman preferences, since the Romans concerned themselves very little with these subjects,<sup>3</sup> it seems likely that many of the changes made in traditional Stoicism by Panaetius and Posidonius were designed to take account of the damaging criticisms of it made by philosophers in the second century, above all by the Sceptic

<sup>1</sup> Most extreme, G. Williams, *Change and Decline* (1978) 116ff.: 'this [Roman eagerness for Greek culture] inspired Greek scholars and poets of all sorts to see a new purpose in their activities.'

<sup>2</sup> *De Or.* 3.110.

<sup>3</sup> Nor are Panaetius' doubts about divination likely to have pleased the Romans.

Carneades. There were few Roman pupils in the lecture-rooms of Athens and Rhodes, even in the first century, compared with those from elsewhere, and they were not the most serious ones; as we saw, the Herculaneum lists of Stoics and Academics mention no Romans at all among the disciples of the various eminent teachers whom they register, and who are obviously professionals as opposed to aristocratic amateurs.

What one must do, in looking for the intended or actual readership of a work, is to distinguish; to ask in the case of particular subjects, particular individuals, and even particular works, to whom they are likely to be addressed. And questions of date must be kept in mind, since Roman sophistication was advancing fast in the last years of the Republic.

We may begin with the *grammatici*, since it was these who provided the foundation of education, and most of them were directly engaged in helping Roman pupils, young or already adult, to read Greek literature. Confining ourselves to those who were unmistakably of Greek origin and wrote in Greek, we find that Parthenius, at the end of our period, frankly wrote potted mythography for Cornelius Gallus to use in his verse.<sup>4</sup> Less directly, one suspects that Hysicrates and the others who elaborated the doctrine of Aeolism, the theory that the Latin language was largely derived from Aeolic Greek, were writing to flatter the desire of many Romans for a culturally reputable origin of Rome as a predominantly Greek city. The same might apply to the theory of Aristodemus of Nysa, based on a consideration of old Roman customs, that Homer was a Roman.<sup>5</sup> It is probable that Hysicrates as well as Aristodemus worked for some time in Rome. But it has been pointed out that the Greeks themselves might be comforted to feel that their conquerors were not really of inferior race, and the patent relationship between Greek and Latin did need explaining (and clearly could not be explained correctly). As is very clear from the list of works written by Philoxenus of Alexandria, who probably also came to Rome, a work *On the Roman Dialect* could take its place in a well-attested scholarly tradition; Philoxenus also wrote on the Laconian, Ionic and Syracusan dialects.<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt that Romans used commentaries to the Greek poets, but no evidence that any were produced specifically for them. Alexander Polyhistor, who spent his whole working life in Rome, wrote on place-names in Alcmán and (probably) a commentary on Corinna.<sup>7</sup> These poets were hardly favourite authors to the Romans, though a few will have ventured among their works. The Romans were however interested in theories of etymology and morphology, which they applied to Latin; but how far their interest in the Greek language went is uncertain. Did they feel a practical need to learn about Greek accents? Tyrannio dedicated a treatise on the subject to Atticus, and Atticus was apparently so eager about it that he could not wait for

<sup>4</sup> *Erotica Pathemata* (most easily available in the Loeb ed.).

<sup>5</sup> L. Robert, *Hellenica* I (1940) 148.

<sup>6</sup> C. Theodorides, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos* (1976) 11. R. Giomini, *PdélP* (1953) 365 argues that Philoxenus' studies of dialect were back-up to his etymological theories.

<sup>7</sup> *FGH*no. 273 frags 95-7.

Cicero's presence before hearing it read out.<sup>8</sup> But Atticus' knowledge of Greek and Greek literature was exceptional.

It seems conceivable that the position of many Greek scholars was not wholly unlike that of modern academics. The research that these undertake is often on subjects only tenuously related to, and on a level above, what they teach, and is addressed primarily to their colleagues. Those who support them financially accept this situation. On the other hand, if there is no teaching in their general field available, there are not likely to be many jobs either (there were few or no Greek mathematicians at work in Rome). Also, while the freedmen, mostly *grammatici*, were in many cases committed not only to Rome but to the beck and call of a patron, the more independent philosophers would often plan, according to Philodemus, to spend so many years in study in Athens, so many in seeing the Greek and barbarian world (for the latter he is probably thinking of Italy and perhaps Egypt, though some went to the Greek cities of Parthia), and so many teaching in their home towns before retiring.<sup>9</sup> Much as for modern academics who take jobs in out-of-the-way places in youth, the question of establishing a scholarly reputation to assist a successful return may have arisen, though of course the whole process was much less formal than it is today, with applications for posts supported by lists of publications. (We must also note that, when a peripatetic career like this is involved, we usually have no idea what was written in Rome and what elsewhere.)

The Romans, perhaps, were sometimes grateful just to be allowed to overhear the Greeks arguing among themselves. This may be to some extent the case with the rhetoricians. None of these seem to have made the slightest concession to Roman circumstances. They do not observe that the practices of the Roman courts make close observation of the rules of judicial oratory difficult; or that the frequent need, in the Senate, to close with a precise proposal for a decree should be allowed for in discussing the peroration in deliberative speeches, while, in the Assembly, the necessity of taking an audience clause by clause through a bill, or simply reporting recent events, as Cicero's *Third Catilinarian* oration does, might also play havoc with the rules of deliberative oratory. They do not seem aware of the custom of giving a public funeral oration in the Forum on a great man's death, which could be seen as the one opportunity in Roman life for purely epideictic oratory, and it seems they never had much influence on its very traditional form. It is then not surprising that Cicero in the *Brutus* can only produce two doubtless deservedly obscure Roman speakers as truly loyal followers of the great systematiser of Greek rhetoric, Hermagoras.<sup>10</sup> Apollodorus of Pergamum, the teacher of M. Calidius and Octavian, founded a successful sect in Rome, but was none the less particularly narrow in his insistence that in all cases the four parts of the judicial speech, prooemium, division, proof and peroration, must be included, in the right order, and Quintilian observes that he, and his

<sup>8</sup> *Ad A.* 12.6.2.

<sup>9</sup> Philod. *De Morte* 5.55-6 Bassi.

<sup>10</sup> *Brutus* 263, 271; they lacked ornament.

younger opponent Theodorus of Gadara, who was also very influential, were both out of touch with the requirements of the courts.<sup>11</sup> In the same way Cicero had earlier picked it out as one of Apollonius Molon's unusual qualities that he had experience of real cases, though these were not of course cases at Rome.<sup>12</sup> One can only conclude that the Romans felt so great a need for the help with the organisation and argument, as well as embellishment, of a speech, that they could derive from Greek rhetoric, that they simply accepted the hairsplitting and impracticality involved (though the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* had some criticisms to make,<sup>13</sup> and Cicero felt the need to go beyond traditional rhetoric in his writings on oratory).

In philosophy the picture was rather different. Now Cicero, in the first version of the *Academica*, was trying to persuade both himself and his readers that the great Roman statesmen of the earlier first century, Catulus, Lucullus and Hortensius, were suitable figures to show discussing technical questions of philosophy. To this end he evokes at every opportunity such contacts as there had been since the mid-second century between Greek philosophers and Roman aristocrats – Scipio Aemilianus taking Panaetius with him to the East; Clitomachus the Academic addressing one work to the poet Lucilius (it seems to have been an elementary account of his school's doctrine) and another to the otherwise quite uninteresting L. Censorinus; Panaetius enjoining his pupil Tubero to learn Crantor's *On Grief* by heart.<sup>14</sup> Two conclusions can be drawn, one general and one particular (even though Cicero has not aimed at absolute completeness and one or two other connections can be dredged up). The general one is that in the late second century at any rate the works that prominent Greek philosophers dedicated or recommended to great Romans were few and untechnical, and indeed perhaps there were none of any moment at all dedicated to such in the early first century. The particular conclusion is that if the important book by Philo, which was apparently written during his stay in Rome, and which enraged Antiochus (a matter of which a good deal is said in the *Academica*), had been dedicated to a Roman, then Cicero would, in this particular context, have leapt to mention the fact. As it is, the best he can do is to say that the Selli and Tetrilius Rogus (quite unknown, and the names may be corrupt, but they could be senators) copied it out enthusiastically.<sup>15</sup> This is perhaps also a strong argument against the belief that Philo's work, which argued that the Academic tradition had never fundamentally changed, was specifically designed for Roman consumption, since the Romans were worried to discover that Plato and Philo did not seem to be saying quite the same thing. But surely even the Romans, who had long before this heard Philo's predecessor Carneades, had realised that *his* views at least were not identical with those of Plato. In fact, if we may trust Cicero, a well-informed Roman, the elder

<sup>11</sup> Quint. 5.13.59.

<sup>12</sup> *Brutus* 316; cf. *De Or.* 2.75 (most Greek teachers have no practical experience).

<sup>13</sup> *Ad Her.* 1.22; 4.1-4.

<sup>14</sup> *Acad.* 2.5, 102, 135. (Scipio Nasica cos. 111 a student of philosophy, DS 34/5.33.8).

<sup>15</sup> *Acad.* 2.11.

Catulus (father of the speaker in the *Academica*) accused Philo of lying. And it has recently been argued that Philo's book must be seen in the context of the recent fragmentation of the Academic tradition at Athens, with rival pupils of Carneades claiming to represent his views, and Antiochus diverging more profoundly, and of Philo's need to establish his own position as scholar when the war that had driven him to Rome should be over.

Cicero also mentions Antiochus' answer to Philo's provocative work, a dialogue named for a compatriot of his own, the Stoic Sosus of Ascalon; this also was pretty clearly not dedicated to a Roman, though since, as we saw, Sosus apparently worked at Teanum Sidicinum, the intriguing possibility arises that the work was set in Italy.<sup>16</sup> But though Philo probably wrote a rebuttal of the *Sosus*, the whole controversy perhaps left no mark in Roman literature until Cicero's much later *Academica*. Antiochus did, later, dedicate a work to Q. Balbus, the exceptionally serious Roman Stoic whom Cicero perhaps optimistically said was as accomplished as the Greeks. It argued that Stoics and Peripatetics agreed in substance though not in vocabulary.<sup>17</sup>

Not of course that even a dedication means very much. Cicero tried to adapt his works to his dedicatees to some extent, finding practically no one but Varro and Brutus suitable for his more serious philosophic dialogues. But what did the soldier, gourmet and tentative orator and historian Hirtius make of the *De Fato*? The Memmius who was probably Lucretius' dedicatee despised Latin poetry and had little sympathy for Epicureans.<sup>18</sup> One wonders if the boy called Gaius to whom Philodemus' work on rhetoric is addressed ploughed through all the arguments on that subject springing directly from an internal quarrel between Epicureans. It appears that Philodemus first wrote a book or books of commentaries, perhaps basically notes from the lectures given at Athens by his master, Zeno of Sidon. These circulated privately and were read by an Epicurean at Rhodes who supposed them to be by Zeno. This man wrote an attack that purported to record discussions held in Rhodes and Cos about the status of rhetoric, whether it was a *technê*, or 'art', or not. Philodemus was thus provoked into writing the partly extant work in more than five books defending Zeno's views and arguing that the Rhodian and perhaps others were going against the beliefs of Epicurus and his immediate circle and were thus 'almost guilty of parricide', as well as of intellectual laziness in not checking their references.<sup>19</sup>

*A fortiori* one doubts if many Romans were much concerned with the moral and educational status of music, also discussed at tedious length by Philodemus, a matter of no immediacy whatever in a Roman context, and precious little by now in a Greek one.<sup>20</sup> And Philodemus' *On Poetry* is to us at

<sup>16</sup> Ib. 12, 18. Cf. Glucker, op. cit. in Chapter 1, n. 20, 27ff. D. Sedley, *Phronesis* (1981) 67 has a slightly different reconstruction, with Antiochus openly defecting in the eighties not the nineties, as *Acad.* 2 69-70 suggests.

<sup>17</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 1.15, 16.

<sup>18</sup> There were two C. Memmii in this generation; the better-known was pr. 58, on whom see *Brutus* 247, and *Ad F.* 13.1 in which he has to be begged not to knock down Epicurus' house in Athens. (In spite of his views on verse he took Catullus and Cinna to Bithynia on his staff.)

<sup>19</sup> Philod. *De Rhet.* 1.223. Sudh.; 1.12.

<sup>20</sup> Id. *De Musica*, ed. van Kreeven.

least a strikingly isolated work; possibly his most original production, it cannot be fitted into a history of Epicurean polemic as the work on rhetoric can, though it seems that it does to some extent depend on Zeno and earlier writers.<sup>21</sup> What can be said is that, though it may have been addressed to a Roman called Gnaeus,<sup>22</sup> and though very faint possible echoes have suggested to some that Cicero knew the work, he and all other Roman writers of whom we know anything remained utterly unaffected by its heterodox views, and its opposition to moralising interpretations of the role of poetry, and to Peripatetics, Stoics and 'the critics' alike. Even more remarkably, it seems to be the case, though this is sometimes disputed, that Lucretius knows nothing of the development of Epicureanism represented by Philodemus and his immediate precursors; his main sources, at all events, are earlier, and so it seems are his main targets.<sup>23</sup>

With Philodemus there is usually a clear distinction between the polemical works, to which the treatises mentioned above belong, and the general ethical essays of the type often if inaccurately known as 'diatribes', written in a more approachable style. The first attack philosophers of various schools from the more recent or remoter past, and though Siro and others of the Campanian colony of Epicureans doubtless read them, it is surely primarily the international scholarly community that is being addressed. Even the 'diatribes' are, however, notably bare of reference to Roman conditions. That on household management deprecates the habit some Romans have of dividing their income into fixed proportions for different purposes, holding it to be too rigid a procedure, and addresses itself to the way the Epicurean Sage will organise his affairs so that he can devote himself to leisure and friendship.<sup>24</sup> This can hardly be meant for Philodemus' patron L. Piso, who was deeply engaged in public life, though some Roman Epicureans of lower rank might find it applicable. The treatise *On the Good King according to Homer* was dedicated to Piso, however, and Roman nobles certainly saw themselves as the equals of kings; it has been argued that the work makes some adaptation to Roman conditions of the usual Hellenistic ideas on kingship.<sup>25</sup> One might suggest that Piso read this (the elegance of the partially surviving papyrus has suggested it was a presentation copy), glanced at some of the other so-called diatribes, sometimes looked in on the dinner-parties on the twentieth of the month to which we saw him being invited,<sup>26</sup> and for the rest felt that a tame Greek philosopher about the villa was a status-symbol, and should be allowed to get on with his work. It may also be noted that the only writings of Philodemus that Cicero mentions in the *In Pisonem* are his easily approachable poems (though it is true that he is addressing a non-philosophical audience, the Senate at large), and that the same is true of

<sup>21</sup> Id. *De Poet.* 5.59 Jensen.

<sup>22</sup> F. Sbordone, *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanesi I* (1969) 345 notes Cn. Piso cos. 23 as about the right age.

<sup>23</sup> D.J. Furley, *Fond.Hardt* 24 (1978) 1.

<sup>24</sup> Philod. *peri oik.* 25. 40 ed. Jensen.

<sup>25</sup> O. Murray, *JRS* (1965) 161.

<sup>26</sup> Chapter 2, n. 26.

Asconius' later commentary on the speech. Even the diatribes perhaps did not circulate widely among Roman readers.<sup>27</sup>

Similarly, the thoroughly exoteric and indeed barely Epicurean work from Piso's library which has been identified as concerned with frivolity and how to avoid it, and has been ascribed to Demetrius of Laconia and dated to about 100 B.C., is very probably addressed to a young Roman, for his inclination to political life, the study of rhetoric and the pursuit of wealth are all accepted; he may be the Claudius Nero who was the dedicatee of Demetrius' work on poetry, or the Quintus mentioned in his book on the gods; and there is certainly a personal tone to parts of the work on frivolity, which is clearly and simply written.<sup>28</sup> But were Demetrius' writings on geometry, also in the library at Herculaneum, dedicated to this young man, or to any Roman? Were they even written in Italy? (There is some evidence that Demetrius was based on Miletus, and his works might be well represented in Herculaneum simply because he was a friend of Philodemus' teacher Zenon.)<sup>29</sup> The dedicatee of the work on frivolity is specifically told not to go too far into astronomy and such subjects, though a mild interest in them may help to settle his mind.

Such is the rage for supposing that all Greek intellectuals were providing materials for the Romans to use that Geminus' *Introduction* to astronomy, of which the date (though it has often been thought to be the earlier first century B.C.) and the place of origin are quite uncertain, has been thought to have been written at Rome for a Roman readership. It might not be too hard for a few Romans.<sup>30</sup>

As for medicine, one would certainly assume at first sight that all works on this subject, which was professed at a serious level by almost none but Greeks, would be addressed to fellow professionals. But we have seen that Asclepiades of Bithynia lectured to general audiences, though we do not know if he published his lectures as some doctors did.<sup>31</sup> And he wrote on diatetics, the health-giving régime, a subject for which general readers are quite thinkable. For what it is worth, one of his works on this subject was addressed to a Roman, Geminus, who might or might not be a specialist,<sup>32</sup> and for what that is worth, we saw that when Cicero was passing through Velia he looked at a medical work, that on *Heavy Eating* by Nicon, who was probably a pupil of Asclepiades; this, clearly a work on 'diet', might have been meant for lay readers. Asclepiades' most famous pupil, Themison, also addressed a work to a Roman.<sup>33</sup> But, though medicine as we shall find was a subject of which it was sometimes thought all educated men should know something, of course most of Asclepiades' works were primarily written for the Greek doctors (and

<sup>27</sup> *In Pis.* 70; Asconius, *In Pis.* 20St.

<sup>28</sup> R. Philippson, *AJP* (1943) 148, E. Renna, *CErc.* (1982) 43. Q. is not a *praenomen* of the Claudii Nerones.

<sup>29</sup> V. de Falco, *L'Epicureo Demetrio Lacone* (1923).

<sup>30</sup> G. Aujac, ed. Géminos (1975) xxii.

<sup>31</sup> E.g. the third-century Baccheius of Tanagra, Galen 8. 749K.

<sup>32</sup> Cael. Aurel. *Morb. Chron.* 2.110; probably too early to be Pompey's friend of that name.

<sup>33</sup> Asilius Dimas, unknown, possibly a freedman?

philosophers) who certainly did, as we know, read them.<sup>34</sup> Even that addressed to King Mithridates may not have been wholly popular, for the king had a special interest in drugs and poisons. In spite of Lucretius' probable lack of interest in most contemporary Epicurean literature, it has several times been argued that he was aware of or even followed some of Asclepiades' corpuscular (if not strictly Epicurean) theories, for example on the origin of disease.<sup>35</sup>

What of the historians? If we are to take seriously the usual commonplaces in Diodorus' preface, that the work will be useful to politicians and soldiers, he should have been thinking primarily of Roman readers, though in spite of their now restricted opportunities some Greeks might still qualify for these descriptions. But he goes on to say that history contributes to forming the power of speech that makes Greeks superior to barbarians.<sup>36</sup> Perhaps Diodorus' convenient précis of various lengthy, usually standard, works, in straightforward contemporary Greek, would seem a convenience to Greek as well as to Roman 'lovers of reading', whose command of Greek of various types was not total and whose time was limited (though the only Roman we know to have read it is the Elder Pliny). Certainly Polybius, whom Diodorus admired, and soon after his own time Dionysius of Halicarnassus, envisaged both Greek and Roman readers (they both of course wrote in Rome). There were also, obviously, historical or quasi-historical works written in Greek and in praise of great Romans, produced in Rome or elsewhere directly in the service of the city or great figures in it, which were directed at a non-Roman readership. This was the journalism and propaganda of the day. One need only briefly mention Theophanes of Mitylene and his history of Pompey's campaigns in the East; Posidonius perhaps wrote on Pompey, and certainly refused to write on Cicero's consulship. Cicero also tells us in a letter that Greeks (in Rome, it seems) had been bothering him for an account of this in Greek for them to put into literary form, until put off (so he believed) by the eloquence of his own effort, and by Posidonius' refusal to touch this. The work actually written by Atticus on the same subject was to be made available primarily in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world.<sup>37</sup> But in the context of the poet Archias' panegyrics of great Romans Cicero observed that, while Latin is read only in a limited areas, Greek is read all over the known world.<sup>38</sup>

Historiography slides, in parts of Diodorus and in the works of Alexander Polyhistor, into ethnography and even geography. It has been held that Alexander's accurate compilations from earlier sources of material on the Chaldaean, Jews and other peoples made the Romans acquainted with nations and authors they had hardly heard of before, but which were now in the centre of their interest, and that the wishes and preferences of his Roman

<sup>34</sup> Beginning with Antiochus, *Sex. Emp. Against the Logicians* 1.201-2.

<sup>35</sup> Recently J.-M. Pigeaud, *REL* (1980) 176.

<sup>36</sup> *DS* 1.1, 2. 5.

<sup>37</sup> *Ad A.* 2.1.2.

<sup>38</sup> *Pro Arch.* 23.

readers largely determined his work.<sup>39</sup> Momigliano has gone further: the Romans from the second century actively recruited Greek ethnographers to describe and interpret their new conquests. These included men of the calibre of Polybius, Artemidorus and Posidonius. 'The Greeks worked hard to describe the Celtic world of Spain and Gaul in the service of Roman expansion.' Equally, Pompey knew how to deal with the Jews: 'he had been informed.' And, after the disaster of Carrhae in 54 at least, the Romans also studied the Parthians.<sup>40</sup>

Now it is true that we shall find that the Romans of the first century B.C. have a wide horizon and some awareness of distant lands from Britain to India, though Strabo says that their own efforts at geographical writing were very superficial.<sup>41</sup> Some of them, it can be shown, certainly read Polybius, Artemidorus and Posidonius. But it should perhaps be remembered that in a sense the Romans did not rule their foreign subjects; they left that to the native authorities. The Roman governor was there primarily to help provide defence against external interference and internal unrest – and to dispense justice to the Roman citizens in his province, who were often numerous, though he could intervene if he wished in suits between the locals. Cicero's attitude in Cilicia may not have been wholly typical, but it is hard to believe that he read Alexander Polyhistor's works on Cilicia and Cappadocia in preparation for his tour of duty. The literary works of which he was so conscious at this time were his own *De Re Publica* and Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*, general works on good government. And, whether a reference by Philodemus to the man now in Cilicia concerns Cicero or not, he too hoped that the governor would follow the principles worked out with philosophers and politicians, not with ethnographers.<sup>42</sup> As for Alexander Polyhistor, no contemporary Roman source mentions him, though he was not wholly strange to later Roman writers; he is mainly known to us through subsequent Greek, including Christian, scholars. It may be worth observing that among his historical and geographic fragments there are none dealing with social and political institutions, knowledge of which might be useful to Roman governors (though this might be the fault of our sources) and most deal with very ancient history indeed: Alexander wrote *Chaldaika*, not *Parthika*. Nor are there, it seems, the precise distances which were the mark of a practical handbook in this period of antiquity, as was information about the products of the country.

If Pompey had taken a rather more professional geographer or ethnographer than his politician friend Theophanes of Mitylene with him to the East, Strabo would not have had to complain that Posidonius had not learnt enough from Pompey's conquests in that area.<sup>43</sup> The authors on

<sup>39</sup> *FGH* no. 273, comm. at IIIa 251.

<sup>40</sup> A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* (1975) 65-6, 121-2, 140.

<sup>41</sup> Strabo 3.C166.

<sup>42</sup> H. Diels, *Philodemus Über die Götter* (1916) 99 n. 4 reports Crönert as thinking Philodemus is referring to a dialogue he had dedicated to Cicero, but is himself sceptical.

<sup>43</sup> Strabo 11.C491-2. It is perhaps worth noting that Varro did not apparently write anything explicitly ethnographic for Pompey, either in Spain or the East, though there was geographic

Parthia, certainly, were not at this time pro-Roman Greeks but Greek-speaking subjects of the Parthian Empire, led by Apollodorus of Artemita, of whom it is not clear when he was first read in Rome. The authors on the Jews were mostly Hellenized Jews, writing for Greeks or even for other Hellenized Jews, sometimes to deflect Greek hostility.

More generally, the decline in this period of Greek mathematical geography, and the rise of descriptive geography, have been traced to the influence of Roman practicality. But they have been perhaps more correctly linked with the difficulty, in ancient conditions, of getting much further with astronomical and mathematical calculations than Eratosthenes had done in the third century. Eratosthenes was heavily criticised by Hipparchus and others, who were not however able to make much advance themselves, and this may have been one of the factors causing interest in a different approach.<sup>44</sup> The Greeks had been accustomed since Alexander or earlier to take advantage of political change to inform themselves about newly opened-up areas, and they certainly took advantage of the opening-up of the West by Roman arms; Polybius, as a close friend of Scipio Aemilianus, had actually used Roman ships for exploration (and certainly it has been supposed that his account of Africa, including part of the Atlantic coast, with its stress on the wealth of the country, and its precise if not always accurate distances, was meant to be directly useful); Posidonius' early travels depended on Roman control of Spain and part of Gaul, though it is probable that at this stage in his career he had no close links with important Romans. Soon after, it was the growth of Mithridates' kingdom, the court of which attracted Greek intellectuals, that stimulated writing about the region, as much as subsequent Roman campaigns. The Romans hardly needed the accounts of Italy that Polybius and Posidonius gave, and might have found useful more description of the central parts of the Greek world than such Greek authors thought necessary.

Strabo, it is true, writing under Augustus and Tiberius, stresses the usefulness of geography to men in high station and statesmen, even though he does not explicitly mention the Romans; in another context, however, he says that the geographer does not write for the sort of public man who has no notion of mathematics, and most Roman governors probably fell into this category. But even if we accept that the Romans are in his mind, it may be inferred that he thinks they have not yet learned their lesson; look what ignorance of Parthian and German conditions has recently led to, he says.<sup>45</sup> In fact, under Augustus there may have been something of a change, and the state of affairs envisaged by Momigliano may have to some extent come

---

information in the *Ephemeris navalis* (see below, p. 265). Sallust does not seem to have learnt a great deal about Numidia as governor, though he got King Hiempsal's Punic Books, perhaps mainly about legendary origins, translated for him. Caesar as we shall see probably did take considerable interest in Gaul and the north.

<sup>44</sup> P. Pédech, *La Géographie des Grecs* (1976) 108.

<sup>45</sup> Strabo 1.C13, 2.C110; 2.C115 balances the needs of science with those of government – the latter has none in the far north.

about. Pliny tells us that Augustus sent the geographer Dionysius of Charax (near the mouth of the Tigris) to make *commentarii* on the East for the use of his grandson Gaius, who was to be sent there; and it can be argued that the work on Arabia by the learned King Juba of Mauretania dedicated to Gaius was a down-to-earth affair concerned largely with names and distances in, and the valuable exports of, Arabia Felix, in expectation of an expedition thither. Even so, Juba's sources were at least in part literary and out-of-date, and the usefulness of the work would probably have been limited.<sup>46</sup>

It seems possible that the Romans, in the earlier first century B.C., were so proud of having stopped being barbarians themselves, and so concerned to measure their culture against that of the Greeks, that they had little serious attention left for other peoples (with, as we shall see, some exceptions in religious matters). The Greeks, on their side, were no doubt proficient flatterers, or so the Romans believed, but they were still, in intellectual and artistic matters, very proud. It was only at the very end of our period that real Greeks, as opposed to freedman *semi-Graeci*, to use Suetonius' term, observed that there was a literature in Latin (partly moved, it seems, by Cicero's claim to be the Roman Demosthenes); and if Dionysius of Halicarnassus is not flattering his Roman patron, as to some degree at least he surely is, in telling us so, they even abandoned 'Asiatic' prose style because the rulers of Rome did not like it.<sup>47</sup> Our conclusion is of course not the paradoxical one that before this no Greek writer in Rome took any serious notice of Roman likes or dislikes. It is simply that we must not make rash generalisations. Every work written by a Greek in Rome, or outside it for that matter, must be placed in its proper position on a scale that begins at one end with writings meant to be of direct assistance to a Roman pupil or patron; continues through works written for a wider but predominantly Roman, and then a partly Roman, readership, or for a Greek readership but in the service of a particular Roman; moves on to works which may be politely dedicated to a Roman patron, but do not engage with any likely preoccupations of his or of his countrymen in general; and finally to works that take no account of the Romans as readers at all, whether they take some interest in them as subject matter or not. Some works of course are extremely difficult to place rightly on this scale; for example, this is one of the things that makes it very hard to understand the relation between Pythagoreanism in Rome and its revival in the Greek East during this period.

As for the Romans who wrote in Greek (when they were not merely practising writing in the language), they surely meant to reach a primarily Greek readership, perhaps in Rome too but certainly abroad: Cicero asks Atticus to see to the dissemination of his memoir on his own consulship in Athens and other Greek cities.<sup>48</sup> Rutilius Rufus almost certainly wrote his Greek history of recent events in Rome when he was himself in exile in the East, and probably wanted to put the record straight for Greek readers. These

<sup>46</sup> Pliny *NH* 6.141 (often emended to Isidorus of Charax, perhaps wrongly). Juba *FGH* no. 275.

<sup>47</sup> *DH The Ancient Orators* 3.

<sup>48</sup> *Ad A.* 2.1.2.

works and other histories and memoirs may have been read fairly widely for information's sake at the time of publication, and were even available later to researchers; Plutarch used Cicero's memoir.<sup>49</sup> None of them were sufficiently prized to have survived till our day (or to be quoted by grammarians), though they may have been more in number than is generally supposed, since works by Roman authors are usually automatically thought to be in Latin by scholars.<sup>50</sup> A few treatises on learned subjects were probably written by Romans in Greek as the only fitting tongue for the purpose – L. Tarutius' work on astrology is the obvious example, but there may also have been a few medical writings. Poems in Greek by Roman dilettanti have also perished, except for a few epigrams in the Greek Anthology which may belong to the first century B.C.

<sup>49</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 8.3. *Crass.* 13. He also knew Greek letters of Cicero (and of Brutus, though these are almost certainly not genuine).

<sup>50</sup> J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (1979) 209ff.; but he goes too far in suggesting that 'the dominant language ... of autobiography and commentaries ... was Greek'.

## CHAPTER FIVE

# Intellectuals in Rome I

It is time that we looked at the scholars and writers in Rome themselves. We will begin with the representatives of the three subjects most vital to ancient education, and in one way or another the basis of all other subjects, *grammatica*, rhetoric and philosophy. Numerous questions present themselves. Are these men Greeks or Romans? What is their social and economic situation? Are they professionals or amateurs? Do they, as we would expect, have patrons, and if so how does the relationship work?

### *Grammatici*

The *grammatici* are to be distinguished from the mere *grammatisteis*, or teachers of letters. The former were concerned with literature, especially poetry, and various aspects of language. Many taught children from about the age of eleven, but those we are most concerned with here almost all also wrote themselves, or provided adults with various kinds of service. Suetonius looked back to our period as one when *grammatica* flourished amazingly: at one point, he says, there were over twenty successful schools in the capital.<sup>1</sup> And he probably means for Latin literature alone (though Greek schools would surely be fewer); but one must remember that the schools would have been small, run by a single teacher, and perhaps an assistant.

During the second century B.C., when Rome was conquering the Greek East, the Romans became accustomed to owning slaves with desirable skills – notably a knowledge of Greek, but often more than that. They employed such slaves to teach their own children, or other slaves (whether together or apart is hard to tell). Thus the Romans became used to owing their earlier education at least to slaves, even where their own language was concerned. Other services rendered by educated slaves to their masters, as secretaries, readers, and so on were regarded as suitable for dependants. But Suetonius gives the impression that most of the *grammatici* who had been slaves were emancipated at an early stage in their teaching careers, either when still young or, if they were prisoners, soon after capture. Unusual qualities, such as intelligence and learning, were thought to deserve freedom, and it may have been felt that a freedman had rather more authority than a slave if faced with refractory pupils.<sup>2</sup> We do not hear of *grammatici* paying a price for their

<sup>1</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 3.4.

<sup>2</sup> J. Christes, *op. cit.* in Chapter 1, n. 73, 182. Q. Cicero says Tiro deserves to be a friend rather than slave of the family, *Ad F.* 16.16.1.

freedom, though some may have done so. Suetonius also does not suggest that any *grammatici* were bound by contract to provide certain services, *operae*, for their patrons, but this too may have been the case.

Most, but not all, of the freedmen who became well-known teachers, had been owned by great nobles at Rome; for them clearly the opportunities both for education and subsequent distinction were greatest. But patrons might die, leaving no direct heirs, and we often find freedmen in this case attaching themselves to someone else, preferably a friend of the original patron, to whom they might already have done some service. Aristocratic *liberalitas* might fail; in his exile Rutilius Rufus is said to have treated Aurelius Opillus meanly.<sup>3</sup> But it is those without patrons who so often fall into want. Not all *grammatici* were freedmen, however, though many were; and even a freedman, who had a *patronus* in law, was often politely referred to as an *amicus*, a term that we have seen was usual between the powerful and the dependent.

The *grammaticus* might find himself called on to offer services outside his scholarly sphere. His position will have varied, depending on whether he was free or freed: if the latter, on whether he had long been a slave in the household or came from outside it; if the former, on his social rank and financial resources; in both cases on his own and his patron's character.<sup>4</sup> Financial arrangements probably varied too. We hear of presents in money given on the presentation of a work dedicated to a patron; of fees for teaching – Antonius Gniphō, exceptionally, did not fix these, but relied on individual generosity. He and Tyrannio, again exceptionally, are said to have made a good deal by teaching. Average fees in the imperial period may have been about 500 HS per pupil a year, roughly the amount a workman could earn; with a reasonable number of pupils, this might add up to a decent, if still modest, living. Salaries were not unknown, and one L. Appuleius was hired to work abroad for a rich *eques* at 400,000 HS a year, an enormous sum equal to the property qualification of an *eques*.<sup>5</sup> Occasional gifts were perhaps felt less degrading than fees or a salary; we do not hear of legacies (perhaps reserved, by Roman ideas, for equals or superiors) as a mark of gratitude and esteem. Dependants could live with their patron (*contubernium*); a legal source of just this date discusses a patron's responsibility for freedmen or clients of himself or his wife who have free lodgings in his home.<sup>6</sup> Patrons would also help a dependant to a small property as a form of pension. But freedmen and others were often expected to be free to travel with a patron, in Italy or on official visits to the provinces.

The *grammatici* for their part, like other scholars and writers, will have needed aid of various kinds: introductions to parents of possible pupils, or to

<sup>3</sup> Symmachus, *Epp* 1.20.2.

<sup>4</sup> See, for poets in the imperial period, P. White, *JRS* (1978) 74; and G. Williams, T.P. Wiseman and P. White in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (1982), ed. B.K. Gold; also R. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (1982) 28.

<sup>5</sup> Suet. *op. cit.* 3.5; Suda s.v. Tyrannio; *Juv.* 7.218ff. (claiming the teacher himself would not get it all); *Hor. Sat.* 1.6.75 (reading *octonos ... aeris*) for low fees, eight asses a month, at Venusia. Augustus gave Verrius Flaccus 100,000 HS a year for teaching his grandsons, Suet. *op. cit.* 17.

<sup>6</sup> Trebatius, *Digest* 9.3.5.1.

other prominent men to whom they could be useful; access to libraries, assistance with 'publication', either by the provision of copyists or just in puffing the work; also, as has been recently stressed, the arrangement of lectures or readings in private houses or public buildings.<sup>7</sup> A number of *grammatici* held school in a patron's house, which would have large rooms suitable for the purpose.

The preponderance of freedmen among the *grammatici* hides various distinctions. There are Greeks who passed through slavery when already either possessed of a good general education or specialised skills. There are those who were born in the household, *vernae*, perhaps of Greek-speaking parents and brought up to teach Greek (though Greek names were very common for slaves and no sure guide to race); *vernae* were however often concerned with Latin.<sup>8</sup> And there were a certain number of free Greeks, from an area where teaching was a respectable profession. There are also a few among Suetonius' Latin *grammatici* who claim free birth, often rather dubiously; it is clear that the profession was risky, often ill-paid, and suffered by its association with men of servile extraction – the better-off in the West would not enter it, and the free poor had limited opportunities for a suitable education.

It is worth looking at some individual case-histories with these considerations in mind. We have enough for a broad framework to emerge, though owing to the survival of Suetonius' *De Grammaticis*, those who taught at least primarily in Latin are over-represented in our survey. Our knowledge of Greek teachers and scholars is relatively casual; not, as we shall see, that the two classes are always neatly distinguished.

Let us begin with those whose expertise was in Greek, and with those of the highest standing. Among the freeborn Greek scholars who came to Rome, perhaps the most respectable socially was Aristodemus of Nysa, from a notable family of scholars and philosophers connected by marriage with Posidonius. He taught Pompey, who later brought his cousin, another Aristodemus of Nysa, Posidonius' grandson, to the city to see to his sons' education.<sup>9</sup> Both men however count as professionals, as they taught and presumably took money for it. At some point the distinguished Alexandrian Philoxenus came, for a visit or to settle; we are told by the *Suda* that he worked in Rome, and Cicero in 45 was asking Atticus to borrow a book from a Philoxenus.<sup>10</sup> The famous grammarian was, as we saw, interested in Greek dialects and in Latin as one of them; he (like Hypsicrates, who shared the view) must have known some Latin. Not all Greek scholars were as monoglot as is sometimes thought. It is unlikely, though not absolutely impossible, that he should have learnt the language in Alexandria. No Greek, however, wrote

<sup>7</sup> Wiseman, *op. cit.* in n. 4.

<sup>8</sup> There were a few slaves of Italian origin, but they will not owe their status to the Social War or any of the Civil Wars, in which captives were clearly not enslaved.

<sup>9</sup> Strabo 14.C650. Education seems not to have 'taken' on Pompey's sons, see Vell. Pat. 2.73.1, *Ad F.* 15.19.4.

<sup>10</sup> *Ad A.* 13.8; but it is unclear that a *grammaticus* would have a volume of Panaetius, and this may be another man, perhaps as Shackleton Bailey (*ad loc.*) thinks a servant of Quintus Cicero.

on Latin literature.<sup>11</sup>

The elder Tyrannio is a well-known example of a man forced, though only technically, to pass through slavery. He was born at Amisus in Bithynia, and originally called Theophrastus, being nicknamed Tyrannio from his overbearing temper. He is also said to have studied with the Alexandrian scholar Dionysius Thrax, probably in Rhodes, whither Dionysius seems to have been driven from Egypt. Tyrannio returned to Amisus to teach, with great success (a rival retreated elsewhere).<sup>12</sup> Here he was taken prisoner by the Romans in the Mithridatic Wars. According to Plutarch, Lucullus' legate Murena asked to be given the captive and promptly manumitted him; Lucullus was indignant, for so distinguished a man should never have been regarded as a slave at all.<sup>13</sup> Whether Tyrannio felt bound to follow his *patronus* (in the most technical sense) or for other reasons (Amisus, even though it was restored, must have been impoverished by the sack), he now settled in Rome. We hear no more of Murena, but he was certainly in contact with Cicero, Atticus and perhaps Caesar; we have already met him as a great *philobiblos* and one who made money teaching. He died an old man, perhaps as late as the first years of Augustus' reign. The list of publications given by the Suda as that of the younger Tyrannio, his pupil, has been thought to contain some items pertaining to his master, but there is no clear evidence of this. It may however be he who wrote *On the Roman language*, holding like Philoxenus to its Aeolian origins, in which case he too must have learnt some Latin.<sup>14</sup>

Proud and perhaps already well-off as Tyrannio was, he probably acted for a while as tutor to Cicero's nephew, then in his early teens, and perhaps even to young Marcus, who would have been about ten and was no intellectual prodigy.<sup>15</sup> This was surely a waste of his time. But even a man like Tyrannio had to be pliant to great Romans, and with higher education a bone of contention between rhetoric and philosophy *grammatici* were compelled mostly to teach the very young; though we have seen that there were lecture courses for adults, and Atticus' freedman Caecilius Epirota refused to teach *praetextati*, young boys, 'except those to whose fathers he could not refuse such a service'.<sup>16</sup>

Cornelius Alexander, called Polyhistor or Historia from his knowledge of antiquity, was originally from Miletus, and another captive. If he already had an education, his original position at Rome, as *paedagogus* to a young Cornelius Lentulus, will have seemed very humble. He is said, however, to

<sup>11</sup> One or two other Greek *grammatici* of standing are sometimes thought to have visited Rome: Asclepiades of Myrleia (but the Suda has conflated several men), and, at the end of our period, Didymus Chalcenterus from Alexandria (because he attacked Cicero's *De Republica* – unless this is a work of the younger Claudius Didymus).

<sup>12</sup> Suda s.v. Tyrannion.

<sup>13</sup> Plut. *Lucull.* 19.7; but Christes, op. cit. in n. 2, 29 thinks these generous sentiments Plutarch's own.

<sup>14</sup> Suda s.v. Tyrannion, *ho neōteros*.

<sup>15</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 2.4.2: *docet apud me* might however imply a class.

<sup>16</sup> Suet. op. cit. 16.

have received his freedom from Sulla while still young, possibly as one of the slaves of the proscribed, rather than when known for his learning. He is recorded as dying in a fire at his house outside Rome, which suggests that he had become comfortably off. He was primarily a *grammaticus* 'of the school of Crates', i.e. Pergamene and Stoicising in tendency, but among his numerous quasi-historical works there is one on Rome, for which he will probably but not certainly have used Latin as well as Greek sources.<sup>17</sup>

Parthenius, the third major captive of the Mithridatic Wars, came like Tyrannio from Bithynia. He was primarily a poet, one whose influence on the 'neoteric' poets at Rome is disputed, but may have been significant in mediating the difficult Callimachus. He was spared by his master for his value as a teacher; this master was called Cinna, and may have been the father of the poet Helvius Cinna.<sup>18</sup> A Greek epigram sneers at his servile status, but he was probably soon freed. He is said to have taught Virgil, and since his only surviving work is dedicated to Virgil's friend Cornelius Gallus, this may be true. This work is a collection of love-stories from the obscurer corners of Greek mythology, briefly narrated, to serve as a source-book for Gallus' verse. Parthenius' reference to his book's lack of the polish which Gallus is aiming for is a mere compliment, no doubt, but one that might have seemed impossibly insincere much before this time. After thirty years in Italy, Parthenius could probably evaluate Gallus' polish for himself.<sup>19</sup>

Cicero calls Atticus' freedman M. Pomponius Dionysius a Greek, though since all Atticus' slaves are said to have been *vernae* he ought strictly to be one too.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps his slave parents were Greek by race, or at least speech, and he was born when Atticus was living in Greece. He is perhaps first seen engaged in menial tasks in Cicero's library at Antium, under Tyrannio, but if so was soon recognised as a learned man – even an omniscient one, according to Cicero, who borrowed him from Atticus and built a new guest-room for his accommodation.<sup>21</sup> It is not clear whether he taught Cicero's son and nephew in Greek; but he also made himself useful to Cicero in his reading, having a remarkable memory, and this was primarily at least in connection with Greek literature. We know that Dionysius had a high regard for the great Peripatetic scholar Dicaearchus. There is no evidence that he published anything himself. Dionysius was an irritable person, capable of self-assertion.

<sup>17</sup> *FGH* no. 273. The fact that he had a wife (who killed herself on his death) also shows settled circumstances.

<sup>18</sup> W. Clausen, *GRBS* (1964) 181; for the master called Cinna, T.P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (1974) 47. But his original master was probably not the poet Cinna himself in youth, for there is little reason to suppose with Wiseman that Parthenius was captured right at the end of the war rather than when Nicaea, his home town, fell in 73. It is true he is not heard of in Rome till much later: had he been with the Cinnas in their native northern Italy?

<sup>19</sup> *Anth. Pal.* 7.377; *Macr. Sat.* 5.17.18; Parthenius, *Erot. Path. praef.* Schol. Parthen. 8. Aristodemus of Nysa seems to have produced a similar collection of stories, but not necessarily for a Roman.

<sup>20</sup> *Nepos Atticus* 13.4.

<sup>21</sup> *Ad A.* 4.8.2, 8a.1, 11.2, 15.1, 18.5, 19.2; 5.9.3; 6.1.12. 2.3; 7.3.10, 4.1 (note that Cicero does not wish to praise him simply as he might a freedman), 7.1, 8.1, 18.3; 8.4.1, 5.1, 10; 9.12.2, 15.5; 10.2.2, 16.1, 13.26, 33a.2.

Though owing much to Cicero, from whom on liberation he took his *praenomen*, and having spent long periods in his house, he refused to come to him in early 49, on the excuse that his own financial affairs (apparently loans) needed his attention; he had his own slaves, and he may later appear with property or business interests in Africa.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps Atticus had put him in the way of acquiring an estate. After the quarrel Cicero claimed that he had not only recommended Dionysius to others but treated him while in his household with as much consideration as Scipio had shown for the distinguished philosopher Panaetius, and had written to ask his return as though he had been Dicaearchus or Aristarchus; Cicero probably did treat scholars with unusual respect, and his earlier references to Dionysius had all been full of regard. Now the fellow was arrogant, *superbus*. Later both men calmed down, but Cicero still thought that Dionysius should have come back to his post as teacher out of gratitude; however, he would not insist, as he implies he could have done. Atticus thought Cicero rather harsh in the matter, but the workings of *officium*, obligation, are nicely illustrated. The breach was repaired after the Civil War and Dionysius came back.<sup>23</sup>

The background and origin of Curtius Nicias are particularly problematic. If Nicias of Cos, known from Cicero's letters, is the man called Curtius Nicias by Suetonius, he may have been a free Greek who had been enfranchised, rare as this still was; possibly with the help of the great banker Curtius (later Rabirius) Postumus, a friend of Pompey and Caesar who had important interests in Egypt and elsewhere in the East. It is also possible, though freedmen are not usually given an ethnic, that he had been born a slave, or a freedman's son, perhaps on a property of Postumus in Cos, which was a centre for *negotiatores* after 88. The inscriptions of the tyrant Nicias of Cos, who may be identical with Cicero's Nicias of Cos, give no father's name, with the Demos honouring him as 'son of the People'; but this is not conclusive evidence of unfree parentage.

Suetonius' Curtius Nicias was an adherent of Pompey and of Memmius (probably Lucretius' dedicatee and the praetor of 58). One notes the double dependence. But Pompey broke off relations when his wife told him that Nicias had brought her a love-letter from Memmius. Cicero's Nicias of Cos was with him, in Italy at least, when he travelled home from the East in 50; he gave advice on the proper form of a Greek name, and Cicero later implies that he is a textual critic. He was also a friend of Atticus. Cicero was touched when Nicias offered to come to him after Tullia's death, and granted that his civilised company, *humanitas*, could give pleasure in ordinary circumstances, but refused the offer, partly because Nicias would not find the comfort he liked at remote Astura. But the following summer at Tusculum they talked philology and gossip (Brutus' divorce, Cornificia's marriage). Nicias is found thereafter in Campania, telling Cicero of the honours paid by Caesar to Dolabella, with whom he seems to have had a close connection; if he is

<sup>22</sup> Perhaps *Ad F.* 12.24.3, but this may be Attius Dionysius, see Shackleton Bailey, *ad loc.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ad A.* 13.2b, 33a.2. He had a son, also Dionysius, who became an elegant declaimer in Greek, *Sen. Rhet. Controv.* 1.4.11; a step up socially?

Curtius Nicias, it would be relevant that Memmius had been exiled and was probably now dead.<sup>24</sup> If the two men are the same, it is remarkable that Suetonius reckons him among Latin *grammatici* and says his work on Lucilius was admired by the learned Santra. His choice of author might have been influenced by his connection with Pompey, who was related to the poet. If it is right that he had been brought up in a Roman household in the east, he could have learnt Latin young.

It is often thought that Cicero's Nicias had a spectacular later career – that, returning to the East with or ahead of Dolabella in 43, as Cicero's letters indicate, he became the tyrant of Cos mentioned by Strabo. The tyrant is also attested by inscriptions and coins, suggesting an eight-year rule, and an epigram tells us that after his death his bones were dug up and dishonoured. Presumably he was one of Antony's unsuitable nominees in the East (Antony was given to delegating jobs to often rather shady intellectual or artistic cronies) and was overthrown by Octavian. But it is odd, if the tyrant is Curtius Nicias, that Suetonius knows nothing of this. But even if he is only Cicero's Nicias, he becomes one of the first Greek intellectuals to attain political power at home by friendship with Roman aristocrats.<sup>25</sup>

Freedmen were, with slight disabilities, Roman citizens, and we have seen that it is sometimes difficult to tell in which language some men were working. Some of Suetonius' Latin *grammatici* also have Greek interests. One of the first of Suetonius' chosen subjects to be of interest to us is Sevius Nicanor, c. 100 B.C., from whom two lines of Latin verse are quoted, and M. Pompilius Andronicus, a Syrian by race, but who wrote on Ennius' *Annals*. Both were probably freedmen, though Nicanor and Andronicus are not usual slave names; perhaps they were not *vernae*, but kept the names they had before enslavement. Andronicus, as we saw, retired to Campania and poverty, presumably being now patronless. Sulla's L. Cornelius Epicadus, whose name has suggested Illyrian origin, finished his patron's memoirs, which were certainly in Latin, and wrote on the Roman subject of *cognomina*; he was freed in Sulla's will and remained close to the family, describing himself as the freedman of Faustus Sulla as well as of his father.<sup>26</sup>

Staberius Eros, whom Suetonius describes as having been publicly auctioned, is also said to have arrived in Italy in the same ship (a slave trader from Delos?) as two Syrian cousins, who were to be well-known as the astronomer Manilius (of whom we know no more) and Publilius Syrus the mime-writer. Eros must have taught Latin, and indeed there is some evidence that he edited a Latin author. He taught both Brutus and Cassius, and generously took the sons of Sulla's victims free.<sup>27</sup>

A number of Suetonius' *grammatici* undergo picturesque adventures, which

<sup>24</sup> Suet. op. cit. 14; *Ad A.* 7.3.10, 12.26.2, 13.1.3, 9.2, 28.4, 52.2, 14.9.3, 15.20.1, *Ad F.* 9.10.1. Syme, *JRS* (1961) 25 = *RP* II.522-5. Shackleton Bailey is cautious about identification but makes Nicias an Epicurean, for which there is no real evidence; he may be wrong to see the *grammaticus* in *Ad F.* 7.23.4.

<sup>25</sup> Strabo 14.C658. *Anth. Pal.* 9.81. G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (1965) 45.

<sup>26</sup> Suet. op. cit. 5, 8, 12.

<sup>27</sup> *Id. ib.* 13; cf. Fronto 15 v.d. Hout (but see p. 44).

have perhaps been embellished. Pompeius Lenaeus is supposed to have run away as a boy from the house where he was a slave, returned home and got a liberal education, and then offered his master the price of his freedom. The master (presumably Pompey) refused it but freed him for his intelligence and learning.<sup>28</sup> At all events, Lenaeus was thereafter loyal to Pompey, whom he accompanied on most of his expeditions abroad. When Pompey and his sons were dead he supported himself by teaching near his patron's old house, and abused in energetic Latin verse the historian Sallust, who had attacked Pompey's memory; Lenaeus accused Sallust of ignorant theft from archaic Latin authors, especially the elder Cato. Lenaeus had in youth heard Lucilius' friend Laelius Archelaus (himself a freedman?) expounding that poet. But his Greek was good enough to enable him to translate Mithridates' pharmaceutical works from that language.<sup>29</sup>

L. Ateius Praetextatus, another freedman, was born in Athens, according to Suetonius.<sup>30</sup> His master may have been the centurion Ateius whom Sulla recorded in his memoirs as the first man to scale the wall in the siege of the city; perhaps also the centurion Ateius whose son rose to be praetor and was the father of the great Augustan lawyer Ateius Capito, who is known to have expressed an opinion on the grammarian.<sup>31</sup> Praetextatus was still active after Sallust's death, so must have been very young at the time if he was captured in 86, but his education was mainly Greek: he wrote to Laelius Hermas (presumably another literary freedman) that he had made great progress in Greek literature, and some in Latin. He had heard the Latin *grammaticus* Antonius Gniphō, and in his later years provided Sallust with an epitome of Roman history and Asinius Pollio with (anti-Sallustian) precepts on Latin style. Suetonius, by including him in his list, must imply that the works he knew were in Latin; he quotes from another letter to Hermas a reference to 'my *Hyle*, a collection of material of every kind in 800 volumes' – obviously unpublished, but recommended for others' use. The Greek title does not prove they were in Greek. Suetonius says that Praetextatus assumed the name Philologus, in emulation of Eratosthenes, and intended thus to draw attention to the breadth of his learning. Ateius Capito the lawyer indeed remarked that (rather like Eratosthenes, who was called Beta because he took second place in every branch of learning) he was 'a rhetorician among

<sup>28</sup> Id. ib. 15, another corrupt passage. Some read *Athenis*, not *catenis* for his escape, and so make him Greek. But Schol. Juv. 1.20, where Lenaeus is a probably correct emendation for Lenius, says that like Lucilius he came from Aurunca (Suessa Aurunca) and wrote satires – the two men are clearly regarded as separate. Lenaeus could have come to Pompey's household from that of one of the Lucilii, his relatives, who had property there. T.E.J. Wiedemann, *CR* (1982) 75 reads *praeceptis* for *perceptis* and infers that Lenaeus had taught, not studied, as a runaway and thus could afford to offer to buy his freedom.

<sup>29</sup> Pliny *NH* 25.5-7.

<sup>30</sup> Suet. *op. cit.* 10.

<sup>31</sup> D.C. Earl, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972) 855 n. 63. But since Sulla did not enslave the free population the future scholar ought to have been already a slave. However, frequent breaches of such rules occurred; so perhaps on this occasion a woman recorded in *Anth. Pal.* 7.368 who claims to be an *Atthis* carried off by Roman arms who became a Roman citizen (doubtless as a freedwoman); she was buried at Cyzicus.

grammarians and a grammarian among rhetoricians'. He returned to, or at least revisited Greece in later life, accompanying two of the Claudii Pulchri to the province, probably on a tour of government.<sup>32</sup>

Such freedmen, poised between two nations and two tongues, had existed in Rome since Livius Andronicus had begun to teach *utraque lingua* in the third century. There were other teachers for whom Latin must have been the main language, though they were rarely *Romani di Roma*. Such in our time were M. Antonius Gnipho, L. Orbilius Pupillus and P. Valerius Cato.<sup>33</sup> These all claimed free birth and undeserved misfortunes. Gnipho, born in Gaul (Cisalpine or Narbonese) is said to have been exposed as an infant, but rescued and brought up by the master who later freed him; Suetonius tells a similar tale of the Augustan scholar Melissus. At all events Gnipho is a slave name. Suetonius, as we saw, doubted a story of education in Alexandria, on chronological grounds, but it shows that Gnipho had Greek learning, and indeed he is called as erudite in Greek as in Latin; it also shows what school he looked to. If his master remained in 'Gaul', Gnipho must somehow have been able to detach himself to come to Rome, where he taught first in Caesar's house and then in his own. He may have become comparatively rich and independent, for as the most famous Latin *grammaticus* of the first third of the century, and an agreeable and generous man, he had a host of students and also taught adults, exacting no regular fee and doing all the better for it. He died before he was fifty, leaving two books *De Sermone Latino* and a mass of works attributed to him but really by pupils, obviously all in Latin (perhaps based on lecture notes).<sup>34</sup>

Orbilius of Beneventum in southern Italy was orphaned by the simultaneous murder of both parents, as we are told. After acting as a magistrate's attendant (a lowly job in the country towns at least? salaries in Caesar's Spanish charter are not much more than a workman's)<sup>35</sup> he served in the army but then returned to his first love, scholarship. He taught first in Beneventum, where a statue later commemorated him; he was shown teaching, sitting beside two book-boxes – and, Suetonius notes, wearing the Greek *pallium* or mantle. It is remarkable that this should be recorded of the one teacher whose free Roman birth could not have been impugned, and a prickly and independent fellow at that. How many Roman *grammatici* stressed their Greek heritage to that extent?

In 63 Orbilius moved to Rome (did he wear the *pallium* rather than the *toga* there too?). He had no discernible patron, and was rude to great men; he also wrote an attack on the carelessness and ambition of parents (one parent we know, Horace's father, ambitious but not careless – indeed one suspects

<sup>32</sup> Praetextatus will not have been his original slave name, but could have been assumed on presiding over some festival as *magister* of a *collegium* in the *toga praetexta* (not because he started teaching precociously young, since as a slave or freedman he could not wear the *praetexta* as free-born boys did):

<sup>33</sup> Suet. op. cit. 7, 9. 11.

<sup>34</sup> Suet. op. cit. 7.

<sup>35</sup> *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Juliae*, FIRÁ I 180. But such men at Rome were of decent status, and Orbilius served in the cavalry.

Orbilius found him intolerably solicitous and interfering). He also abused fellow-teachers, and Horace is not the only source for his savage use of the whip on his pupils. But he bought up and brought out the study of Ennius' *Annals* that Pompilius Andronicus had had to sell in his poverty, presumably to a rival who wanted either to suppress it or to publish it under his own name (but never did so). In old age Orbilius lived in poverty and a garret himself. A son and a slave of his carried on the profession; both had perhaps been his assistants.<sup>36</sup> This is the only case we know of in which a son follows the father in his trade (except among free Greeks). It may be relevant that freedmen are often thought rarely to have left free children; but fathers probably hoped their sons would do better in another walk of life.

P. Valerius Cato also claimed to be freeborn, though some said he was the freedman of a man from Gaul, most probably again northern Italy. He asserted in his *Indignatio*, presumably an apologetic work, that he had been orphaned young and thus easily despoiled of his property in the Sullan upheavals. He had many well-known pupils and, having as far as we know no grand patron, may have made money by teaching, for he acquired a villa at Tusculum (less because he had claims to fashion than because of the libraries and other opportunities there?). But he fell into debt and lost it, and the poet Furius Bibaculus described him in old age as living in a very poor way off the produce of a small garden.<sup>37</sup> Furius' reference in this context to Zenodotus and Crates reminds us again how even the most Roman *grammatici* placed themselves firmly in the Greek tradition. Cato had been highly regarded by the 'neoterics' as a learned poet in Latin and as a judge of poetry, and was considered the best teacher for those who wanted to write verse themselves.<sup>38</sup>

Atticus' freedman Q. Caecilius Epirota was born in Tusculum and was probably in spite of his name a *verna*, perhaps son of a slave or slaves from Atticus' estate in Epirus. He is said to have been the first actually to teach the 'new poets', when he opened a school after the fall and death of Cornelius Gallus, with whom he had been living.<sup>39</sup> This was the usual resort when patronage failed; we saw how he lost his original patron by making love to his daughter. It is worth noting that Cicero's Tiro, who began as a secretary rather than a teacher, was probably a *verna* too; his literary works, published after his patron's death and presumably while living on his little estate, were in Latin and dealt with Latin literature.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, we pass to a different level of society with two *equites* from the early

<sup>36</sup> Suet. op. cit. 9, with quotations from the poets who suffered under him. The slave was later freed as Scribonius Aphrodisius, ib. 19. In *CIL* X 3969 Furius Philocalus, schoolmaster at Capua probably in the late Republic (Chapter 2, n. 84) may be wearing a toga. In the imperial period the convenient *pallium* was much worn in Italy.

<sup>37</sup> Suet. op. cit. 11. The Valerius mentioned with Nicias of Cos as in Tusculum by Cicero, *Ad A.* 12.51.1, 53, may be Valerius Cato in his villa-owning days, see Syme, op. cit. in n. 24.

<sup>38</sup> None of his verse survives.

<sup>39</sup> Suet. op. cit. 16 – only to a small class of older boys or even young men (*adulescentibus*), and probably as a supplement to, not replacement of, the normal curriculum (R. Mayer, *AJP* (1982) 305).

<sup>40</sup> Frags in *GRF* 393ff.

part of the century, the famous Aelius Stilo and his son-in-law Ser. Clodius (who proved disreputable, making off with a manuscript of Stilo's). Significantly, Suetonius does not call them *grammatici*; he says they advanced the study of *grammatica*. But Stilo is called Varro's *magister* and Cicero speaks of himself passing time *apud Aelium*, the usual expression for studying with someone.<sup>41</sup> It is hard to imagine an *eques* teaching for pay at this point; Stilo must simply have been ready to talk to and encourage studious upper-class youths. It is possible however that Stilo, who was only the son of an auctioneer, was not an *eques* until formally given the gold ring by a patron holding high office, perhaps one of the Metelli, as the actor Roscius was given it by Sulla (after this Roscius took no fees). This would be an interesting if exceptional case of a free man rising in status by his intellectual achievements.<sup>42</sup> It was of course entirely true, as Suetonius remarks and as we shall see, that men of the highest position were concerned with, and indeed wrote on, 'grammatical' subjects.

### Rhetors

The teaching of rhetoric, vital as it was to the Roman aristocracy, was long almost entirely in the hands of Greeks. Though Suetonius tells us that the early Latin or half-Latin *grammatici*, and a few later ones, taught rhetoric as well (among the latter Antonius Gniphos and Ateius Philologus – in which language?),<sup>43</sup> the full-time Greek rhetors resident in Rome were mostly of fairly low position, but not actually freedmen; only a free man could decently concern himself with political and judicial oratory. Though Cicero complains that few Greek rhetors had actually had experience in these fields, we can sometimes glimpse men with a background in public life who had fallen on evil days, like the exile Diophanes of Mitylene, who taught Gaius Gracchus. But the fact that we know so little of the rhetors at Rome suggests their insignificance. In the nineties Cicero was persuaded by the learned men in the house of L. Crassus to continue his rhetorical education solely in Greek, but he does not think it worth while to mention their names, even in the detailed account of his education in the *Brutus*, where he does pay tribute to Apollonius Molon and other distinguished rhetoricians teaching in the East. Likewise Cicero does not in that work tell us of the teachers of any of his predecessors (except the Gracchi) or of his contemporaries; he omits, for

<sup>41</sup> Suet. op. cit. 3; A. Gellius 16.8.2; *Brutus* 207 (*cum essem apud Aelium adulescens eumque audire perstudiose solerem*).

<sup>42</sup> L.R. Taylor, *TAPA* (1968) 469. She suggests that Ser. Clodius was promoted in the same way, also possibly the lawyer Trebatius at Caesar's hands. The *grammaticorum equitum doctissimum* of the (probably contemporary) lines prefixed to *Hor. Sat.* 1.10 is unidentified; he need not be a real *grammaticus*, for Cicero could call Atticus so in joke, on the grounds of his interest in the subject, *Ad A.* 7.3.10.

<sup>43</sup> Suet. op. cit. 4, 6, 7.3, 10.1: perhaps note the high standing of Gniphos and Philologus, leaders of the profession, also teaching a skill usually taught by free men. Greek *grammatici* occasionally taught rhetoric, so Aristodemus of Nysa, Strabo 14.C650. Under the Empire rhetors were better paid than *grammatici* at Rome, *Juv.* 7.217, and other evidence. Theodorus of Gadara however was of slave parentage, according to Suidas (captives of the Mithridatic war, suggested Cichorius, *R.u.M.* 62). Heliodorus, *Hor. Sat.* 1.5.2, unknown.

instance, in discussing the cool and lucid style of M. Calpidius, to tell us the extremely relevant fact that he had been taught by Apollodorus of Pergamum, who was to become, admittedly after Cicero wrote, very famous, and who had a strictly intellectual approach. It is true, however, that in this work Cicero is trying to show off the Roman achievement in oratory and set it beside the Greek, and true too that he thought natural talent and practice more important than the inculcation of mechanical rules by the rhetor.<sup>44</sup>

It is very much by chance that we learn that M. Brutus was intimate with the rhetor Empylus of Rhodes, who wrote an account of Caesar's murder and whose fine memory is noted;<sup>45</sup> or that Philagrus taught Metellus Nepos to speak in a high-flown style and was rather grandly commemorated by his pupil after death;<sup>46</sup> or that Cicero thought fairly well of one Paeonius, who was teaching young Quintus, though Cicero felt that his nephew would benefit from his own broader approach.<sup>47</sup> (Cicero was a natural teacher, who regretted that the teaching of oratory was not so well-regarded as that of law, though of course one would not teach 'like a schoolmaster', but through questioning and giving advice, as indeed he did in his last years with several friends.)<sup>48</sup> He clearly despised the 'learned rhetor' to whom Trebatius turned but who had never heard of Aristotle's *Topica*, and was very cavalier with his son's teacher in Athens, Gorgias, who was dismissed for corrupting his pupil with luxurious living, though Gorgias, who later came to Rome, was or was to become a personage of importance.<sup>49</sup> And it was easy to stir up distrust of a Greek rhetor in the courts. Thus the *Pro Flacco* on a certain Heraclides of Temnus, who was conceited enough to set up as a teacher though he had not even got into the Council at Temnus and always lost his cases in court; he appears to have been teaching some rich young men in Rome, 'making them half as stupid again as they were before', but not stupid enough to lend him money, so that he was condemned in his own town to debt-bondage.<sup>50</sup> Even the reputable authorities in the East at this time, some of whom, like Apollonius Molon, did plead in court and act as ambassadors, may not have been quite the equals of the wealthy scions of leading families, who, both teaching and giving display speeches, were to be the stars of the

<sup>44</sup> Suet. *De Rhet.* 2; *Brutus* 315-16, 104, 274ff. Apollodorus, already elderly, accompanied his pupil, not yet Octavian, to Apollonia in 44, but probably returned to Pergamum on the grounds of age and weakness (Nic. Dam., *FGH* no. 90, frag. 130.44).

<sup>45</sup> Plut. *Brut.* 2, *Quint. Inst.* 10.6.4. He appeared in the courts. Strato, Plut. *Brut.* 52, perhaps a fellow-student not rhetor.

<sup>46</sup> Plut. *Cic.* 26.7: possibly the Rhodian rhetor Philagrus (Dion. Hal. *De Dinarch.* 8).

<sup>47</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 3.3.4. <sup>48</sup> *Orator* 142ff.

<sup>49</sup> *Top.* 1: *Ad F.* 16.21.6.

<sup>50</sup> *Pro Flacco* 42. Of course men in public life made enemies, and this may explain some of the slurs on rhetors. Heraclides had held minor office at Temnus and been chosen as an envoy; he may not be as bad as Cicero makes out.

Greeks teaching rhetoric in Rome probably did not include Asclepiades of Bithynia, who is said by Pliny to have turned from rhetoric to medicine only to make more money. This is perhaps based on his reputation as an eloquent lecturer, *De Or.* 1.62; see E. Rawson, *CQ* (1982) 358. Paradoxically, a 'Roman' rhetor seems to have lectured in Greece (and Greek): one D. Junius D̄f., at the gymnasium in Delphi, L. Robert, *Études Épigraphiques et Philologiques*, *BEHE* 272.15, restoring *rhē[tor]*.

Second Sophistic movement, at whose pleas on behalf of suffering home towns it was proper for an Emperor to shed tears.

Indeed the Romans had to get over a deep distrust of Greek rhetoric as a power capable of evil as well as good, a tool for the demagogue as well as the statesman. Rhetors were expelled from Rome at least once in the second century,<sup>51</sup> and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, writing probably in the eighties, distrusts, though he is totally dependent on, Greek theorists. But Greeks in Rome might be controllable by their patrons and employers. The first Latin rhetor mentioned by Suetonius is L. Plotius Gallus, who opened a school in the nineties that ran into opposition that may have been partly political. It was denounced by the censor of 92, L. Crassus the orator himself, as contrary to *mos maiorum*, a disingenuous claim for one whose house was full of Greek teachers. Cicero had been anxious to go, a fragment of a letter reveals, but was prevented by his teachers, the protégés of Crassus, who preferred Greek on intellectual grounds. As a character in the *De Oratore* says, what Greek would allow a Roman any merit in these matters? But Crassus in that work is made to claim that the school is a school of impudence, which sounds political.<sup>52</sup> Plotius was a friend of Marius, who was not consistently reliable in the eyes of conservative aristocrats (and distrusted the study of Greek); one of Plotius' few identifiable pupils seems to be Licinius Macer, later author of a distinctly *popularis* history of early Rome, which Cicero describes as clever in style but owing nothing to Greek eloquence, only to that of 'little Latin clerks', while his speeches were tasteless and impudent (he came, or claimed to come, from an old family). And Varro in his *Satires* presents a mere driver, as we noted, who has picked up a vulgar and tumid rhetorical style from Plotius.<sup>53</sup> One wonders if Plotius re-opened the school under the Marian-Cinnan régime of the eighties; he himself survived all vicissitudes to be accused by Cicero of writing, in 56, a speech for the very young Atratinus' prosecution of Caelius, who called him a *hordearius rhetor*, meaning, says Suetonius, vulgar and superficial.<sup>54</sup> As the prosecution was mounted by the patrician Claudii, or so Cicero alleges, Plotius was perhaps now a hanger-on of a new demagogue, P. Clodius. There is some evidence of a Plotius editing the speeches of C. Gracchus, but this may mean little politically, as Gracchus was widely admired as an orator. But Plotius did certainly write on gesture, possibly as part of a more comprehensive work on rhetoric; so the *rhetores Latini* were perhaps not so ignorant of any theoretical framework as is sometimes supposed.<sup>55</sup>

Suetonius' list of 'famous professors of rhetoric' in Latin is very short, and he claims it could not be made longer. It contains Plotius; L. Voltacilius Pilutus (the exact form of his name is uncertain), who was a freedman, being said to have served as a chained slave doorkeeper before taking to rhetoric

<sup>51</sup> With philosophers in 161, Suet. *Gramm.* 25. Those living with a patron were perhaps protected, G. Kennedy, *Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (1972) 54.

<sup>52</sup> *De Or.* 3.931; cf. Suet. *op. cit.* 25.

<sup>53</sup> *De Leg.* 1.7; Varro *Sat.* 257B.

<sup>54</sup> Suet. *op. cit.* 26.

<sup>55</sup> Fronto 15 v.d. H. (but see p. 44). Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.143.

and becoming Pompey's teacher;<sup>56</sup> M. Epidius, who as we saw claimed descent from a local deity in Campania but who had a bad reputation as a mounter of fraudulent prosecutions, and taught Antony and Octavian, not to mention, if the *Life* is reliable, Virgil; and the witty Sex. Clodius from Sicily, who taught in both languages and was largely rewarded by Antony, to Cicero's disapproval. C. Albucius Silus of Novara in northern Italy had held office in his home town but been condemned in the courts.<sup>57</sup>

Even if these stories are not true, they are indicative. The climax of disreputableness is provided by T. Annius Cimber, who actually reached the praetorship, doubtless with the aid of Antony who, according to Octavian, admired and imitated his style. The puzzling *Catalepton* 2 calls him a rhetor and establishes his taste for Thucydides and archaic Greek word-forms. It is possible that he taught in Greek, which might account for his failure to attract Suetonius' attention. Cicero calls him *Lysidici filius*, indicating foreign or freedman parentage; if a freedman, he probably should not strictly have held office, but the period was an unsettled one. Cimber was actually accused of murdering his brother, both by Cicero and the pseudo-Virgilian poem.<sup>58</sup> The *grammatici*, by contrast, had tended to be the victims of society, not its villains.

The first rhetor to be a Roman *eques*, according to the Elder Seneca, was Blandus, probably Rubellius Blandus, early in Augustus' reign.<sup>59</sup> But of course Romans of position, deeply concerned with public speaking, might write, though not formally teach, on various aspects of rhetoric, just as they did on *grammatica*.

### *Philosophers*

By comparison the philosophers were pillars of society. No serious scandals are recorded, in spite of the pleasure taken in pointing out that philosophers did not always practise what they preached. These men are free, and Greek. The best training was to be had in Athens or Rhodes, and Roman masters would presumably not have sent slaves to study with young nobles abroad. And a slave given a literary training who turned out to be not very clever would be a useful reader, copyist or clerk; what could you do with a bad philosopher? The subject also, especially in its political and ethical branches, was primarily suited to free men. (None the less, we may notice that young P. Crassus' freedman Apollonius, whom Cicero recommended to Caesar, had studied with Cicero's Stoic guest, the blind Diodotus, either philosophy proper or mathematics.)<sup>60</sup>

The philosopher might still, of course, be captured or kidnapped.

<sup>56</sup> S. Treggiari, *CR* (1969) 264 declines to identify him with the M. Voltacilius Pitholaus who make a joke against Caesar, or the Rhodian Pitholeon who wrote in a mixture of Latin and Greek (*Hor. Sat* 1.10.22), and rejects Jerome's version of his surname, Plotus.

<sup>57</sup> Suet. *op. cit.* 28, 30.

<sup>58</sup> *Phil.* 11.14, 13.26. A Greek rhetor of slightly later date, Moschus, a pupil of Apollodorus, was actually convicted in Rome of poisoning, Sen. *Controv.* 2.5.13.

<sup>59</sup> *Id. ib.* 2. *praef.* 5.

<sup>60</sup> *Ad F.* 13.16.4.

Philodemus is perhaps referring in veiled fashion to slavery when he says that many students are attracted to Athens and the philosophic schools there, but some stay in the great capitals, Rome and Alexandria, either by necessity or else by choice, wishing to advantage themselves or their cities. Elsewhere he observes, as we saw, that many who call themselves philosophers plan to spend a certain number of years in Athens studying, so many in seeing the Greek and barbarian world (perhaps primarily Italy), so many teaching in their home town, and the rest in distinguished retirement.<sup>61</sup> A teacher's professional credentials consisted in having studied with a well-known figure, preferably in Athens; our literary sources frequently note under whom a man has worked.<sup>62</sup> Of course, there was little to ensure that he had learnt much from his master, but letters of personal recommendation, such as those the Epicurean Phaedrus gave Patro to Cicero and others, will have played an important part.<sup>63</sup>

There is some evidence of philosophers coming from wealthy backgrounds. Phaedrus certainly came from a distinguished family in Athens, and the house on the Acropolis of Antiochus' brother Aristus must have been an ample one, since Cicero stayed there as proconsul in 51 B.C.; Cratippus' son was to hold a grand priesthood.<sup>64</sup> But even if free men and thus able to plan their lives in the fashion Philodemus suggests, most of those who came to Rome for a time or permanently were dependent on a patron. They had not even the resource of opening a school, since pupils would be relatively few even had the pull of Athens and Rhodes been less strong. However, the fact that they were not receiving fixed fees from parents probably contributed to their standing; it is possible that they tended to receive occasional gifts from their patrons rather than a salary – thus the Epicurean Demetrius of Laconia seems to have received a large sum from a Claudius Nero in return for the work on poetry dedicated to him (though whether Demetrius was in Rome is uncertain). Not that we can entirely believe Philodemus when he implies that rhetors earn large sums, but philosophers are quite uninterested in profit (a very few may have taught *gratis*). He also says that if one is unsuccessful in philosophy it is better to teach geometry, grammar, music or military tactics than to sink to being a rhetor; this reflects philosophic disdain for the subject, for we have seen that in Rome at least rhetors were rather higher than *grammatici* in social status, even if morally more dubious.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 2.145 Sudh.; *De Morte* 5.55-6 Bassi.

<sup>62</sup> Indeed histories of philosophy often took the form of lists of teachers and their pupils, like the *Indices* of Stoics and Academics from Herculaneum.

<sup>63</sup> *Ad F.* 13.1.2.

<sup>64</sup> Raubitschek, op. cit. in Chapter 1 n. 28; the son of Phaedrus, Lysiades, was probably archon 52/1 and certainly an Areopagite, and Antony made him a *iudex* at Rome (*Phil.* 5.13; 8.27), so he will have had the citizenship and considerable property. Aristus, *Ad A.* 5.10.5; Cratippus' son, Bowersock, op. cit. in n. 25, 114 (*CIL* III 399).

<sup>65</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 2.159-60, 1.320 = 2.54 Sudh.; Athen. 6 274d, probably from Posidonius, says the nobles Mucius Scaevola, Aelius Tubero and Rutilius Rufus gave large presents to friends 'aiming at great things from education', because they were adherents of the Stoa – the gifts then perhaps mainly to philosophers.

Like Hellenistic kings in this as in so much else, many great men in Rome liked to keep a household philosopher for intellectual stimulus or as confessor and conscience. And the standing at home of some philosophers, with the relevance of the subject to ethics and politics, meant that they might be valued as advisers on affairs in the Greek world. Although, as we shall see, Stoic influence permeated many intellectual fields, the philosophers who came to Rome were not predominantly Stoics. Staseas of Naples, whom we met living with M. Pupius Piso in the nineties, was a Peripatetic. So was the teacher, one Alexander, to whom M. Crassus gave hospitality, if it could be so called, for Plutarch says that it was a puzzle to tell whether Alexander was poorer before or after his association with Crassus, who would lend him a cloak for the journeys they took together, and remove it afterwards.<sup>66</sup>

Antiochus of Ascalon, the distinguished Academic, was scarcely a house philosopher, but he accompanied Lucullus on official visits to Sicily, Egypt and Syria. In spite of Cicero's efforts in the first version of the *Academica* to turn Lucullus into a qualified expounder of philosophy, and Plutarch's assurance that Lucullus liked all philosophical schools but especially the Academy, it seems unlikely that Antiochus' value to his patron was for his technical skills; he was perhaps a general adviser on Greek affairs, and it has been surmised that he may have been responsible for the constitution which Lucullus gave Cyrene in 86, and for his reminding its people that they had once asked Plato to write them laws. (A similar role was surely that of Panaetius when he was Scipio Aemilianus' sole companion on his embassy to the East.) M. Brutus, who 'lived with' Antiochus' brother and successor, the amiable Aristus, was a more serious student than Lucullus and an adherent of Antiochus' views, but again Aristus, who is said to have led a very busy life, may not have simply tutored Brutus in philosophy; at any event, he probably accompanied him on his missions to Cyprus and Cilicia in the fifties. Other philosophers who travelled with Roman *amici* include Philodemus, who went to Macedonia with his patron L. Piso, and apparently also to Gaul. But as an Epicurean he is unlikely to have had a political function. A little later, if Antony may have put a *grammaticus* into power at Cos, Augustus was to use a couple of philosophers to run Tarsus – Athenodorus son of Sandon (for whom see below) and Nestor the Academic – and was also to make use of the advice of his own tutor, Areius of Alexandria.<sup>67</sup>

Cicero did indeed keep a Stoic philosopher in his house for many years, the blind Diodotus, who was able to leave his patron about 100,000 HS when he

<sup>66</sup> Staseas, p. 6; Alexander (not Polyhistor as once thought), Plut. *Crass.* 3.3;

<sup>67</sup> Plut. *Luc.* 2.3-4; 42; *Acad.* 2.4; Plut. *Brut.* 2.2. Gucker, op. cit. in Chapter 1, n. 20, 21ff. 'Lived with' may only mean 'spent much time with', cf. Antiochus and Atticus, *De Leg.* 1.54 (no doubt in Athens, where both surely had their own homes). Plut. *Brut.* 12 mentions Brutus' *hetairos* Statilius 'the Epicurean', but B. 'passed him over' for the conspiracy, so he was probably a senator, not a professional, as indeed the Roman name indicates; cf. 48, P. Volumnius, *anēr philosophos*, whom B. addressed at the end with reminders of *tôn logôn kai tēs askēseōs*; a fellow-student at Athens or subsequently? He had accompanied B. in all his campaigns. Cf. the young man who tried to die with Cato, but was argued out of it by the philosophers, and did die at Philippi, Plut. *Cato* 65, 73 and *Brut.* 51.

died (a substantial sum, later sometimes the qualification for a municipal council). But Cicero was not really a Stoic himself. He never shook off the influence of Philo and the sceptical New Academy, holding that the school took the wrong turning with the more dogmatic Antiochus and declined with the good-natured Aristus. He put his son, when at Athens, under the charge of Cratippus, a pupil of Aristus who had turned to the Peripatetics (as most of the known pupils of Aristus did). Cicero gave Cratippus the unique honour, for a Greek, of a role in one of his dialogues and, as we saw, got Caesar to give him the citizenship and procured honours for him from the Areopagus, so that he should return to teach in Athens. Cratippus took the name M. Tullius Cratippus, but there is no evidence that he ever went to Rome. It is significant for the possible status of a philosopher that young Marcus is anxious to claim that his relation to Cratippus is that of a son to his father; of a probable teacher of rhetoric in Latin he only notes that he is subsidising the man.<sup>68</sup>

Cato to some extent redresses the balance in favour of Stoicism, for he had, presumably at different times, at least three philosophers of that persuasion about him. Plutarch associates his friendship with Antipater of Tyre with an early period of his life (in 43 Antipater had recently died in Athens). And while still young Cato, as we recall, tempted Athenodorus Cordylion of Tarsus away from the library at Pergamum. Cato regarded Athenodorus as a great catch, as he had hitherto avoided all relations with great men, but we know that he had been caught piously expurgating the works of the older Stoics of extravagances criticised at this time, especially, it seems, Zeno's communist and quasi-Cynic *Politeia*. The excised passages were restored, and Athenodorus came into some kind of danger. Perhaps he was glad to go to Rome, where he died in Cato's house. Pliny tells us that Cato also brought a philosopher home from his mission to Cyprus in 57, but it is not clear who this was. Two little-known figures, Apollonius the Stoic and Demetrius the Peripatetic, were with him at the end. Even to an Academic, Philostratus, whom he knew in Sicily in 49, he gave the place of honour when they walked together.<sup>69</sup>

The other Athenodorus of Tarsus, the son of Sandon, also a Stoic, may conceivably have been under the patronage of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, whom Cicero once requests to take Athenodorus' teachings to heart; Appius came from a family with huge *clientelae* in the East, including Cilicia (the relevance of such *clientelae* in forging links between great Romans and Greek scholars should not be forgotten). Athenodorus son of Sandon was certainly in Rome in 44, when Cicero got him to make a résumé of Posidonius' *On Duty*.<sup>70</sup> He became Octavian's teacher, and was to be highly favoured by his pupil, like his colleague the Platonist Areius of Alexandria. Athenodorus was fertile in published works;<sup>71</sup> perhaps many of those known mainly as house philosophers were not, but since we should know almost nothing of

<sup>68</sup> Diodotus *Ad A.* 2.20.6; Cratippus, p. 290 and *Ad F.* 12.16.2, 16.21.3; Plut. *Cic.* 24.

<sup>69</sup> Plut. *Cato* 4.1, 10, 65.5; Pliny *NH* 7.113; *De Off.* 2.86; Plut. *Cato* 57.2.

<sup>70</sup> *Ad F.* 3.7.5; *Ad A.* 16.11.4, 14.4 (but Shackleton Bailey thinks this is Cordylion).

<sup>71</sup> Strabo 14.C674.

Philodemus' voluminous writings were it not for the discovery of the Herculaneum library, we should be cautious here. For example, it may be in a book that Cato's protégé Antipater of Tyre criticised omissions in Panaetius' treatise *On Duty*.<sup>72</sup> The greatest Stoic of them all, Posidonius, had ties with various Romans, and had visited the city, but he was too big a fish to be kept in a Roman fishpond.<sup>73</sup>

The position of the philosopher at Rome was a tricky one, half mentor and half servant as he was. In some respects the picture of dependence as we sketched it for the *grammatici* will apply. So sometimes, perhaps, will the description by Lucian, two hundred years later, of the trials of the Greek philosophers and other intellectuals who took service in the houses of wealthy Romans for a salary, or weakly agreed simply to accept their keep and an occasional present.<sup>74</sup> He draws a depressing picture of the ostentatious vulgarity and compulsive meanness of the great men, who usually lack any real interest in things of the mind, so that the philosopher is even reduced to minding his mistress' pregnant lap-dog on a journey. Perhaps things were often better in our period, when the Romans felt there was still much for them to learn. But the philosopher's audience will often have left much to be desired. An Epicurean philosopher in Campania once called for questions after his lecture; Cicero's friend Papirius Paetus, who belonged nominally at least to that persuasion, did not ask 'if there were innumerable worlds or anything of that kind', but said that he had been wondering all day – who would ask him to dinner?<sup>75</sup>

It is clear that the three groups that we have considered, the *grammatici*, rhetors and philosophers, are on the whole sharply differentiated. But we will put off conclusions till we have examined the men concerned with other fields as well.

<sup>72</sup> *De Off.* 2.86.

<sup>73</sup> pp. 5, 8.

<sup>74</sup> Lucian, *De Mercede Conductis*, passim.

<sup>75</sup> *Ad F.* 9.26.1.

## CHAPTER SIX

# Intellectuals in Rome II

This chapter will introduce us to the men who were concerned with or wrote on subjects other than *grammatica*, rhetoric and philosophy, and in particular to the part played in these activities by members of the aristocracy, which was great. But we will begin with two humbler classes.

Cicero describes the professions of medicine and architecture as honourable for those who had to learn their living;<sup>1</sup> he clearly did not envisage gentlemen taking to them, though both often counted among the 'liberal arts'. The fact that doctors were traditionally associated with fullers, dyers, shoemakers and carpenters, not to mention the humblest type of schoolmaster, at the *Quinquatrus*, the festival of Minerva, does not suggest high standing in earlier times.<sup>2</sup> Medicine, as a science and perhaps as a full-time profession, as opposed to the casual application of traditional maxims and (often) charms, was an entirely Greek import to Rome. In the first century B.C. its significant representatives were almost exclusively Greeks. There was some specialisation, oculists in particular being marked off (and of lower status). If Pliny is right, prejudice against Greek medicine was first broken down by Asclepiades of Bithynia, who died not long before 91 B.C., though there had of course been Greek doctors in Rome long before his time. We know nothing of his parentage, but he probably had a good general education, since Cicero comments on his eloquence (Pliny is almost certainly wrong however in claiming that he first taught rhetoric at Rome). Doctors in the Hellenistic world were often of considerable standing, for example holding municipal office, and by refusing to leave Rome for the court of King Mithridates Asclepiades probably lost an opportunity for considerable political power, since other doctors in the service of the King were highly honoured. Pliny holds that Asclepiades turned from rhetoric to medicine in order to earn more money, and certainly in his own day a few doctors in Rome became rich. Asclepiades had an aristocratic clientèle, which included the orator L. Crassus and perhaps much of his circle; a not very reliable story claims he had a house in the suburbs, which suggests prosperity. Crassus is made to describe Asclepiades as his *amicus* as well as his doctor, though we have seen that this does not imply any kind of equality. But he was certainly a man of some learning in the philosophic as well as the medical tradition, and may have participated in the relative respect with which many philosophers were regarded by educated Romans. He was a voluminous author, of whom

<sup>1</sup> *De Off.* 1.151.

<sup>2</sup> Ovid *Fasti* 3.827; cf. Varro's *Quinquatrus*, one of the *Menippean Satires*, frags. 440-8B.

nearly twenty titles are recorded.<sup>3</sup>

The profession was a highly competitive one, with doctors vying for wealthy clients; Cicero tells us that Asclepiades defeated the other doctors of his time by his eloquent lectures, which probably made him known on his first arrival in Rome. He founded a large school, drawing pupils, mainly at least Greeks, from a wide area; a number of these, most notably the influential Themison of Laodicea, forerunner of the Methodist school, are also recorded as authors of medical writings.<sup>4</sup> Even those who are perhaps unlikely to have written might claim to be serious students of the subject: an interesting inscription introduces us to a doctor who practised in a country town in southern Italy and was probably a freedman, but he boasts that he is by origin Menecrates, a citizen of Tralles in Asia, a scientist (*physicus*) and wine-giver – which probably means that he is a follower of Asclepiades, who had this nickname. Menecrates is a name borne by other doctors, which suggests that its owner either came from a medical family or took the name himself. Such careful claims concerning origin and training cannot be paralleled in this period epigraphically, for any other profession.<sup>5</sup>

There were certainly many slave and freedman doctors, originally captives, assistants to free doctors, or perhaps handed over for training by masters who wanted a house physician. The humble will have had access to the half-educated, or to no one, though the master of a household, as in the elder Cato's day, may sometimes still have treated its members, and favoured or valuable slaves will often have had good doctors called in to them. Varro thinks farm slaves, like animals, can usually be treated by the chief herdsman. In Rome the poor might go to the temple of Aesculapius, where the temple staff may have had some medical education. Varro says that 'most women' call in witches rather than doctors to their children.<sup>6</sup> Even among well-trained doctors it is clear that many were fairly low in status, and easily exposed to suspicion, particularly that of murder. L. Piso took a doctor with him to his province of Macedonia, whom Cicero accuses of killing a man at his master's bidding (whereas he carefully shields from real reproach Piso's protégé the poet and philosopher Philodemus). M. Brutus in 43 wrote in some distress to Cicero about Glycon the doctor of the consul Pansa; he had been accused of murdering his master, who had died of wounds after the battle of Mutina. The man was married to a sister of a dependant of Brutus' own, perhaps also a doctor; he could not possibly have killed Pansa, for it was not to his interest, and he was a *modestus homo et frugi*, slightly deprecating praise for one of lowish position.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> E. Rawson, *CQ* (1982) 358.

<sup>4</sup> Ead. *ib.* T. Aufidius Sikelos (Siculus?) was possibly not Greek or Grecised.

<sup>5</sup> *ILLRP* 799. But cf. the oculist C. Numitorius C.1. Nicanor, who says he is *nationi* (*sic*) *Tebaeus*, and was perhaps taken prisoner by Sulla in Greece, I. di Stefano Manzella, *Epigraphica* (1972) 105. *ILLRP* 798, a freedman doctor, C. Hostius C.1. Pamphilus, was able to set up a fairly grand inscription for himself, his wife and his own freedmen.

<sup>6</sup> Varro *De RR* 2.1.21. *id. Catus de liberis educandis. Memipp.* 152B may attest Serapis as a god of healing.

<sup>7</sup> *In Pis.* 83; *Ad M. Brut.* 1.6.2. Doctors in the suites of great men, Suet. *DJ* 4 (captured with Caesar by pirates); Plut. *Cato Min.* 70.2 (Cleanthes, his trusted freedman, at Utica). Doctors called on by the troops in battle (unclear if freelance or on the payroll) *Tusc. Disp.* 2.38.

Cicero himself certainly often paid some measure of respect to doctors. He valued one who had treated Tiro in Greece for his *ars* and *scientia* as well as his faithfulness and good will, and was upset by the death of his own physician Alexio, regretting the loss of his civilised company, his *humanitas*. Alexio left Cicero money under his will (there is no evidence he was his freedman as some suggest) and so may have been fairly well-off.<sup>8</sup> And Cicero expressed faith in Craterus' treatment of Atticus' little daughter, who was prone to alarming fevers; Craterus was indeed a rising practitioner, to be referred to by Horace as pronouncing on an invalid with great authority, while Galen preserves two of his prescriptions.<sup>9</sup> Caesar also treated doctors as on a level with teachers of all the liberal arts in offering the citizenship to Greeks in these lines who settled in Rome, though no one can be certainly traced as taking up the offer.<sup>10</sup>

Veterinary medicine certainly carried less prestige. Varro as we saw expected the care of sick beasts to be mainly in the hands of the herdsman, but he does envisage *medici* for some troubles; unfortunately he tells us nothing about them, except that the Greeks call them all *hippiatri*, horse-doctors, whatever animals they treated.<sup>11</sup>

The other art that Cicero describes as suitable for free men, architecture, is the first we have met to introduce us to a few men from something like an Italian professional class. Vitruvius, who was born perhaps quite early in the first century B.C., was the son of free parents and expressed gratitude to them for his education, which did not however include much literary or rhetorical study, as his apologies for possible contraventions of the laws of *grammatica*, and his clumsy style, half-colloquial, half-technical, show. He also professes great regard for his teachers, but who or what these were he unfortunately does not tell us.<sup>12</sup> He claims to have always preferred a good reputation to wealth, and to have refused to tout for clients and pull strings; he has at last been rescued by Octavian from poverty. He has never had a name, but has hopes of posterity (justified, as it turned out).<sup>13</sup> In view of this, it is unlikely that he was Caesar's *praefectus fabrum* Mamurra, whom Catullus attacked for ill-gotten wealth, bad verse and other vices, but Mamurra may possibly have been Vitruvius Mamurra, from a leading family in southern Latium, and the architect a poor relation of his, introduced by Mamurra to Caesar, under whom it is clear from his work that he served.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Ad A.* 15.1.1, 2.4.

<sup>9</sup> *Ad A.* 12.13.1, 14.4; *Hor. Sat.* 2.3.16.1.

<sup>10</sup> Suet. *DJ* 42.1. Verres' doctor Artemidorus of Perge had already become Cornelius Artemidorus, *In Verr.* 2.3.57: an important figure remembered in the medical tradition. Lucretius' imagery suggested to Goethe that he was a doctor, and T.P. Wiseman (*Cinna the Poet* (1974) 11ff.) holds that he may have been at least an apothecary; but he probably just took an interest in a subject often reckoned one of the liberal arts. His social standing is quite uncertain, but his education wide (for an Epicurean).

<sup>11</sup> Varro *De RR* 2.1.21, 7.16.

<sup>12</sup> *Vitr.* 6 *praef.* 4, 4.3.3.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* 2 *praef.* 4; 6, *praef.* 5.

<sup>14</sup> The identification, proposed by P. Thielscher, *PW* IXA 427, is refuted by P. Ruffel and J.

The post of *praefectus fabrum*, theoretically in charge of carpenters, engineers and so on with the army, indeed rarely went to experts rather than men of substance and equestrian rank, though a recently discovered inscription does reveal an architect of free birth, one L. Cornelius, holding the job under the consul of 78, the younger Catulus.<sup>15</sup> The state did not employ high-class engineers in the way that Greek cities had often done (Vitruvius has a story of a visiting military engineer at Rhodes giving so impressive a public lecture that he displaced the existing incumbent and got his salary).<sup>16</sup> Military engineers seem not to have been much regarded. Even Caesar does not tell us who designed the bridge over the Rhine that he describes so carefully, though he gives officers down to the rank of centurion credit for military exploits, and in the army of the imperial period, as in the bureaucracy of Rome, engineers and architects are of low rank.<sup>17</sup> When Vitruvius finally got a job overseeing Octavian's artillery and other weapons, together with several other men (with good Roman names, and so of free birth) their position will not have been an elevated one. He has been seen as belonging to the class of *apparitores*, which included *scribae* and other salaried servants of the state, who might be free or freed, the free among them ranking below, but sometimes rising to join, the *equites*; both alike might be well educated. He seems late in life to have held municipal office at Fanum, where he oversaw the building of the basilica he designed. Vitruvius was anxious to stress how wide a background in all the liberal arts an architect and engineer needed; and many such men might want to use the Greek authorities on their subject (though it is sometimes argued that Vitruvius got much of his information, on all matters, from anonymous Latin manuals).

Vitruvius complains that uneducated and unskilful persons, who are not even capable carpenters, now profess to be architects. Perhaps these are the people who ruin clients by miscalculating costs; Vitruvius would like to introduce legal penalties, such as obtain at Ephesus, for incorrect estimates on public buildings, and to extend them to private ones.<sup>18</sup> (This is the only reference to any form of control of professional standards in our period.)<sup>19</sup>

---

Soubiran, *Pallas* (1962) 123. But a Vitruvius Mamurra is found in Africa (both names are rare) and Vitruvii in Formiae, whence Mamurra came (cf. Livy 8.19, Vitruvius Vacca, a *princeps* of nearby Fundi). The architect, probably if not certainly Vitruvius Pollio, entertained a native notable in Africa, probably while with Caesar's army there, and refers to Caesar's sieges of Larinum in the Alps, otherwise unknown, and Massilia. He may have written the bulk of his work in or before the early thirties; he mentions a couple of men active in the forties (Caesar's secretary Faberius, the businessman Vestorius) but there are no clear references to the triumviral period, even to Agrippa's famous aedileship, though the work was of course dedicated to Augustus in the twenties.

<sup>15</sup> G. Molisani, *RAL* (1971) 41; he was also architect for Catulus as censor in 65, and perhaps re-builder of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus of which Catulus was in charge.

<sup>16</sup> Vitr. 10.16.3.

<sup>17</sup> P.A. Brunt, *JRS* (1980) 81. The equestrian surveyors of *De Leg. Agr.* 2.32 may be unqualified overseers; the *architecti* appointed under the law are not so described, but linked with *scribae* and *librarii*.

<sup>18</sup> Vitr. 10 *praef.* 1-2.

<sup>19</sup> Legal safeguards under the Empire, Brunt *op. cit.* in n. 17.

Hence the rise of amateurs designing their own buildings, of whom Vitruvius is tolerant, perhaps because his book is largely designed for 'all learned persons'. One wonders if these amateurs included Fuficius or Septimius, who, with Varro in his *Disciplinae*, which dealt with all the liberal arts, were Vitruvius' only predecessors in writing on architecture in Latin. Septimius may have been Varro's quaestor, the dedicatee of Books 2-4 of the *De Lingua Latina*. At all events, Vitruvius looks back regretfully to the days when, he says, professional architects were of decent background and taught only sons or other relations to follow in their footsteps, which gave some guarantee of reliability.<sup>20</sup>

He may be thinking mainly of the Greek world, and it is in fact hard to suppose that there were not in fact Greek architects in Rome now, as later; indeed Caesar probably employed one for his large schemes in Rome. Vitruvius insists, however, that there had been many excellent Roman architects.<sup>21</sup> There were also slave and freedman architects (probably not military engineers, as neither class served in the army). These might have begun as assistants to free or other architects or building contractors, who were sometimes but not always the same persons. There is at least one freedman architect called Vitruvius epigraphically attested.<sup>22</sup> The architects with whom Cicero had to do seem to be freedmen, and he appears rather amused at the pretensions to knowledge of the theory of optics that one of them, Cyrus, flaunted. Cyrus may however have prospered; Cicero and P. Clodius were present at the signing of his will, and were both heirs under it.<sup>23</sup>

In a society that paid as much for works of art as that of Rome, expertise was at a premium. But it was mainly the prerogative of practising artists, for example the two brothers Hiero and Tlepolemus, one a painter and the other a sculptor in wax, who helped Verres to strip Sicily bare in well-informed fashion. (As is well-known, the status of artists tended to be low, as they worked with their hands, though their works were treated very seriously.) The most notable writer on art in this period, Pasiteles, from some Greek city in southern Italy, was also an active and successful sculptor. The estate and art dealer Damasippus, to whom Cicero proposed to sell unwanted sculptures and who appears some years later in Horace's *Satires*, having lost his money and been saved from suicide by a conversion to Stoicism, is represented in this latter source as a great expert on ancient Corinthian bronze vessels and a buyer-up of antique statues.<sup>24</sup> His social position may be interesting: rather

<sup>20</sup> Vitruvius 7 *praef.* 14. A Septimius of about the same period wrote *libri observationum*, observations or notes on it is not clear what, from which Quint. 4.1.19 quotes a remark by Cicero of legal interest.

<sup>21</sup> *Ad A.* 13.35.1, with Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*; Vitruvius 7. *praef.* 15-18. He thinks temples by Cossutius and Mucius rival the most famous ones by Greek architects – but their designers wrote nothing on them.

<sup>22</sup> *CIL* V 3464; cf. X 3393 – a naval architect, as at Misenum? unless *arch.* means *archigubernus*: R. Palmer, *Athen.* (1983) 343.

<sup>23</sup> *Ad A.* 2.3.2; *Pro Mil.* 48. A little later, Agrippa's engineer for his Campanian naval installations, Cocceius, is probably the freedman L. Cocceius Auctus of *CIL* X 1614. Cf. Chapter 2, n. 11.

<sup>24</sup> *Ad F.* 7.23.3 (cf. *Ad A.* 12.29.2, 33.1, for activities in real estate); Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.16.

than the son of the senator Licinius Damasippus,<sup>25</sup> he may be the son of the Marian praetor Junius Damasippus, killed by Sulla, and himself therefore debarred from entering public life. If so, he was thus forced into a very dubious trade for a senator's son, but one in which contacts with the aristocracy and a decent education (Horace suggests his literary background) were useful. If an anecdote is reliable, he could have Cicero to dinner, but his wine was not as old as he claimed; nor, Horace may hint, were his bronzes, 'used by Sisyphus'.<sup>26</sup>

A number of other subjects were the preserve of the upper class. This is above all true of jurisprudence, where Greek influence was only indirect. Traditionally it had been the great Roman nobles who not only pleaded in court for their friends and clients, but sat at home in the high chair or *solium* to give advice on legal and indeed all other problems, and informally educated the sons of friends, who would attend them at home and in the Forum. Originally the civil law had been entwined with pontifical law, and the great lawyers had been *pontifices*.<sup>27</sup> The famous lawyer of the early first century, Q. Mucius Scaevola, recalled his father, *pontifex maximus* like himself, saying that no one could be a good *pontifex* without knowledge of the civil law, which Cicero however queried. He himself still learnt his law in the old way, with Scaevola Pontifex and, before that, with Scaevola's homonymous elder cousin, the Augur. Scaevola Pontifex, and Ser. Sulpicius Rufus among Cicero's contemporaries, were distinguished lawyers who rose to the consulship, on the old model. The story goes that in his youth the latter consulted Scaevola on a legal point, failed to understand the reply, and was told that it was disgraceful for a patrician, who spoke in the courts, not to know the law. But during the first century the pattern changed to some extent, and Cicero complains that, in a time of social upheaval, men of the highest rank have been displaced from the field: this is hard on Ser. Sulpicius, who could have outshone all his social equals.<sup>28</sup> Some scholars take Cicero to mean that there were now upstart incompetents, but it is clear that Cicero is talking of social position, not ability. It was inevitable that, with the increasing complexity of the law, and the growing importance for those with political ambitions of a time-consuming study of rhetoric, the paths of the two subjects should diverge. Already in Scaevola's time the orator M. Antonius perhaps despised legal expertise, as Cicero represents him doing. So, to some extent, did Cicero.

There were still men of distinguished family who turned to law, perhaps after failing to succeed in pleading. Thus Q. Tubero, son of Cicero's friend, who could look back to the earlier Q. Tubero, Aemilianus' nephew, a considerable lawyer – and where aristocratic families are concerned, one must always bear in mind the pressure to emulate one's *maiores*, often in quite

<sup>25</sup> So D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *AJAH* (1976) 162.

<sup>26</sup> *Macr. Sat.* 2.2.2; Hor. loc. cit. in n. 24.

<sup>27</sup> The social background of the jurists has been investigated in detail by W. Kunkel, *Herkunft und Soziale Stellung der Römischen Juristen* (1967).

<sup>28</sup> *De Off.* 2.65.

specific ways. Earlier, Sex. Pompeius was the brother of the consul of 89 B.C., but he did not enter the Senate. L. Lucilius Balbus, of a senatorial family, perhaps reached the praetorship. C. Aquilius Gallus, Scaevola's most important pupil, a rich man but probably not a senator's son, did become praetor, but declined to stand for the consulship partly on the grounds of his extensive legal practice. Later, A. Cascellius went into the Senate and possibly held the praetorship, but refused the consulship in, perhaps, the thirties.<sup>29</sup>

Other prominent lawyers probably never sat in the Senate at all, and many of them came from the towns of Italy. Cicero's young friend Trebatius was probably from Velia in the far south. Trebatius' teacher Q. Cornelius Maximus is unknown, but his *cognomen* shows that he was not of the patrician Cornelii. A. Ofilius, a pupil of Sulpicius, bears an Oscan name and though a close associate of Caesar's appears not to have had a political career, any more than Sulpicius' other pupils (with the exception of Alfenus Varus, perhaps from Cremona, consul in the disturbed triumviral period). Pacuvius Labeo (this is probably the proper form of his name),<sup>30</sup> father of the great Augustan lawyer Labeo, is clearly Oscan by background. Volcatius, Cascellius' teacher, is probably from his name of Etruscan origin, and it has been argued that Cascellius is so too.

But all these men were probably *equites* by origin, and many can be shown to have had an excellent general education. As Cicero points out, nothing could be more different from the situation in Greece, where legal experts, *pragmatici*, were of humble status and hired by orators for a fee to give advice.<sup>31</sup> Certainly, in Rome, legal expertise at the highest level was a way to wealth as well as standing, as Cicero also makes plain; but not through the formal charging of fees. It was rather the loans, legacies and so on, resulting from the establishment of an obligation, that were so profitable. During the course of the first century, owing to the increasing specialisation of the subject, the lawyers probably took to teaching in rather more formal fashion than simply allowing a few young men to listen to their *responsa* and accompany them around; for example, Aquilius seems to have taken Ser. Sulpicius off to his retreat on the island of Cercina. But the first famous lawyer who is recorded as living from teaching dates from well into the first century A.D.<sup>32</sup>

There were, however, persons lower down the social scale with much legal knowledge. Cicero talks of *praedictores*, who bought up real estate sold by the state after confiscation, and became such experts in the law of property that Scaevola Augur sent clients to them for advice.<sup>33</sup> One of these was probably the father of the famous jurist Cascellius. Many public *scribae* will have acquired considerable experience, and it was perhaps from this class that the professional legal draftsmen mentioned by Cicero came: 'petty clerks' are

<sup>29</sup> Kunkel, *op. cit.* in n. 27, 19, 21, 24.

<sup>30</sup> Not Pacuvius Antistius Labeo, see E. Badian in *Polis and Imperium* (1974) 152.

<sup>31</sup> *De Or.* 1.253.

<sup>32</sup> *Digest* 1.2.2.50, Masurius Sabinus.

<sup>33</sup> *Pro Balb.* 45.

noted as knowing about international law (treaties, etc.).<sup>34</sup> It was part of the juriconsults' job to draw up legal documents for private clients ('cautelary jurisprudence'); these were obviously required at all levels of society and in every part of Italy, and the senatorial and equestrian experts must of necessity have had humbler colleagues. Indeed, the schoolmaster Furius Philocalus of Capua wrote wills, presumably for his poorer neighbours,<sup>35</sup> and in the imperial period there is more evidence, from inscriptions and legal sources, of notaries and unofficial drawers of documents. At some point on the scale formal fees must have become usual.

The agronomists were all wealthy Romans, from the elder Cato through the Sasernae, perhaps father and son (who seem to have owned property in the Po valley, while younger members of the family emerged into public life as supporters of Caesar), and on to Tremellius Scrofa, whose family had reached the praetorship in six successive generations, and finally to Varro, who had also been praetor and owned estates in various parts of Italy. Pliny notes that 'even abroad' kings and generals had deemed the subject worthy of their pens.<sup>36</sup> All these men wrote for their own class; we do not hear of works telling veterans how to farm their plots. There was, beneath them, no highly skilled class of professional land-agents, as there was in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England. Columella, complaining under the Empire that there were no schools for agriculture, was to lament that any slave, even an illiterate one, was thought fit to be a *vilicus* or bailiff,<sup>37</sup> though Varro as we saw had at least demanded elementary literacy; and this was so even though agriculture was the main productive activity and the landowners were often largely, or completely, absentees. If so, they might indeed employ *procuratores*, who could be freedmen or free men, sometimes even of some standing,<sup>38</sup> but hardly highly trained and probably often not even full-time. But we can imagine some of these reading the agricultural writers if we wish.

Historiography had long been seen almost as an extension of public life, and practically all the native historians of Rome in the second century, whether they wrote in Latin or Greek, had been senators. In the early first century we meet the first non-senators, as the so-called 'Sullan annalists' Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias seem to have been, to judge from Cicero's lack of interest in or knowledge of them, and from their apparently defective political experience and feeling.<sup>39</sup> We are told that the first freedman to write a history in Latin was Voltacilius Pilutus, Pompey's dependant, who celebrated the deeds of his patron;<sup>40</sup> and dependants, though

<sup>34</sup> *Ib.* 14.

<sup>35</sup> See above Chapter 2, n. 84.

<sup>36</sup> Pliny *NH* 18.22.

<sup>37</sup> Columella 1. *praef.* 5; cf. *Pro Planc.* 62: no *artes*, only *frugalitas*, *labor* and *vigilantia* required of a *vilicus* or shepherd.

<sup>38</sup> e.g. Varro *De RR* 3.6.3; *De Or.* 1.249, *Pro Tull.* 17.

<sup>39</sup> T.P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979) 113 revives the idea of a Caesarian date for Valerius, but see not only Vell. Pat. 2.9.6, not as confused as sometimes thought, but *DH AR* 1.7, who seems to be following chronological order.

<sup>40</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 27; see above, Chapter 5, n. 56.

sometimes men of higher position than Voltacilius, and so carrying more weight, increasingly came to do the like. (Poets, Greek or Latin, might fulfil a similar role, enlarging the *dignitas* of a great soldier in life and thus also of his family after his death.) In Greek hands, the profession of rhetoric might go hand in hand with historiography; so might the profession of *grammatica*. But Diodorus Siculus, who dedicates his work to no friend or patron and who does not write like a professional teacher of rhetoric or grammar, was probably a man of independent means, though without the political and military experience that Polybius and so many others had thought vital to the historian. Theophanes of Mitylene was according to Strabo a *politikos anêr*, however, and no doubt gained more experience while serving Pompey, whose deeds he also wrote up.<sup>41</sup>

And among the Romans the old tradition continued strongly. C. Licinius Macer (though *popularis* in outlook), L. Cornelius Sisenna (easily the best historian yet, said Cicero), L. Luceius, T. Ampius Balbus, L. Scribonius Libo were all senators (though some were supporters of one of the great dynasts). And Cicero himself was thought by some, including himself, to be uniquely qualified to be the great historian Rome still lacked. He proposed to write his history in old age and retirement, as many Roman senators had probably done.<sup>42</sup> Finally, Sallust was to embark on a historiographical career when he had retired from politics, though still a youngish man. The old tradition of Roman senators writing history in Greek was also not entirely extinct, though it was less important now than it had once been to conciliate Greek opinion. Cn. Aufidius, an ex-praetor, was in Cicero's boyhood writing a history, doubtless of Rome, in Greek;<sup>43</sup> Lucullus' early history of the Social War in Greek was merely the result of a bet.<sup>44</sup> Cicero, and perhaps Atticus, writing in the same language, only claimed to be producing *commentarii* for others to elaborate.

Political memoirs were political apology, and were primarily written by the protagonists themselves in autobiographical form, though they did not make the claims to literary and moral seriousness that belonged to much historiography proper. Three great men of the early first century represented this genre, M. Aemilius Scaurus, the immensely influential and controversial *princeps senatus*, the elder Q. Catulus, who felt his achievements in the war against the Cimbri had been unjustly denigrated, and Rutilius Rufus, who was also at the centre of political feuds (and who wrote a history in Greek as well, both while in exile). Then came the commentaries of Sulla,<sup>45</sup> and those of Caesar. Biography, traditionally a less serious genre, was in the less distinguished hands of Santra, perhaps a *grammaticus*, of Nepos, perhaps an *eques*, certainly a scholar of the *grammaticus* type, and, here taking on a political

<sup>41</sup> Strabo 13.C617.

<sup>42</sup> *De Leg.* 1.5ff.; he also thought he might give legal advice, when not strong enough to work in the courts.

<sup>43</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.112.

<sup>44</sup> Plut. *Luc.* 1.5; *Ad A.* 1.19.10, he added some errors to show he was a Roman.

<sup>45</sup> Peter *HRR* I 195.

cast, of Oppius, an equestrian friend of Caesar. His freedman Tiro was to write on Cicero, whether from a political as well as a scholarly standpoint we do not know.<sup>46</sup>

Antiquarianism of various kinds, though it had deep roots in *grammatica* because of the need to understand ancient documents, was also important to members of the governing class, guardians and interpreters of Roman tradition, which they were anxious to explore and sometimes to revive. Sometimes the subject was pursued by lawyers, concerned with legal antiquities, sometimes by priests, concerned with religious ones – and priests, of course, were drawn from the very highest nobility. Ap. Claudius Pulcher, L. Julius Caesar and M. Valerius Messalla, all patricians, and C. Marcellus, from a newer but very great family, were all augurs, and wrote on augury before the Civil War of Pompey and Caesar; they were joined by the *novus homo* Cicero, who was intensely proud of his augurate. Appius in particular was learned in everything to do with Roman antiquity, as well as being interested in various forms of religion and magic.<sup>47</sup>

However, Veranius, who wrote on augury and ‘Pontifical Questions’, was perhaps neither an augur nor a pontifex; but if he was Catullus’ friend, who sent the poet a present of napkins from Spain, he will have been a man of some birth and position.<sup>48</sup> His work was undoubtedly based on the documents of the two colleges, so it seems that outsiders might use these; Cicero, an augur but not a pontifex, had certainly seen ancient pontifical commentaries. Similarly Granius Flaccus, whose *De Indigitamentis* was dedicated to Caesar, must have used old pontifical documents; he probably comes from a family prominent in Puteoli, Marian and then Caesarian in sympathy, but is not very likely to have been a pontifex.<sup>49</sup> Tarquinius Priscus and A. Caecina, who translated the *disciplina Etrusca* into Latin, were from distinguished Etruscan families; the *disciplina* had always been hereditary in these. If we press a passage of Macrobius, Tarquinius was even a Roman pontifex, perhaps conceivable for the triumviral period.<sup>50</sup> Fonteius and Capito, mentioned by a late source as writers on the *disciplina*, have recently been amalgamated into C. Fonteius Capito, a friend of Antony, senator and pontifex.<sup>51</sup> The general picture shows a clear contrast with that in Greece, where those who wrote on religious institutions and their history were very commonly professional scholars, either *grammatici* or philosophers.

The new and unofficial art of astrology was a different kettle of fish, treated

<sup>46</sup> GRF 400.

<sup>47</sup> *Brut.* 267. Letters to Appius, *Ad F.* 3.7 and 8, refer to philosophy and philosophers; Cicero adapts his letters carefully to their addressees. Appius also professed an interest in Cicero’s writings in the fifties, and sent him his own speeches.

<sup>48</sup> Catullus 12; cf. 9, 28 – as *comes* of a governor called Piso. Perhaps the Veranius Flaccus whose archaising style Octavian accused Antony of imitating, *Suet. Aug.* 86.3.

<sup>49</sup> Granius, T.P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (1971) 49, 234.

<sup>50</sup> For both men, see p. 304; *Macr. Sat.* 3.20.2-3.

<sup>51</sup> S. Weinstock, *PBSR* 1950, 44; but there was a later haruspex called Fonteius. *Arnob. Adv. Nat.* 3.40 quotes a Caesius, who has been identified with T. Caesius, pupil of the jurist Ser. Sulpicius; the name could be Etruscan, but is an easy corruption of Caecina.

in Greek (as a technical scientific subject) by L. Tarutius of Firmum, of whom we know that he was an acquaintance of Cicero and Varro and only cast horoscopes 'for scientific purposes', i.e. not for money; and perhaps even by the freedman Manilius.<sup>52</sup> But it was also discussed, perhaps less technically, by Nigidius Figulus, who was in addition concerned with augury (private rather than public), the *disciplina Etrusca* and almost every possible religious and magical tradition. He is a frustratingly mysterious figure, though he was a friend of Cicero and praetor in 58; he is not known to have held religious office in Rome. A late source, not very reliably, implies that he knew Etruscan, and there are Nigidii in Perugia with whom he could be connected, though others in Pompeii and elsewhere.<sup>53</sup> Nigidius claimed to be a Pythagorean, and founded some sort of society in Rome thought of as concerned with magical practices, even necromancy. One would like to know if it encouraged study of the many learned subjects on which Nigidius wrote, especially (with an occult tinge) natural science; Cicero in his unfinished *Timaeus* calls his friend a *physicus* and wheels out to confute him the Peripatetic Cratippus, presumably as an authority on sane, Aristotelian, science, and himself in sceptical or 'Carneadean' mood. One would also like to know if Nigidius' society had political aspirations, like the early Pythagorean circles in south Italy. But the two men (both senators) thought to have belonged to the *sodalitium*, Vatinius, who is associated rather vaguely with Nigidius by a scholiast, but was certainly a Pythagorean, and Sallust, who is said to have been twice prosecuted for membership, were both Caesarians, while Nigidius was strongly optimate.<sup>54</sup> There is little evidence that Romans at this period had much interest in the political aspects of Pythagoreanism,<sup>55</sup> but Cicero attributes great *gratia*, influence, to his friend, who seems on the surface not important in public life,<sup>56</sup> and Caesar rather notably did not extend his usual *clementia* to him; Nigidius died in exile in 45.

The future was to see Nigidius as 'philosopher and magician'.<sup>57</sup> It was because at Rome students of philosophy came, as far as we can see, almost entirely from the upper class, that there were no Roman professional philosophers. (But we remember the village Epicureans and *rustici Stoici*.) When a professional did emerge, it was Q. Sextius, who refused the offer of political advancement, to which we are told his birth entitled him, from Caesar; perhaps to depart to Athens, where an anecdote places him, and as the fact that he wrote in Greek might suggest, though he later taught in Rome. His 'Roman philosophy', which seems to have had Stoic and Pythagorean elements, was developed after our period closes, but we may note the

<sup>52</sup> *De Div.* 2.98, Plut. *Rom.* 12.5; Pliny *NH* 35.199 – though Manilius may not have written anything.

<sup>53</sup> Frag. 83 Swoboda; T.P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (1971) 244.

<sup>54</sup> Schol. Bob. 146St. with *In Vat.* 14; [Cicero] *Invect. in Sall.* 14.

<sup>55</sup> Varro did say that Pythagoras only entrusted political activity to his most advanced pupils (*Aug. Ord.* 2.20). This contradicts our other evidence, and might thus suggest contemporary relevance.

<sup>56</sup> *Ad F.* 4.13.3.

<sup>57</sup> Jerome *Chron.* 156H.

passionate devotion to philosophy that led him in his youth, fearing he might not succeed in his chosen field, to the brink of suicide. If it is right to see as one of his ruling principles the rejection of politics and the life of action,<sup>58</sup> it may be that experience of the political atmosphere in Rome and of Caesar's dictatorship were the original stimulus, as similar depressing experience had been in creating Epicureans. None the less, though there were Epicureans of senatorial rank, especially in the forties, on the whole the quietist tenets of the school were difficult to reconcile with the traditions of the Roman aristocracy, and most Roman Epicureans were of equestrian, or, as we gather from Cicero, probably yet lower rank.

We have met the few Romans who took philosophy seriously in the earlier part of the century, and some of the rather larger number of those who did so later. But even in 45 Cicero notes that some, even educated, men disapprove of philosophy altogether (we seem to identify one in Atticus' friend Cornelius Nepos) while others do not object to a mere smattering of it.<sup>59</sup> The aristocrat most committed to philosophy was undoubtedly the younger Cato, who lived and died by Stoic principles;<sup>60</sup> he died, it is clear, by Panaetius' rule that duties differ for different men, but each must act consistently – it was not possible for him to accept Caesar's clemency, though others should do so. He probably also found Stoic warrant for devotion to a republican constitution, which he no doubt saw as 'mixed', from elements of kingship, aristocracy and democracy, though Stoics had also accepted monarchy. He had, says Plutarch, a slow but tenacious mind; he read philosophic literature not only in Lucullus' library but probably in the Senate while waiting for proceedings to begin, and treated that body to philosophic lectures.<sup>61</sup> Cicero, writing to Cato, says that they two, almost alone, have brought philosophy into 'the Forum and the very line of battle'.<sup>62</sup> But it was not only in the notorious passage of the *Pro Murena*, but in his private letters, that Cicero complained that Cato lacked realism. Cato had much influence after his death; but in his life, high as his reputation stood, his behaviour was only imitated by his friend Favonius, praetor in 49 but not of prominent family, whose Stoic style, if we may trust Plutarch, even shaded into Cynicism.<sup>63</sup>

But those aristocrats whom we may describe as intellectuals usually, unlike Cato, had more than one interest. Cicero has no single word for such men, but a fairly clear conception of the thing; he speaks of 'men devoted to our studies', or 'the best studies', and so on. He felt, for example, that in

<sup>58</sup> I. Lana, *RFIC* (1953) 1, 209.

<sup>59</sup> *De Fin.* 1.1. Some branches of philosophy, notably politics and ethics, were more suitable subjects for great Romans than others; but we shall see interest in dialectic and some in some sciences, notably astronomy – though Cicero fell back for a projected dialogue on a Greek professional, against his custom, to represent Aristotelian science against Nigidius Figulus' occult variety.

<sup>60</sup> Though also by the traditions of his family, as a Roman noble should; he took care to emulate Cato the Censor.

<sup>61</sup> Plut. *Cato Min.* 1.3, 19.1.

<sup>62</sup> *Ad F.* 15.4.16.

<sup>63</sup> Plut. *Brut.* 34.4.

Cato's nephew M. Brutus intellectual interests and social position combined to qualify him for a leading place in public life. Brutus' philosophic views were certainly strongly held; Quintilian was to say that you could see he meant what he said in his philosophic dialogues, and indeed Caesar had observed how earnest he was about anything he wanted.<sup>64</sup> Cicero insisted that Brutus was not a Stoic, but Antiochus' Stoicizing Academicism, combined, it may be, in the last period of his life, with his uncle's memory, brought him near to Stoic positions. We have noticed his contacts with philosophers and rhetoricians, and to the latter we may add the 'sophist' (exponent of display oratory) Artemidorus of Cnidus, whose closeness to Brutus' circle brought him knowledge of the conspiracy in 44.<sup>65</sup> His own speeches were polished, Cicero admitted, and he made his young friend the dedicatee of works on rhetoric. He was also interested in history, making epitomes, which Cicero found useful, of the earlier historians C. Fannius (a writer noted for truthfulness) and Coelius Antipater; he was working on a résumé of Polybius the night before Pharsalus. All these were serious authors. He also asked Atticus to write a history of the Junii, and had in his house a family tree based on Atticus' researches.<sup>66</sup>

Cicero seems to have thought that M. Marcellus, consul in 51 and nephew of the augur, had similar qualifications. He writes to him after the Civil War as one of those whom Caesar will favour because of their talents.<sup>67</sup> In a passage of the *Brutus*, which almost seems to balance Marcellus against Caesar himself, Brutus is made to praise Marcellus' style as resembling Cicero's and to describe (on the basis no doubt of his own *De Virtute*, set in Lesbos at the time) Marcellus' exemplary life in exile there, devoted to declamation and work with the Peripatetic Cratippus.<sup>68</sup> When, on his way home after receiving Caesar's pardon, Marcellus was murdered at the Peiraeus, Ser. Sulpicius thought it proper to have a monument to him erected in the Academy itself.<sup>69</sup> His death was a blow to Cicero's hopes of building up a group of able *boni*, capable of influencing Caesar or taking over from him.

But the most learned, and the most fertile, of all Roman aristocrats was M. Terentius Varro. His family was noble, though he himself was not to go beyond the praetorship (around 70) and he was perhaps never an independent politician, rather a faithful supporter of Pompey, with and for whom he fought, and for whom he wrote a handbook on senatorial procedure. He is not known to have held any priestly office, but it has been suggested that he was an XVvir.<sup>70</sup> Though clearly no period of his life was wholly barren, he probably conforms to an aristocratic pattern by writing chiefly more light-hearted works when young (the *Menippean Satires* and poetical works)

<sup>64</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.123.

<sup>65</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 65. He was the son of Caesar's friend Theopompus, the mythographer and probably like him enfranchised by Caesar.

<sup>66</sup> *Ad A.* 12.5.3, 13.8, Plut. *Brut.* 4.4; Nepos *Att.* 18, *Ad A.* 13.40.1 (Nepos is referring to a book and Cicero to a *philotechnêma*, a 'work of art').

<sup>67</sup> *Ad F.* 4.7-10.

<sup>68</sup> *Brutus* 248ff. He may be the dedicatee of Varro's *De Sermone Latino* and the leading figure in his *logistoricus*, *Marcellus de Virtute*.

<sup>69</sup> *Ad F.* 4.12.5. Plato's tomb was there, with many others.

<sup>70</sup> C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (repr. 1961) 199.

and the greater part of his scholarly productions in a retirement that was in his case precipitated by Pompey's defeat, interrupted by Caesar's abortive commission to found a public library, and prolonged into extreme old age after he had escaped the proscription by Antony to which his wealth exposed him. We do not know even the titles of all his works, for an ancient scholar grew tired before he had recorded half of them,<sup>71</sup> but it has been reckoned that there were about 75 of them, in over 600 volumes. He took almost the whole field of human knowledge as defined in his time as his subject, or at least all areas covered by the notion of the liberal arts, or the Greek *enkyklios paideia*, with the extensions, such as medicine and architecture, which were sometimes but not always included. His chief concentration was on Latin language and literature, and Roman antiquities, but Cicero also regarded him as a serious student of philosophy. The Romans were always impressed, indeed over-impressed, with breadth of knowledge, and they regarded Varro as one of their glories, superior even to any of the Greek *grammatici* or other professional scholars.

Not all, perhaps not many, members of the very highest aristocracy had serious interests or wrote. They could rely on birth alone for distinction, and the path of public life was almost inexorably marked out for them. Cicero thought, for example, that Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 54) displayed an utter lack of education in his speeches, though his son may have been more civilised, as the younger generation tended to be; and he complains that Metellus Scipio (cos. 52), who united two famous houses, confused a couple of early Scipiones, even though one was the great Africanus.<sup>72</sup> One or two very aristocratic families had a tradition of scholarly interests. The Calpurnii Piones form one, from L. Piso Frugi, the late-second-century historian, through M. Pupius Piso, a Calpurnius by birth, with his philosophic studies, and perhaps Cicero's serious young son-in-law C. Piso,<sup>73</sup> to the L. Piso who was patron of Philodemus and beyond. The other is the highly connected but probably even in the first century far from wealthy house of the Aelii Tiberones, beginning with Quintus, the pupil of Panaetius, dedicatee of works by the Stoics Hecaton and Posidonius, too Stoic to be a successful orator, but a lawyer of note; through Cicero's friend and connection L. Tubero, author of a history and dedicatee, as to a fellow-Academic, of the sceptical works of Aenesidemus of Cnossus.<sup>74</sup> His son gave up oratory for jurisprudence under Caesar, and he rather than his father may be the annalist used by Livy, while he is probably the dedicatee of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' work on Thucydides. One or the other took the leading role in Varro's *logisticus* (a form of dialogue) *Tubero De Origine Humana*.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Rufinius, *Apol.* 2.20, from Jerome: see F. Rischl, *Opuscula* III 525.

<sup>72</sup> *Brutus* 267 cf. *Ad A.* 8.1.3, no one is *stultior* (*Ad F.* 6.22.2 to the son); *Ad A.* 6.1.17.

<sup>73</sup> *Brutus* 272.

<sup>74</sup> Photius, *Bibl.* 211.1.

<sup>75</sup> H. Dahlmann, *Navicula Chiloniensis* (1956) 117 prefers the father, but thinks the son may have had the *cognomen* Catus and been the protagonist in another *logisticus*, the *Catus de liberis educandis*. Either the father or the son dedicated a work, or wrote a published letter, on an uncertain subject, to Caesar's friend Oppius, A. Gellius 6.9.11.

What emerges from the survey of so many individuals in these last two chapters is that there were various classes, not one class, of intellectuals, depending very largely on the subject involved. This is likely to be true in any complex society, but is markedly so of Rome. Some of these classes are predominantly or entirely Greek, some are predominantly or entirely Roman. Only in one subject, but that the most basic of all, *grammatica*, does it become hard to distinguish Greeks and Greek scholarship clearly from Roman. Here were Suetonius' *semi-Graeci*, and while some even of the really Greek clearly learnt some Latin, some of the really Roman may even have adopted Greek dress, and certainly stressed their Greek heritage. But free foreigners, *peregrini*, were still rarely given Roman citizenship, though Pompey's friends Theophanes of Mitylene and Balbus, from Gades, who were only rather incidentally writers, were harbingers of the future, as were the teachers and doctors favoured by Caesar, with the philosopher Cratippus and Caesar's friend Theopompus of Cnidos, who is described as a mythographer. This separation of the two peoples at a political level doubtless helped to keep apart some intellectual traditions, above all law on the one side and medicine on the other. Few, even of the best regarded Greeks, could treat with leading Romans on anything like an equal footing – perhaps only Posidonius, to whom Pompey lowered the *fasces* and who could refuse a request of Cicero's without insulting him.

Some of those we have met took fees, some salaries, some the occasional gift, many benefits in kind; others only exploited the indirect advantages created by obliging others, or were even not on the receiving end at all. The role of the upper class indeed is crucial at Rome, not only for patronage but for production. It is likely that it was harder, and more expensive, to get a good education and buy books (in two languages) than it was in the Greek world, and this put the rich, as well as the members of their households and their protégés, at an advantage. How far did this lead to dilettantism? The pupils of the rhetors, the orators, were of course in their own way professionals, engaged in cut-throat competition in a field where one's own, and other men's, career and fortune depended on one's skills, and Cicero for one thought it was necessary to work extremely hard in youth to become a real orator, indeed almost to cut out social life entirely.<sup>76</sup> *Grammatica* and rhetoric were both crucial to such men, and it is not clear that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, or Caesar's grammatical works, to take two examples, fell short of professional standards, though these might of course vary widely. In law, too, especially after the great nobles and practising orators and politicians had given way to minor senators and *equites*, it would be wrong to speak of amateurishness. Philosophy is another matter. Historiography perhaps suffered, by a disinclination to detailed research and a narrow social outlook, but benefited by its authors' practical experience. It is significant that agronomy, in the hands of landowners, never became a serious technical subject, and technical subjects in general were of course neglected. Perhaps

<sup>76</sup> *Pro Cael.* 46 (exaggerated no doubt).

one of the real troubles of aristocratic predominance was that it reinforced intellectual conservatism; there was no desire to transform society with the aid of the intelligence – except in one case to which we will come.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>77</sup> See H. Dahlmann, *Gymnasium* (1931) 185 for a picture of the ‘Römische Gelehrte’, seen as wide-ranging but superficial and amateurish; perhaps too closely based on a few well-known figures, however.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

# Towards Public Patronage

We have tried to show some aspects of what that tricky word 'patronage' means in Roman conditions by exploring the various forms of dependence which bound many intellectuals to great men in Rome. What we have not seen is any of the great men instigating particular activities, and indeed we have argued that sometimes they were really not very much interested in what their dependants were doing, as long as they spent part of their time helping their masters to read, providing them with stimulating company, teaching their children, or otherwise making themselves useful. But it is worth investigating three exceptional figures, to see to what extent they may have attempted, more like a 'patron of letters' in the modern sense, to influence and encourage intellectual and cultural life at Rome. These three men are Cicero's friend Atticus, a private citizen who played no direct part in politics; Pompey, one of the great dynasts of the collapsing Republic, who may have modelled himself upon a king, Alexander the Great; and Caesar, who at the end of his life replaced the *res publica* with his own person.

Atticus, after his death in 32 B.C., was remembered as Cicero's confidant, but his interests were no mere mirror of his friend's, and this highly cultivated and extremely wealthy *eques* was probably one of the most influential figures in the cultural life of his day. He was born in 110, a few years before Cicero, and given a careful education by his father, a prosperous *eques* from an old urban family, who had scholarly and antiquarian tastes.<sup>1</sup> We know that he studied law with Q. Scaevola the Augur, and he must earlier have studied rhetoric, for Cicero revered and ever feared him as a critic of his speeches, and in the *Brutus* put into his mouth tempered, and occasionally even tart, judgments of a number of speakers, designed to balance the enthusiastic ones he often presents in his own person.<sup>2</sup>

We cannot linger here on Atticus' role as a connoisseur of the visual arts, except to note his dislike of extravagant building and collecting, and the sense of period that made him prefer the old-fashioned simplicity of his uncle's house in Rome,<sup>3</sup> or on his love of poetry, which he read delightfully, and in which his tastes fairly clearly diverged from Cicero's.<sup>4</sup> It is clear that he was

<sup>1</sup> *Nepos Att.* 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad A.* 1.14.3; *Brutus* 20, 99, 244, 252-61, 269, 293-7; this last might suggest he had read widely among old speeches.

<sup>3</sup> He did embellish his estate in Epirus, *Ad A.* 1.16.15; Pompey regarded him as a connoisseur, *Ad A.* 4.9.1. He preferred Rhodian earthenware to the valuable plate usual on Roman sideboards, but this was an elegant ware favoured by Cleopatra, *Ad A.* 6.1.13, Athen. 229C.

<sup>4</sup> *Nepos ib.* 4.1. It is Atticus who quotes the epigrammatist Leonidas of Tarentum, *Ad A.* 9.7.5 (while Cicero rarely quotes epigrams and then for historical content). It is surely significant that

not a serious Epicurean, though other Roman Epicureans too were unorthodox in taking an interest in politics or literature. Cicero says that Atticus' friendship, while he lived in Athens, for Phaedrus the Head of the Garden and his successor Patro, was a personal matter, and he never makes Atticus voice the Epicurean view in any of his dialogues, while in his letters he cracks only the most general of philosophical jokes (contrast the letters to Cassius, another Epicurean).<sup>5</sup> He also laughs at members of the sect for being blockheads in a way that would be uncharacteristically tactless had Atticus felt strongly about its doctrines. The only philosophical work of Cicero's that he is recorded as reading twice is the untechnical *Tusculan Disputations*,<sup>6</sup> and he is the dedicatee only of the very general essays on friendship and old age. No philosopher is recorded as living in his house, and there is no evidence that there was much philosophy in his library (though there was a bust of Aristotle) apart from his friend Phaedrus' work on the gods and the usual authors on the untechnical subject of grief.<sup>7</sup> His Roman Epicurean friends all had other interests as well as philosophy, and he does not seem to have had contacts with the Campanian group. His adherence to the School was probably little more than a warrant for the cult of private life, simplicity and friendship, and perhaps for a dislike of superstition; Cicero makes him agree very strongly in the *De Legibus* that no form of divination exists,<sup>8</sup> and the letters do not let us glimpse him as concerned in any pious activities.

Political philosophy is another matter. Here Cicero expects Atticus to pick up references to Theophrastus and others, and Atticus greatly admired the works of Dicaearchus, which were both political and antiquarian. The letters show that he expressed admiration of Cicero's *De Oratore* and *De Republica*, while in the *De Legibus* he is an active participant, and makes his views, more narrowly conservative than Cicero's, forcefully clear.<sup>9</sup> Under Caesar's dictatorship he kept urging Cicero to write on political subjects (if partly as political insurance). His library clearly contained much political thought, from Antisthenes' *Cyrus* (on kingship) and works by Dicaearchus to a book by a Cotta who is probably Caesar's legate and which seems to have been about the Roman *res publica*.<sup>10</sup> He was sent, perhaps as dedicatee, a Greek work on

---

he is not found praising Cicero's verse or urging him to write it. The poet Julius Calidus, whom he rescued from proscription in 43, was a wealthy friend (Nepos *ib.* 12.4). Atticus' correspondence with Octavian often turned on poetry, *id. ib.* 20.2.

<sup>5</sup> *De Fin.* 5.3; cf. 1.16; *Ad F.* 13.1.5. The fact that Cicero cast Epicureans as the defeated speakers is not a full explanation for Atticus' silence in the dialogues.

<sup>6</sup> *Ad A.* 15.2.4, 4.2-3.

<sup>7</sup> *Ad A.* 13.39.2, 12.14.3; Aristotle, 4.10.1 – but Aristotle had interests in historical and literary scholarship.

<sup>8</sup> *De Leg.* 2.34.

<sup>9</sup> *Ad A.* 4.16.2-3, 5.12.2 (where he seems to be reading the *De Republica* with the aid of someone, probably a scholar, called Thallumetus or, as Shackleton Bailey suggests, Halimetus), and other passages; *De Leg.* 3.26, 29, 37.

<sup>10</sup> *Ad A.* 13.44.3, cf. Athen. 273b who calls it *peri politeias*, though he quotes it for a historical fact about Britain. (Not in Greek – the speaker is a Roman.)

Concord by Demetrius of Magnesia.<sup>11</sup> Cicero also thought highly of his judgment in political matters, and clamoured for his advice.

Atticus' interests were primarily linguistic, literary and historical. Cicero, reproved for using a wrong form, jokingly calls his friend a *grammaticus*; he also called him the Aristarchus of his speeches, implying that the gist of the criticism was stylistic.<sup>12</sup> There is evidence of his contacts with several Greek *grammatici* – Nicias, possibly Philoxenus, Tyrannio. The last-named probably dedicated his work on Greek accents to a certainly appreciative Atticus.<sup>13</sup> We know that his slaves were given a literary education – even his footmen, according to Nepos – and we have met his learned freedmen Dionysius and Epirota. He included material on Roman literary history in his *Annales*.<sup>14</sup> And what did interest him in Cicero's philosophical work was the problem of finding a Latin dress for Greek philosophical concepts, as the words put into his mouth in the *Academica* and *De Finibus* show (though he is otherwise almost silent in these dialogues), like the letters discussing possible Latin equivalents for Greek technical terms.<sup>15</sup> His historical interests are shown by his *Annales*, by the family histories such as the one on the Junii undertaken at the request of M. Brutus, and by various well-known passages in Cicero's dialogues and letters, where he reveals himself as a sophisticated and meticulous scholar.<sup>16</sup> It can be shown from Cicero's letters that there were many historical works in his library. The writings dedicated to him by Varro, with whom he was more friendly than Cicero (who found the great scholar prickly) ever really was, may reflect Atticus' interests neatly. One was the antiquarian *De Vita Populi Romani*; the other was the *logisticus* called *Atticus de Numeris* probably on metre or music.<sup>17</sup>

It is possible that Atticus stood at the very point where Roman civilisation was beginning consciously to rival Greek. He had lived long in Greece, and spoke Greek, says Nepos, like an Athenian. Back in Rome, he remained in touch with Athens and with wealthy and prominent Athenians.<sup>18</sup> We know of the Greek authors, such as Sophocles and Dicaearchus, by whom he set special store. But he was also, as Cicero makes him say, a great lover of Rome and her traditions. He much wanted Cicero to write history; his reason, as Cicero's flattered references show, was that this was a subject in which Rome had no one to set beside the great Greek authors. He seems to have begun his

<sup>11</sup> *Ad A.* 8.11.7. For Demetrius see J. Mejer, *Hermes* (1981) 447: basically a *grammaticus*; his work distinguishing writers of the same name, and including some biography and criticism, will have interested Atticus, and may possibly have been used by Cicero.

<sup>12</sup> *Ad A.* 7.3.10; cf. 1.14.3. Cicero feared criticism for his exuberance.

<sup>13</sup> *Ad A.* 12.6.2.

<sup>14</sup> *Brutus* 72–4.

<sup>15</sup> *Acad.* 1.14, 18, 25, 41; *De Fin.* 5.96; *Ad A.* 13.21.3, 16.14.3.

<sup>16</sup> Nepos op. cit. 18; and esp. *Ad A.* 13.30.2, 33.3, 6.4, 4.1, 5.1; 12.5b; cf. 13.10.1. 3.23.1 shows he dated letters carefully (in a meticulous hand contrasting with Cicero's hasty scrawl).

<sup>17</sup> Less probably on arithmetic, reflecting his business interests; *De Muneribus* has also been suggested.

<sup>18</sup> E. Rawson, *Athenaeum* (1985, forthcoming). Possibly one of these, Herodes, was threatening to write a historical or political work in 60, *Ad A.* 2.2.2.

persuasions in 59; in 44, thinking perhaps that Cicero's philosophic ardour might now be flagging, he returned to the charge in a formal letter of great *elegantia* (his most characteristic quality). Its recipient was almost ready to make a start, if Atticus would help him. The latter's lasting regret that this gap was not so filled is probably reflected in his friend Nepos' own lament on the subject some years later.<sup>19</sup>

Atticus was perhaps also sensitive to other gaps. In 59 he was also trying to persuade Cicero to write on geography, a subject not yet treated in Latin. Here too, at least in the first instance, he failed,<sup>20</sup> and perhaps fell back on Cornelius Nepos, who was not, however, a very satisfactory choice. Nepos was a man to whom Atticus was clearly fairly close, but who was not a humble dependant; he may have been an *eques*, though younger and less socially distinguished than his friend.<sup>21</sup> If, like Nepos and his own freedman Epirota, Atticus was interested in the neoterics (and Cicero does think that Atticus might pass on to them a splendid spondaising hexameter he found himself producing)<sup>22</sup> this might have been in part because they were naturalising in Latin new forms of Greek poetry, with new sophistication. His own *Annales* bridged the chasm in that, like Nepos' *Chronica*, which he may have instigated, it correlated events of Roman history with happenings in the Greek world, for the first time in a coherent fashion. Atticus further urged Nepos to write a full-scale life of Cato the Censor,<sup>23</sup> and Nepos' short *Vitae*, of which the surviving 'Foreign Generals' at any rate are dedicated to Atticus and sometimes use him as a source, also united Greek and Roman subject matter, and may even have been the first work to deal with Greek history in Latin. Atticus may well have felt, as an admirer of Dicaearchus, that Rome needed a biographical literature, though priorities are hard to establish here.<sup>24</sup>

We do not have a single letter from Atticus' pen, but we can deduce a good deal from Cicero's letters to him. If we did have his correspondence with his numerous and devoted friends, who included many of the most intelligent members of the upper class, notably M. Brutus, we should probably see that it was not only with Cicero that he busied himself in keeping up standards, especially stylistic ones, suggesting subjects for treatment, sending members

<sup>19</sup> *De Leg.* 1.2.8, *Acad.* 1.18; cf. *De Fin.* 1.11; *Ad A.* 16.13.1, 13b 2; Nepos, frag.

<sup>20</sup> *Ad A.* 2.4.1, 3; 6.1, 7.1. But Priscian *GL* 2.267.5 seems to quote a *Chorographia* by Cicero, though the word is uncertain. Written in the later fifties, where we have few letters?

<sup>21</sup> Nepos was in Rome by 65, when he heard Cicero's *Pro Cornelio* says Jerome (23.365 Migne). As dedicatee of the *Poems* of Catullus, a probably younger man from the same area, he will have been a person of standing. He was deeply suspicious of philosophers, *Ad A.* 16.5.5, Lact. *Inst.* 3.15.10.

<sup>22</sup> *Ad A.* 7.2.1.

<sup>23</sup> *Or.* 120 shows the *Annales* included some foreign history; Nepos' *Chronica* are earlier than publication of Catullus' poems (in the fifties), but the *Lives* may be later (that on Atticus was expanded after its subject's death in 32). *Hann.* 13.1 uses Atticus' *Annales*, and there may be other connections.

<sup>24</sup> The first biographers are said to be Nepos, Varro and Santra, but in what order is unclear. For urging on others to write, cf. Cicero himself, who claims to have inspired others to write on philosophy, *De Nat. Deor.* 1.8, *De Off.* 2.2, *Tusc. Disp.* 2.6. He urged friends to produce: *Ad F.* 7.25 (M. Fabius), 12.20 etc. (Cornificius).

of his household to help arrange libraries or carry out research, lending or ferreting out books. Even if his use, perhaps only after the Civil War, of his trained slaves to copy his friends' works (the only certain example not by Cicero is Hirtius' *Anticato*) was on a small scale, and the readings of them that he arranged were domestic, their importance will have been considerable. In all this he may have kept his eye on what his natural *patria* could learn from the *patria* he had for a time adopted. He hardly wanted personal glory for this. But he did receive, as a Roman historian, a biography by Nepos which, affected by the low esteem in which Nepos' other surviving *Lives* are held, is not usually recognised for what it is, an illuminating study of a remarkable man.

Pompey, who was probably the great-nephew of the poet Lucilius and related to the Stoic Lucilii Balbi, was certainly the nephew of the 'learned and wise' Sex. Pompeius, and profited from his education with that 'noteworthy *grammaticus*' Aristodemus of Nysa and the freedman rhetor Voltacilius Pilutus, though military avocations clearly prevented a progression to philosophy. But he showed promise as a speaker very young, when prosecuted for the theft of public property, one of the charges in fact being that his father had given him books from the booty taken at Asculum in the Social War.<sup>25</sup> He is said to have taken up declamation again in 50 to be able to counter young Curio's attacks. Quintilian calls him a fluent narrator of his own achievements, and Cicero thought him an excellent writer, quite capable of composing his own letters.<sup>26</sup> But on the whole when Cicero and Pompey were together they seem to have talked politics, though Pompey once asked (in vain) to hear Cicero's recent literary productions.<sup>27</sup> This is not a very promising basis for the picture that has been drawn of Pompey's house as the main focus in Rome of literature and learning during the fifties, to which are supposed to have been drawn in particular the Latin *grammatici* who studied the *Satires* of Lucilius, and some of the neoteric poets.<sup>28</sup> It is true that Curtius Nicias did write on Lucilius, though we do not know whether it was before Pompey broke with him, and it is true that Pompeius Lenaeus, Pompey's freedman, referred to his early study of Lucilius with an intimate of the poet.<sup>29</sup> Valerius Cato, the scholar and learned poet, was also interested in Lucilius, but this does not make Cato an intimate of Pompey, or Pompey of the neoterics. Not very much can be made of the fact, if it is a fact, that Pompey freed Lenaeus *gratis* for his learning, or that he dedicated a shrine to Minerva on his return from the East (inspired rather by Alexander's dedications to Athena?),<sup>30</sup> took care for his children's education, even that of his daughter, and got on well with his studious last wife, whom he only married in 52. But given the contentious history of the project, to build a

<sup>25</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 4.1; cf. *Brutus* 239.

<sup>26</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 25, Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.36, *Ad A.* 7.17.2.

<sup>27</sup> *Ad F.* 16.10.2: Cicero said that with Tiro away he was mute.

<sup>28</sup> W.S. Anderson, *Pompey, his Friends, and the Literature of the First Century B.C.* (1963). p. 270.

<sup>30</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 15; Pliny *NH* 7.97.

permanent theatre in Rome was perhaps even now a philhellene gesture; he could quote Sophocles (which may not prove that he knew more of this poet, now rather fashionable in Rome, than a few tags, but reflects a change since the second century, when all that great Romans seem to produce in a crisis is a line or two of Homer). If he had prepared the speech that he intended to address to Ptolemy XIII on landing in Egypt, this does not prove that he was shaky in Greek or on the rules of rhetoric, though he may have been.<sup>31</sup>

But Pompey may have been given, at all periods of his life, to somewhat ostentatious intellectual discussions. According to Oppius (whom, Plutarch points out, we need not believe, since he was a close friend of Caesar's) in 82 Pompey acted very badly to an 'exceptionally learned and scholarly man', Q. Valerius, probably Valerius of Sora, who fell into his hands in the war in Sicily. After talking to him in private and learning much he had him put to death. On his last flight after Pharsalus, we are told, he put in at Lesbos and discussed Fate with the Peripatetic Cratippus, who had come to pay his respects. Perhaps this is too neat a story.<sup>32</sup>

Several works were dedicated to Pompey by his loyal friend Varro. Some were probably meant to be of practical use: in 77, in connection with the campaign in Spain, Varro wrote the *Ephemeris Navalis*, apparently a sailing guide and calendar, and in 71 he produced for the newly elected consul, who had never sat in the Senate, a handbook on procedure there.<sup>33</sup> More interestingly, Pompey was the dedicatee of the *De Origine Linguae Latinae*, and he clearly had an interest in the all-pervading subject of language. The grammarians report his habit of writing *kadamitas* for *calamitas*, probably, given the linguistic self-consciousness of the age, on some principle. He was also much exercised about the proper form in which to refer to his third consulship on an inscription, and asked around the experts for advice; Cicero proposed a non-committal abbreviation.<sup>34</sup> Pompey consulted authorities on other matters too – Atticus arranged his works of art, perhaps in the theatre, Maecius Tarpia approved the plays for its opening.<sup>35</sup> In intellectual and artistic matters, as in political ones, Pompey is prone to disappear behind a smokescreen of friends. These might indeed be concerned with both areas at once; his closest advisers, towards the end of his life, were L. Luceius and L. Scribonius Libo, and for Greek affairs Theophanes of Mitylene, who all wrote histories as well as having political experience.

Nothing so far has suggested that Pompey is likely to have taken a very active part in intellectual matters. But it may be that he was encouraged to feel that he had responsibilities in this line by the fact that he had taken on the role not merely of a Hellenistic king (as many great Romans did) but of Alexander the Great himself. Notoriously, this dates from his assumption of

<sup>31</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 78.4, 79.2.

<sup>32</sup> Id. ib. 10.4, 75.3-4. Aelian, *VH* 7.21 says Pompey did not disdain to go to Cratippus' house; but philosophers sought out at home by rulers are something of a *topos*.

<sup>33</sup> The latter was lost before its author's death, A. Gell. 14.7.3.

<sup>34</sup> Pomp. *Orat.* 22; A. Gell. 10.1.7.

<sup>35</sup> *Ad A.* 4.9.1, *Ad F.* 7.1.1.

the name Magnus and those early years in which flatterers declared that he resembled Alexander in face and character. The trophy set on the Pyrenees was probably meant to recall the monuments Alexander erected in India. And when Pompey engaged in conquests in the East the parallel became even more attractive, though Pompey was now older than Alexander had been at his death, a fact panegyrists concealed by deducting ten years from Pompey's age at his second triumph, at which the list of subjugated kings included a Darius of Media, some of the booty was supposed to have belonged to the old Achaemenid court, and Pompey himself wore a cloak that he claimed had belonged to Alexander.<sup>36</sup>

In particular, Pompey may have felt that Posidonius (whose daughter had married an uncle of his own teacher Aristodemus) was the nearest thing he could find to a modern Aristotle, and indeed, with his wide interests, which included science and the writing of history, Posidonius was not wholly unworthy of the role.<sup>37</sup> At the time of the campaign against the pirates Pompey attended one of Posidonius' lectures at Rhodes, and at the end asked if the philosopher had any commands for him, only to be told in the Homeric line that also inspired Cicero, 'always to excel and be superior to others'.<sup>38</sup> It was apparently some years later, on his return from the Mithridatic Wars, that Pompey again came to visit Posidonius, to find him ill in bed but determined to ignore the pain and not disappoint the victor, to whom he gave a disquisition on vice as the only real evil. So Cicero, claiming Pompey as his source; Pliny says that Pompey refused to let his lictor knock on Posidonius' door in the usual manner, and lowered the *fascēs* to him as to a superior. Plutarch tells us that Posidonius gave a talk for Pompey on *inventio*, the finding of arguments in oratory, attacking the views of the rhetorician Hermagoras (was he out of bed now?<sup>39</sup> And did he think this was a subject Pompey and his suite could cope with?). Later Strabo thought of Posidonius as Pompey's friend, and as we saw complained that the former's account of the area of Pompey's conquest ought therefore to have been more accurate than it was.<sup>40</sup> This Aristotle did not need a nephew to write of his pupil's deeds; he undertook the task himself (perhaps in his *Histories* rather than a monograph). How far Pompey's own ideas were influenced by Posidonius we cannot say; he is never called a Stoic. He may have been reassured by Posidonius in his belief in astrology and divination, which like many Stoics the latter accepted. Alexander, it may be noted, was supposed to have received true prophecies from the astrologers at Babylon.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 46.1, DS 40.4, Appian *Mithr.* 116-17.

<sup>37</sup> Strabo 2.C104 makes the comparison, stressing Posidonius' enquiry into causes and his work on the Ocean.

<sup>38</sup> Strabo 11.C492.

<sup>39</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.61; Pliny *NH* 7.112; Plut. *Pomp.* 42.5.

<sup>40</sup> Strabo 11.C492.

<sup>41</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 73.1. It has sometimes been supposed that Pompey's humane settlement of the defeated pirates was inspired by Posidonius' wide social sympathies, or more generally by Stoic belief in the brotherhood of man.

Pompey also heard 'all the sophists' (show orators, who probably also taught rhetoric) at Rhodes, and gave each one a talent. Arriving at Athens, he treated the philosophers likewise. Large money gifts to learned men not closely connected with the household were probably not in the Roman tradition. But Alexander was said to have given philosophers money. Pompey also showed his respect for Athens by giving fifty talents for public works.<sup>42</sup>

Alexander was interested in medicine, and sent botanical and zoological specimens back from Asia to Aristotle. Pompey ordered his freedman Lenaeus to translate into Latin the work attributed to King Mithridates and supposedly found among his papers on the toxic, antidotic and medicinal properties of plants.<sup>43</sup> Mithridates, says Pliny (probably using Lenaeus) also left a collection of specimens collected from all over his vast realm, and one may wonder what Pompey did with these. He certainly deposited on the Capitol Mithridates' collection of precious stones.<sup>44</sup> There had long been a tradition at Rome that booty should be largely used for the public benefit, and temples, partly as a result, fulfilled in part the function of museums.

In connection with these possible scientific interests of Pompey, we should note that Geminus, author of an extant introduction to astronomy in Greek, and of at least two lost works, one on mathematics in general and one an epitome of Posidonius on meteorology, is sometimes thought to have been Cn. Pompeius Geminus, either a freedman of Pompey's or a Greek enfranchised by him.<sup>45</sup> Unfortunately both Geminus' date and the place where he was active are uncertain, and the case must be regarded as unproved.<sup>46</sup>

Pompey was certainly the supreme example of the great Roman who is the object and perhaps the instigator of encomiastic historical or biographical

<sup>42</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 42.5; *Alex.* 8.4.

<sup>43</sup> Pliny *NH* 25.5.

<sup>44</sup> *Id. ib.* 37.11.

<sup>45</sup> Partly because he is thought to be a pupil of Posidonius, which is doubtful, for the epitome hardly proves it, and Geminus opposes astrology, which Posidonius accepted, while connections with Rhodes (notice of observations made there) are slight; partly because Dionysius of Halicarnassus some time after 30 B.C. dedicated his letters on style to a Cn. Pompeius Geminus, sometimes identified with and sometimes thought to be son of the mathematician (who is apparently Greek-speaking and perhaps a rhetor). G.P. Goold, *TAPA* (1961) 168 postulates on little evidence a circle of, especially Jewish, intellectuals still dependent on Pompey's family (on whom exactly? Lenaeus had had to open a school); cf. also Geminus, *Introduction aux Phénomènes*, ed. G. Aujac 1975, xxii.

<sup>46</sup> The earlier first century B.C. is often suggested, and it is true that he mentions no sources later than this period, and shows an ignorance of northern regions that suggests he wrote before the Roman conquests in this area; nor is there reference to the Roman calendar. But O. Neugebauer, *History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy* (1975) 580 puts the work c. 50 A.D. on the basis of a notice about the Egyptian calendar. There are few references to Rome or to observations made there, and if the latitude on which calculations are based is that of Rome, it is one that had been used earlier by Greek authorities. The fact that Geminus and Aelius are once quoted together for a view on the rainbow does not put the former firmly in a Roman context (who this Aelius is is unclear). The *grammaticus* Asclepiades of Myrleia is said to have taught at Rome 'in Pompey's time' by the Suda, but this is probably a confusion and if it were not would not make him a dependant of Pompey (*pace* Aujac, *op. cit.* in n. 45).

works. The rhetor Voltacilius Pilutus recounted the deeds of his father Pompeius Strabo as well as himself, perhaps at a fairly early stage of the latter's career. The history of the Social War which L. Luceius was, in 61, planning to bring down to his own day is likely to have been favourable to both Pompeius Strabo and his son (its routine disclaimer of bias was not meant to preclude a point of view), for Luceius was, as we saw, to be one of Pompey's close advisers.<sup>47</sup> Of neither work do we know more. Varro, at what date is uncertain, wrote at least three volumes *De Pompeio*. He too was a loyal friend, though doubtless not a mere flatterer. T. Ampius Balbus, a close adherent, wrote a history, at least in part on contemporary events, of which Cicero knew by 46. And L. Scribonius Libo, another adviser, whose daughter married Pompey's younger son, is fairly certainly the author of *Annales* known to Cicero.<sup>48</sup> How serious Pompey's interest in Roman history was where he himself was not concerned it is impossible to say. At all events Cicero held that Pompey had no profound political principles, and these, in a Roman, were often bound up with a concern for Rome's past.<sup>49</sup>

In Greek there was Posidonius' account,<sup>50</sup> and that of Theophanes of Mitylene. Theophanes first knew Pompey in the East, and must have written his work before he came to Rome, for Cicero says that Pompey gave him the citizenship at a meeting of the troops as a reward for it;<sup>51</sup> there had been very few grants of citizenship for anything but military service at this time. It must have had immediate propagandistic intentions, but Strabo later used it, so that we know something of it. It talked about Amazons, a sure sign that it developed the comparison between Pompey and Alexander, locating them on the river Mermadilis.<sup>52</sup> Possibly Theophanes is the source for Plutarch's declaration that Pompey defeated not only the Albanians but their allies the Amazons, for some of the same geographical information recurs in his account. He also makes Pompey kill the Albanian general in single combat. It might be rash to attribute to Theophanes all the other statements in Plutarch's *Life of Pompey* assimilating him to Alexander – that he was thirty-four on his return to Rome, that he restored the women of Mithridates' household unharmed to their kin (the line of chivalrous conquerors begins with Xenophon's Cyrus and passes through Alexander to Scipio Africanus), that he had a 'desire and envy' to march on to the Erythraean Sea, which recalls Alexander's *pothos* to go ever further; and, explicitly, that he outdid Alexander by defeating the Iberians. But if not owed to Theophanes, all this must be due to some publicist of the same period.<sup>53</sup> Again from Plutarch, we know that he said that among the captured documents of Mithridates (he perhaps listed as Plutarch does the memoranda on the king's murders,

<sup>47</sup> *Ad F.* 5.12.

<sup>48</sup> *Ib.* 6.12.

<sup>49</sup> *Ad A.* 1.13.4.

<sup>50</sup> Strabo 11.C492.

<sup>51</sup> *Pro Arch.* 24.

<sup>52</sup> Strabo 11.C493. He perhaps used the work only for additions to his main account (R. Laqueur, *PWVA* 2 (1934) 2090).

<sup>53</sup> Plut. *Pomp* 46.1, 38.2; 35.3-4, 34.5.

interpretations of dreams, and Monima's love-letters) was a letter from the exiled Rutilius Rufus urging the famous massacre of 88 of the Roman residents in Asia. This Plutarch rightly refused to believe, putting it down to the fact that Rutilius' memoirs had treated Pompey's father roughly, or to Theophanes' own villainy. We do not gain a very favourable idea of Theophanes' work; Strabo shows it to have been inaccurate and superficial on geography and natural history.<sup>54</sup> It may be noted that Pompey does not seem to have wanted poets to celebrate his deeds, in Latin at least (he listened at Mytilene on his way home to poets vying in his praises and was struck with the theatre there).<sup>55</sup> Perhaps he wished to dissociate himself from Lucullus, who patronised Archias.<sup>56</sup> But the Alexander-myth had been largely developed in prose. Nor did Pompey follow Sulla's example of writing his memoirs; Alexander had not done that.

Caesar does not seem in the earlier part of his career to have gathered scholars or literary men around him, although he was generous to clients and dependants in spite of his debts.<sup>57</sup> Perhaps this was partly because he looked for political support largely to the People, who were unlikely to be impressed with such things. He was himself, of course, one of the most brilliant men in Rome. Like so many in this time, he was greatly interested in literary and linguistic matters, but possibly also in some scientific subjects. Modern works sometimes describe him as an Epicurean, but there is no real evidence for this, though Epicureanism might be a decent cover for scepticism in religion – the cool and reasonable speech that Sallust attributes to him in the *Catilinarian War* denies a future life, the *Commentaries* are strikingly rationalistic compared with those of Sulla, and there were memories of his mocking haruspicy;<sup>58</sup> though this last may have had a political purpose, and for political reasons he exploited his own position of *pontifex maximus*, and the beliefs of others. He is not said to have attended Posidonius' lectures when in Rhodes as a student, and no links with philosophers are mentioned, except that one late Greek source, assuming as such sources do that all good rulers have philosophers as advisers, associates him with Ariston, whom we have already met as living in Alexandria when Lucullus was there. It is surely there that Caesar is supposed to have heard him; indeed another notice says that he stood modestly in the crowd to listen to philosophers there.<sup>59</sup>

His *juvenilia*, suppressed by Augustus, were poetic, and the only lines of his verse to survive contain a famous critical characterisation of Menander. He

<sup>54</sup> Id. ib. 37; Strabo 11.C528: animals that breed in the snow – probably from a literary source, not autopsy. Theophanes overestimated the size of Armenia and said the River Tanais rose in the Caucasus, flowed north, and returned to issue in Lake Maeotis (the sea of Azov).

<sup>55</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 42.4 (but his theatre in Rome was not based closely on it as Plut. claims).

<sup>56</sup> *Pro. Arch.* 5-6, 11.

<sup>57</sup> Suet. *DJ* 71. In the 50s the hostile Catullus damns Caesar and his praef. fabr. Mamurra as *erudituli* (57.7).

<sup>58</sup> Sall. *Bell. Cat.* 51.20; E. Rawson, *JRS* (1978) 132.

<sup>59</sup> Aelian *VH* 7.21: he did not disdain to visit Ariston's house, or Pompey that of Cratippus. There is no evidence Pompey met Cratippus more than once, and the phraseology is probably mere rhetoric. Cf. Appian *BC* 2.89, Caesar in Alexandria; if from Pollio, good evidence. Cicero's praise of Caesar in the *pro Marcello* for *sapientia* sometimes has philosophical implications.

may have been influenced in verse, he certainly was in prose, by his uncle C. Julius Caesar Strabo, tragic poet, orator and wit; in an early speech he quoted or adopted a passage of his uncle's *verbatim*.<sup>60</sup> He was educated in *grammatica* and conceivably rhetoric by the distinguished Antonius Gniphō, and then set off for Rhodes and Greek rhetoric under Apollonius Molon. (Captured *en route* by pirates, he is said to have passed the time writing poems and speeches, presumably in Greek, as he read them to his captors.)<sup>61</sup> His early prosecution of Dolabella brought him fame as a speaker, and Cicero in the *Brutus* makes Atticus praise him very highly indeed for choice language and elegance of style.<sup>62</sup> His two books on a favourite grammatical issue, the theory of analogy (we shall consider them later) were written in Gaul and dedicated to Cicero, with whom he was temporarily on close terms. Cicero indeed could get on best with Caesar on the literary plane; his recommendation to Caesar of the freedman Apollonius is full of quotations from Homer and Euripides, and when the Dictator came to dinner they kept off politics to discuss literary questions.<sup>63</sup> Cicero wrote rather proudly at this time that his own witticisms were being retailed to Caesar at his command, and that Caesar claimed to be able to tell which were genuine<sup>64</sup> – as a good critic should; though his chief reason for interest in Cicero's satirical *mots* was doubtless political.

Little remains of Caesar's two invectives against Cato, apparently conventional essays in the *genre*; but the *Commentarii* on the Gallic and Civil Wars have always been admired for their lucid style and clear military narrative, while the former is noteworthy also for its digressions on feats of engineering and on geography and ethnography. Caesar once or twice stresses his own responsibility for technical improvements (for example the more suitable ships used for the second crossing of the Channel),<sup>65</sup> though as we saw he does not mention any technical officers. The pretence, perhaps it was no more, that the *Commentarii* were mere notes for embellishment by others may suggest that Caesar had little patience with the highly coloured historiography of his time. But he was probably well-informed on the past of Rome and of his ancient family; a L. Julius Caesar, perhaps an uncle, wrote of the legendary period, perhaps with a special reference to the ancestors of the Julii, and Caesar's political activities included some splendid examples of antiquarian play-acting.<sup>66</sup>

During Caesar's later years, however, we find him connected with a number of publicists, mostly minor figures. When he became too busy to do all his propaganda himself, his officer Hirtius finished off the *De Bello Gallico*

<sup>60</sup> Suet. *DJ* 55.2.

<sup>61</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.2.

<sup>62</sup> *Brutus* 261-2. Atticus is the expert on these qualities. Even DS 32.27.3 notes Caesar's eloquence.

<sup>63</sup> *Brutus* 253; *Ad F.* 13.16; *Ad A.* 13.52.

<sup>64</sup> *Ad F.* 9.16.4.

<sup>65</sup> Caesar *BG* 5.1.

<sup>66</sup> L. Caesar *Origo Gentis Romanae* 15.4, 18.5; play-acting, especially the trial of Rabirius in 63 B.C. Suet. *DJ* 56.6, improved form of reports to Senate (with *paginae*), and use of cipher in letters to intimates (this, though very simple to our eyes, was more complex than that used by Augustus, Suet. *Aug.* 88, and a book was devoted to these passages by a *grammaticus*, A. Gell. 17.9.5).

(he claims indeed to have carried on to Caesar's death), and wrote an *Anticato*; he had some literary ability, even if Cicero gave him lessons in public speaking partly as political insurance. Officers of even slighter powers, content with anonymity, recorded some of the later campaigns of the Civil War. Another officer, Aurunculeius Cotta, who probably had some sort of family connection, wrote a work on the Roman constitution that we would like to possess,<sup>67</sup> especially since the letters attributed to Sallust which purport to give Caesar advice are probably not genuine, and we are therefore ill-informed about the views of his adherents. Poetic treatments of part or all of the Gallic War were produced by Varro of Atax (himself from Gaul) and Furius Bibaculus, and planned by Cicero.<sup>68</sup> Whether the first two reaped a reward we do not know. Much pro-Caesarian literature was produced shortly after his death, in direct response to the political crisis of the time; his faithful agent Oppius wrote a life (also one of Cassius, presumably hostile, and another of Scipio Africanus, who may have been seen as a type of Caesar) and the equally faithful Balbus must also have written something, since we owe him an account of a prophecy announcing Caesar's death.<sup>69</sup>

There were Greeks in Caesar's train, too. He freed Cnidos for the sake of Theopompus 'the mythographer', probably the Theopompus Cicero knew in Rome as a friend and agent of the Dictator. Theopompus' son Artemidorus has also been met by us in Rome, as a 'sophist' or display orator, who had contacts with Brutus, and may have gone to dinner with Philodemus. Both were probably given the citizenship by Caesar.<sup>70</sup> P. Crassus' freedman Apollonius, who after his master's death in the East in 54 had been one of Caesar's people in Alexandria and later joined him again with a recommendation from Cicero, intended to write a history of Caesar's *res gestae*, but whether he did so we do not know. The Hypsicrates who did write on Caesar's Eastern campaigns is sometimes identified with the grammarian from Amisus who lived to extreme old age and wrote on Latin as a Greek dialect; it is uncertain if he knew Caesar personally, and if so where. Caesar is also said to have urged Tyrannio to write on a disputed subject in Greek metre, though we do not know at what date, and Tyrannio of course had other patrons.<sup>71</sup>

Caesar's time in Egypt, as we saw, possibly had some important effect in bringing Alexandrian intellectual traditions to Rome. He may have brought one or two interesting prisoners home. He may perhaps really have had some contact with Ariston, an Academic turned Peripatetic who was interested in logic and also wrote on the Nile and the causes of its flood, a subject that one can well conceive Caesar being interested in. The Alexandrian philosopher

<sup>67</sup> Athen. 6.273b.

<sup>68</sup> Whatever the truth about the mime-writer Laberius' standing before he was forced to appear on the stage by Caesar and then given the gold ring, in *ad F.* 10.32.2 Pollio shows the younger Balbus boasted he was copying Caesar by giving a *histrion* at Gades the ring and a seat among the *equites*.

<sup>69</sup> Peter *HRR* II.46.

<sup>70</sup> Strabo 14.C656, Plut. *Caes.* 48, 65; *Ad A.* 13.7; App. *BC* 2.116.

<sup>71</sup> Jacoby *FGH* no. 190; cf. *PWIX*.433; Suda s.v. *skolion*.

Areius, who may have been teaching Octavian by 45, may have followed Caesar from Egypt; and we are told that in his reform of the calendar Caesar was using Egyptian models, so it is hard not to accept that the astronomer Sosigenes, whose aid he employed, was an Alexandrian.<sup>72</sup> (Plutarch speaks of a committee of learned men.)<sup>73</sup> Simply to extend the year to the length of the solar one, and to change as little else as possible, might not seem to need much learned help, but Pliny refers to Sosigenes' three treatises, with repeated revisions. Perhaps he was also working on the book that Pliny knew as Caesar's *De Astris*, in Greek.<sup>74</sup> Suetonius does not mention the work among Caesar's writings, and though Greek might be thought the proper language for a scientific work, the book seems to have consisted mainly at least of a *parapegma*, an astrometeorological calendar, tying the rising of different stars to the newly established civil calendar and noting the weather to be expected at each time. The information would be valid only for Italy, and primarily useful for farmers, so Latin would perhaps have been the natural language for it if the author or authors had not been Greeks. One sees how such a work could be called Caesar's calendar, and that Caesar may really have had an interest in astronomy (as many Romans did) is suggested by his note in the *De Bello Gallico* on measuring the short summer nights in Britain.<sup>75</sup> Again, a calendar of this sort was not very difficult to compile – Geminus observes that such a work in untechnical and depends merely on experience<sup>76</sup> – but distinguished philosopher-scientists had been responsible for examples. It is possible that a copy or copies of the work, whether in translation or not, may have been set up in public, as such things were in Greece, and later at least in Italy; but there is no evidence for this.

Late and somewhat dubious geographical sources have what is in the fullest version a very circumstantial tale that in 44, by decree of the Senate, Caesar initiated a survey of the whole Empire, that was only finished by Augustus; the Empire was divided into four areas, each under a particular Greek skilled in 'philosophy', one of whom, called Didymus, might just conceivably be identified with an Alexandrian metrologist from whom we have a treatise.<sup>77</sup> In spite of the low authority of the sources, it is tempting to believe this; it might be borne out by the fact that another late source, this time in the corpus of *gromatici*, land-surveyors, mentions a 'letter' of Caesar as relevant to the foundation of the art.<sup>78</sup> And of course Agrippa did ultimately

<sup>72</sup> Pliny *NH* 18.211; cf. 2.39.

<sup>73</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 59.2; Macr. *Sat.* 1.14.2-3 mentions a *scriba* of Caesar's, M. Flavius.

<sup>74</sup> *NH* 18.212; cf. Macr. *Sat.* 1.16.39, books on *siderum motus*, based on Egyptian learning.

<sup>75</sup> Caesar *BG* 5.13.

<sup>76</sup> Geminus 17.21-5.

<sup>77</sup> *GLM* 21, Iulius Honorius, *Cosmographia Iulii Caesaris*. Ritschl, *Opusc.* III (1877) 743 argues that the plan lapsed on Caesar's death but was taken up again in the thirties. Kubitschek, *PW* X.1. (1917) 614 s.v. Iulius Honorius thinks not of an actual survey but a literary work based on books. A. Klotz, *Klio* (1931) 38, 386 argues that Agrippa's *commentarii* show some influence from Eratosthenes, but distances are mainly not astronomically fixed but based on itineraries etc., perhaps mediated by literary sources. *Pace* Klotz, Greek scholars might at this date proceed in this way.

<sup>78</sup> [Boethius] *Ex Demonstratione Artis Geometricae Excerpta*, in *Grom. Vet.* 1.395.

publish *commentarii* on all the provinces, giving distances from place to place, and set up a map of the world. This might be seen as the fulfilment of Caesar's plan. But the Empire can hardly have been divided baldly by Caesar into north, south, east and west, and it is alarming that our historical sources, much interested in Caesar's plans, do not mention the scheme. One would like, of course, to see the survey, like the calendar, representing an attempt by Caesar to use Greek science in the service of the state in a way and on a scale that no Greek state itself had done. One would also wish to know more of a possible attempt to improve the technological level of the army; we have seen Caesar's interest in engineering, and it has been suggested that he increased the amount of artillery available and made other changes.<sup>79</sup> His siege of Massilia was regarded as a model of siege warfare and grand engineering plans for Italy were said to have been left unaccomplished at his death.

However all this may be, there can be no doubt that Caesar as Dictator did have what might be called an intellectual policy, or at least a determination to use intelligent and highly qualified persons in public affairs. The business of the calendar is one example; so is the commissioning of Varro to create a Greek-style public library, or rather two, in Greek and Latin books. Perhaps Rome had to rival Alexandria – though one may doubt if Caesar wanted to model his position on that of the Ptolemies, as some hold. But his apparently deep regret that Menander was better than Terence, and praise of Cicero for improving the 'name and standing of the Roman people' by his stylistic achievements and 'extending the boundaries of the Roman genius', suggest cultural competitiveness. One also notes the offer of citizenship to doctors and teachers, whose predecessors had by contrast in the second century been expelled from Rome:<sup>80</sup> likewise the plan for a codification of the laws, the precise nature of which we will consider later. This of course takes us to a high social level, on which we find prominent lawyers closely associated with Caesar; in particular Ofillius, who dedicated legal works to him, with Cicero's young friend Trebatius, who had served in Gaul and continued to be close to him; while the greatest lawyer of the older generation, Ser. Sulpicius, at least accepted a governorship at Caesar's hands.<sup>81</sup> Caesar's reorganisation of the priestly colleges and revival of some ancient rites may have drawn on the expertise of the authors of works dedicated to him, primarily Varro's great *Antiquitates Divinae*, but also Granius Flaccus' *De Indigitamentis*.<sup>82</sup> Cicero for one had no doubt about Caesar's intentions. He told distinguished friends with bookish interests who had fought for Pompey but hoped for forgiveness that the Dictator was greatly favouring talent.<sup>83</sup> Among the latter's own adherents were a number of clever young men, who had perhaps attracted his favour partly by their intelligence. One such is Q. Cornificius, who is best remembered as a friend of Catullus, but like many of that circle moved on to

<sup>79</sup> E. Gabba, in *Tecnologia, Economia e società nel mondo romano* (1980) 219.

<sup>80</sup> Suet. *DJ*42.1

<sup>81</sup> *MRR* 2.299, 302.

<sup>82</sup> See below, Chapter 20.

<sup>83</sup> *Ad F.* 6.6.8, cf. 4.8.2.

a political career,<sup>84</sup> and another is C. Trebonius, ultimately one of the leaders of the tyrannicides.<sup>85</sup>

Whether it was owing to Caesar himself, and perhaps to a remaining touch of the *popularis* in him, or whether it was simply something in the air at the time, we can trace a feeling in Caesarian circles that the public had certain rights, in particular of access to works of art. It is true that, as we saw, these, like various curiosities, were often dedicated in temples, and also that people (perhaps only people of some standing?) could visit villas and possibly palaces in Rome to see works of art. But there may now be something more. Pliny quotes a decree of the Senate, of about this period, introduced by an aedile, insisting that a noble restore a work of art to its previous public place (the impiety of the removal does not seem to be the prime consideration.)<sup>86</sup> Caesar himself made generous dedications, especially of paintings, thus, says Pliny, increasing the public regard for this art.<sup>87</sup> But the idea of public ownership is seen most clearly in his will, by which he left his *horti* (i.e. a suburban residence with gardens) to the people of Rome as a park. With the gardens went, as we are explicitly told by Cicero, statues and paintings – which Antony however soon carried off.<sup>88</sup> That the new ideas were influential is shown by the fact that Caesar's follower Pollio, who was also very anxious that people should visit his own galleries, took up the idea of a public library.<sup>89</sup> And Agrippa is said to have even wanted to nationalise all works of art.

Pliny was to say of Pollio's introduction of a public library *primus ingenia hominum rem publicam fecit*. It could have been said even more truly, and in a broader sense, of Caesar.<sup>90</sup> The way was now open to imperial patronage, though perhaps no Emperor was ever so intellectually serious as Caesar.

<sup>84</sup> See E. Rawson, *CQ* (1978) 188. Also no doubt a friend of Calvus, which would explain his 'Atticising' sympathies in oratory; Cicero's letters suggest he also had philosophic, perhaps Stoic interests, and urge him to write, certainly in prose; he just could be the author of a stoicising *De Elym's Deorum*, on gods' names. He fought well for Caesar and was pr. 45. Would even Catullus, with whom Caesar was anxious to be reconciled after suffering his abuse, have made the *gran rifiuto* like Ovid and stuck to poetry?

<sup>85</sup> Consul for part of 45, after fighting for Caesar; in 47 he made a collection of Cicero's jokes; Cicero gracefully said the introduction was so witty he was exhausted with laughing before he got to his own part; not apparently sympathetic to the neoterics or Atticism, when he wrote a poem it was a Lucilian satire against an enemy. Like Cornificius, he read the *Orator*; he begged to receive a part in one of Cicero's dialogues, so probably had philosophic pretensions, and asked for generous mention if Cicero wrote about the Ides (*Ad F.* 15.20, 21; 12.16). When he was murdered in 43, Cicero praised his *ingenium* and *humanitas*, *Phil.* 11.9.

<sup>86</sup> Pliny *NH* 34.93.

<sup>87</sup> *Id. ib.* 35.26; 37.11.

<sup>88</sup> *Phil.* 2.109.

<sup>89</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.33; 35.10, 26.

<sup>90</sup> *Id. ib.* 35.10.

PART II  
The *Artes*



## CHAPTER EIGHT

# *Grammatica*: the study of language

The Greek term *enkyklios paideia* meant general or usual education.<sup>1</sup> It covered a number of subjects, thought of sometimes as propaedeutic to a study of philosophy. To the Romans these were the *artes liberales*, suitable for a free man, or rather for a gentleman (any kind of technical instruction was of course excluded); the term is attested as early as the eighties B.C., and was doubtless not new then.<sup>2</sup> Vitruvius at least believed that the *encyklios disciplina*, as he called it, formed a single body, and that all the arts were connected and had similar theoretical principles; to learn one helps in learning the others.<sup>3</sup> But sometimes distinctions were made between separate groups of *artes*. By the first century B.C. certain subjects had become canonical, though the list was susceptible of various extensions. First came grammar (*grammatica*), rhetoric and dialectic (roughly logic), and then the mathematical subjects, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and musical theory. Of these the first three were to form the mediaeval *trivium*, and the others the *quadrivium*. When Varro, possibly late in life, wrote the nine books of his *Disciplinae*, which also covered medicine and architecture, he began, as was usual (in listing the arts – the Greeks had not written encyclopedias of this kind) with grammar, rhetoric and dialectic (or possibly dialectic and rhetoric). These subjects were those that put into the hands of their students the very tools of expression and thought. They preoccupied in particular the Romans themselves in this period, and it is at least interesting that the three great works of his time that Vitruvius declares will go down to posterity represent *grammatica*, rhetoric, and philosophy (though not dialectic): Varro's *De Lingua Latina*, Cicero's *De Oratore* and Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*.<sup>4</sup>

The study of language had been of concern to Greek thinkers from various points of view since the time of the Sophists. But during the Hellenistic period *grammatica*, covering everything concerned with language and (primarily poetic) literature had developed independently, especially in the hands of the Alexandrian critics and scholars. They studied the archaic and classical literature, now in need of linguistic and historical elucidation, and the Greek dialects, now giving way before the *koinê*. They also developed a part at least of what we call grammar, particularly the study of morphology. The subject maintained its connection with philosophy, however, especially owing to the interest taken in it by the Stoics, who discussed various grammatical or

<sup>1</sup> F. Kühnert, *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike* (1961).

<sup>2</sup> *De Inv.* 1.35.

<sup>3</sup> *Vitr.* 1.1.12.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* 9 *praef.* 17.

quasi-grammatical questions under the subdivisions of dialectic, the first concerned with what is said or signified, and the second with the way the voice is articulated to say or signify things, i.e. expression. Taking up a firm position in the old quarrel between *Physis* and *Nomos*, Nature and Law or Convention, they argued that language was directly derived from Nature (the Epicureans took the opposite view). They were thus inspired to fanciful excesses in etymology, which they regarded as a guide to the correct use of language, postulating a number of basic words or elements that were supposed to imitate things, or, more strictly, not things but the impressions these make on the mind.<sup>5</sup> Interest in etymology was not a Stoic prerogative; poetic etymologies were an Alexandrian speciality, and Philoxenus of Alexandria, whose work has been called the high point of etymological science in antiquity, developed a system in which most Greek words go back to monosyllabic verbal roots (not simply nouns, as was usual with the Stoics). Some which are not in use in any dialect can none the less be postulated, he held, and from these 'prototypes', by various regular formations – the principle of regularity in language was known as analogy and associated with Alexandria – the rest of the vocabulary was derived.<sup>6</sup> The Stoics however made important advances relevant to grammar in the narrow sense, especially in isolating the parts of speech, and some in phonetics, where, however, classical antiquity lagged behind ancient India.

At Rome the influence both of Pergamum, where the Stoic Crates who is said to have introduced the Romans to serious *grammatica* worked, and also of Alexandria, was felt. The most important Roman *grammaticus* of around 100 B.C., Aelius Stilo, thought of himself as a Stoic. But Antonius Gniphos, as we recall, was in the Alexandrian tradition, and Philoxenus of Alexandria is said to have worked in Rome. There had perhaps already been something of a fusion, at least at Rhodes, where Tyrannio had worked, probably with the Alexandrian exile Dionysius Thrax, but where Stoicism flourished under Posidonius.

Varro somewhere defined *grammatica* to include general knowledge of what poets, historians and orators have said: it had four functions, reading, writing, understanding and evaluating; or reading, explaining, emending and judging.<sup>7</sup> These definitions are close to Greek ones; modern linguistics tend to be more concerned with the spoken word. The surviving treatise known as the *Technê Grammatikê* or *Art of Grammar* of Dionysius Thrax counts six functions: the reading of verse, especially with the proper rhythms, exegesis of poetic figures, explanation of rare words and obscure references, etymology, inflexion, and finally criticism. If we could be sure that the work was

<sup>5</sup> M. Frede, in *The Stoics* (1978) ed. J.M. Rist, 27. Dialectic and rhetoric, for the Stoics, make up the 'logical' part of philosophy.

<sup>6</sup> C. Theodorakis, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikern Philoxenos* (1976); R. Giomini, *PdLP* (1953) 365 sees some Stoic influence on Philoxenus.

<sup>7</sup> *GRF*, M. Terentius Varro frags 234, 236 (cf. 237, probably Varronian: 'elements' are the origins of *grammatica*: they make up letters, these syllables, these words, these parts of a speech, these a speech: a speech praises virtue, virtue extirpates vice). Philodemus can simply say *grammatica* teaches one how to read, *Rhet.* 1.194 Sudh.

genuinely written about 100 B.C. by Dionysius, a pupil of Aristarchus, and was influential in Rome, as some have held, it would be worth spending more time on the way it carefully classifies accents, stops, letters and syllables, and in a separate section defines and describes eight parts of speech and their subdivisions, and gives some paradigms of inflexions. There is nothing on syntax, which was little developed till the imperial age, though the abstract idea seems to have existed, and it was sometimes covered, in a sense, by what the Stoics called *syntaxis*, the distinction of types of sentences (*lekta*) on a logical rather than linguistic basis; and also, from the stylistic point of view, by rhetoric. But some hold that the *Technê* of 'Dionysius' is a much later work,<sup>8</sup> and that the first 'Arts of Grammar' were by Asclepiades of Myrleia (said very dubiously to have worked in Rome)<sup>9</sup> early in the first century B.C., and the Alexandrian grammarian Tryphon, a little later. Asclepiades divided the subject into three parts, technical, historical and grammatical (by which he meant literary).<sup>10</sup> We will concentrate in this chapter on the first.

The education of every child in Rome who went beyond merely learning to read was based on *grammatica*, so that it is not surprising that 'grammatical' interests and procedures penetrated every area of intellectual activity. But there were perhaps three reasons why the study of language created so much interest there. One was that it was in the Greek world too an exciting subject at this date, where great advances had just been and were being made, and Greek scholars of distinction were working in Rome, such as Tyrannion and (though it is tiresome that this rests on the *Suda* alone) Philoxenus. The second is that traditionally-minded Romans needed assistance in understanding ancient documents of all kinds, and often found it in etymology and derivation, while the Greek habit of collecting glosses was also obviously helpful. The third is that the Latin language was not yet equal to all the new tasks being imposed on it, and was furthermore changing rapidly; debates sprang up on the right way to write and spell it, and how to protect it from the rustic or foreign influences caused by the vast influx of new inhabitants into the city, some of whom spoke non-metropolitan varieties of Latin, and others foreign tongues, most commonly Greek.

At the end of the second century the poet Lucilius wrote verse which was not only seen at once to require comment and elucidation, but which itself dealt with grammatical controversies, such as spelling. At that time and in the early first century two men who link us directly with Varro were active. One is the tragic poet Accius, whose grammatical studies, if separate from his usage in his tragedies, possibly belong to the later part of his long life; he died about 90 B.C. and was known to the young Cicero. To him Varro dedicated an early grammatical work. Accius attempted to reform the spelling of Latin, using a doubled vowel for long syllables (found on some inscriptions for a time) and writing the sound usually spelt -ng- as -gg-, on the Greek model. He also wished to keep the original inflexions of Greek words and names,

<sup>8</sup> V. di Benedetto, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa* (1958) 169, (1959) 87.

<sup>9</sup> *Suda*, s.v. Asclepiades.

<sup>10</sup> *Sex. Emp. Adv. Math.* 250-2 for both Dionysius Thrax and Asclepiades.

which early Latin had unselfconsciously naturalised.<sup>11</sup> The traditionalist and patriotic Varro was on the whole to refuse to follow the *recentiores* in this, apparently lively, debate, though he was not always consistent.

The second figure is L. Aelius Stilo, as we saw a Roman *eques*. He was a friend of Marius' enemy Metellus Numidicus, whom he joined in his exile at Rhodes, where he could possibly have heard Dionysius Thrax. But, according to Cicero, *Stoicus esse voluit*, he tried to be a Stoic, a deprecating phrase that may indicate lack of mastery of his doctrine. He is in fact often seen as an eclectic. His written work could be far from lucid. Aulus Gellius, wishing to understand what was meant by certain terms used by *dialectici*, logicians, in particular *proloquium* or proposition, turned to the *De Proloquiis* of Stilo and found it totally confusing.<sup>12</sup> It may be that Stilo, though dealing with the Stoic logic of propositions that did duty for syntactical theory, had not yet adopted the dialectic method of organising his work by careful definitions and subdivisions, which we shall treat later. Varro, however, sometimes used this same term, *proloquium*, and may have had it from Stilo, though he also uses *profatum* and Cicero has yet another word. A technical vocabulary in Latin was developing.

Varro called his old master Stilo the greatest man of letters in living memory, but he often criticised him. For example, Stilo was not ready enough to find Greek origins for Latin words (it is not clear if the theory of Aeolism had been fully worked out in his time – he probably died in the eighties). He also proscribed as new-fangled some words Varro admitted, like *novissimus*, the superlative of *novus*.<sup>13</sup> Stilo's Stoic view that etymology showed words naturally related to what they signify led him, for example, to explain an obscure word in the Twelve Tables, *lessum*, as 'lamentation', because it sounded like that.<sup>14</sup> From the basic elements of the Stoics all words are derived, either by combination, or by the transference of a basic element to a concept that is either similar, 'neighbouring', or – desperate resource, and perhaps a recent innovation – opposite. The most famous example of this last procedure is *lucus a non lucendo* – a grove, *lucus*, is so called because, being shady, *non lucet*, it is not bright. Varro refused one of Stilo's examples of this kind, but defends him for inserting or removing a letter when laying down etymologies, which Cicero, for one, regarded as cheating; probably in the wake of the sceptical New Academy, he had little opinion of the whole game.<sup>15</sup>

The author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, probably writing in the eighties, intended to compose an *ars grammatica*, dealing among other things with the way to avoid barbarisms and solecisms (mistakes in single words or

<sup>11</sup> GRF, L. Accius frags 24, 25.

<sup>12</sup> Ib., L. Aelius Stilo test. 19.

<sup>13</sup> GRF Varro, frag. 130 (but several frags give Greek etymologies); Varro, *De LL* 6.59.

<sup>14</sup> Aelius frag. 13.

<sup>15</sup> Varro *De LL* 5.18, *caelum* from *celatum*; at 5.89 he passes silently over Aelius' *miles* from *mollis* (frag. 18). Varro accepts some of his etymologies, but he is probably not a main source. Extra letters. *De LL* 7.1-2; with *De Nat. Deor.* 3.62, *Tusc. Disp.* 3.18.

combinations of words) in Latin;<sup>16</sup> (the *Technê* of Asclepiades of Myrleia had dealt with these 'vices of style', though they are often associated with the Stoics). Correct Greek or Latin was regarded as the first virtue in writing. If this *ars* was ever produced we know nothing of it. But on certain aspects of the language the practice – now certainly self-conscious – of prominent authors was more influential than grammatical theorising, though the relationship of practice and theory in this period is often problematical. For the early part of the century there was Caesar's uncle, the tragic poet and orator, C. Julius Caesar Strabo, who like Accius tried to introduce more correct forms of Greek names into Latin, writing for example Tecmessa, not Tecumessa, Alcmeo, not Alcumeo.<sup>17</sup> And light is thrown on the intellectual fashions of the seventies, an ill-documented period, by the tastes of the historian and orator L. Cornelius Sisenna, praetor in 78. Sisenna, who combined experience of politics and (almost certainly) war with a taste for melodrama and high-flown 'Asiatic' rhetoric, may also have been an Epicurean, and was devoted to 'analogy', the Alexandrian belief in and desire to extend logical and regular word-formations, as opposed to 'anomaly', the Stoic acceptance of language with all its irregularities as a natural growth, which seems to have been developed by Crates. Sisenna may have gone further in attempting reforms than any Greek grammarian ever tried to do, though extremists of whom we know little are possible. But the fluid state of Latin, with varying forms and genders existing cheek by jowl, made reform tempting. Cicero says that Sisenna wanted to correct language as generally used, and thought that to speak correctly was to speak against all tradition. Varro makes it clear that when Sisenna employed the active verb *adsentio*, I agree, in the Senate instead of the deponent *adsentior*, and some followed him for a time, this was an attempt to defeat usage in the name of *ratio*, reason: to agree, presumably, is an active thing to do. Varro also tells us that Sisenna insisted on *patres familiarum* instead of *patres familiae*, and this more logical plural, whether by his influence or not, came into fashion.

Cicero's account of Sisenna's reforming zeal suggests that it had some importance, and shows that he was almost the first practising orator to be consciously concerned with pure Latinity, which second-century nobles had commanded by mere birth and upbringing.<sup>18</sup> Where Sisenna acquired his devotion to analogy we cannot say, for the first *grammatici* in Rome known to have favoured it are perhaps too late to have influenced him, and probably advocated a much less peculiar style.<sup>19</sup> Antonius Gniphō wrote *De Latino Sermone* and wanted, we know, to form the plurals of *ebur* and *robur* as *ebura* and *robura*, presumably as being clearer and more logical, and to write *marmur* not

<sup>16</sup> *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.17.

<sup>17</sup> Titles of his tragedies (not the pure Greek Alcmeon or rather Alkmeon).

<sup>18</sup> For Sisenna, E. Rawson, *CQ* (1979) 327. He also had a mania for adverbs in *-im*, probably introducing new examples. *De Or.* 3.46 shows that M. Cotta, in his desire for old-fashioned purity of accent, came to appear rustic.

<sup>19</sup> G. Calboli, *Studi Grammaticali* (1962) 139, against K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica* (1922). They are not very clear if so.

*marmor* to match. Staberius Eros wrote a *De Proportione*, *proportio* being an early equivalent for *analogia*;<sup>20</sup> later the word *ratio* was sometimes used. Gniphotaught Caesar and Eros Brutus, both of whom had a pure and simple style, as unlike as possible to that of the eccentric and innovatory Sisenna. Sisenna probably wished to expand Latin vocabulary as well as correct it; it was felt that Latin was poorer than Greek, though Cicero tried to deny it. The Stoics in particular allowed new formations, and the imitation of Greek words became for the Romans one of the legitimate categories.<sup>21</sup> Sisenna's notorious *sputatilica*, produced in court to an opponent's jeers, was probably based on a Greek word.<sup>22</sup>

Caesar's own two books *De Analogia* are said to have been written while he was crossing the Alps to return to his army after the winter's judicial business in Cisalpine Gaul; but they were taken entirely seriously by later grammarians. The preface, to Cicero, observed he had performed a notable service to the glory of Rome by labouring to see that ideas could be expressed with splendour, but argued that a simpler, every-day manner was not to be neglected. Cicero praises the care with which the work was written and describes it as being *de ratione Latine loquendi*; he quotes the first book as saying that the choice of words is the foundation of eloquence. (A great noble who is an orator does not, one notes, deal with *grammatica* for its own sake.) Though Caesar notoriously said that an unusual word is to be avoided like a reef, and though Cicero claims that he only emended usage on the base of better usage (Varro said the same of Aristarchus), and he perhaps openly opposed Sisenna, he may have introduced new forms, if not new words. His book was probably unconcerned with quarrels of philosophic origin and simply assumed that analogy should be pursued. It concentrated on nouns, as Aristarchus had done, and said very clearly that if nouns are alike in eight different ways, then they are analogous.

It seems to have been distinctly authoritarian in tone: the genitive of words like *Pompeius* should be written with three i's, *Pompeiii* (to distinguish it from the vocative singular and nominative plural, no doubt). Unlike Nigidius Figulus and Varro, he argued for *senatus*, *senatu*, not *senatus*, *senatui* in the genitive and dative. *Harena*, sand, has no plural, but *quadrigae*, a four-horse chariot, must not be used in the singular. Caesar may have been the first to propose a participle of the verb to be, *ens*: Greek had such a form. *Se* and *sese* are firmly distinguished in meaning. One must write *lac*, milk, not *lact*, for no noun ends in two mutes. Caesar follows the older practice of giving Greek names Latin terminations. Later grammarians quote his speeches, rather than his surviving *Commentaries*, for analogic forms, notably *frustro* (elude or delude) for *frustror*; this was probably a rare but not unknown usage that seemed more logical. The feature of the style of the *Commentaries* that does

<sup>20</sup> GRF, Antonius Gniphota, test. 4, frag. 4; Staberius Eros, frag. 1.

<sup>21</sup> *De Fin.* 3.5, *De Or.* 1.155; *Part. Or.* 16. Cicero was very cautious in forming new words.

<sup>22</sup> *Brutus* 260: perhaps based on *kataptusta*. The commentary on Plautus attributed to a Sisenna seems to be post-Virgilian (and would probably be the work of a professional teacher): Schanz-Hosius 1.326.

perhaps reflect his theories is his habit of fixing on a single, straightforward word for a single purpose and eschewing all variation.<sup>23</sup>

Caesar's authority, as Varro admitted, had considerable effect.<sup>24</sup> More, probably, than that of Nigidius Figulus, 'Pythagorean and magician', later linked with Varro as one of the two most learned men of the age. He wrote *Commentarii Grammatici* in at least 29 books (beside inevitably considering related questions elsewhere); their date is uncertain, but since Nigidius died in exile in 45, it must be before the emergence of Varro's biggest grammatical work, the *De Lingua Latina*.<sup>25</sup> Varro does not refer to Nigidius in this, and though Nigidius agrees with Varro's youthful book on the alphabet in rejecting the letters K, Q, and X, and calling H a mere aspiration, they may be following a common source.<sup>26</sup>

Though the *Commentarii* were perhaps not, as the title has suggested, mere notes and queries, the fragments do not suggest a clear organisation. From books 4, 8 and 10 we have careful distinctions between words or phrases of similar meaning, such as *vetusciscere* and *veterascere*, to spoil and to improve with age, or *mendacium dicere* and *mentiri*, to lie and to mislead, which may be meant to be prescriptive as well as descriptive, and which are backed by appeals to old documents<sup>27</sup> or etymology. From book 24 there is a discussion on the different intonation and spelling appropriate to the difference cases of a noun: Nigidius would write *huius amici* (genitive) but *hii amicii* (nominative plural), *huius terrai* (the old genitive) but *huic terrae* (dative), and he distinguished the intonation of the two uses of the vocative, in calling and questioning.

In spite of prescriptive tendencies, Nigidius was on the side of the natural origin of language; whether this was an old Pythagorean position is not clear. Among other arguments he claimed that in the actual enunciation of *vos* compared with *nos*, *tu* with *ego* and *tibi* with *mihi*, the direction of the breath and movements of the lips were towards another person, and that the same was true in Greek. This bears some resemblance to a remark of the Stoic Chrysippus.<sup>28</sup>

Gellius calls the argument about *vos* and *nos* charming and attractive; he does not call it true. And he praises a couple of Nigidius' etymologies as clever and subtle rather than accurate. In fact his etymologies are much like the simpler of Varro's, often assuming the contraction of two words into one, on'

<sup>23</sup> Suet. *DJ* 56; *GRF*, C. Julius Caesar frags 2, 11, 15, 10, 3, 26, 28, 14, 20; a sceptical question (with *num*) suggests at least a passing hit at the idea that language is a natural growth, 3a.

<sup>24</sup> *GRF*, Varro frag. 269 (in writing *lacrimae*, *maximus*, not *lacrumae*, *maxumus*).

<sup>25</sup> Jerome *Chron.* (45 B.C.)

<sup>26</sup> Frag. 56-7 Swob. To use *H* in the wrong place is rustic, frag. 39. There was clearly a lively dispute about aspiration at this time. Cicero, *Or.* 160, felt forced to adopt *ch*, *ph*, and *th* in Greek names, though it went against Roman tradition; while Catullus' butt Arrius (84) seems to have aspirated with pride at every opportunity, though the poet claims it betrays his humble origin (if he is the Q, Arrius of *Brutus* 242, he was an upstart of little education).

<sup>27</sup> Or an old verse, lacking, to A. Gellius' annoyance, an author's name, frag. 4 Swob. But he perhaps often quoted named writers, usually poets.

<sup>28</sup> *SVF* ii 8841: in saying *egô* lower lip and chin point to the chest, evidence for this being the centre of consciousness. Nigidius' interest in phonetics is also shown in his insistence that the *n* in *-ng-* is not a real *n*, as the tongue does not touch the palate, frag. 54 Swob.

possible or impossible principles; they sometimes depend on fortuitous similarities of sound, or of sound and meaning. Once there is recourse to a Greek word, though whether this implies a belief in 'Aeolism' is unclear. There is no reference to any other language or dialect (except rustic Latin). Gellius, though reverencing his learning, twice complains of Nigidius' obscurity, once in terms reminiscent of his complaint about Stilo as writing for himself, not others. A reputation for *obscuritas subtilitasque* may explain why his influence was never comparable to that of Varro.<sup>29</sup>

There were numerous minor authors in Latin of whose work we know too little to form a clear picture of their ideas. Some, like Orbilius, certainly distinguished the meaning of words of similar form.<sup>30</sup> Varro also quotes *glossarum scriptores*, authors of lists of words and their meanings, of whom perhaps the most important was Ateius Philologus with his *Glossematorum libri*.<sup>31</sup> We may pick out two other men. Aurelius Opillus at the beginning of our period explained and gave etymologies for poetic words (this was an Alexandrian activity and he was an Epicurean in leanings), mainly perhaps in his nine books called *The Muses*. He wanted to spell Greek names ending in *-ros* with *-rus* in Latin: Alexandrus, Teucrus, not Alexander and Teucer.<sup>32</sup> At the end of the period, it is possible that the author of a Stoicising *De Etymis Deorum*, which seems to quote Cleanthes and Posidonius, and deals mainly with Greek divine names which it derives from common Greek words, is to be identified with Cicero's friend Q. Cornificius, whose intellectual interests we have noted.<sup>33</sup>

No fragments survive from the discussions of punctuation that probably existed; this is because the late grammarians, who might have quoted them, wrote when the classical system of Latin punctuation had been given up. From the earliest times the Romans, unlike on the whole the Greeks, had separated words, usually by a dot, as inscriptions show, and since the second century at least had marked a new paragraph by a new line, indentation, and a large ('capital') letter. When the *librarium notae* which Cicero mentions as marking the end of a clause or period came in is not clear; the Sullan age has been suggested, but they might be a little earlier. Various marks or gaps were used, primarily in literary texts, by Augustus' time, to indicate lighter or heavier pauses; they were not employed wholly consistently, but it is clear that the Romans could and did punctuate extensively for sense (and in addition an apex – acute accent – was used, if again not wholly consistently, to indicate a long vowel especially if this was ambiguous and the sense affected). Oddly, given the high incidence of the question in rhetorical works, a question mark was not developed. It is remarkable that this system was not taken over from the Greeks (who used the dot for a stop); it is even more remarkable that the Romans gave it up, with the habit of dividing words, in

<sup>29</sup> Frags 41, 53; cf. 35, 49, 50 Swob. Gellius also sees that the generalisation that all adjectives in *-osus* imply undesirable excess (as *bibosus*) will not hold, 4.9.12

<sup>30</sup> *GRF*, Orbilius Pupillus frag. 1, 2.

<sup>31</sup> Varro *De LL* 7.10; *GRF*, L. Ateius Praetextatus frag. 2.

<sup>32</sup> *GRF*, Aurelius Opillus frags 1, 25.

<sup>33</sup> *Ib.* Cornificius Longus frags 1ff.; E. Rawson, *CQ* (1978) 188.

the second century A.D., in order to emulate the Greeks more closely. But for a time, surprisingly, it was surely easier to follow a train of thought in a Latin than in a Greek manuscript.<sup>34</sup>

Varro quotes many of his Latin predecessors and contemporaries; he also quotes the great Greek scholars of the past (and some very minor ones), and, among those of his own day, both Hypsicrates and Tyrannio, respectfully. He does not mention Philoxenus, whose views on etymology he or or a Greek source used by him have sometimes been thought to be combatting.<sup>35</sup> Hypsicrates, as we recall, wrote on Aeolism as well as on contemporary history, and Tyrannio, as we also saw, probably dedicated a book on the fairly new subject of Greek accents to Atticus, while the Suda says that Caesar suggested he write on metre.<sup>36</sup> Philoxenus wrote a number of works apart from those on dialect and etymology, treating for example comparative adjectives, verbs ending in *-mi*, conjugation, and reduplication or other lengthening of stems. Analogy and etymology for him determine proper forms, unless a word was used by good Attic writers; the thorough-going Atticism of the imperial period looms ahead.<sup>37</sup> We have other titles for the Greek *grammatici* who spent at least some time in Rome, such as Aristodemus of Nysa, but we cannot be sure when or where these works were written, and there are few enlightening fragments. Our best source for grammatical thought in Rome remains Varro.

Most of his philological work is lost, though it was extensively quarried by later grammarians. But we have a part of the *De Lingua Latina*. Of its twenty-five books, written in the forties, we have, not quite complete, books 5-10 which open with a dedication to Cicero. Its typically Varronian form was based on groups of three books, two triads forming a hexad; the first triad argued for, against, and about the true nature of, a grammatical theory or procedure, the second showed it in operation. There were four hexads, though Varro says that the study of speech has three parts – how names were given to things, how words take different forms, and how they are joined to make sentences:<sup>38</sup> i.e. etymology, morphology and derivation, and ‘syntax’. The last of these filled two hexads.

After an introduction, books 2-4 dealt with etymology: was it an *ars*, a subject that could be treated in an organised fashion, and was it useful? In the extant books 5-7 Varro gives actual etymologies, and to some extent meanings, as etymology and semantics are linked. He gives us the Greek terms, but puts his own definition of these ‘two natures’ of the word into periphrastic Latin; the Latin terminology he had inherited seems to have had serious gaps.

There are four levels to the science of etymology. To the first even the ignorant can aspire: the origins of some compound words are obvious. The

<sup>34</sup> *De Or.* 3.173 (if pressed, this would take us back to the nineties for attested use of punctuation for sense). Cf. E. Otha Wingo, *Latin Punctuation in the Classical Age* (1972).

<sup>35</sup> C. Wendel *PW* XX.1 (1941) 194 – the old view of Reizenstein.

<sup>36</sup> Suda, s.v. *skolion*.

<sup>37</sup> See n.6 above.

<sup>38</sup> *De LL* 8.11.

next was the province of *grammatica antiqua*, the explanation of the words of the poets. The third is that of the philosophers, and to this Varro hopes to attain, as he has studied with the Stoics and Cleanthes, as well as with the grammarians and Aristophanes of Byzantium.<sup>39</sup> But the fourth level holds 'the mysteries of the king', the holy of holies, and here he will be content with opinion rather than knowledge. What this last stage is has been much discussed, and the text may be corrupt. Is the language Pythagorean, referring to the wisdom of the early rulers who first gave things their names? Or does the mystery reside in the Stoic *primigenia* or first elements, onomatopoeic or at least expressive of their meaning?<sup>40</sup> Varro accepts that 'nature led man in giving names', even though Greeks, Syrians and Romans have different words for the same thing, and though some words have been improved 'voluntarily'. In fact, natural theories of language were not finally abandoned till in the nineteenth century the history of the Indo-European tongues was studied and the way in which languages in general developed became clearer. Modern linguists hold that the origin of language is beyond the scope of science; no truly primitive languages exist. But in a sense Lucretius must have been right in claiming that language developed gradually from primitive animal cries.<sup>41</sup>

The basic units of language, Varro considers, are words, just as atoms are the basic units of matter, though words are not infinite in number like atoms. Words are native, foreign and obsolete; Varro will ignore the obsolete. Pythagoras said all things start from pairs, like finite and infinite, good and evil; also station and motion, station being divided into subject and place, motion into time and action.<sup>42</sup> Book 5 deals with words for places and objects in places, 6 with those for time and acts in time. Book 7 is reserved for rare, especially poetic, words, but has the same four subdivisions within it, so that a scheme we know some Stoics to have used is here imposed on Alexandrian material.

After Varro has discussed a number of general words for places he moves on to proper names, particularly in Rome, and we are taken on an antiquarian tour of the city. For things in places, we begin with a – far from complete – survey of the names of the gods, then of animals, plants etc., and then rather perturbingly back, *via* cities in general, to places in Rome. Book 6 deals with words and things in time (and other words closely connected with them, for Varro's interest in families of words can obscure his quadruple division).<sup>43</sup> It

<sup>39</sup> Ib. 5.7-9; or, as he puts it elsewhere, with Chrysippus and Antipater as well as Aristophanes (of Byzantium) and Apollodorus, 6.2. As a follower of Antiochus and his Academy Varro did not have to toe the Stoic line, but he claims that the discoveries of the scholars are less valuable than those of the philosophers, as the words of the poets are pleasing rather than useful; the scholars have more learning, if less acumen, however.

<sup>40</sup> Most recently, W. Pfaffel, *Quartus Gradus Etymologiae* (1981). Varro's root words seem to be often verbs, sometimes nouns.

<sup>41</sup> Lucr. 5.1022, 1029ff., opposing the idea of a single name-giver.

<sup>42</sup> *De LL* 5.11.

<sup>43</sup> In 6.36 he notes that if there are 1000 *primigenia*, as a certain Cosconius claims, we can easily reach 5 million words by derivation from these.

includes words to do with time itself, its measurement and the calendar; then verbs and verbal nouns. Varro notices, but might as a believer in 'Aeolism' be more disturbed by it, that few verbs, unlike nouns, seem to come from the Greek, though he lists those he thinks do.<sup>44</sup> Book 7, on the words of the poets, is brief, confused and disappointing. Varro is aware that his treatment here is incomplete, but is impatient with the subject, holding that if poetry only explained the ancient words it preserves it would 'bear more fruit'.<sup>45</sup>

In the second hexad, on *declinatio*, we have, not quite complete, the three theoretical books. The structure reflects the conflict between analogists and anomalists, for which Varro is our main source, though some have argued that he exaggerated or misunderstood the quarrel. Obviously both parties had to make some concessions to the facts, but one side could stress that rules and regularities did exist, and the other put weight on the exceptions. For example, the supporters of anomaly in Latin could object, says Varro, that *Perperna* was a man's name but *Alfena* a woman's, so you could not give a rule that nouns ending in *-a* were feminine.<sup>46</sup> It has been suggested that the anomalists had been influenced by the empirics in medicine, who stressed observation and would not theorise, and also that their position was easier to hold when the ordering and classification of language were not in fact far advanced. In particular, the Stoics had it seems made no distinction between derivation and inflexion, for both of which Aristotle had introduced the word *ptosis*, and which Varro feels to be at least allied and deals with under the title *declinatio* (Greek *klisis*).

In Book 8 the anomalists are made to argue rather speciously; it is not sure what sources Varro is using and unclear if there had been full-blown Roman anomalists, though perhaps *Stilo* had been something of one. Varro rejects their case, which would indeed make many sorts of linguistic enquiry impossible.<sup>47</sup> His conclusions are conciliatory, though how original it is hard to tell. *Chrysippus* the Stoic was right to show that like things are denoted by unlike words and *vice versa* (for example deponent verbs are passive in form but active in meaning and thus anomalous), but *Aristarchus* is right to tell us to follow regular patterns in morphology where usage allows. Usage and regularity both spring from custom, both must be accepted. We need to decide how far to follow or impose regularities; for some words are common property, others belong to their creators, the orator or the poet. A community should obey *ratio* and *veritas* and impose a degree of analogy, changes being gradually and tactfully made.<sup>48</sup> This is all very unlike modern linguistics, which normally eschew the prescriptive.

<sup>44</sup> *Ib.* 6.40, 96.

<sup>45</sup> *Ib.* 7.2. The poets for Varro are primarily *Ennius*, second-century dramatists and *Lucilius*. Some of their words are simply old-fashioned rather than specifically poetic, while the poets had in fact been quoted in the earlier books.

<sup>46</sup> *De LL* 8.81; or that *lepus* (hare) and *lupus* (wolf) look alike, but behave differently in oblique cases, *ib.* 8.34.

<sup>47</sup> *De LL* 9.1 is especially severe on *Crates*, who understood neither *Chrysippus* whom he followed nor *Aristarchus* whom he attacked.

<sup>48</sup> *Ib.* 9.4-5.

In Book 10 Varro proposes to develop the subject of these two principles, and makes a claim for originality: 'their foundations have not yet been laid by anyone, or their order and nature expounded as the subject demands.'<sup>49</sup> But it is clear that the Greeks have laid down the guide-lines of the discussion.

Varro now divides words into 'sterile' and 'fecund'; the latter can generate other forms (unlike say *mox* or *vix*), either by 'voluntary declension', as when Romulus formed the word Rome from his own name (and here it is clear that there can be much irregularity) or by 'natural declension', in which words are divided into those with cases, those with tenses, those with neither, those with both. He gives a detailed definition of 'likeness' in words. These are more alike if they have more similarities, but our use of the word depends on which parts resemble each other, and appearances can mislead. This is a difficult subject, he says, which writers on grammar avoid or in which they get stuck: Dionysius of Sidon reckoned with 71 distinctions, others have different totals. It is best to hold to two principles: like words must have the same *materia* (basic nature, rather unclear) and the same inflexional pattern. Varro then plunges into a mathematical discussion aimed at producing a diagrammatic schema for inflected words. In a fragment from another, unnamed, work Varro defines nature and analogy differently; nature is our unalterable inheritance of words (we cannot say *scrimbo* for *scribo*), analogy is what grammarians have made of natural speech, and distinguishes a polished speaker from an uneducated one.<sup>50</sup>

Varro has only four parts of speech: nouns (including adjectives, as usual in antiquity), verbs, participles and particles (including adverbs). These are respectively his words with cases, tenses, both and neither. He does not differentiate within the last class, the 'sterile' words, nor isolate the different conjugations of the verb. The ablative, to which there was no Greek parallel, is just called the sixth or 'Latin' case. The next generation of Roman grammarians was to remedy these omissions.

The next three books presumably dealt with declension in practice, and the last two hexads, as we saw, with 'how words are joined to make a sentence'. Gellius gives us Varro's definition of *proloquium* from Book 14, and the examples of different *proloquia* listed by Gellius may also come hence: adjunctive (hypothetical), conjunctive, disjunctive.<sup>51</sup> It is hard to see how Varro filled six books with this sort of thing, but Chrysippus' works on propositions dealt with true and false, possible and impossible, fallacious and ambiguous sentences, among other matters, and it is sometimes thought that the last hexad dealt with sentences rather from the point of view of style.

Finally we may see Varro at practical work in the books on etymology. His method is basically the Stoic one, which we described in connection with Stilo, and so not as arbitrary as it looks. One trouble is the philosophic

<sup>49</sup> Ib. 10.1. Varro insists that *declinatio* exists in all languages, though he knows that in Phoenician and Egyptian nouns do not have cases (and do in Gallic and other languages), 8.65. There are few other signs in this period of awareness of foreign languages other than Greek; if Nigidius knew Etruscan, it left no trace in surviving fragments of his grammatical works.

<sup>50</sup> GRF, Varro frag. 268: analogy is the use *sermonis a natura proditi ... secundum technicos*.

<sup>51</sup> Ib. frag. 22.

obsession with meaning, rather than purely linguistic matters; another is the ancient failure to separate roots from inflexional elements, and tendency to neglect differences in vowel quantity, perhaps a sign of the interest in the written rather than the spoken word (but odd in view of the concern with metre). And one may add, subtract, change the order of and alter letters with great freedom. Varro is vague about even sound-changes that had occurred in Latin relatively lately, and though he knows that intervocalic *-s-* has changed into *-r-* and for example *duellum* into *bellum*, he does not apply the knowledge consistently, and very rarely postulates a word no longer in use.<sup>52</sup> There are traces of 'sympathetic' etymology, already known to Lucilius; for example, words may get shorter or longer than those they derive from because they refer to something smaller or larger than the original word did: thus *laena*, a thick cloak 'equal to two togas', is so called as it uses a lot of *lana*, wool.<sup>53</sup> This is an extension of the original Stoic theory, introducing symbolism to the other principles of etymology. But Varro was cautious over the ancient *primigenia* or root-words, which he admits are often obscure: he instances *equus*, horse. He often derives Latin words from Sabine, a dialect partly of Oscan origin, occasionally from other dialects or languages; he does not try to pursue these foreign words further. Sometimes his etymologies are modelled on Greek ones, like *ignis* from *gnasci* to be born, which closely recalls *πῦρ* and *φῦο*.<sup>54</sup>

Scholars have disagreed over Varro's achievement in the *De Lingua Latina*. Certainly there are contradictions, repetitions and obscurities. But one judge at least<sup>55</sup> thinks he was more original than later Roman grammarians, who carried over from Greek, with minor modifications, a traditional schema that could not fit another language satisfactorily (though it suited Latin better than it suits the modern languages to which it was also later applied), and admires such insights as his observation that animals which are important to man's life are given names that differentiate the sexes, while others, crows for example, are not.<sup>56</sup> The basic modern criticism is the confusion of linguistic and other criteria in his sub-divisions.

Varro's lost philological works were many, and cannot be fully discussed here. To judge by the extant *De Rebus Rusticis*, incidental remarks on words and language may have appeared anywhere, and fragments to which no title is attached are unassignable. A number of works may have prepared the way for the *De Lingua Latina*, one was an epitome of it. The *De Sermone Latino* (*On Latinity*) in probably five books covered a wide field, from the best forms of words to pronunciation or intonation, metre, the doctrine of the vices and

<sup>52</sup> *De LL* 5.73; 7.26. In 6.95 he states dogmatically that *e* and *i*, *c* and *g*, 'have much in common', and in 5.138 '*l* and *s* often change places'. But note the reference back in 5.6 to a formal discussion in the lost books.

<sup>53</sup> *De LL* 5.133.

<sup>54</sup> *Ib.* 7.4; basically onomatopoeic words like *murmurari*, to murmur (6.67) and *sorbere*, gulp (6.84) are explicable *primigenia*. *Ignis*, 5.70. Ancient lexicographers rarely admit that they do not know the meaning, as opposed to the etymology, of a word.

<sup>55</sup> R.H. Robins, *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe* (1951) 54ff.

<sup>56</sup> *De LL* 9.56.

virtues of style, and how the comic poets expressed character and emotion.<sup>57</sup> Several works probably combined the historical with the prescriptive; so perhaps the early *De Antiquitate Litterarum*, dedicated to Accius, which discussed the origin, number and names of the letters, and said wrongly that the Chaldaeans invented the alphabet.<sup>58</sup> Varro, like others, held that the early Romans used fewer letters than were now employed, several of which as we saw he thought unnecessary. Somewhere he classified syllables on phonetic principles, and probably discussed sounds, and Stoic and other views on their corporeal or incorporeal nature.<sup>59</sup> He must, interestingly, have dealt somewhere with Greek, for he followed Tyrannio on accents, introducing a fourth, *media prosodia*, to the three that we still use; it marked a syllable that moved neither up, nor down, nor up and down.<sup>60</sup> His metrical writings were certainly based on Hellenistic predecessors, and concerned primarily with Greek literature, for many of the more complex metres had not yet been introduced into Latin, unless Cicero's remark that Varro himself had composed verse 'in almost every metre' is to be taken seriously.<sup>61</sup>

Varro, as we saw, said that to speak correctly was to speak *secundum technicos*, according to professors of the *ars*, and Vitruvius was apologetic about his style, which might not always follow the norms of the art of grammar<sup>62</sup> (in fact his style is unclassical, his syntax awkward and his genders uncertain). How much did the *grammatici*, with their conflicting advice about pronunciation and spelling, the correct forms and genders of words, their distinctions between apparent synonyms and their ventures into etymology, really serve the development of the language? There were those who ignored the rules of spelling and held that one should write as one spoke;<sup>63</sup> but the *grammatici* made questions of language vital to most educated men, and assured them that language could be improved by looking either to logic or to the past. Cicero may not have been exceptional when he said that one should be careful of correct expression in every utterance of one's life.<sup>64</sup> But it was above all the practising writers who turned the heavy Latin of the second century into the often elegant language of the first, by expanding the vocabulary, stripping it of its clumsier words, and perhaps most important of

<sup>57</sup> *GRF*, Varro frag. 33ff. Authority may determine a best form: e.g. *Cretenses*, Cretans, as opposed to *Cretes* (as in Greek) was used by Ennius.

<sup>58</sup> *GRF*, Varro frag. 1ff. The Phoenicians of course invented the alphabet; Varro has been confused by the 'Chaldaeans' early invention of *writing*. The problematic grammarian Ennius (Sex. Ennius), see Suet. *Gramm.* 1, perhaps late second or early first century (and not identical with the poet) wrote on 'letters and syllables' (also metre). Caesar, *GRF* frag. 4 held that the *maiores* only used eleven letters (impossible).

<sup>59</sup> *GRF*, Varro frags 243, 278.

<sup>60</sup> *Ib. id.* frag. 282.

<sup>61</sup> *Ib. id.* frag. 284ff. F. Della Corte, in *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt IX* (1962) 141. Cornelius Epicadus may have preceded Varro here, *GRF* frag. 2; *Acad.* 1.9.

<sup>62</sup> *Vitr.* 1.1.18.

<sup>63</sup> Augustus seemed to be one, Suet. *Aug.* 88.

<sup>64</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 10.7.28. 1.7.34 calls Cicero *artis huius [grammaticae] diligentissimus* and *in filio, ut epistulis apparet, recte loquendi asper quoque exactor*. Naturally he frequently quotes the forms Cicero prefers.

all developing the complexity and lucidity of its syntax, which the grammarians had probably not been able to discuss to a great extent. Varro and Nigidius were certainly not stylists themselves; but Cicero and Caesar, who were, were far from despising the theorists of language. Sallust outraged many *grammatici*, but his archaising style owed them much.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Ateius Philologus, pupil of the purist and analogist Gniphio, urged Pollio to use ordinary language and avoid Sallustian brevity and *audaciam in translationibus*; Pompeius Lenaeus catalogued Sallust's 'ignorant thefts' from old authors: Suet. *Gramm.* 10. 7; 15.2.

## CHAPTER NINE

### *Dialectica*

*Grammatica* taught the proper use of words; *dialectica* was 'knowledge of the way to argue well'.<sup>1</sup> The influence of dialectic, it may be argued, was of overwhelming importance in this period, a turning point in the intellectual history of the Romans, and recognised as such by themselves.<sup>2</sup> Not that much was actually written on the subject in Latin: the lady Dialectice, in Martianus Capella's allegory (written in the fifth century A.D.) claims that if it were not for Varro she would not be able to speak Latin at all.<sup>3</sup> She ought perhaps to have remembered Aelius Stilo's *De Proloquiis*, a work on Stoic propositional logic, though apparently an unsatisfactory one.<sup>4</sup> But the habit of approaching a subject by means of a prefatory definition, or definitions, and then treating it by dividing it into parts or aspects that are to be gone through in order, which was the main gift of *dialectica* to the Romans, could be mediated by works either in Greek or later in Latin, on grammar and rhetoric in particular, if they were already organised in this fashion. Cicero however traces the method firmly to its philosophic fountainhead in the logic of Academy, Peripatos and Stoa. Plato was concerned with it, and modern scholars have traced it back to the sophists of the fifth century B.C.<sup>5</sup>

Varro's discussion of the subject came in one of the first three books of his *Disciplinae*. Martianus Capella almost certainly used this, or at least derives from it in part, though he had other later sources too; and Varro is also thought to have provided the foundation for the unfinished treatise on dialectic attributed to St Augustine, the first couple of chapters of which are very close to Martianus' introduction.<sup>6</sup> Martianus' use of Varro is perhaps borne out by the fact that he uses *proloquium* for the Greek *axioma* or proposition, as Varro seems to have done (Cicero used *enuntiatum*, others *propositio*) and this might carry with it the basic structure of much of Martianus' book, which is also that of 'Augustine'. The first four parts of the subject are here relevant: first, *de loquendo*, which defines the words making up the dialectician's technical vocabulary – *genus* and *forma* or *species*, *differentia*, and the words for accident, property, definition, part, whole, equivocal or univocal, and so on. *De eloquendo* deals with nouns and verbs, the way in

<sup>1</sup> Augustine *De Dial.* 1.1: *dialectica est bene disserendi scientia*, perhaps from Varro. Posidonius (frag. 188 E and K) called it the science dealing with what is true, false, or neither.

<sup>2</sup> E. Rawson. *PBSR* (1978) 12.

<sup>3</sup> Martianus Capella 4. 335.

<sup>4</sup> A. Gellius 16.8.2.

<sup>5</sup> M. Fuhrmann, *Das Systematische Lehrbuch* (1960) 122ff.

<sup>6</sup> W.H. Stahl, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts I* (1971) 110ff.

which they are combined to make complete sentences (with subject, predicate, and so on), and the relations of sentences to propositions. *De proloquendo* deals with these last, which make true or false assertions, and all their different kinds, universal, particular, indefinite, comparative, negative; they differ in 'quantity' or 'quality'. The *summa proloquiorum* is concerned with the combination of propositions in syllogisms; with premise and conclusion, and the different sorts of syllogism: categorical, conditional and so on. There is nothing on fallacies, perhaps an odd gap.

'Augustine' is even less complete; in the wake of the Stoics he begins with single words and their meanings (we saw that Stoic 'logic' covered parts of grammar in our sense, but the sound of words is here said to be the province of the grammarian). Unfortunately the treatise breaks off after classifying sentences into statements, questions and so on, which are either true, false or neither, promising to discuss definition in its due place, and considering the different ways in which sentences can be obscure or ambiguous (two different characteristics).<sup>7</sup> In many ways Cicero will give a better summing up of what elementary dialectic meant to the Romans in the first century B.C.

Arguing in the *Orator* that the true orator needs to know dialectic, Cicero says that he should be trained in the school of Aristotle or of Chrysippus; elsewhere he refers to the Academy.<sup>8</sup> He must know the force, nature and kinds of words, both single and in combination; the different types of sentence; the way to judge what is false and what is true; deduction, i.e. what follows from something, and what is contradictory to it; and since there are many sorts of ambiguity, how to classify and explain these. Furthermore, in order to teach anything rationally, we must decide by defining it what is the subject that we are talking about – or our debate will get nowhere. When we have thus made plain its *genus*, it must be divided into parts, so that the whole discussion may be arranged under them. In another passage Cicero carefully distinguishes between *partitio*, listing the parts that go to make up a whole, and *divisio*, which operates with the concepts of *genus* and *species*, though because he does not like the oblique forms *specierum* and *speciebus* he will use *forma* instead of *species*.<sup>9</sup> In the *Tusculans* he implies that the Stoics are particularly concerned with definition and partition.<sup>10</sup>

When treated logically in this fashion, a subject becomes a *technê*, or in Latin *ars*. Speaking of jurisprudence in the *De Oratore*, L. Crassus is made to say that 'there has been no one to put together in classes what has been artificially separated; for nothing can be reduced to an art, unless the man who knows the material of the art he wishes to introduce also has the knowledge to make material that is not yet an art into one.' He goes on: 'almost everything that is now confined in the form of an art was once

<sup>7</sup> Martianus, loc. cit.; [Augustine] 1-2 is printed as Varro frag. 265 in *GRF*; some have thought they come from *De LL* 1, which does not seem likely.

<sup>8</sup> *Or.* 11.5-7 (cf. *Part. Orat.* 139).

<sup>9</sup> *Topica* 28ff. Cf. *DL* 7.60-2, in his summary of Stoic dialectic.

<sup>10</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 4.9. On this subject, disorders of the soul, the Peripatetics however leave aside the *spinas partiendi et definiendi*.

scattered and unorganised – music, geometry, astronomy, grammar and rhetoric. Art comes from the philosopher's ability to combine and connect. Let the object of civil law be this [a definition follows]. Then the different classes are to be marked, and reduced to a small and definite number; the classes and their subdivisions are to be delineated; names for them must be defined.<sup>11</sup>

Not surprisingly, there was great dispute in antiquity as to which subjects could aspire to the condition of an *ars*. Cicero, in the *De Oratore*, argues for a broad definition: if rules have been observed, collected, given names and divided into classes, as is obviously the case with rhetoric, then in a general sense we can talk of an *ars*.<sup>12</sup> Almost every other subject, too, can be described as an *ars* in this loose sense – generalship, politics, acting. Philodemus in his work on rhetoric grappled with the same problem of defining an art, in connection with his subject of 'sophistic rhetoric' or literary prose, and came up with a similar broad conclusion, based on the existence of rules and the common usage of the word.<sup>13</sup> We see now why Vitruvius held that the Liberal Arts were all inter-related by the possession of common principles, and that learning one helps us to learn the others.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, it was practically impossible, it was sometimes held, to learn a subject that was not an art. Others might refuse to use the term in some context, but continue to employ the method of definition and division.<sup>15</sup>

It is usually taken for granted that this is the ordinary system by which the Greeks organised their handbooks, and its adoption by the Romans does not command much attention. But we shall see that it was not adopted without effort and difficulty, and that it was applied to many different kinds of work. Nothing, for instance, could be less like textbooks than Cicero's mature treatises; but he carefully explains in the *De Re Publica* how one must start, in any subject, if one wants to avoid error, by seeing what its name means. Having decided what the *res publica* is he will go on to discuss its different forms, though, since he is writing for intelligent men on a well-known subject, he will not aim at the absolutely complete account, with repeated signposting by definitions, that a teacher might give.<sup>16</sup> In his other treatises too the framework is there, often unobtrusively, but not employed in a mechanical fashion.

It may seem odd that the development of this important capacity of understanding and organisation in the Romans can best be traced in writings on agriculture, but this is the case, largely because the one second-century prose work that we have for comparison is the Elder Cato's *De Agricultura*. It

<sup>11</sup> *De Or.* 1.186-9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ib.* 1.108: the stricter Charmadas had defined a *technê* as dealing with matters that can be certainly and truly known, and are not merely a matter of opinion; he denied that rhetoric qualified, *ib.* 189ff.

<sup>13</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 1.69.

<sup>14</sup> Vitruv. 1.1.12.

<sup>15</sup> Dionysius Thrax (*Ars Grammatica* 1, in *GG I* 1) calls grammar only an *empeiria* but classifies firmly.

<sup>16</sup> *De Rep.* 1.38.

was of course a sign of Greek influence that he should write on this subject at all, and he may have had some acquaintance with Greek technical literature; he begins with a formal preface, and at one point he divides cabbages into three kinds and considers two aspects, their *natura* and *vis*.<sup>17</sup> But this influence is superficial and sporadic. Although it may be partly true, as has often been argued, that the confusion of the construction is due to the text being either unfinished or interpolated, the work, which seems to set out to describe in sequence the buying and fitting up of an estate, soon degenerates into a hotchpotch of instructions on various subjects connected with the land, interspersed with recipes and charms. This is most glaring at the end, where we have a model contract for the sale of lambs, advice on cypress plantations, on elm-twig brooms for scraping winejars, on making and selling wine, an injunction to drain land in winter and recommendations for planting asparagus and curing ham – on which note we end abruptly, without having been told anything about, for example, the harvest.<sup>18</sup> A desperate explanation for this has been the supposition that Cato was writing for a slave foreman, whose gangs would not be concerned with the harvest, for which extra labour would be hired.<sup>19</sup> But in fact in so far as he envisages any reader clearly, Cato seems to be addressing the proprietor, as one would expect. It is best to accept that the work is simply somewhat primitive; other undeveloped cultures can show similar lack of structure in their written works. It is interesting that the elder Pliny, using some of Cato's prescriptions, feels impelled to reorganise them into 'classes based on their use'.<sup>20</sup>

The fame of its author kept Cato's book well-known, but the most widely read work on agriculture at the end of the second century was the Latin translation of the huge work in 28 books in Punic of Mago the Carthaginian (conceivably a corpus that went under Mago's name as the Hippocratic corpus did under that of Hippocrates).<sup>21</sup> The Senate had ordered, it seems, a committee under the Roman most accomplished in the Punic language, D. Silanus, to undertake the translation (the only example of Punic influence in literary matters and almost the only one of senatorial intervention). How far the translators adapted the work to Italian conditions we do not know, nor how it was organised; but Pliny suggests that Mago knew Greek agricultural writers. A Greek translation was also made, perhaps in the early years of the first century, by Cassius Dionysius of Utica; it compressed and completed Mago (might it also have re-organised him?) in twenty books. In Varro's time and later this seems to have been more commonly used in Rome than the archaic Latin version.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Cato *De Agr.* 157.

<sup>18</sup> *Id. ib.* 150ff.

<sup>19</sup> K.D. White, *ANRW* I 4, 439.

<sup>20</sup> Pliny *NH* 29.16.

<sup>21</sup> J. Heurgon, *CRAI* (1976) 441. Varro refers to a *plostellum punicum* used in threshing, especially in Spain, *De RR* 1.52.1.

<sup>22</sup> Pliny *NH* 18.22, Varro *De RR* 1.10. Cassius Dionysius (who possibly took his name from the Cassius Longinus found in Africa in 111) dedicated his work to a praetor P. Sextilius, perhaps the man who was in Africa in the eighties, *MRR* II 41. An epitome in six books was also

Mago seems to be the ruling authority in 91 B.C., to judge from the *De Oratore*. It was probably then a little later that the work attributed to Saserna or the Sasernae appeared – perhaps begun by a single author and added to or edited by his son.<sup>23</sup> It consisted of *libri* in the plural, and so was on a larger scale than Cato's single book. What is important to us is that Varro attacked its omission to define its field, and the resulting inclusion of irrelevant subjects like brick-working (if brickworks, why not mines?) and of charms against the gout. Varro also complains that, like Cato, Saserna did not give general rules for the ratio between jobs and man-hours, and that the work was too tied to the conditions of Cisalpine Gaul to be useful outside it. There are signs also that Saserna was confused by the fact that Mago wanted vines (in Africa) to face north, while Cato said that they should face south; he himself veered between north, south and east. He probably had read some Greek sources; he was aware of theories of changes of climate and soil, and Columella indeed regards him as more 'learned' than Cato. But it is clear that the work was still immature.

We know wretchedly little about the probably much more sophisticated Cn. Tremellius Scrofa, who is a character in Varro's dialogue *De Re Rustica* and author of a work that was the first, according to Columella, to introduce eloquence to Latin writings on farming.<sup>24</sup> The rules of rhetoric, it may be noted, were as much concerned with order as with style. Exactly when he wrote is uncertain; he should be praetor before 67, the dramatic date of Varro's *De Re Rustica* 2, where he appears as having already held this office. The lack of any reference to Scrofa's writings in Varro is hard to understand, although we could assume that they appeared after 67, when Varro's Book 2 is set, and even after his book 1, set and conceivably written in the fifties.

Some have thought Varro's silence due to the fact that he is plundering his predecessor wholesale. Martin even believes that Scrofa's views can be reconstructed from the *De Re Rustica*; he lays particular stress on the insistence of Varro's Scrofa that agriculture is an *ars* and a *scientia*, that is to say that it can be reduced to rules and systematised.<sup>25</sup> But when Martin argues that Varro is parodying Scrofa's passion for subdivisions it becomes hard to follow him – the other characters show much the same tendency, as does Varro in all his other works. The dialogue tradition did not encourage historical accuracy (though the treatises of Cicero form something of an exception), and Varro's largely arbitrary collection of men with names lending themselves to agricultural puns suggests he did not worry much about the verisimilitude of the words he put in their mouths. This being so, we must get what information we can out of Scrofa's fragments, mostly

---

made by Diophanes of Bithynia, and another in two by Pollio of Tralles, who taught in Rome 'under Pompey', says the Suda (really somewhat later). Columella (12.4.2) refers also to the work of a Hamilcar, followed by Greek authors; it is not known if it was familiar to the Romans from any other source.

<sup>23</sup> F. Speranza, *Helikon* (1971-2) 446.

<sup>24</sup> P.A. Brunt, *CR* (1972) 304.

<sup>25</sup> R. Martin, *Recherches sur les Agronomes Latins* (1971) 237.

quotations by Columella. He clearly knew Greek sources, for Columella says that in his theory that the land was gradually becoming exhausted he was 'misled by too much regard for ancient authorities which discuss similar matters'.<sup>26</sup>

Whatever Scrofa's work was like, with Varro we breathe an air totally different from that of Cato's *De Agriculture*. It is the only one of Varro's multifarious productions to survive entire. It is not a mere text-book; Book 1 is dedicated to his wife, doubtless elderly in 37 when the preface if not the whole work was written, and the others are addressed to friends; the dialogue convention, learned references and literary digressions attest the author's aspiration to artistic form, and indeed the settings and characters are vividly and often amusingly evoked. Possibly Varro was taking up the challenge of a passage in Cicero's *De Finibus*, which claims that the subject of agriculture is quite unsusceptible of literary refinement, though it has developed a technical vocabulary.<sup>27</sup>

The preface begins firmly by explaining that the author will show what should come under the head of agriculture; he will then follow the 'natural divisions' of the subject, drawing his material from three sources, experience, reading and the advice of others. Scrofa, in whose mouth the first disquisition is put, insists that agriculture is a great and necessary *ars* and can be taught; its elements are the four elements of the world, earth, air, fire and water, its purposes are two, pleasure and profit. It is defined, and the Sasernas' brickworks repudiated; in fact, all writers, Greek, Roman and Punic, have spread their net too wide. As will become apparent, Varro believes that he is both more complete in covering and stricter in defining the subject than any of the Greeks. Agriculture has four parts, *partes*, themselves divided into at least two *species*, each with their own subdivisions. But this framework, Varro observes, is simpler than that of the philosophers, and especially than that of Theophrastus in his botanical works; strictly philosophic techniques are not suitable to a work of the present kind. In similar vein Cicero said that in speeches brief and strict definitions such as the philosophers aim at are not desirable; one often needs to dwell at length on the meaning of a word.<sup>28</sup>

Varro does not stick precisely to his proposed scheme, and there are marked gaps and confusions.<sup>29</sup> It is perhaps not very serious that what are described as the six stages of agriculture (preparation, sowing, tending, harvesting, storing and bringing out) are not equally elaborated. But when discussing the different types of vineyard Varro introduces difficulties by combining the separate question of their relative profitability. On the other hand, on enclosures, the subdivisions are more regular – we move from classes, which are defined, to subclasses, and usually examples of where each type is found

<sup>26</sup> Columella 2.1.2. Scrofa saw that Punic precedent was not always relevant to Italy. If he did not touch stock-breeding, on which Columella does not quote him (and it is with an apology that Varro *De RR* 2.4 makes him, because of his name, discuss pigs) then Varro will not have thought his definition of farming, if there was one, complete.

<sup>27</sup> *De Fin.* 3.4.

<sup>28</sup> Varro *De RR* 1.5.1-2; *De Or.* 2.107-9.

<sup>29</sup> J. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (1968) 26ff.

are given; but here we are not told which type is best. And Varro often presents a mere definitional analysis, establishing the various meanings of a word when only one is at all germane to the subject at hand (he is also inevitably prone to use etymology as a way to discover the true meaning of a word). On one occasion, having established at least 99 classes of soil, he takes fright and reduces his *discrimina*, distinctions, to only three.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, in Book 2, the 81 heads under which the keeping of flocks and herbs are to be treated do give the book a clear structure, in spite of the mass of information provided, and anyway are treated with some humour. There are here three classes of stockbreeding, each with three components, in respect of each of which nine points are to be treated. One wonders if Varro, in imposing this elegant symmetry, really thought he was following the *naturales divisiones* of the subject.

Book 3 claims that while in the course of time agriculture was divided into agriculture proper and the breeding and herding of stock, no previous writer has clearly distinguished the keeping of animals in the fields from the keeping of them in and around the villa itself (poultry, bees, etc. are in question). Some have erroneously treated this last with agriculture proper, while it is really *pastio*, animal husbandry, and has not been *explicata*, analytically developed, in its entirety and by itself, by anyone, as far as Varro knows. So there are three *genera* of *res rusticae*, corresponding to the work's three books. One notes the loose use of terms: *villatica pastio* is first a part of *pastio*, which is itself a part of *res rusticae*, but then it is promoted to be one of the three parts of this last.<sup>31</sup> For Varro's deficiencies in the use of his method it is possible to blame haste, or advanced age, or sometimes even corruption of the text;<sup>32</sup> but in general the Romans did not find this method easy to handle elegantly. Varro's penchant for certain numbers and his use of them in making his subdivisions is usually seen as springing from the number-mysticism of the Pythagoreans, according to whose rites we know that he desired to be buried.<sup>33</sup> But there is little parallel for such mysticism taking quite this form, and it would seem best to suppose that it has been crossed, in Varro, with the eager desire of his time to introduce dialectical principles of organisation.

It is then not clear exactly when these principles were introduced into Latin works on farming, but it looks as if it was by stages, with work still left for Varro to do after the middle of the century. When the change came in other subjects can sometimes be surmised. We have seen that the Greeks had done much classification in grammar by the early first century, but that Aelius Stilo had been so obscure in his book on *proloquia*, which we are told he seemed to have written rather as notes for himself than in a manner designed to teach others, that Gellius had to fall back on Greek works, which at least defined what an *axioma*, a proposition, was.<sup>34</sup> We have also seen the complex

<sup>30</sup> Varro *De RR* 1.9.

<sup>31</sup> *Id. ib.* 3.1.8-9.

<sup>32</sup> For the last, D.O. Ross, *CPh* (1979) 52.

<sup>33</sup> For arithmology see below, Chapter 11; burial, Pliny, *NH* 35.160.

<sup>34</sup> p. 120.

organisation that Varro imposed on the *De Lingua Latina*; the fourfold division that he used for words – places, things in places, time, things in time – was such a favourite with him that he apparently used it even in the handbook on senatorial procedure that he wrote for Pompey in 71.<sup>35</sup> We shall see in the next chapter that, where rhetoric is concerned, the little work of M. Antonius, written in the nineties and pretty clearly not in the form of an *ars*, was replaced soon after by the Greek-style *artes* of the young Cicero and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, though the Greeks themselves had not quite completed the job yet, and figures of speech and thought remained to be classified. In law there is great dispute as to how important the influence of dialectic was and when it came; the discussion of this must also be put off. Where philosophy is concerned, a pre-technical stage in Latin writing on the subject is at first sight apparent. Cicero has a complete contempt for the vulgar Epicurean writers such as Amafinius and Rabirius: ‘they give no definitions, make no divisions, come to no neatly argued conclusions’, and in short they do not accept that there is any *ars* of speaking or discussion. However, this may not be because they are Roman or Italian primitives, but because they are Epicureans; Cicero criticises Epicurus himself in very similar terms,<sup>36</sup> though probably somewhat unfairly, since his approach to dialectic was in fact rather different from that of the Stoics (but the passage bears out how important Cicero thought dialectic was). It is true that the familiar analytic method is not very much used, it seems, in the works of the Epicurean Philodemus. But Varro ran riot with analysis in his philosophical works. In his *De Philosophia* he elaborated the incomplete *Carneadea divisio*, the list given by Carneades of the possible ‘ends’ in life, and reached the number 288; having done this, he showed that some of his variables are unimportant (such as whether one practises the Cynic way of life) and worked back to what he held to be the one correct position, that of Antiochus’ Stoicising Academy.<sup>37</sup> Even religious matters and the gods themselves could be classified, as we shall see *à propos* of the *Antiquitates Divinae*; equally Nigidius’ *De Deis*, though we do not know how it was organised overall, notes that Orpheus and others have distinguished the gods by kinds (*genera*) and ages, and that the Etruscans say there are four different classes of Penates.<sup>38</sup> Cicero’s Etruscan friend Caecina classified thunderbolts to some extent, though the younger Seneca was to say that a Greek teacher of his, a Stoic, had done it much better.<sup>39</sup> The letter on electioneering attributed to Q. Cicero (which may or may not be genuine) is full of classification – one is dependent on the support of (a) one’s friends, (b) the People; one’s friends fall into a number of classes, there are different ways of conciliating the People.<sup>40</sup> This work describes itself as a *commentariolum*, and shows us that works unpretentiously called

<sup>35</sup> A. Gellius 14.7.

<sup>36</sup> *Acad.* 1.5, *De Fin.* 1.22.

<sup>37</sup> *Aug. CD* 19. 1-3.

<sup>38</sup> *Nig. Fig.* frags 67, 68 Swob.

<sup>39</sup> Seneca *NQ* 2.39, 48-50.

<sup>40</sup> J. Richardson, *Historia* (1971) 436. The work is often thought to be a later literary exercise.

*commentarii*, notes or aides-memoires, need by no means be innocent of dialectic influence. Similar patterns have been traced even in Varro's *Menippean Satires*, humorous and fantastic works partly in verse; convincingly, since Cicero attests the influence of dialectic on the work.<sup>41</sup> Finally, it was possible to write biographies not so much chronologically as *per species*, under the headings of various qualities of character and so on, though the main representative of this genre in Latin is the much later Suetonius.

Almost as surprisingly to our eyes, Vitruvius had some success in the analytic treatment of architecture; his work is one of the best examples of the first-century urge for classification, and it has been recognised that his chief claim to originality is his systematic plan. In the preface to book 4 he says that when he saw that many persons had left works on the rules of architecture and volumes of commentaries that were not organised, *ordinata*, but had merely taken them up, to leave them to wander like atoms, he thought it a worthy and useful task to reduce the mass of the subject to a perfect order, *ordinationem*, and to explain in the several books the nature of the parts, *genera*, assigned to each of them. Book 1 indeed sets out doggedly on the task of listing and defining the various skills and qualities the architect should have, and the various aspects of architecture itself (*ordinatio, dispositio* and *oeconomia*, with their *species*, subdivisions); and then its three parts, the making of buildings, sundials and machines. Buildings are divided into public and private, and public buildings into buildings for worship and buildings for convenience. These should all possess, in Sir Henry Wotton's famous rendering, 'commodity, firmness and delight'. The rest of the work is organised according to these three parts of architecture and their subdivisions, including many that only emerge in the course of the work, and Vitruvius halts repeatedly to remind us of his plan. There are a good many awkwardnesses, partly due to the use of various different sources, for example in books 3 and 4, which deal with the architectural Orders.<sup>42</sup>

Vitruvius ends book 10 by saying that he has written *de singulis generibus et partibus* of architecture, so that the whole work contains, clearly laid out (*explicata*), all the departments of the subject.<sup>43</sup> Again, the work aims at being a little more than a textbook; Vitruvius is addressing an at least partly lay readership, for whom he shows off his general education, and tries to make the going easier by rather awkward historical and literary digressions. It is certainly a mistake to suppose that Vitruvius' interest in systematisation is merely due to the influence of Varro's book on architecture in the *Disciplinae* (which is also not necessarily earlier than Vitruvius' conception of his programme); for one thing, Vitruvius' classification is much more straightforward in character than Varro's usually is. In fact, he dislikes the proliferation of subdivisions, and thus fails to do justice to the variety of Greek architecture before his time, tending to seem narrow and autocratic. The method was not so easy to apply as it might seem. As Plato said of dialectic in

<sup>41</sup> U. Knoche, *Roman Satire* (Eng. tr. 1975) 68-9, cf. *Acad.* 1.8, *multa dicta dialectice*.

<sup>42</sup> P. Gros, *Latomus* (1975) 986.

<sup>43</sup> *Vitr.* 10.16.12.

a different context, it is (not very hard to explain, but extremely hard to employ'.<sup>44</sup>

What of the biological sciences, in which taxonomy has often been of great importance? We do not have the evidence to say how far the Romans of this period, no great scientists, adopted the classifications of Aristotle and Theophrastus; in fact, Aristotle had been pessimistic about the possibility of a classification of biological organisms by strictly essential characteristics, and the great days of classificatory biology only began with the Renaissance.<sup>45</sup> Pompeius Lenaeus' adaptation of Mithridates' work on pharmaceutical botany, which Pliny calls the first on its subject in Latin, does at least seem to have tried to describe different kinds of, for example, laurel, of which it produced more than Cato had known.<sup>46</sup> And Cloatius Verus (late Republican or early Augustan in date) listed the different varieties or *genera* of nuts, apples, pears and other fruits, possibly other vegetables and plants too, in a work called, curiously, *Ordinata Graeca*; but the title is well attested. Since many of the varieties he lists are Italian, the title cannot mean 'Greek things set in order'; can it mean 'Things set in order in the Greek way', in other words distinguished into classes? This was how Vitruvius used the word *ordinare*.

Within each class, Cloatius sets out his varieties in alphabetic order. Here was another new principle of organisation, this one due to the grammarians of Alexandria; Cloatius was basically a *grammaticus*. At this period it was only rarely employed in an administrative context in Ptolemaic Egypt, and not at all, it seems, in Rome.<sup>47</sup> But alphabetisation, though still only taking account of the first letter of a word, was used in some, though not all, Greek glossaries and lexica; it seems that it was employed in Philoxenus' work on the 'prototypes' of words. Varro in the *De Lingua Latina* quotes the comedies of Naevius in alphabetic order,<sup>48</sup> and the alphabetic order of Plautus' plays in our manuscripts may go back to him. Of course, there were works that were arranged in neither of the ways we have been examining, for example as commentaries on a pre-existent text, or simply as miscellanies, what the Greeks called *Atakta*.

By the first century A.D. some of the convert's zeal for systematisation may have passed in Rome. In agronomy, Columella's work is lucidly organised, but much more simply than Varro's, which it probably implicitly criticises: it is not the duty of a scientific farmer to list every variety of soil, nor of an *ars* to digress in pursuit of all the innumerable *species*, but only to advance through

<sup>44</sup> Plato *Philebus* 16c.

<sup>45</sup> D.H. Balme, *CQ* (1962) 81; but note the comic poet Epicrates' skit on the classification of vegetables in the Academy (Kock II 287): Plato encourages his pupils to decide on the pumpkin, and someone classifies it as a tree.

<sup>46</sup> Pliny *NH* 15.127.

<sup>47</sup> *GRF*, Cloatius Verus frags 6-10; *Vitr.* 4 *praef.* 1. L.W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization* (1967) 54 thinks it was the use of this alphabetic principle that determined Cloatius' title.

<sup>48</sup> Varro *De LL* 7.107.

the *genera*, which are manageable by both reader and writer.<sup>49</sup> Both in Greek and Latin, however, new classificatory work was still being done, and its principles were being discussed by Greek philosophers. For example, Andronicus of Rhodes, who probably worked in Rome or Italy on the copies of Aristotle's works in the library once belonging to Apellicon, little if at all after our time, wrote a work specifically *On Division*.<sup>50</sup>

Here then is one of the most vital lessons learned by the Romans from the Greeks. To some extent one might compare the passion for Aristotelian logic that seized intelligent minds in the eleventh and more fully in the twelfth centuries, leading to the great advances in intellectual achievement of the High Middle Ages; when logic, as R.W. Southern has said, was 'an instrument of order in a chaotic world'.<sup>51</sup> It penetrated and transformed theology, law and political thought. The Middle Ages were to be obsessed with syllogisms, while the Romans were primarily concerned with definition and division. But both movements were of profound importance for Western civilisation. We, who have Greek logic in our bloodstream, often find it hard to realise what it is like to be without it.

<sup>49</sup> Columella 2.2.2.

<sup>50</sup> Boethius *De Div.* 875d, Migne lxiv.

<sup>51</sup> *The Making of the Middle Ages* (1953) 179.

## CHAPTER TEN

# Rhetoric

Dialectic was not enough to teach one to manage every form of discourse. The pleading of a case in court, the recommending of a course of action in Senate or Assembly, eulogy and invective, all had to be not only well argued but clearly organised as speeches, as well as brilliantly ornamented and effectively put across. There must have been many Romans of the later second century B.C. for whom the rules of rhetoric, far from appearing a straightjacket (and there was after all much choice built into them) helped to produce order out of chaos. Even the vigorous Elder Cato, as the sympathetic Aulus Gellius admits, had not managed to organise his famous speech for the Rhodians in a satisfactory fashion.<sup>1</sup> It is after all harder than might at first be thought to achieve even a coherent narrative of complex events (often needed in a speech), as many a mediaeval chronicle will show. Rhetoric then was profoundly relevant to the historian, as well as to the orator proper, quite apart from the tradition of inserting speeches into a historical work. Indeed it was vital to the writer of any kind of artistic prose. It is even, says Cicero, useful for cultivated conversation.<sup>2</sup>

Yet teachers of rhetoric, as we saw, did not rank high in society, and there was fear of the power that skill in speaking might give unsuitable people. And among the Greeks a battle had raged on the nature and proper field of rhetoric, vis-à-vis those of philosophy. Isocrates had declared that broad, moral, but basically rhetorical training *was* a philosophical one; Plato notoriously demoted rhetoric, as an art, to the status of cookery; Aristotle tried to rehabilitate it, though holding that its arguments could not provide strict logical proof. The battle swayed to and fro, rhetoricians and philosophers both at times annexing part of the disputed territory; thus the Stoics thought that a proper, rational, rhetoric formed, together with dialectic, the 'logical' division of philosophy,<sup>3</sup> and the Academic Philo taught rhetoric. But it has been noted that the three distinguished philosophers who visited Rome in 155 B.C. were all in different ways opposed to rhetoric, at least as commonly practised – Carneades the Academic Sceptic, Critolaus the Peripatetic, and Diogenes of Babylon the Stoic. And there can be little doubt that (*pace* Philodemus) Epicurus had no place for it at all. On the other side,

<sup>1</sup> A. Gellius 6.3.

<sup>2</sup> *De Or.* 1.32.

<sup>3</sup> They influenced a few Romans in the late second/early first century, notably Q. Tubero and Rutilius Rufus. Tubero could 'dispute', but not 'speak', *Brutus* 117; Rutilius was notorious for concision and a reliance on rational argument, with unsuccessful results, *De Or.* 1.227, *Brutus* 113ff.

the distinguished rhetors who worked in Rhodes, Apollonius 'Malakos' and Apollonius Molon, wrote works entitled *Against Philosophy*.

If we had Philodemus' work *On Rhetoric* in more satisfactory form we should know rather more of the debate. Though it was written in Italy, perhaps in the seventies, it seems to depend closely on the works of Philodemus' master Zeno of Sidon,<sup>4</sup> who had an un-Epicurean regard for literary style, and it is perhaps for this reason that it deals largely with the arguments of Critolaus and Diogenes, and even earlier figures. Philodemus is here not writing a handbook of rhetoric, but a polemical work about it on a more general level – and tediously repetitive, like most of his prose works, it seems to have been.

As usual with Philodemus, the fragmentary state of the treatise means that it is difficult to make sense of, though parts are better preserved than any of his other writings. It is not always easy to see to whom the different arguments are attributed. But it is fairly clear that Philodemus is forcing the interpretation of various passages of Epicurus' *On Rhetoric* and other works in order to find authority for his own view that 'sophistic' rhetoric – basically epideictic or display rhetoric, as opposed to judicial or political speechmaking – is an art, though this status has been denied it. Certainly the terminology that Philodemus uses is not Epicurus' own, however loyal a follower he tries to show himself.

Philodemus defines *technê*, art, referring to his friend Bromius' work *On Arts* and refuting various rival definitions, many of which he considers too narrow. His own is sanctioned, he claims, by usage: it is simply that fundamental principles have been observed which apply in a majority of cases.<sup>5</sup> 'Sophistic' oratory, written as much as spoken, is an art, for which rules can be given; what he means, of course, is simply literary prose. His chief example is Isocrates, though Isocrates' own belief that rhetoric trains for political life and has political and moral content is rejected. Rather, 'sophistic' rhetoric is an art, but, like logic, a 'useless' art, in that it is not concerned with content. There was some discussion of the moral neutrality of sophists, who may lavish their eulogies on bad men, as Isocrates did on Busiris.

'Sophistic' rhetoric then is a matter of form and style alone. Philodemus discusses what he considers the rules for style in some detail, advocating a 'naturally beautiful' manner as opposed to the arbitrary and high-flown one of the pupils of Gorgias, of the historian Cleitarchus, the 'Asianist' rhetor Hegesias and others who over-use metaphors. He deprecates taking a model to copy – people differ in their preferences, for example between Isocrates and Thucydides, and Isocrates for one had several different styles.<sup>6</sup> 'Hellenism', the standard of pure Greek (a subject of concern to rhetoric as well as *grammatica*) is considered, but Philodemus is not yet an out-and-out Atticiser, for all that he seems to have thought the past could show better orators, philosophers, doctors and poets than the present, and took almost all his

<sup>4</sup> Philod. *Rhet* 1.78 Sudh.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. 1.64, 69.

<sup>6</sup> Op. cit. 1.152-3.

historical examples from classical Athens. He makes, in fact, no mention of any contemporary 'sophist'. He also discusses ornamentation, that is the use of figures of thought and diction, and also allegory, solecism, and, not without contempt, delivery.<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, successful persuasion in legal or political matters is, he thinks, wholly dependent on experience and knowledge of the past, not on rules, and so does not deserve to be called an art, even a 'conjectural' art; it is rather a skill resembling that of the merchant, hunter or thief. A man wholly without training in sophistic rhetoric can be a good politician, while sophists (e.g. Isocrates) are usually failures in courts and assemblies; most of the Athenian orators ended as exiles. Critolaus is probably quoted as saying that the Spartans and Romans, prime examples of wise and successful peoples, carry on their public life without rhetoric; perhaps even a Greek could not have said this of the latter in his own person in the seventies. Some of the most famous Athenian orators never studied rhetoric, notably Demades and Aeschines, though Demosthenes admittedly did; Homer's heroes felt no need for it. The *theorēmata* of political and judicial rhetoric may be false, and it often fails to achieve its end; no true art is so chancy. What is valuable in it is stolen from the *dialectici* and representatives of other arts.<sup>8</sup>

All suggestions that rhetoric has any sort of content are rejected – for example, the claim of the fourth-century philosopher, the 'Democritean' Nausiphanes, much attacked by Epicurus, that only the natural scientist, by which he seems to mean the psychologist, can be an effective public speaker. Aristotle, who had admitted rhetoric as a proper study for the philosopher, is not spared; he should have left it to Isocrates. Diogenes of Babylon is attacked for claiming that the Stoic sage is the only true orator – no statesman, not even the Athenian Phocion, has in that case qualified as an orator or ever will. And the life of the philosopher is shown as far above that of the sophist, let alone that of the speaker in public life, with all its attendant anxieties: look at the wretched deaths of the great Athenian statesmen.<sup>9</sup>

Philodemus' work was probably far from complete. He does not seem to have taken account of the claims of the rhetoricians themselves, for example that of the most influential late Hellenistic rhetorician, Hermagoras of Temnus, who held that the material of rhetoric (by which he meant basically judicial rhetoric) included general as well as particular 'political' cases: not only 'should Orestes be punished for killing his mother?' but 'should matricides be punished?'<sup>10</sup> This was a position that the Stoic Posidonius felt obliged to refute, in his lecture delivered before Pompey, doubtless on the ground that these general questions, *theses* as opposed to *hypotheses* in Hermagoras' terminology, belonged to the philosopher.<sup>11</sup> And Philodemus

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit. 1.73.

<sup>8</sup> Op. cit. 1.14; 2.97.

<sup>9</sup> Op. cit. 2.202; 1.250, 359.

<sup>10</sup> For Hermagoras see D. Matthes, *Lustrum* (1958) and *Hermagorae Temnitae: Test. et Frag.* (1962).

<sup>11</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 42.5. Posidonius had his own classification of *staseis* (bipartite, with subdivisions), Quint. 3.6.37.

was hardly up to date; he does not seem to have taken account of the Academic Philo, who tried to reconcile rhetoric and philosophy, teaching both,<sup>12</sup> and may have had influence on Cicero's ideal of the (political) orator with profound philosophical training. At all events, Philodemus' work was unlikely to cut much ice with the Romans, who were finding the ordinary rhetorical training for courts and political gatherings of great practical use.

The word *rhetorica* first occurs in Latin in a fragment of Ennius; at this time Greek rhetoric was perhaps better known to the Romans through the flowery speeches to which, in the Senate or abroad, they were subjected, than through formal study. This is probably true of the Elder Cato, though he committed some thoughts on the subject to papyrus, perhaps as part of his educational work for his son rather than in a separate book.<sup>13</sup> These thoughts included his famous definition of an orator as *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, and his equally famous adjuration, *rem tene verba sequuntur*. About this time formal rhetoric was beginning to be taught by Greeks at Rome; but nothing else that we can at all grasp, or that Quintilian was to know, was written in Latin until the 'very thin' little book of the distinguished orator M. Antonius, though Suetonius says that early *grammatici* also taught rhetoric and left many *commentarii* on it.<sup>14</sup> Cicero makes Antonius say in the *De Oratore* that his work had been published without his knowledge, and Quintilian says that it was 'incomplete'.<sup>15</sup> It did not, Cicero said, give a *disciplina dicendi*, and he makes Antonius say that it contains the fruit of experience, not learning, and indeed, rather surprisingly for this date, that he had not studied the *ars*, i.e. the system of rules. There can thus be little doubt that his work was not organised as an *ars*, in the systematic fashion we have met, and this is also suggested by the fact that Antonius is made by Cicero the mouthpiece of an attack on the definitions of the *dialectici* and the divisions of the rhetors, though doubtless in more sophisticated terms than he could really have commanded.<sup>16</sup>

Cicero quotes Antonius as saying in his book that he has seen many fluent speakers (*diserti*), but no truly eloquent one; even a god could hardly portray such a man.<sup>17</sup> Since *disertus* seems to mean intelligent and clear, and *eloquens* elaborately elegant, it looks as if expectations are rising – unless this interpretation is Cicero's own. How much else of what Cicero puts under Antonius' name in the dialogue is really his is uncertain, but it would be like Cicero to use a character's own writings where he could. Antonius advised that the orator should try to hide his *eloquentia* in order to avoid distrust,<sup>18</sup> but he was certainly not totally innocent of Greek learning, for Quintilian

<sup>12</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.9.

<sup>13</sup> A. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (1978), App. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 4.6.

<sup>15</sup> *De Or.* 1.94, 208; *Quint.* 3.1.19. Cicero would probably have mentioned any intervening Latin writings in the *De Oratore*, and Quintilian clearly knew nothing else.

<sup>16</sup> *De Or.* 2.77ff.

<sup>17</sup> *De Or.* 1.94.

<sup>18</sup> *Quint.* 12.9.5 (under the head of *actio*, delivery, though it is not clear that this is the most relevant aspect). Presumably from Antonius' *libellus*.

shows that he knew the doctrine always associated with Hermagoras of Temnus, though not invented by him, that of the *staseis* or issues of a judicial speech. According to Hermagoras, who wrote his *Technai Rhetorikai* in six books somewhere around 150 B.C., issues arose either from fact, or from the interpretation of legal documents. There were four subdivisions under each head. The issue of fact was the more important for the rhetoricians: the four subdivisions were as follows. First, did the accused commit the deed? Second, was it a case of the crime alleged (e.g. sacrilege rather than simple theft)? Third, was there some special justification for the accused (and here various further subdivisions were listed)? Fourth, is the court in some way incompetent to try the case (various ways in which it might be so were given)? This last *stasis* had been added to the others by Hermagoras. But Antonius only had the first three, and must have been using either an earlier, or perhaps more likely a later, adapted, tradition.

It appears from Quintilian's quotation of Antonius that in his day there was still no proper technical terminology in Latin for this sort of thing.<sup>19</sup> It was those who followed him, Quintilian goes on, who spoke of the three divisions of the issue of fact as *status coniecturalis*, *legalis* and *irudicialis*, and subdivided each of them. (This confirms that Antonius' work was not an *ars*, the first requirement of which is a precise vocabulary, but suggests that he was influential.) This is still not strict Hermagoreanism (it omits his fourth type). But Hermagoras, as Quintilian attests, was a dominating figure, and his dry text-book will have been well-known in Rome. Cicero, probably accurately, suggests that L. Crassus had been brought up on it, while in the so-called *De Inventione*, written in the eighties, he says that we can all observe that Hermagoras did not write eloquently himself.<sup>20</sup> In the *Brutus* Cicero notices a minor speaker as 'a product of Hermagoras' training, which lacks resources for rhetorical ornamentation, but is a convenient and easy guide to invention. It provides fixed and systematic instructions for oratory, which though they lack stylistic elaboration, being baldly expressed, are logically arranged and provide roads which keep the orator from going astray'.<sup>21</sup> Hermagoras' main interest was certainly in the finding or 'invention' of material; it was under this head that he discussed both the *thesis/hypothesis* distinction and the doctrine of *stasis*, so obviously crucial to the speaker's basic grasp of his task. He was less concerned with the other 'parts of rhetoric', which he arranged in an idiosyncratic order in which, most significantly, style was simply a subdivision of *oikonomia*, arrangement.

Quintilian says that Antonius was followed by 'less well-known' authors whom he does not name. Perhaps about 91 B.C. the young Cicero embarked on what we call his *De Inventione*, the torso of a projected systematic work on the five parts of oratory, *inventio*, *dispositio* (organisation) *elocutio* (style), *memoria* (memory) and *pronuntiatio* (delivery). It was broken off, perhaps by the

<sup>19</sup> Quint. 3.6.45: *paucae res sunt, quibus ex rebus omnes narrationes nascuntur, factum non factum, ius iniuria, bonum malum.*

<sup>20</sup> Quint. 3.1.16; *De Or.* 1.138; *De Inv.* 1.8.

<sup>21</sup> *Brutus* 263, cf. 271.

Social War and then the influence of Philo, though some have seen traces of Philo's teaching in the work. Probably only a few years later (though this early date has been queried) there was written the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which is on a smaller scale and covers all five parts.<sup>22</sup> The extreme closeness of much of its treatment of *inventio* to that of the young Cicero provides a problem; it has been suggested that both works derive from a re-working of a Latin *ars* closely based on a Greek one that combined Hermagorean with other Hellenistic ideas, the Latin *ars* itself being mediated according to some by two different teachers (to explain for example the fact that Cicero has the four Hermagorean *staseis* of fact and the *Ad Herennium* only three).<sup>23</sup> If there was such a Latin *ars*, it was probably a very recent work, for both the *De Inventione* and the *Ad Herennium* are much more advanced than we suspected Antonius was in technical vocabulary, though *constitutio* is used for the Greek *stasis* in place of the later *status*, which Cicero came in time to adopt. The three types of *constitutio* which the *Ad Herennium* has are *coniecturalis*, *legitima* and *iuridicialis*, very close to the terminology of those who came after Antonius according to Quintilian. The author of the *Ad Herennium* claims that the technical vocabulary he is using for figures of speech and thought is new and unfamiliar, indeed that it is his own, which perhaps militates against a published source, or at least one that covered all departments of the subject.<sup>24</sup>

In spite of the author's declared interest in philosophy, sometimes suspected of being Epicurean in cast,<sup>25</sup> the *Ad Herennium* is more practical and less theoretical than the *De Inventione*. It does not, like the latter, specifically claim to have used a number of sources or introduce general philosophical considerations into its prefaces; it attacks the logicians' treatment of ambiguities, which confuses people by making them look for these where it is unnecessary to do so<sup>26</sup> (the *dialectici* are primarily the Stoics; Cicero of course thought their activities valuable for the orator). The terminology is entirely Latin, with only a few references to Greek equivalents, and no Greek rhetorical source is mentioned by name, while the *De Inventione* talks of Aristotle, Hermagoras and others. The author's direct knowledge of Greek literature may be limited too. He attacks the unnecessary complications introduced by Greek writers on the art of memory in order to make it hard to learn, and his insistence on the need to invent one's own example of the figures is couched in the form of an attack on 'the Greeks'.<sup>27</sup> The historical *exempla* are more exclusively Roman than those of Cicero's work, with more

<sup>22</sup> For a date near the end of the Republic, A.E. Douglas *CQ* (1960) 65, mainly on the basis of rhythms. It is also curious that L. Crassus should be reckoned among the *antiqui* 4.2 (perhaps only meaning predecessors). But the author mentions no later speakers, or events later than the eighties, and does not know the *De Inv.* (in circulation by 55, *De Or.* 1.5). He is interested in *popularis*-style oratory, but probably not exclusively enough to qualify as a pupil of the *rhetores Latini* (which would make his closeness to the *De Inv.* hard to explain).

<sup>23</sup> Recent ed., with comm., G. Calboli (1969), *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*.

<sup>24</sup> *Ad Her.* 4.10.

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.* 1.1.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.* 2.16.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.* 4.1ff.

concentration on what were probably recent events. But the work is strictly under the spell of Greek theory none the less; there is one demurrer, where it is noted that a particular type of *constitutio* is usually argued in Rome, unlike Greece, not before the judges but in preliminary proceedings.<sup>28</sup>

That rhetoric is an *ars* the author does not doubt, laying stress on his clarity of organisation and the need to give methods and principles, which will allow one to dispense with the mass of examples given by 'the Greeks'; and he promises to give a special proof elsewhere that there is an *ars* of developing the memory. His object is to write 'briefly and clearly', and his practical didactic purpose is plain throughout, though he professes to value practice and experience as much as theory. He ends by claiming that there is nothing more to rhetoric than what he has given, though in fact he is very inadequate on rhythm and various other matters.<sup>29</sup> In general, however, the work is competent and intelligent, and as our best surviving source for the kind of rhetoric the Romans were learning in our period, though different teachers will have made minor variations, it is immensely valuable.

There are, we are told, three sorts of plea, demonstrative (epideictic), deliberative and judicial – the three kinds of speech basic to all ancient rhetoric. The orator must have five faculties, *inventio* and the rest, reached by three methods, theory (art), imitation and practice. *Inventio* is applied to the six parts of a speech, *exordium* (preface), *narratio* (narrative), *divisio* (classification of matter to be treated), *confirmatio* (proof of one's case), *confutatio* (disproof of the opponent's case), and *conclusio* (peroration);<sup>30</sup> rhetors were in fact usually most concerned with judicial speeches. Each of these parts is then treated at length, in its different varieties. (It is worth noting that like the *De Inventione* the *Ad Herennium*, discussing the rhetorical syllogism, concentrates on the number of parts it has, and their names.)<sup>31</sup> This takes two books; book 3 deals briefly with deliberative and demonstrative speech, and at last we have done with *inventio*. We move on to *dispositio*, arrangement, only to find we have dealt with it already, as the ideal order of a speech has been used for the framework of the discussion about *inventio*.<sup>32</sup> There is then a brief treatment of *pronuntiatio*, divided into voice and gesture, which includes the expression of the face as well as gesture proper. A limited number of gestures are described; in the peroration one may slap one's thigh or strike one's head, but should not imitate the artificial elegance of an actor or dancer.<sup>33</sup> The fourth function of the orator is memory, which can be natural or artificial. The latter, though studied as a part of rhetoric, can be used in many contexts. The system is to be able to visualise in order a series of *loci*, places, real or imaginary, such as different rooms in a house or points in a town, and then on different occasions to set against each of these an image

<sup>28</sup> Op. cit. 1.22.

<sup>29</sup> Op. cit. 4.69.

<sup>30</sup> Op. cit. 1.3ff.

<sup>31</sup> Op. cit. 2.28; *De Inv.* 1.57.

<sup>32</sup> *Ad Her.* 3.16.

<sup>33</sup> Op. cit. 3.27.

which calls up 'things', or facts, one wants to remember. The author's images, or at least some of them, seem to be little scenes involving one or more persons engaged in striking activities, and made vivid by unusual dress or some special mark; these scenes remind us of the fact we want to remember by some play on words. It is more complex and difficult to have an image for every word one wants to recall; most Greek sources have listed images for up to a thousand words, but we are told it is better to invent one's own, and that to develop an artificial memory for words is valuable for training, but what the orator needs is a memory for 'things'. Very hard work is necessary to develop the power. Cicero says so too, and makes it clear that some people rejected the system as in fact crushing to the memory; but it was probably quite widely practised in Rome (certainly by Lucullus, and probably by the great orator Hortensius).<sup>34</sup>

Book 4 of the *Ad Herennium* deals with *elocutio*, style. It opens with a justification of the author's intention to invent his own examples (except for faults) instead of quoting as the Greeks do; invented examples are clearer and show that the author can practise what he preaches. In fact, this has been thought to come from a Greek rhetor's attack on Hermagoras; some Greek rhetoricians had certainly invented their own examples, and in practice those of our author are often just Latin elaborations of well-known tags from the Greek orators.

We are introduced to the three styles, the grand, middle and low, and their corresponding vices. Good style is based on *elegantia*, *compositio* and *dignitas*. *Elegantia* rests on *Latinitas*, correct Latin, and *explanatio*, perspicuity (the choice of natural and proper words for the subject on hand). *Compositio* is a matter of juxtaposing letters and words pleasingly, avoiding hiatus (one word ending and the next starting with a vowel), too much alliteration, and awkward word order. *Dignitas* is attained by the use of *exornationes*, ornaments, the term here used for the Greek *schēmata*, figures of speech and thought. No less than 64 of these are listed and exemplified; the title of some to either status is dubious, and the division between the two not clear. It is possible that Hermagoras had not dealt with them at all.

The figures were not to be properly classified even by the Greeks till the early imperial period, but the ten figures of speech that the Stoics called tropes are grouped under a rather vague definition as words not used in their proper senses.<sup>35</sup> This has suggested that the *Ad Herennium* ultimately reflects the teaching at Rhodes, where Stoicism flourished. We may note the advice against over-use of certain figures, which will appear 'puerile', and remember

<sup>34</sup> Op. cit. 3.28ff; *De Or.* 2.351ff. (the system is all right if you have the basic capacity); *Acad.* 2.1.2. Hortensius' phenomenal memory, *Brutus* 301. The archaic poet Simonides was credited with the first memory system; Metrodorus of Scepsis, who left Athens and philosophy for Mithridates' court, rhetoric and politics, was said to have perfected it, probably by producing a complex memory-system for words, using 360 different places based on the signs of the Zodiac. This may be one of the complicated systems the *Ad Her.* rejects; Cicero knew Metrodorus' memory was famous, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.59, *De Or.* 2.369, and may have known his system.

<sup>35</sup> *Ad Her.* 4.42.

that the Rhodians opposed the wilder excesses of Asianic floridity.<sup>36</sup> Stoic influence has been seen elsewhere, and so have a few echoes of Rhodian life or attested teaching, such as the advice that a peroration should be brief, for 'nothing dries more quickly than a tear'.<sup>37</sup> At all events, an interest in figures reflects recent Hellenistic rhetoric; the figures of speech include repeated words, exclamation, rhetorical question and so on; the figures of thought include the division of a concept into its parts, the use of examples, of dialogue, of direct speech by a real or imaginary figure, and so forth.

It is possible that the Stoic Rutilius Rufus, writing his memoirs some time after his exile in the late nineties, discussed oratory in Rome, doubtless in the context of his own sober and unsuccessful defence at his trial, and attacked two of the most famous speeches ever delivered in Rome, Ser. Galba's emotional and theatrical self-defence on a charge of extortion, and L. Crassus' demagogic speech on behalf of a bill about the jury-courts; it may also be he who described the three philosophers visiting Rome in 155 as representatives of three styles of oratory, Carneades violent and rapid, Critolaus clever and polished, Diogenes serious and restrained.<sup>38</sup> Where works on rhetoric are concerned, Quintilian mentions a few other writers from our period.<sup>39</sup> Cicero's great rival in his earlier years, Hortensius, wrote on *loci communes*, 'common-places' or general topics that might be used in various speeches, such as arguments for or against relying on witnesses.<sup>40</sup> Nigidius Figulus is mentioned along with Marius' friend Plotius as writing *de gestu*: possibly both wrote on delivery as a whole, which the *Ad Herennium* had said no one had yet treated with care.<sup>41</sup> It may be that Roman feeling for proper delivery was different from Greek; we know the Romans spoke more slowly than the Greeks, and certainly the arrangement of the toga, which exercised Nigidius and Plotius, was a Roman problem. Possibly the fashion, new in Cicero's youth, of formally 'declaiming' for practice led to a greater stress on delivery, as the Roman interest in humour and pathos as opposed to the more intellectual aspects of rhetoric may have done;<sup>42</sup> though the subjects set for declamation were partly chosen to illustrate and give practice

<sup>36</sup> *Puerile*, the Greek *meirakiôdes*, means tasteless. K. Barwick, *Probleme der Stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik* (1957) 102 argues that the doctrine on figures comes from Theophrastus via Athenaeus and Apollonius Molon.

<sup>37</sup> *Ad Her.* 2.50; the aphorism is ascribed at *De Inv.* 1.109 to Apollonius, presumably Malacus or Molon. Stoic influence has been seen at *Ad Her.* 2.28, the argument and its parts.

<sup>38</sup> G.L. Hendrickson, *CPh.* (1933) 153. Views of Polybius and Rutilius on the philosophers' style, A. Gellius 6.14.8-10 – the latter is perhaps not Rutilius Lupus, for whom see n.50. It is not clear if the three are meant to represent the three styles of oratory, grand, middle and low.

<sup>39</sup> There is still dispute as to whether the author of the *Ad Her.* is the Cornificius of Quintilian; their views seem to coincide at several points, but he seems to be thought of as post-Ciceronian, Quint. 3.1.21. The Stertinius there mentioned might be Horace's Stoic, see p. 53.

<sup>40</sup> Quint. 2.1.11, cf. 4.27.

<sup>41</sup> *Ib.* 11.3.143; *Ad Her.* 3.19. We know Theophrastus dealt with it, and the Hellenistic rhetor Athenaeus stressed its importance, Philod. *Rhet.* 1.193 Sudh. The Stoics treated it, doubtless enjoining reserve.

<sup>42</sup> Nigidius and Plotius let one drop the toga to the heels, as the Greeks did with the *pallium*, but this was later disliked, Quint., loc. cit. Declamation, G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the*

in treating the various *staseis*. The great actor Roscius wrote a book, we are told, in which he was so bold as to compare oratory and acting.<sup>43</sup> It was doubtless basically concerned with acting as 'delivery'. Roscius is described as *doctus* by Horace, and it is clear from Cicero that he was not only a serious and conscious artist but a careful teacher of acting, while Cicero for one took hints from him for his own style of delivery.<sup>44</sup> Roscius, unique among Roman actors, had attained social respectability; of free birth, admitted to polished society for his intelligence and charm, he was given the gold ring of the *eques* by the stage-struck Sulla and to maintain his status took no fees thereafter.<sup>45</sup> Presumably he was trying by his book to give acting intellectual respectability as well, arguing that if delivery was part of the *ars* of rhetoric, then acting, for which in Greek the word is the same as that for delivery, *hypokritikê*, was an art too. He doubtless demanded a wide general education for the actor; Lucian's pamphlet on dancing suggests that such a demand is vital to any claim to the status of a liberal art.<sup>46</sup> Roscius may have had Greek predecessors, though none seem to be known; he would have had to face opponents like Philodemus, who insists that beautiful and fitting gestures rest merely on individual observation, not on rules that can be handed down, any more than they can be for acrobatics and sword-dancing, and says that the rhetors' claim to give rules for delivery is new-fangled idiocy; poets and philosophers do not deal with the subject because empirical observation is a trivial thing.<sup>47</sup>

Quintilian never refers to the rhetorical works of Varro, who, though no great orator himself, devoted a book of his *Disciplinae* to rhetoric (and may possibly have written a larger work on the subject). We know little of it, and a late source which praises it for giving Rome a technical vocabulary was perhaps under a misapprehension; this vocabulary had developed earlier.<sup>48</sup> (Interestingly, Quintilian was to some extent to return to using Greek terms.) Cornelius Nepos was also no orator himself, and did not, like Varro, write on rhetoric; but apart from probably including lives of both Greek and Roman orators in his collections of biographies, his *Exempla* were no doubt supposed to be useful to orators. These were presumably a collection of anecdotes from perhaps both Greek and Roman history exemplifying virtues and vices (like

---

*Roman World* (1972) 123. Suet. *Gramm.* 25.9 notes that at first declaimers used specific cases and names; unless the exercises were set by Greek teachers, one might compare the trouble they had in legal writing in getting away from specific cases (see p. 204).

<sup>43</sup> Macrob. *Sat.* 3.14.12.

<sup>44</sup> Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.82; *De Or.* 1.129-30 (his stress on *decor*); *Pro Rosc. Com.* 30; *Pro Quinct.* 77; Plut. *Cic.* 5.3: Cicero also studied the art of Aesopus, the tragic actor. Val. Max. 8.10.2, however, shows Roscius and Aesopus studying Hortensius' gestures (which we know were elaborate).

<sup>45</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 3.14.13; *Pro Rosc. Com.* 23. He had earned vast sums (cf. Pliny *NH* 7.128).

<sup>46</sup> Lucian *De Salt.* 35.

<sup>47</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 1.73ff., 193ff. Sud. *Ad Her.* 3.20 refers the teaching of voice production, which needs natural gifts and *cura* (only?), to experts, but does discuss it to some extent.

<sup>48</sup> Priscian *GL* 2.489 refers to *Rhetoricorum libri* in at least three books, but the work is sometimes doubted. The *Peri Characterôn* was probably about the three styles of oratory (grand, middle and low) though partly at least as they appear in the poets; the *De Descriptionibus* may have been about *ekphrasais*, formal descriptions (see *Ad Her.* 4.51 and 63 on different types).

that later compiled by Valerius Maximus); the surviving fragments chiefly illustrate Roman luxury. Greek precedents for such a work are as it happens not well attested.

Cicero, impatient in his maturity with the formal *artes*, since natural talent, experience and emotional force seemed to him so important, turned to deal with the problems of oratory in a broader and more critical fashion; Quintilian distinguishes his early work on rhetoric from his later books on oratory. There was it seems less reaction to Cicero's works than one might expect; perhaps no one was capable of meeting him on his own plane. But Caesar's *De Analogia* has been thought to be in part an answer to the *De Oratore* and to its rather cavalier attitude to *Latinitas*.<sup>49</sup> Cicero and the much younger Calvus exchanged letters on style in oratory; but we cannot enter into that well-known critical controversy, on Roman Atticism.

Little can be said of the doctrines of the few Roman rhetors mentioned by Suetonius; several were connected with Antony, whose own style was Asianic, but according to Plutarch acquired in the East. It is possible that the less distinguished Latin rhetors did tend to be 'Asianic'. Where the Greeks are concerned, it is interesting that Cicero was willing that his son should study in Athens with Gorgias, perhaps the last rhetorician of strong Asianic sympathies, a man of note who was to be the author of a work on the figures of which we have a Latin epitome.<sup>50</sup>

Cicero's own last teacher had been Apollonius Molon, the only Greek theorist of the early first century, and the first after Hermagoras, whom Quintilian mentions. Cicero tells us something of his methods of teaching, but nothing of his theory, and he is easily confused with the older Apollonius 'Malakos' who also taught in Rhodes. Quintilian attests that he wrote much, however, and we hear of a definition of figures, shared with the earlier Athenaeus, which stressed that their object was to give pleasure.<sup>51</sup> This fits with his moderately Asianic style and probable distaste for the dry Hermagoras. But to judge by the *Brutus*, his influence on Cicero seems to have been chiefly a matter of delivery.

It is disappointing that we learn nothing from Cicero about Apollodorus of Pergamum, the teacher of M. Calpidius, a speaker whom the *Brutus* esteems highly.<sup>52</sup> It is not clear whether Calpidius, who stood unsuccessfully for the consulate in 51 and 50, had studied in Rome or the East. But Apollodorus, already elderly, was in Rome in 45 when Caesar chose him to teach the future Emperor Augustus. Other Roman pupils of whom we know only reached maturity in the thirties or the early Augustan age, and the great dispute between Apollodoreans and followers of the rather younger Theodorus of Gadara erupted after our period. But Apollodorus had probably developed his views by 45, though the *ars* dedicated to a Matus, possibly Caesar's friend, might or might not have been written by then (he may have

<sup>49</sup> G.L. Hendrickson, *CPh* (1906) 97.

<sup>50</sup> Quint. 9.2.102ff.; Rutilius Lupus, ed. Barabino (1967) and in *Rhet. Lat. Min.* (Halm) 3-21.

<sup>51</sup> Quint. 3.1.16.

<sup>52</sup> *Brutus* 274-8.

retired, or tried to retire, in 44). Quintilian tells us that other works were attributed to Apollodorus, but falsely, and that his views were best learnt from the works of his pupils, both Greek and Roman.<sup>53</sup>

Apollodorus' doctrine was narrow and rigid; he was said to have written as if rhetoric were not merely a *technê* or *ars*, but actually an *epistêmê* or science. He dealt only with judicial oratory and argued, more strictly than the Theodorean, that the parts of a speech (for him four in number) had always to occur in their set order. He regarded the function of oratory as primarily rational persuasion; *pathos*, emotion, was restricted to the proem and peroration, and so were 'common-places'. This was not new, nor is there anything revolutionary about what else we know of his views; for example, he attacked the distinction of *thesis* and *hypothesis* on the ground that any *hypothesis* is essentially general, and listed a greater number of possible types. Much of his or his disciples' dispute with the Theodorean seems to have concerned minor points – Strabo is impatient with it 'whatever it is about'.<sup>54</sup> Theodorus was less strict, but in some respects (e.g. on *status*) his terminology was more complex, though Apollodorus listed a great many elements in the 'circumstances' of a case, and a large number of ways in which the mind of a judge must be prepared, denying that they could be summed up under the three usual heads of securing attention, goodwill and readiness to learn. Apollodorus also complained that the doctrine of figures was 'incomprehensible', and apparently used 'figure', *schema*, only in the general sense of form, perhaps saying that every speech must have its own natural form. Again, this sounds like a quarrel about words.<sup>55</sup>

Perhaps we should see the ideal Apollodorean orator in Calidius as described by Cicero. He clothed original and subtle ideas in a flexible and translucent style. His many metaphors always seemed natural, his rhythms were varied and unobtrusive, his 'figures' frequent, his identification of the issue clear, his organisation accorded with the rules; he lacked only force and emotional power (for example he was restrained in gesture – he did not slap his thigh). Caelius, who was a contemporary, and Quintilian agree.<sup>56</sup> Cicero suggests that Calidius' coolness reflected his temperament, but the Elder Seneca tells us of a speaker who lost much of his native vigour by becoming a follower of Apollodorus.<sup>57</sup> At all events, we can see one reason why Octavian disliked Antony's exaggerated style.

The last words on our period may be said by Tacitus. In his *Dialogus de Oratoribus*<sup>58</sup> Tacitus makes the modernist Aper complain that the unsophisticated public of pre- and early Augustan times was happy with longwinded speeches closely based on the rhetors' rules, since these had the charm of novelty (even more so did philosophic excursions). The taste was for

<sup>53</sup> Quint. 3.1.18. It is in connection with Apollodorus and Theodorus that he complains of the impracticality of their rules.

<sup>54</sup> Strabo 13.C625.

<sup>55</sup> Quint. 9.1.12.

<sup>56</sup> Caelius, *Ad F.* 8.9.5; Quint. 12.10.11: *suptilitatem Calidi*.

<sup>57</sup> Sen. *Rhet. Controv.* 10 *prae*f. 15.

<sup>58</sup> Tac. *Dial.* 19.

lengthy *exordia*, interminable narratives starting ridiculously far back in time, the parade of numerous heads to be treated, innumerable stages in proof, and 'all the other things recommended in the utterly arid treatises of Hermagoras and Apollodorus'. He exaggerates, of course. But the *Brutus* does show that when Hortensius first came forward his capacity to explain the various heads that he intended to treat, and then sum up, seemed new and impressive.<sup>59</sup> If Cicero sometimes suffers from excessive length, it is not because he stuck too closely to the rules; but when indicating the dominance over even Hortensius that he acquired in the sixties, he notes qualities, such as an ability to vary the monotony with an agreeable digression, or to raise the question to a general level, that rest securely on the foundation of formal rhetoric.<sup>60</sup> If even these two had still much to learn from the theorists, lesser men are likely to have been yet more dependent on them. The period from M. Antonius to the Apollodoreans seems to be that in which the Romans devoted themselves to Greek rhetoric with most passion, even when it was not wholly relevant to their problems, and provided themselves with Latin versions of it. Like *grammatica*, it was a subject still in the process of development in the Greek world, and capable of exciting fierce disputes. Cicero managed to digest and transcend Greek rhetoric, and with the rapidly increasing sophistication of the second part of the century others may have begun to do the same; but it was essential to them all.

<sup>59</sup> *Brutus* 302; Cf. *Hort. frag.* 27 Grilli, probably Cicero to Hortensius, saying that no one had been stricter in division, definition and explication.

<sup>60</sup> *Brutus* 322.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

# The Mathematical Arts

The four mathematical arts – geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and music or more properly musical theory, which were to form the mediaeval *quadrivium* – were a settled part of the *enkuklios paideia* and thus, in Rome, of the liberal arts. But they were a part to which only lip-service was paid. Schoolboys were taught mathematics to an elementary level, for practical purposes, as Horace shows.<sup>1</sup> Any serious mathematical teaching would come from a philosopher who happened to be interested in a subject which since Plato or indeed Pythagoras had been closely associated with certain forms of philosophy. Cicero's Stoic protégé Diodotus was one such,<sup>2</sup> and Cicero may have learned a little geometry from him (often regarded as the most important and most basic of the mathematical arts); but he confessed to Atticus that he was totally stumped by the mathematical aspects of Serapio's geography.<sup>3</sup> He did know something about Archimedes' discovery of the relative volumes of different solid shapes, though, significantly, this may have been by means of a poem.<sup>4</sup> The Herculaneum library included a few mathematical works by Demetrius of Laconia (his interests were unusual for an Epicurean), but they were probably not written in Rome, and not necessarily studied by Romans. Few of these are recorded as having any interest in the subject; perhaps, for our period, only Pompey's uncle, his last wife, and the young Virgil.<sup>5</sup> We do not know how advanced any of them were. (Astronomy, as we shall see, is a slightly special case.)

In Cicero's *De Republica* we find the idea, which goes back at least to Isocrates, that the study of astronomy and related subjects is useful for quickening the wits of the young in preparation for more important, indeed more 'liberal' subjects, notably politics.<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere Cicero reveals himself as perfectly aware of the contrast between Greek and Roman attitudes: among the Greeks geometry was held in the highest honour and none were more famous than mathematicians, but we have restricted the art to the practical purposes of measuring and reckoning. (Vitruvius however regretted that in

<sup>1</sup> Hor. *AP*325-30 (fractions of the *as*, a coin).

<sup>2</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.113; *Brutus* 309 shows Cicero studied various subjects with him.

<sup>3</sup> *Ad A.* 2.4.1, 6.1.

<sup>4</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 1.5.

<sup>5</sup> *Brutus* 175 (geometry); Plut. *Pomp.* 55.1 (geometry); *Vita Vergilii* 7 (*mathematica*).

<sup>6</sup> *De Rep.* 1.30: put in the mouth of Laelius, in the late second century, but probably Cicero's view. He foolishly supposed that, obscure and complex as the art was, there had been so many complete mathematicians in Greece that anyone who wanted it enough could master the subject, *De Or.* 1.10.

Greece philosophers and mathematicians had not received the honours heaped on athletes.) In the *Academica* Cicero admits that Rome lacks a 'geometrical' vocabulary, and this is borne out by Aulus Gellius: those who *have* written on numbers keep many Greek terms, such as *hemiolus*, a number containing a whole number plus its half (e.g. 3, which is 2+1, or 15, 10+5).<sup>7</sup> He is probably thinking mainly of Varro, who himself complained about geometry that 'we either do not study these subjects at all, or we leave off before we understand why they should be studied; for the pleasure and usefulness of them lie in the more advanced parts, when they have been completely mastered – the elementary stages seem pointless and disagreeable.' The question of usefulness was important, as Varro thought all the arts had grown from practical needs. Vitruvius, too, assigns a limited and utilitarian role to the great mathematical discoveries – Pythagoras' theorem, Archimedes' discovery of the relative weights of different materials – though it is natural that, given his profession, he should think of practical applications; and he does recognise that the really able, of whom there are exceedingly few, will go beyond what the architect needs and become real mathematicians and engineers. He also sees that mathematics can give pleasure.<sup>8</sup>

Even in the Greek world the first century B.C. was not a great age for mathematics. Education there too, if to a lesser degree than in Italy, was dominated now by *grammatica* and rhetoric; Euclid had a place in the school curriculum, but astronomy was regularly taught through the poetic résumé of Aratus. Still, Nicolaus of Damascus, for example, did study music and mathematics, perhaps before moving on to philosophy proper.<sup>9</sup> The most original mathematician of the time was Posidonius, who had careful observation and intelligent explanation of the phenomenon of tides to his credit (in study of these he had spent a month at Gades on the Atlantic coast of Spain); it is natural that a Stoic, who believed in the interconnection of everything in the cosmos, and especially in the power of the heavenly bodies, should find this an important subject. Posidonius also made his own computation of the circumference of the earth, unfortunately much lower than that of Eratosthenes, who had got it almost right long before.<sup>10</sup> But no Roman pupils of his seem to have been seriously interested in this side of his work, unless Geminus really was a disciple, and a Roman or a freedman of one; if we had to take account of him our picture would be rather different, as he wrote extensively on mathematical and astronomical matters.<sup>11</sup>

Apart from Posidonius, it was an age of popularisations, or else already too

<sup>7</sup> *Acad.* 1.6; *Vitr.* 9. *praef.* 1-3; A. Gellius 18. 14.3 also *epitritus*, a number made up of a number plus a third of it, e.g. 4 or 12. It is interesting that Vitruvius' symbols for fractions are based on the Greek alphabet (10.10-11); later, Frontinus (*De Aqu.* 1.23-63 has a less obviously Greek system (E. Schramm, *Sb. Berl. Akad.* (1917) 718).

<sup>8</sup> A. Gellius 16.8.6; Cassiod. *Inst.* 2. *praef.* 4; *Vitr.* 9. *praef.* 6-14, cf. 1.1.17. Archimedes a happy man, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.66.

<sup>9</sup> *FGH* no. 90 frag. 132.

<sup>10</sup> Posidonius frags 49, 202, 214ff. E and K.

<sup>11</sup> See p. 107.

inclined to revere the great figures of the past, even when recent work was in fact superior (it might be harder to understand than more primitive theories). Thus the heliocentric theory of the universe put forward by Aristarchus of Samos in the third century never established itself, partly because it was denounced by the Stoics, who disliked a system that seemed not to give a central place to either God or Man.

Varro and Vitruvius are the main figures we need to discuss in this chapter, and we shall find both operating at a low intellectual level, often combining mathematics with material that to us seems irrelevant – linguistic, moral or aesthetic. We shall also see Greek influence coming from a direction we have not yet much considered, that of Pythagoreanism. Varro's *Disciplinae* of course had their four books on geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and music, perhaps in that order. Vitruvius claimed that all the usual liberal arts (and more too) were essential to the *architectus*: geometry, because he must use rule and compass, optics, because he must understand lighting problems, arithmetic, for assessing costs and making measurements, astronomy, especially for constructing sun-dials. But he conceded that the architect will only be able to know the basic principles; complete practical mastery is the prerogative of the expert.<sup>12</sup>

Varro's books in the *Disciplinae* presumably did not claim to be more than elementary outlines. Whether even so they went beyond what the ordinary educated Roman knew is not to be determined, but they probably did. They seem to have been familiar and influential in late antiquity, but it is rash to see large sections of the works of Martianus Capella or St Augustine as directly reflecting them. Something can be said of them, however. Varro's definition of geometry was broad. The first men began by learning to measure the land and set up boundary stones, to prevent quarrels over property; they then learnt to mark off time by the moon, and so became interested in the distance of the earth from the moon, and the moon from the sun; next they tried to estimate the size of the earth, and so the name 'geometry' was born.<sup>13</sup> Varro also divided 'geometry' into visual and aural branches, *optice* and *harmonice*; astronomy and musical theory are thus really parts of geometry.<sup>14</sup>

The book on geometry proper was still wide in scope. It was here that Varro described the earth as shaped like an egg, its section circular one way but oval the other; it was perhaps here that he rejected Posidonius' figure for the circumference of the earth in favour of that of Eratosthenes (who may have been admired by Varro as a polymath and man of letters). Varro probably also discussed land-surveying – the first step in geometry, as he supposed – for the *grammatici* of the imperial period, in technical writings on the subject, seem to have been interested in his work (unless what they are really referring to is a separate *De mensuris*). He derived the skill from Etruria, where it was

<sup>12</sup> The *Disciplinae*, F. Ritschl, *Opusc.* III (1877) 352; Vitruv. 1.1.16.

<sup>13</sup> Cassiod. *Inst.* 2.6.1.

<sup>14</sup> A. Gellius 16.18.

practised as part of the *disciplina Etrusca*.<sup>15</sup>

Varro may also have included in his book on geometry, as Martianus Capella was to do in his, a good deal of geographical information, especially measurements of seas, continents, distances between towns and so on. But there may be too much material in Pliny (attributed to Varro but to no special work of his) all to come from this book.<sup>16</sup> Varro certainly considered here, however, the various geometrical figures, both plane and solid, probably using Euclid, and stressing that they are ideal, not material; it is likely to be here that he defined line, as length without width or height, and the cube, which he compared with a die. Gellius noted that he was less brief than Euclid, because he did not dare to coin new technical terms in Latin. Certainly the Greek name of the cube was kept, and in this connection the cube of a number was also explained.<sup>17</sup> He may have included diagrams. It may also be that Varro asked questions no modern mathematician would ask, such as which figures are the best, most beautiful and most perfect (the circle, as the most regular; the point, as the simplest). Under optical geometry he also considered the way in which mirrors can give multiple images, or images upside down, and explained optical illusions like the magnifying effects of water and the apparently small size of distant objects.<sup>18</sup> The stress on definition and classification is to be noted; nothing suggests Varro actually went through any proofs. As we saw, the mania for classification was in some respects responsible for great advances at Rome; but its static character has been seen as one of the causes of Roman inadequacy in science.<sup>19</sup> Some Greek mathematical handbooks, however, were also merely descriptive.

It has been thought that Vitruvius could have got all the geometry that he parades out of an elementary handbook, perhaps in Greek. But it might be just to admit that he has looked at, if not always understood, the works of the great men whom he names, asserting his abhorrence of plagiarism ('readers of Archimedes will object ...', 'Eratosthenes has calculated ...').<sup>20</sup> He does refer his readers to diagrams, though only one survives in our manuscripts.<sup>21</sup> Two were used in connection with the passage in 1.6 where Vitruvius shows how to lay out a city and keep the eight winds from blowing down the streets. He gives directions for finding the north, by the use of a circle with the radius consisting of the shadow cast by a gnomon some time before mid-day. The shadow, at the same length of time after mid-day, will touch the edge of the

<sup>15</sup> Cassiod. *Inst.* 2.6.1. The *gromatici* (see H. Dahlmann, *PW* Suppl. VI) reveal that Varro's book on geometry was addressed to a Rufus, unfortunately the commonest *cognomen* in the Roman world. Mediaeval manuscripts of the *gromatici* are often bound with geometric material, W.H. Stahl, *Martianus Capella and the Liberal Arts* (1971) 47. But a *De Mensuris*, Priscian, *GL* II 420 and Boethius *De Geom.*, Migne LXIII 1359 C.

<sup>16</sup> Geographic statements in Martianus' book on geometry are mediated *via* Pliny, and Martianus confesses they are a digression; Stahl op. cit. 44 thinks therefore there were none in Varro's geometry.

<sup>17</sup> Mart. Cap. 6.228G; A. Gellius 1.20; cf. *Acad.* 2.116.

<sup>18</sup> A. Gellius 16.18, cf. 1.20.

<sup>19</sup> Stahl, op. cit. 4.

<sup>20</sup> Vitruvius 8.5.3, 1.6.9.

<sup>21</sup> A circle with inscribed octagon, for the wind-rose in book 1.

circle again. Midway between these two points will be north (found where two circles centred on these points intersect). So much is clear, but Vitruvius is then confused as to the way to divide the circle into sixteen segments, and it has been suggested both that part of the text should be excised as repetitive (probably wrongly); and that he does not know how to give angles in degrees. He produces Eratosthenes' figure for the circumference of the earth – and then remarks that some have said he could not have inferred its true measure, and himself refuses to pass judgment on the matter. One suspects already that his understanding is limited.<sup>22</sup>

In fact, he makes a number of mistakes. He attributes to Plato the doubling of the square – wrongly, as a careful reading of the *Meno* would have showed him. He says that Pythagoras was responsible for the famous discovery concerning the square on the long side of a right-angled isosceles triangle, but perhaps does not recognise that it applies to all right-angled triangles. And he is sketchy on the doubling of the cube by Archytas and Eratosthenes, a complex problem. Elsewhere he is unnecessarily bad – and undecided – about the value of  $\pi$ . Perhaps he is more at ease in pointing out that Archimedes' discovery of the specific gravity of different materials enabled him to bring to book a man who was trying to fob King Hiero off with silver-gilt for gold: thus scientific inventions may have moral value, as that of the weighing machine also did.<sup>23</sup>

Optics are regarded as a part of geometry, and briefly considered in Book 6 (with a very imprecise comparison to *trompe-l'oeil* scene-painting). We are told that the distorted image of oars under water (a stock example) is due to the thinness of the element, which sends images to the surface of the liquid, which are there disturbed and so look crooked. In fact Vitruvius refuses to decide between the two main ancient theories, either that images from an object strike our eyes or that rays from our eyes strike the object. In accordance with the second view he writes that with distance the eye finds it increasingly hard to cut through the thickness of the air (so it is necessary to compensate by increasing the size of the more remote architectural features). It has been noted that Vettius Cyrus, Cicero's architect, seems to have used more mathematical terminology when talking about optics than Vitruvius does.<sup>24</sup>

Varro's book on arithmetic – though it is true that our quotations may be biased – seems again much concerned with questions of nomenclature and definition. For example, the different meaning of such forms as *secundum* and *secundo*: the former means 'in second place', the latter 'for the second time'; Ennius was perhaps quoted in support, and Pompey's hesitations recorded. Varro probably also listed the various terms compounded from figures and the word *as*, a monetary value: *centussis*, worth 100 *asses*, is the highest in the series. It may be here too that he discussed the different meanings of *dimidius*, half, and *dimidiatus*, halved, quoting the poets again. It is curious to see

<sup>22</sup> Vitr. 1.6. 11.

<sup>23</sup> Vitr. 9. *praef.* 4-14; 10.9.1.

<sup>24</sup> Vitr. 6.2.2; *Ad A.* 2.3.2 (rejecting the theory of images; language Greek).

arithmetic so heavily under the influence of *grammatica*; but doubtless here, as in other fields, the establishment of agreed terminology was essential.<sup>25</sup>

It is possible that Varro also included a certain amount of arithmology, of Pythagorean origin, such as informs many later treatments of arithmetic: for example the first book of Augustine's *De Musica*, which classifies various relations between numbers, and then dilates on the figure ten (the 'tetractys') and the way it is made up of the first four numbers ( $1+2+3+4=10$ ), and, among other things, the 'perfection' of 3 and 4, which have a beginning, a middle and an end ( $1+1+1=3$ ,  $1+2+1=4$ ).<sup>26</sup> The Pythagoreans believed that 'all things are like number'. Alexander Polyhistor, writing in Rome in our period, had a noteworthy mathematical cosmogony as part of his account of Pythagoreanism: the *archê*, cause or principle, of all things is the monad or unit. From it comes, as matter, the undefined dyad (or, in earlier terminology, 'the unlimited'). These form one of the pairs of opposites. From them spring numbers, from these points, from points lines, hence plane figures and from them solid figures. From these, by means of the four elements, come sensible bodies, which form a perfectly spherical universe, alive and intelligent, with the earth, also a sphere (the most beautiful of the figures) at its centre. Light and dark, hot and cold, dry and moist, these pairs share the universe.<sup>27</sup>

This last statement reminds us of the Pythagorean pair that starts book 5 of the *De Lingua Latina*. And there was certainly arithmology in two works of Varro. One was the *Hebdomades*, the collection of 700 portraits of famous men, in the preface to which he sang the praises of the number seven: astronomy gives an important role to the number seven, the seed in the womb develops in stages marked by intervals of seven days, and seven continues to be important throughout the life of man; also, though this Gellius thinks trivial, there are Seven Wonders of the World, Seven Sages, seven laps in the races in the circus, and Seven against Thebes.<sup>28</sup> In the *logistoricus* entitled *Tubero de Origine Humana* Varro expands on Pythagorean theories of gestation (though he probably also retailed those of other philosophers and doctors). There are two sorts of birth, one after seven and one after nine months, or more precisely 210 and 274 days. These numbers are related to that fundamental Pythagorean subject, musical theory. In the first type of birth 6, which is a 'perfect' number, is the basis: for six days the seed is a milky liquid, for eight more it is blood;  $6+8$  correspond to the musical interval of the fourth. For nine more days the seed is turning into flesh:  $6+9$  make up the fifth in music. Then during twelve days the foetus is taking human shape:  $6+12$  represents the octave.  $6+8+9+12$  together make up 35, and the foetus comes to birth after  $6 \times 35$  days. The second type of birth is based on the number 7 instead of 6.<sup>29</sup> It should be explained that the fourth, fifth and octave, the basic

<sup>25</sup> A. Gellius 10.1, cf. Nonius 700L; Priscian *De Fig. Num.* 15, cf. perhaps Ausonius *Ecl.* 6 (names for fractions of the *libra*, pound weight); A. Gellius 3.14.

<sup>26</sup> Aug. *De Mus.* 1.12.

<sup>27</sup> FGH no. 273 frag. 93.

<sup>28</sup> Varro *De LL* 5.11; A. Gellius 3.10.

<sup>29</sup> Censorinus *De Die Nat.* 9 and 11.

intervals, which were common to all types of music, were supposedly first seen by Pythagoras to depend on the fixed ratios 4:3, 3:2 and 2:1; he will have discovered this on the monochord, finding for example that a certain length of string will give a note an octave above one twice as long.

Above all, it is usually supposed that Varro's *De Principiis Numerorum*, in no less than nine books, was devoted to Pythagorean arithmology. It is not clear how Varro established the usefulness of this subject, and it is hardly the typical production of a 'practical Roman', though it seems to have had little influence, at least till late antiquity, and possibly not even then.<sup>30</sup> Where Varro got his arithmology is hard to say; Posidonius does seem to have been interested in the subject, but his role as a mediator to later periods was at one time much exaggerated.<sup>31</sup> Alexander Polyhistor appears to have used 'Pythagorean Commentaries', which he perhaps found in Italy. It is curious that there is no evidence for Nigidius Figulus, 'Pythagorean and magician', being interested in number mysticism. Cicero knew something of it, but only uses it to give the Dream of Scipio at the end of the *De Republica* a slightly archaic colouring (he believed that there had been much Pythagoreanism in earlier periods in Rome); here he analyses Scipio Aemilianus' age at his death, 56, as significantly made up of  $7 \times 8$ , two 'full' or 'complete' numbers, a term of Pythagorean origin.<sup>32</sup>

Let us return to the Liberal Arts, and now to astronomy. This was the mathematical subject that appealed most to the Romans, partly perhaps because of its connection with the calendar, especially the agricultural calendar, but perhaps partly also because Greek achievements in the subject had been spectacular. As early as the middle of the second century a Roman noble, Sulpicius Galus, had produced a book on it, which explained eclipses and gave a Pythagorean account of the distance of the earth to the moon, the moon to the sun, and the sun to the stars.<sup>33</sup> In the next generation Q. Tubero may have written something on the subject, as a passage of Pliny suggests; and Cicero in the *De Republica* makes Tubero show an interest in astronomy, which his teacher Panaetius might have encouraged.<sup>34</sup> Astronomy is also a remarkably frequent theme in Varro's *Méniptean Satires*, probably from fairly early in the first century (though perhaps it is sometimes used as the Cynics had long used it, as representative of the unnecessary sciences – the proper study of mankind is man).<sup>35</sup>

By now the Romans had come to understand how sun-dials worked (in the third century they had innocently supposed that a sundial carried off from

<sup>30</sup> Listed in Jerome's catalogue, see Ritschl, *op. cit.* in n. 12, 525. Ausonius 16. *praef.* might refer to it ('Varro's numbers', obviously with much on the number 3).

<sup>31</sup> F.E. Robbins, *CPh* (1921) 97 sees Varro as standing rather apart from other representatives of the tradition. Cf. *id. ib.* (1920) 309 for Posidonius.

<sup>32</sup> *De Rep.* 6.12.

<sup>33</sup> *De Sen.* 49, Pliny, *NH* 2.83: 126,000 stades to the moon, twice that from the moon to the sun, three times from the sun to the Zodiac (cf. Livy 44.37.5, on eclipses). J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (1979), 255 thinks the work was in Greek.

<sup>34</sup> Pliny *NH* 18.235, on the *stella regia*; *De Rep.* 1:15ff.

<sup>35</sup> J.P. Cèbe, *Varron, Satires Méniptées* 3 (1975) 412, 417, 451, 455-6.

Sicily would give the time correctly in the different latitude of Rome).<sup>36</sup> They were also extremely proud of two of Archimedes' hollow celestial globes, rescued from the sack of Syracuse in 212; these could be turned to show the movements of sun, moon and stars, the phases of the moon, and perhaps eclipses. Cicero and Ovid refer to them.<sup>37</sup> In fact they were antiquated, partly because Hipparchus had in the interim discovered complications in the course of the planets. Lucullus is said to have brought back a sphere from the East, and Cicero notes that Posidonius had recently constructed one; perhaps these were more up-to-date.<sup>38</sup> Though these globes may have used simple gears, no literary source refers to anything like the much more sophisticated flat-surfaced astronomical or calendrical calculating device, with over thirty gear wheels (more complicated than an astrolabe, or indeed than anything which could have been made in modern Europe before the later nineteenth century), which was probably on its way to Rome when a ship, also carrying works of art, sank off Anticythera in the Aegean in the first half of the first century B.C. It has necessitated a re-estimation of Hellenistic scientific technology. This device may have been made in Rhodes, in spite of the Egyptian month names inscribed on it; the Egyptian calendar was often used by astronomers on account of its regularity, having twelve months of thirty days.<sup>39</sup> One wishes that one knew for what Roman noble, or Greek savant in Rome, it was destined.

What we do have literary record of is a building in the grounds of Varro's villa at Casinum. This was a *rotunda* or *tholos* in which the dome, *hemisphaerium*, seems to have represented the sky, and the morning and evening stars at least were made to move round it and show the time. There was also, perhaps copied from the Clock Tower or 'Tower of the Winds' at Athens, which Varro compares (built perhaps a century earlier by the astronomer Andronicus of Cirrhus), a 'circle of the eight winds', with a windvane which showed, inside the building, what wind was blowing. Varro's account is brief, since his real subject in this passage is his aviary, and it is possible that his astronomical clock was a complex affair, as that in the Tower of the Winds is thought to have been.<sup>40</sup>

Varro certainly dealt with astronomy in a number of his works. We know little for certain about the book on it in the *Disciplinae*, though it is often thought to lie behind Martianus Capella's book on the subject.<sup>41</sup> It contained no doubt various etymologies – certainly *stella* from *stare*, to stand (presumably in contrast to the wandering planets).<sup>42</sup> It is said to have

<sup>36</sup> Pliny *NH* 7.214.

<sup>37</sup> *De Rep.* 1.21-2, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.63; Ovid *Fasti* 6.277 (271-6 are sometimes bracketed). It was worked by water.

<sup>38</sup> Strabo 12.C546; *De Nat. Deor.* 2.88. But O. Neugebauer, *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy* (1975) 652 does not think much of Posidonius as an astronomer.

<sup>39</sup> D.J. de Solla Price, *Gears from the Greeks* (1975).

<sup>40</sup> Varro, *De RR* 3.5.17; J.V. Noble and D.J. de S. Price, *AJA* (1968) 345.

<sup>41</sup> Stahl *op. cit.* 50-1, 174-5; Martianus' book is, for him, unusually brief and clear; it defines and classifies.

<sup>42</sup> Cassiod. *Inst.* 2.7.2, cf. Mart. Cap. 8.275G.

showed 'the origins of stars, and their bright paths';<sup>43</sup> presumably it expounded the usual cosmology, sketched for example by Cicero in the Dream of Scipio, with the nine concentric spheres of the sun, the planets and the fixed stars (but perhaps he noted Heraclides of Pontus' theory that Mercury and Venus circle round the sun). And it almost certainly referred to the music of the spheres, which as Cicero tells us is supposed to be produced by the motion of the spheres themselves, whose distance from each other is so fixed that high and low tones mingle in harmony, though men are so used to the sound that they are deaf to it.<sup>44</sup> This again is Pythagoreanism, and Pythagoreanism in this book is perhaps also illustrated by an observation that the revolutions of the moon partake of the nature of the cube of three, since they occupy twenty-seven days.<sup>45</sup> In expatiating on the virtues of the number seven in the *Hebdomades* Varro pointed out that there are seven stars in each of the Bears, and seven Pleiades; seven planets, seven circles or zones on the celestial and the terrestrial sphere, that it is in the seventh sign of the Zodiac that the equinoxes occur; and here he says that the moon's phases are completed in four times seven days (according to Aristarchus of Samos).<sup>46</sup> It is unlikely however that he dealt with astrology, for all that it was usually regarded as a scientific subject (its practitioners were the *mathematici par excellence*, while *astrologia* can cover both astronomy and astrology); the tradition of the *artes liberales* seems to have excluded it, perhaps because it was formed before astrology became widely influential.

In the *De Ventis*, strictly speaking a work on 'meteorology' rather than astronomy, Varro also showed his astronomical knowledge; he seems to have linked the directions from which his sixteen winds came to the rising or setting of the sun at different points in the year (solstice, equinox and so on), and probably also to the twelve divisions of heaven as marked out by the circles of the sphere, which are cut across by the circles of the horizon and meridian.<sup>47</sup> A calendar, dividing the year astronomically into eight divisions, in each of which the farmer has different tasks, forms the basis of some chapters of Varro's *De Rebus Rusticis*; this is the so-called *Bauernkalendar*, and has been thought to be Varro's own creation.<sup>48</sup> However this may be, Varro probably did concern himself with calendars: his *Ephemeris Navalis* seems to have included one which correlated risings and settings of sun and stars with likely weather for the sailor (giving prognostics or signs for foretelling the weather), and there seems to have been another work called simply *Ephemeris*, from which a reference to Caesar's calendar is quoted, and the introduction of the month name July in his honour is mentioned.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> So the poem of Licentius, a pupil of Augustine, quoted in *Aug. Ep.* 26; it shows Licentius struggling with several books of the *Disciplinae*. Cf. perhaps Pliny *NH* 2.89ff., stars 'suddenly born', i.e. comets (cf. Lydus *De Ost.* 10, who says Nigidius also discussed these).

<sup>44</sup> Licentius 7; *De Rep.* 6.18.

<sup>45</sup> Favonius Eulogius *In Somm. Scip.* 17.1.

<sup>46</sup> A. Gellius 3.10.6.

<sup>47</sup> Seneca *Nat. Q.* 5.16.3-6, and probably 17.

<sup>48</sup> *De RR* 1.28ff.; A. Rehm, *Parapegmastudien* (1941).

<sup>49</sup> H. Dahlmann, *PW Suppl.* VI (1935). M. Terentius Varro 1253 rejects the idea that there was a second edition of the *Ephemeris Navalis* (originally written for Pompey in the seventies). Quotations esp. in Lydus *De Mens.*

It is easier to grasp the nature of the calendar in the *De Astris*, attributed to Caesar but perhaps as we saw really by the Alexandrian Sosigenes, though not to be confused with the treatises on the new calendar the latter published under his own name.<sup>50</sup> The title suggests that there was at least an introduction dealing with astronomy in general, but what is plain is that there was an astronomical calendar, fixing the rising and setting of certain stars and the sun's path through the signs of the Zodiac and noting the weather to be expected in connection with each. Such a calendar is closely related to the *parapegmata*, in which pegs were placed in holes next to particular days on an inscribed zodiacal calendar, to tie it to the local civil one. These were popular in the Greek world, and known to Cicero and perhaps the Romans in general.<sup>51</sup> Geminus, who notes that different calendars were needed in different places, insists that the creation of a weather-calendar is an empirical and unscientific business, resting on the generalisation of observations over a number of years and often false in its predictions (and that it is an error to think stars actually cause weather changes).<sup>52</sup> Yet distinguished scientists had produced them; though the *De Astris* does not, like many literary calendars, quote learned authority for each observation, and though it claims to be relevant to Italy alone, Sosigenes, who had presumably only recently arrived in Rome, probably used literary sources; there are coincidences with statements in other Greek *parapegmata*. As a result it has been severely criticised in modern times. Its framework however is not the zodiacal year, though the rising of the signs of the Zodiac is still mentioned, but the new Julian year, by which the civil and astronomical calendars were to continue to coincide; pegs would not have been needed therefore if an inscribed version was set up.<sup>53</sup>

Vitruvius thought the architect needed to know some astronomy, but the long digression in Book 9 is presumably there partly because readers were interested in the subject, for not much of what he says is of practical application. Complicated calculations are avoided and there are striking omissions, for example eclipses. Outdated explanations lie cheek by jowl with reliable information: thus the Babylonian theory reported by the priest, Berossus (who wrote in Greek in the early third century) as to the phases of the moon – that it was dark on one side and light on the other, though the Greeks had long known better – is preceded by times of revolution for the planets which, except in the case of Venus, are very accurate.<sup>54</sup> In one place Vitruvius accepts the idea of Plato's pupil Heraclides of Pontus that the orbits of Mercury and Venus are heliocentric, but confuses it with the Stoic

<sup>50</sup> Pliny *NH* 2.39 quotes, probably from one of them, a note about the course of the planet Venus, at one point over 22 degrees from the sun.

<sup>51</sup> *Ad A.* 5.14.1.

<sup>52</sup> Geminus *Eisagoge* 17.6. That at the end of his work probably does not belong there.

<sup>53</sup> Vitr. 9.6.3 admiringly notes famous scientists who produced calendars. For a typical passage of the *De Astris* see *NH* 18.237: Feb. 16 for Caesar marks three days' changeable weather, as does Feb. 22 by the appearance of the swallow and on the next day the rising of Arcturus in the evening; also on March 5 at the rising of the Crab, on March 8 at the rising of the northern part of the Fish, and on the next day at the rising of Orion.

<sup>54</sup> Vitr. 9.2.1-2 (3-4, from Aristarchus, is not clearly preferred); cf. 9.1.5-16.

doctrine of the sun's heat drawing along the planets, and shortly after, in flat contradiction, speaks of the seven concentric spheres of the planets (including the sun). He clearly had various sources (the names of Posidonius, Varro and Nigidius have been floated), and once seems puzzlingly to distinguish his teachers, *praeceptores*, from the *maiores*, ancient authorities.<sup>55</sup> He does not seem ever to have gone out to look at the sky, to judge by his errors in the relative position of the constellations. It should be remembered, however, that popular and elementary accounts of astronomy in Greek too are often incomplete and even confused.

In Book 6, dealing with climate, Vitruvius produces the extraordinary theory that the voices of those who live in the south are higher in pitch than those of dwellers in the north, because just as the strings of the *sambuca* (harp) are shorter at one end and the notes they emit higher, so the sky in the south is closer to the earth than it is in the north.<sup>56</sup> He adds that objects, like pots, give lower notes when moist, and again ascribes the general harmony of the universe to the power of the sun. This last has been thought a pointer to Posidonius, but the rest of his theory here surely rests on a confused impression of the doctrine that the axis of the celestial globe becomes more apparently tilted the further one goes on the earth from the equator.

When Vitruvius comes to the ostensible subject of Book 9, time-pieces, (which give the date as well as the time of day), he is openly afraid of boring his readers, and between brevity, the poor state of the MSS, further digression, and an inability always to detach the essential from the less so, he is often gappy and obscure. He describes the analemma, the mathematical drawing giving the two-dimensional projection of the celestial sphere, from which 'many varieties and kinds of sun-dial can be produced', but he does not show in detail how this is done. He simply states who invented what kind of sundial (including travellers' dials, which posed the problem of different latitudes), not even in chronological order, and he refers the reader to the inventors' own books.<sup>57</sup> The men are all distinguished Greeks (Berossus Graeco-Babylonian), and when Vitruvius says that he can't be expected to invent another kind at this time of day, one is inclined to suspect that he would not anyway have been up to it. He then moves on to Ctesibius' water-clock and the 'anaphoric' astronomical clock, also run by water – and here it appears, from the Anticythera mechanism, that he much underestimates what had been done with gearwheels.<sup>58</sup> Unfortunately we have little idea how Vitruvius' understanding and sophistication were rated by his Roman contemporaries.

Many Romans did not satisfy their taste for astronomy by reading handbooks or prose discussions, but by reading poetry; astronomy is after all a science that has always appealed to the imagination. This meant primarily

<sup>55</sup> Ib. 9.1.16 (the former are responsible for his doctrine on the Zodiac and the planets, the latter for that on the moon).

<sup>56</sup> Ib. 6.1.5-7.

<sup>57</sup> Ib. 9.7, 9.8.1.

<sup>58</sup> Ib. 9.8.2-15.

Aratus, as it did in Greece; Cicero probably rightly represents him as already known in Rome in the second century.<sup>59</sup> Greek *grammatici* no doubt read his work with their pupils; in fact even Geminus considers it an authority and quotes it, though he doubtless knew, as Cicero did, that the strictly astronomical part was a mere versification of Eudoxus.<sup>60</sup> It treats of the constellations and their role as weather-signs, and deals much in mythology and description of natural scenes; it is coloured by Stoic pantheism. Cicero seems, in his own youthful translation of the work, to have used the Greek commentators on the poet, who corrected some of its errors, but he imports more himself, for example adding descriptive adjectives that sometimes make small constellations huge and dim stars brilliant (he does not seem to have gone into his garden to check). He is careful to provide both Greek and Latin names for stars and constellations, even at the price of a loss of poetic momentum; as so often we see how important at this stage of Rome's development it was to ensure that Greek terminology was understood.<sup>61</sup> Varro of Atax perhaps also produced a rendering of Aratus, at least of the part known as *Prognostica*; and there are two fragments of an astronomical poem attributed to Cicero's brother Quintus, in which the risings of the signs of the Zodiac are correlated with the sun's course, the seasons of the year and to some extent the weather, in a fashion familiar to us. There is of course much astronomy in Lucretius, and Virgil thought an interest in the subject a proper taste in a poet.<sup>62</sup> Thus poetry combined with agriculture to give astronomy a special status at Rome.

Finally, music. Musical theory was a highly abstract subject, with limited connection with musical practice (to the impoverishment of both). Writing on music consisted largely of theoretical discussion; we do not hear of written 'methods' to help players, of criticism of individual pieces or performers, or even of biographies of pure musicians (as opposed to poets). Augustine's definition of music has been thought to be Varro's: *ars bene modulandi*, the system for moving sound well or appropriately.<sup>63</sup> Varro seems to have divided it into parts dealing with rhythm, melody and metre. The six books of Augustine's *De Musica* in fact deal entirely with rhythm and metre, claiming that while the names of the different feet are the province of the *grammaticus*, their combination, with the use of pauses, is part of music. (The six books that were to deal with melody, i.e. intervals and modes, were never written.) One passage throws light on an odd fragment of Varro. Somewhere in the *Disciplinae*, probably in the book on music, he considered the way the dactylic hexameter falls into two parts, of five and seven half-feet, which he says are none the less equivalent to each other, as can be proved geometrically; Augustine, at the end of Book 5, his last technical book, argues that the

<sup>59</sup> *De Rep.* 1.22, cf. 56. He is mentioned in Varro's Satire *Gnôthi Seauton* 206B.

<sup>60</sup> Geminus op. cit. 17.46; *De Rep.* 1.22, *De Or.* 1.69.

<sup>61</sup> Ed. A. Traglia, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Poetica Fragmenta* (1963) frags 19-52.

<sup>62</sup> Varro Atacinus, *FPL* 98; Q. Cicero, ib. 79; Virgil *G.* 2.475ff. A contemporary Greek poem by Alexander of Ephesus was perhaps read in Rome, as his poem on geography was, p. 44.

<sup>63</sup> Aug. *De Mus.* 1.1.

hexameter, the noblest of metres, must have equal parts, as equality is a noble characteristic: if the part made up of seven half-feet is divided into two, of three and four half-feet, it can be seen that the squares of three and four are equal to the square of five. It can probably be inferred that Augustine's framework, with his definitions of 'rhythm', 'metre' and 'foot', is basically Varro's.<sup>64</sup>

In the section on *melos*, melody, Varro probably talked of the *tonoi*, probably pitch-keys, from Hyperlydian to Hypodorian. He certainly somewhere praised their power to calm excited minds and even attract snakes, birds and dolphins.<sup>65</sup> This was probably where the usefulness of music lay. (Indeed he seems even to have said it attracted floating islands, in a lake in Asia.)<sup>66</sup> A passage about ancient flutes which Varro had seen in a temple of Marsyas in those parts and which only had four holes shows that as usual there was much antiquarian information in the work.<sup>67</sup> Varro knew something of practical musicians, against whom one of his satires seems to be directed; this was probably largely about music in the theatre, but there is a reference to Aristoxenus of Tarentum, the great theoretician of music (a Peripatetic, but of Pythagorean background) and to some technical terms, such as *harmoge*.<sup>68</sup> The divorce between theory and practice was not total. The Stoic Diodotus 'practised string music in the Pythagorean fashion'; we should compare a remark, perhaps from Varro, that to imbue his soul with his own divinity Pythagoras sang to the lyre before rising or sleeping.<sup>69</sup>

Varro apparently held children should learn to sing;<sup>70</sup> Vitruvius thought the architect must understand musical theory as well as almost everything else. For he must control acoustics in a theatre, and know how tight to twist the ropes of catapults. He warns us that *harmonice* is difficult, especially for those without a Greek education, and that he will have to use Greek words as there are no Latin equivalents. He goes on to explain, with the aid of a diagram and, he claims, the direct use of Aristoxenus, that there are three styles of modulation or internal sequence, harmonic, chromatic and diatonic, in each of which the tetrachord is made up differently. Harmonic, which moves via two tones and two quartertones, is solemn and artificial; chromatic has the smaller intervals of semitone, semitone, sesquitone; diatonic the 'natural' intervals of two tones and a semitone. There are eighteen notes, *phthongi*, in each style, eight of which, fixing the boundaries of the tetrachord, are common to all three (there are five tetrachords); the others vary. In fact, this seems to be a very simplified and inaccurate account

<sup>64</sup> A. Gellius 18.15.2; Aug. *De Mus.* 5.12 – in fact, he says, any verse must be made up of two halves, unlike but with some sort of equality to bind them together.

<sup>65</sup> Cassiod. op. cit. 2.5.8. The part on the *phthongi*, notes, may also be from Varro.

<sup>66</sup> Mart. Cap. 9.314G.

<sup>67</sup> Ps.-Acro on Hor. *AP* 202; cf. perhaps further information on Phrygian *tibiae*, Ser. *Aen.* 9.615.

<sup>68</sup> *Onos Lyras* 348-369B.

<sup>69</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.113; Censor. *De Die Nat.* 12.4.

<sup>70</sup> The *logistoricus*, *Catus de Liberis educandis ap.* Nonius 108L, 314L: 108L distinguishes vocal and instrumental music.

of Aristoxénus' teaching on the *genê* or kinds of music, which formed only a small part of his doctrine on the subject. Vitruvius' object in all this is to make bronze vessels resound to these notes in theatres that do not have the acoustic advantage of being made of wood, as is done in some parts of Italy.<sup>71</sup>

There was one other aspect of music with which philosophers had been much concerned: its moral and emotional effects. This concern goes back to the time when 'music', including the words which were hardly separable from their setting, was one of the twin pillars of Greek education together with 'gymnastic'. A musical revolution in the late fifth century, and the development of prose literature, made the importance of music's role harder to maintain. But Philodemus' *On Music* is one of the few even partly surviving assaults, of which there were clearly a number, on the dominant view that music expresses ethical states or produces ethical effects.<sup>72</sup> To discuss this work here, however, would take us too far away from the mathematical sciences.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Vitr. 5.4. This is the only time that he announces unambiguously that he is drawing direct from a Greek source; since he clearly found it very hard to understand, the errors are doubtless his own. 10.8 gives directions for constructing a water-organ, too briefly to be very comprehensible, as Vitruvius realises.

<sup>72</sup> Philod. *De Mus.* ed. van Kreeven. For date note 3.22.5, a reference to Antony.

<sup>73</sup> It is an assault, of which there were clearly a number, on the dominant view of music as expressing ethical states or having ethical effects. Plato and the Pythagoreans are attacked, and the more recent Stoics. Without quite understanding how fifth- and fourth-century developments had changed the meaning of 'music', Philodemus insists it does not include words; music as such only gives pleasure, for melody is irrational and only reason can affect the soul. Though the relation of music to states of mind is hard to analyse in fact, Philodemus is led by the ancient worship of reason into denying that music can even rouse or lull.

## CHAPTER TWELVE

# Medicine

The place of medicine among the liberal arts was not unquestioned. But there were many in the Hellenistic period who did see it as part of the *enkuklios paideia*, for example Athenaeus of Attaleia, founder of the Pneumatic school, in the first century B.C.<sup>1</sup> In Rome, Varro placed books on medicine and architecture at the end of his *Disciplinae*, and Vitruvius, who so stressed the wide education in all the liberal arts, and more, needed by the architect, was insistent that he must know something of medicine in order that his buildings should be situated in healthful positions, near good supplies of water.<sup>2</sup> It will be recalled that Cicero thought medicine and architecture suitable for free men to earn their living by, and that Caesar linked doctors with teachers of the liberal arts in his offer of citizenship to those living in Rome.<sup>3</sup>

We saw that almost all real doctors in Italy in this period were Greeks. All serious writing on medicine was in this language, though we shall find that there were some works on peripheral aspects of it in Latin. But it was in the first century B.C. that Greek medicine became properly established in Rome, to the extent that important developments even took place there, although the main centre for study remained Alexandria. Of these developments the Romans were not unaware, and in them they perhaps took even an exaggerated pride. It is interesting to contrast the way in which Greek influence was exercised in this most Greek of all subjects, with the way it affected the most Roman, law.

There may have been, as Pliny indicates, a certain amount of prejudice against Greek medicine in the second century B.C. (indeed he still has some himself). An early historian tells us that the 'first' Greek doctor in Rome (at the time of the Hannibalic War) got the reputation of a butcher, and the Elder Cato certainly advised his son to have nothing to do with Greek *medici*, who were sworn to kill every barbarian they treated, and for pay at that (it seems to have been the tradition at Rome for the *paterfamilias* to treat his own household, and the idea of taking money to cure may have seemed as immoral as taking money to defend in the courts).<sup>4</sup> Not everyone will have been as extreme as Cato; but Pliny believed that Asclepiades of Bithynia managed to establish a position and make a good deal of money, partly by the unprecedentedly agreeable nature of his treatment and partly because of a

<sup>1</sup> *ap.* Oribasius, *Coll. Med.* IV (*libri incerti*) CMGVI 2.2. 139-41.

<sup>2</sup> Vitr. 1.1.10.

<sup>3</sup> *De Off.* 1.151; Suet. *DJ* 42.1.

<sup>4</sup> Pliny *NH* 29.12-15. Cato had note-books of his own with prescriptions and recipes, probably also charms.

reaction against the exaggerated claims made for their drugs by the *magi*, oriental magicians; though naturally the *magi* were not entirely driven from the field, and were in particular to influence Nigidius Figulus.

At all events, Asclepiades made his name in Rome by eloquent lecturing, acquired aristocratic patients, and died some time before, probably only shortly before, 91 B.C.<sup>5</sup> Pliny holds that he turned Greek medicine completely upside down, abandoning the old treatment based on drugs (about which Pliny thought he knew little) for his agreeable prescriptions of warm baths, carriage exercise, and judicious use of food, wine and drinking water.<sup>6</sup> Celsus, the sensible though probably lay writer on medicine of the early first century A.D., also thought that Asclepiades, by his concentration on 'diatetics', the healthy régime, as opposed to pharmacology or surgery, introduced an entirely new epoch.<sup>7</sup> Later Apuleius regarded him as the greatest doctor since Hippocrates.<sup>8</sup> It was supposed by all three that he had rescued a man supposed to be dead from his funeral bier. The Roman writers may exaggerate the importance of a figure who could in a way be regarded as their own, and it is perhaps typical that they stress the originality of his treatment, rather than the more fundamental question of the originality of his ideas. But Asclepiades' reputation was international. He refused an invitation from King Mithridates, pupils apparently came to him from as far away as Asia, and his writings were taken note of by the philosopher Antiochus, who called him second to none in medicine, but having also a tincture of philosophy, and by the doctor Athenaeus of Attaleia; Posidonius and Asclepiades are the only two recent thinkers granted a place in a first-century B.C. Greek doxographic work known as the *Vetusta Placita*.<sup>9</sup> Indeed it is almost possible to argue that he was the most original and influential figure working in Rome during the late Republic. His school flourished after his death, and his views were still being attacked or followed in the time of Galen, and even later.

It is clear from his knowledge of his predecessors, and from the fact that he had observed cases elsewhere before coming to Rome, that Asclepiades was (*pace* Pliny) a properly trained doctor; but the ignorance of anatomy of which both Pliny and Galen accuse him suggests that he had not studied in Alexandria,<sup>10</sup> though his theoretical principles were such that anatomy was not of primary importance to him. He is perhaps not likely to have been able to teach human dissection in Rome.<sup>11</sup> He was however by no means so

<sup>5</sup> E. Rawson, *CQ* (1982) 358. There is as yet no adequate collection of Asclepiades' fragments. *De Or.* 1.62 dates his death.

<sup>6</sup> *NH* 26.12-20; cf. 7.124, *summa fama* among all the doctors known to Pliny.

<sup>7</sup> Celsus *proem.* 11.

<sup>8</sup> Apuleius *Florida* 19.

<sup>9</sup> *NH* 25.6; *Sex. Emp. Against the Logicians* 1.201-2; Galen 7.615-16K. H. Diels, *Doxog. Gr.* 185.

<sup>10</sup> *NH* 26.12 implies inadequacy; Galen *De Fac. Nat.* 3.7.166 Brock. But Asclepiades could criticise the great Herophilus on an anatomical point, Galen 1.109K.

<sup>11</sup> It may even have ceased to be practised in Alexandria about this time (though at one stage vivisection on criminals had existed there). *Tusc. Disp.* 1.46 might suggest that *medici* in general practised dissection (the human head is in question) but may reflect an earlier Greek source; cf. however Celsus *proem.* 74, *discentibus necessarium*.

ignorant of drugs as Pliny and to some extent Celsus held, and indeed the volumes he dedicated to Mithridates probably dealt with pharmacology.<sup>12</sup> It is also clear that he recognised the need for surgical intervention in some cases, though he was not primarily a surgeon.<sup>13</sup> But it was his 'physical' theories that were important, and his new forms of treatment (not all as new as he claimed) sprang directly from these theories.

Asclepiades' basic hypothesis was atomistic, though he may not have used the word. There is some difficulty in establishing the precise nature of his views, and the terminology he employed,<sup>14</sup> but it is clear that, influenced by Heraclides of Pontus, a pupil of Plato, but perhaps also by Epicurus, he postulated *onkoi*, masses, which are continually in motion in the void and splitting into innumerable fragments, *thrausmata*, of different shapes and sizes. These are intelligible only, not sensible, and without qualities, but reform to create perceptible bodies. The particles are separated by invisible gaps or 'pores', *poroi*, and most pain and illness is owing to disturbance of movement or jamming in the pores. The heat of the body is the result of friction between particles, not of any 'vital fire'. Earlier doctors had talked of *poroi* and blockages, but not, or not so consistently, in the context of a corpuscular theory; the great third-century doctor Erasistratus was perhaps Asclepiades' closest predecessor.<sup>15</sup>

This doctrine, which can be described as mechanistic (and Asclepiades often uses comparisons with simple instruments or machines) was anathema to Galen because it denied the fundamental principles of the main medical tradition, particularly the Hippocratic tradition: the purposive character of Nature and her own healing effort, and the functions of the various organs in her service, with the sympathy between them. Asclepiades, like Epicurus, said that the gods took no care for man; nature, made up only of body and movement, could harm as well as help; and he had little interest in the famous four (or more) humours. He even rejected the fundamental dualism between body and soul. For him, the *pneuma* or spirit, or rather what he called the *leptomeres*, the fine-particled element, was dependent on breathing and nourishment. It had no ruling principle or *hêgemonikon* in Reason, as others held – for him all understanding came ultimately from the senses – and was not located in any one part of the body, such as the heart or the brain, but spread all round it in the form of particularly small particles. By contrast Erasistratus for example had held, at least at one stage, that the 'vital *pneuma*' was centred in the heart, and the 'psychic *pneuma*' travelled from the heart to its seat in the brain (the arteries held *pneuma* not blood). And the Stoics, for whom *pneuma* was part of the fiery substance that gives life to the whole cosmos, located it entirely in the heart. Asclepiades showed, perhaps by actual

<sup>12</sup> *NH*, loc. cit. in n. 6; Celsus 3.4.2, 18.13; but see Scrib. Larg. 3H, and Pliny *NH* 25.6. Pliny also uses him, as the Indices show, in the books on plants (this is not the later Asclepiades Pharmacion, whom Pliny, roughly his contemporary, does not know).

<sup>13</sup> We hear of him performing abortion and laryngotomy; but *NH* 26.17, he refused agonising operations on the throats of sufferers from quinsy.

<sup>14</sup> Most recently, G. Harig, *Philologus* (1983) 43.

<sup>15</sup> He had been influenced by the Lyceum.

experiment, that various animals can live on for a while if these supposedly essential organs are removed.<sup>16</sup>

Some other doctors had thought breathing created the *pneuma*. But to Asclepiades, since he denied natural forces and functions in the body, breathing was a willed forcing together of the tiny passages and bunching up of the particles. The lung acts as a funnel through which the outside air, which is composed of big particles, is forced into the chest, where the particles of *pneuma* are finer, and swept along by certain movements becomes fire itself; part is breathed out again. Galen refers to a special work on breathing and the pulse, which like Erasistratus Asclepiades saw as the dissemination of *pneuma* through the arteries (though for him these also carried blood). If the pulse was weak there was too little *pneuma* and it was too thin. (A follower of his in the first century A.D. partly corrected these views, observing that breathing and the pulse are not in any way synchronised.)<sup>17</sup>

Asclepiades was extremely consistent in his theories, as Galen concedes, though arguing that his boastful and provocative arrogance led him into absurdities. For example, he said that food was simply distributed around the body in the state in which it was ingested (hunger was the opening of larger passage-ways in the stomach, thirst of smaller ones), though the usual belief was that it was either cooked or became rotten in the stomach – and that it does undergo alteration, Galen pointed out, is easily proved by examining vomit. In fact, seeing processes in terms of the movement of particles, Asclepiades was unwilling to recognise qualitative changes. He also went back on the anatomical discoveries of the last centuries by refusing to accept the obvious function of the kidneys, ‘known to every butcher’ says Galen, and supposing that the fluid we drink passes into the bladder as vapour through the pores in its surrounding coat, ignoring the ducts. He also refused to accept that the nerves were sensitive. Rejecting all notions of ‘force’ or ‘attraction’ he went so far as to deny the attraction of the magnet, says Galen, for which Epicurus had at least tried to provide an explanation in terms of his atoms, though not, Galen thinks, a convincing one.<sup>18</sup>

Asclepiades’ approach was diametrically opposed to that of the recently very influential school of the Empirics, who had found much Greek medicine over-speculative, and had refused to look for any but the most obvious causes of disease, defining illness primarily in terms of combinations of symptoms, or syndromes. They denied the possibility of various kinds of medical knowledge, even arguing, as Cicero once notes, that the very process of dissection might alter the organs and perhaps mislead.<sup>19</sup> Experience was however defined fairly widely, to include the experience of the past, the results of some rather primitive forms of experiment, and argument from analogy. Asclepiades’ near contemporary, Heraclides of Tarentum, who worked in

<sup>16</sup> But acc. Galen *Hist. Philos.* 19.254K the *leptomeres* did concentrate in some places more than others.

<sup>17</sup> Galen 8.758K.

<sup>18</sup> Galen *De Fac. Nat.* 1.13-14 Brock.

<sup>19</sup> *Acad.* 2.122.

Alexandria, was too great a man to be strictly confined by a sect, but he is called an Empiric, and his extensive commentaries on the Hippocratic corpus may be inspired by Empiric appreciation of past tradition.

Asclepiades by contrast counted as a Dogmatist, one who thought relevant truth was reached by theory as well as experience, though those to whom the word was applied varied widely in their beliefs. While as we saw he thought that all knowledge ultimately came from the senses, he denigrated medical experience, appealing to the old maxim of Heraclitus that one can never step into the same river twice, and arguing that diseases never stay the same, and that treatment must differ for different patients and in different places (venesection is good for certain sufferers in Parium but not elsewhere).<sup>20</sup> Such differences in fact the Empirics did concede. But in view of these variations, Asclepiades denied the old theory of special 'critical days' in the progress of a disease (Celsus agreed, and thought Pythagorean number-mysticism had been partly to blame for it). His stress on causation was often thought to be carried too far, however; Pliny says the old doctors had been interested in this, but Asclepiades had reduced medicine to 'guess-work about causes'. Aetiology also got into his definitions of particular diseases, which some thought an error in method.<sup>21</sup>

It might be argued that, since we can attribute no actual discovery of importance to him, Asclepiades cannot count as one of the greatest Greek doctors. The best age of Greek medicine had ended with Herophilus and Erasistratus in the third century, and there was now too much dispute between sects, and in some quarters too much reverence for the past. Asclepiades may however have described some diseases for the first time ('elephantiasis' and hydrophobia are said to have first occurred in his day). But his importance as the most extreme and logical representative of a mechanistic and anti-dualistic biological theory has been much stressed of late, and was to give him importance in the sixteenth century and after, at the time of the anti-Galenic reaction. His rejection of harsh and barbaric treatments was also influential outside his own school.

Asclepiades' numerous writings included commentaries on Hippocrates, presumably critical; and polemic against Erasistratus, in spite or because of the similarity of some of their views. He is also said to have followed the 'old doctor Cleophrantus', also from the third century, to some extent in his treatment of fevers by the use of wine.<sup>22</sup> It is clear that Pliny is wrong in saying he had no medical education, for he probably could not have got this knowledge of his predecessors at Rome in the late second century, for all that there were some Greek doctors there. But an obscure passage in Galen, which seems to accuse Asclepiades of not being able to give a proper *logos* for his doctrine of pores, because he left his papers at home fearing shipwreck, suggests a lack of intellectual substructure that may help to explain Pliny's obviously biased account.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Sex. Emp. *Against the Logicians* 2.7 (it is sad that Sextus' full refutation of Asclepiades is lost).

<sup>21</sup> Celsus 3.4.12; Pliny *NH* 26.13.

<sup>22</sup> Celsus 3.14.1

<sup>23</sup> Galen *On Med. Exp.* Walser 26.6.

The late Latin writer Caelius Aurelianus shows us how Asclepiades applied his theories – sometimes inconsistently, it is claimed. For example, phrenitis, in which Asclepiades was obviously interested and which is defined as insanity with fever but without pain (or normally without pain: Caelius is not sure which Asclepiades meant) is, like lethargy, due to an obstruction of the corpuscles in the membrane of the brain. There is also madness without fever, which can be due to drugs, or to strong emotion especially depression, or to epilepsy; it can also be the result of certain other severe and painful diseases. Asclepiades' treatment of the insane was notably humane; but the reason, for example, why he did not deprive them of all light, as older doctors had often done, sprang from his belief in the nature of perception. In light, images merely created by the mind may be overcome by those received by sense, but in darkness they become dominant. Asclepiades tried in such cases to induce sleep by gentle massage, rather than by drugs such as poppy which might bring on lethargy. He pointed out that music can sometimes work a cure.<sup>24</sup> The turning away from the doctrine of the humours was also responsible for the new approach to mental disturbance, though of course for Asclepiades mental disturbance had to be reduced to physical disturbance.

Asclepiades saw almost everything in terms of the movement of his particles, and denied processes that involved qualitative change. Hence no doubt his limited interest in drugs; Galen points out that the atomists cannot explain the speed of the changes that do occur in the body. But Asclepiades was doubtless right to hold that many ancient medicines were bad for the stomach, and Pliny admits that earlier practice had involved crude and dangerous methods, and that Asclepiades' refusal to make much use of emetics was also correct.<sup>25</sup> In fevers and acute illnesses he thought it safest for the patient to take only carefully regulated food and wine, but in a work called *Preparations* he said that it is a poor doctor who has not two or three compositions ready and tested for use against any ailment.<sup>26</sup> Pliny's accusations about his lack of training and unwillingness to leave his lecture-room to search for simples are clearly unfair.

Asclepiades' book on the use of wine would seem to have been one of his most discussed works. Pliny says that he got his nickname *Oinodotes*, the wine-giver, from it, and that subsequent discussions of it were numberless, medical opinion being much divided on the subject. It is uncertain how much of Pliny's own discussion of wine goes back to Asclepiades, but he is quoted as saying that the usefulness of wine is almost equal to the power of the gods.<sup>27</sup> True, roast meat and wine had been used before in treating patients: but Asclepiades of course gave reasons for his prescription. These would appear to include a belief that wine both coagulates food in the body and thins

<sup>24</sup> Cael. Aurel. *Morb. Ac.* 1.1.6; cf. 1.1.15, quoting from Asclepiades' *Definitions* the idea of thoughts being too big for the passages, or these last too big for the movements taking place in them. Caelius follows the great Greek doctor Soranus fairly closely and probably as a result is more aware than the other Latin sources of the philosophical basis of Asclepiades' therapy.

<sup>25</sup> Pliny *NH* 26.17; also violent purging, Celsus 1.3.17.

<sup>26</sup> Scrib. Larg. 3H. Scribonius also gives a prescription for 'Asclepiades' pills', the best preparation for artery trouble, ch. 75.

<sup>27</sup> Pliny *NH* 23.32, 38.

it out, as rennet in milk thickens cheese and leaves a thin residue. Again, there is no question of a qualitative change.

He was much concerned with his 'Common Aids', massage, rocking, and the use of water for drinking and bathing.<sup>28</sup> We also know that Asclepiades thought that gynaecology was not really a separate branch of medicine, as all bodies are made of the same materials. However, writing about generation, he held that male and female infants are differentiated by their heat; the former were 'hotter in their articulation' and so born sooner. Perhaps it was in this connection that Asclepiades said that Ethiopians are old by thirty as their bodies, being overheated by the sun, become relaxed and porous in their material, while the British live to be a hundred, since the cold makes their pores close and their bodies become resistant.<sup>29</sup>

Though there can be no doubt that Pliny is wrong in dating Asclepiades to 'the time of Pompey the Great', it is hard to reject his statement that Themison of Laodicea at least was Asclepiades' *auditor* or direct pupil, for Caelius Aurelianus says that Themison's work on periodic fevers was written before Asclepiades had distinguished catalepsy.<sup>30</sup> Themison certainly practised in Rome or conceivably, for a time at least, in Italy: we have his observation on a case in Mediolanum.<sup>31</sup> It is embarrassing that we have no evidence for his activity in the middle of the first century B.C., which is where we shall have to put him, but there is no definite proof of the later date usually given him. The youthful work on periodic fevers, which he was the first to treat separately, shows him still talking of the *onkoi*, but 'in old age' he developed and to some extent altered his master's views at least on 'diet', a healthful régime, on which he was regarded as a great authority. There was a book on this, and there are fragments of his writings with gynaecological and pharmacological content.<sup>32</sup> Pliny also mentions a work on the common herb *plantago*, plantain; there was said to be nothing like it for 'the fluxions the Greeks call *rheumatizmus*' (catarrh). In cases of insanity he gave what Pliny thought of as an unusually small dose of hellebore.<sup>33</sup> He remained an important and frequently quoted authority, though not the controversial figure of the front rank that Asclepiades had been.

But Themison was the fore-runner to whom the Methodist school liked to look back. The rather simplistic outlook of this sect, which claimed that a doctor could be trained in six months, has been thought likely to commend itself to the Romans;<sup>34</sup> but its representatives, such as Nero's doctor Thessalus, were still mainly Greeks, and it had connections with Greek philosophy as the other sects did.<sup>35</sup> Like the Empirics, the Methodists

<sup>28</sup> Celsus 2.14ff.

<sup>29</sup> Diels, *Doxogr. Gr.* 443.

<sup>30</sup> Pliny *NH* 29.6 (cf. 26.12, 22.128). Cael. Aurel. *Morb. Ac.* 2.12. 84.

<sup>31</sup> *Id. op. cit.* 3.18. 186.

<sup>32</sup> Celsus *proem.* 11; Cael. Aurel. *Morb. Chron.* 1.1.50, 2.1.57, *Ac.* 1.16.155. He also wrote on acute fevers.

<sup>33</sup> Pliny *NH* 25.80, 58.

<sup>34</sup> Though Celsus criticises it for this very reason, *proem.* 62-7.

<sup>35</sup> Its relations with Scepticism are however problematic, M. Frede in *Science and Speculation* (1982) ed. J. Barnes *et al.*, 1.

thought that causes, even evident ones according to Celsus, had no bearing on treatment; nor had the variations in a disease due to varying circumstances. It was not strictly necessary to know physiology and anatomy. But the Methodists were more interested in classification than the Empirics, and thought the latter had no real 'art' of medicine. For themselves, diseases fell into three categories: in the *status strictus* (to use Celsus' Latin terminology) matter in some part of the body was too crowded, in the *status laxus* too relaxed; excretion through the *poroi* was thus either too little or too much – the descent from Asclepiades is clear. There was also a *status mixtus*, with too much excretion from one part and too little from another.<sup>36</sup> These were the *koinotêtes*, common or general states, recognisable on inspection. Knowledge is attainable, and its object is such generalities. The Methodists distinguished also between acute and chronic illnesses, and those which were increasing, stationary and declining, all of which had to be treated differently. Themison seems to have had the conception of the *koinotêtes*, though much later Soranus, who was basically a Methodist, criticised his decision to let blood in cases of haemorrhage of the womb, which like all haemorrhages needs constricting.<sup>37</sup>

The impact which Asclepiades and his pupils had on their non-medical contemporaries is hard to evaluate. In particular, did Asclepiades stand at all close to or in any way influence the Epicureans in Rome? He used sometimes to be regarded as Lucretius' master in matters of physiology, but this is certainly an exaggeration. It has recently been argued that Lucretius is aware of but reacts against him, accepting the dualism of body and soul and the traditional 'vitalist' beliefs. In Book 4 one passage holds that food is not transformed in the body, and this might suggest Asclepiades' influence; but another accepts that it is 'cooked', and the explanation of thirst, not in terms of the opening of 'pathways' but the extinction of fires, is alien to him. And in Book 6 Lucretius accepts the attraction of the magnet, though his main explanation of it in atomic terms is not quite that attributed to Epicurus by Galen.<sup>38</sup> The elaborate description of the plague at Athens that ends his work seems to be drawn from Thucydides, and from the Hippocratic Corpus, perhaps used with the aid of a lexicon of Hippocratic terms such as we know existed (indeed the Epicurean Demetrius of Laconia had recently written one).<sup>39</sup> It has also been argued that Virgil, who is said to have studied medicine, and was an Epicurean in his younger days, shows in the *Georgics* knowledge of the ideas both of the Hippocratic tradition and of Themison.<sup>40</sup> Vitruvius, in spite of admiration for Democritean atomism, thinks many diseases caused by winds, and puts faith in *medicina contraria*, which cures in some cases by *adiectioes* and in some by *detractioes*; wind can also draw the

<sup>36</sup> Celsus. *proem.* 54-7.

<sup>37</sup> Galen 10. 35K for Themison's use of the *koinotêtes*: Soranus, *Gyn.* 2.9.42.

<sup>38</sup> *Lucr.* 4. 631, 867-76; 6.906-1089. J.-M. Pigeaud, *REL* (1980) 176.

<sup>39</sup> See Bailey's comm. esp. to 6.1183-95.

<sup>40</sup> Most fully, J.-M. Pigeaud, *Helmantica* (1982) 539: esp. *Georg.* 1.84-93, where one suggestion applies Themisonian ideas of tightened or expanded passages to the earth as though it were a human body. Would it be rash to note that Themison may have worked at one period in Mediolanum, where Virgil spent some time in study?

sap from sick persons and make them thinner, while a smooth and thick air nourishes them. Finally, Cicero had some familiarity with medical ideas and language, but there is little sign of knowledge of Asclepiades or Themison; indeed he seems to be against giving wine to the sick. He can say confidently that Tiro is being wrongly treated when *kakostomachos* – technical terms are of course Greek.<sup>41</sup> As we saw, he has some awareness of the tenets of the Empirics, and one might think that his Academic Scepticism would give him sympathy with these; but occasional remarks on physiology tend to come from other, including Stoic, sources. It is interesting that we hear nothing in Rome of the medical school most closely connected with Stoicism, that of the Pneumatics, founded by Athenaeus of Attaleia, who is said to have been a pupil of Posidonius.<sup>42</sup> This shows that we should not generalise too rashly about the influence of Stoicism, or of Posidonius, in Rome. The lack of close contact with Alexandria is also to be noted.

Varro certainly had considerable medical knowledge. There is no evidence that Lucilius' satires had mocked doctors, but one of Varro's *Menippean Satires* did so; its title, *Quinquatrus* (the festival doctors shared with craftsmen) may suggest that they were being devalued, and Varro doubtless criticised medicine from an old-Roman, and Cynic, point of view, claiming as he does in the *De Re Rustica* that people were healthy in the good old days, or perhaps if they lived according to nature. Doctors are less valuable than philosophers, the doctors of the soul; what is Heraclides of Tarentum to Heraclides of Pontus? They give disgusting medicine and wield terrifying weapons like *forcipēs dentharpages*. But there is also a description of spoiled patients lapped in luxury who are perhaps Asclepiades' clientèle. The scanty fragments also refer to the third-century Alexandrian doctor Herophilus; he finds water in the stomach and is contrasted with a (more useful) Tuscan water-diviner.<sup>43</sup> The work was naturally not wholly serious. In the *De Re Rustica* Varro tells with pride (modestly comparing himself to Hippocrates) how once, in a pestilence in Corcyra, he saved his whole household by blocking up the windows and doors of his house and making new ones facing north: for earth, water and air, three of the four elements, can send forth noxious vapours. This is Hippocratic doctrine. The same work contains the famous reference to tiny invisible animals from the marshes which, breathed in, cause malarial fever. There is probably a Greek source for this, but we cannot identify it.<sup>44</sup>

The book on medicine in the *Disciplinae* had as we would expect some historical material; it traced the art to the temple of Aesculapius in Cos and to Hippocrates' relation with it, and it is possible that much of what Pliny says about Asclepiades comes from this work. Part of it seems to have dealt with

<sup>41</sup> Vitr. 1.6.1-3; *De ND* 3.69 (perhaps from his philosophic source); *Ad F.* 16.4.1.

<sup>42</sup> Galen *De Caus. Cont.* Kalbf. 2.

<sup>43</sup> Frags 440-448B. Frags 199-200B (from the *Gnôthi Seauton*) touch on the physiological question of how bodies grow and are nourished; and 575B (from the *Hydrokyôn*) quotes a medical source, Mnesitheus, on the different effects of different sorts of wine.

<sup>44</sup> Varro *De RR* 1.4.5; 1.12.2. I am not clear that the *animalculae* are identical with the 'seeds of disease', found in certain ancient sources, including Lucretius, which V. Nutton, *Medical History* (1983) 1 thinks may have been accepted by Asclepiades and/or Themison.

remedies for various conditions, often of a popular kind (such as the benefits of chewing the herb purslain).<sup>45</sup> The untechnical nature of the book is further suggested by the fact that Celsus does not mention Varro as a forerunner of his own in writing of medicine in Latin.

The *logisticus* entitled *Messala de valetudine* presumably dealt to some extent with medical matters (perhaps dietetics), as the *Orestes de insania* may have done; we have seen how the *Tubero de Origine Humana* discussed Pythagorean, and probably other, theories of generation.<sup>46</sup> The *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* also cited Aristotle's view on this matter, one in which, as Aulus Gellius says, both doctors and philosophers were interested.<sup>47</sup> There were also three books *De Valetudine Tuenda*, perhaps on dietetics; and the *Hebdomades* may have given portraits of, and some information on, famous doctors.<sup>48</sup>

As was noted at the start of this chapter, there was some writing in Latin on quasi-medical subjects. The agricultural writers had something to say on veterinary medicine – especially the translations of Mago, it seems.<sup>49</sup> But (perhaps surprisingly, since much dissection had to be animal dissection) medicine proper was not much interested in animal health, and when, from a later period, we have Greek and Latin treatises on the subject, they have little theoretical framework. Botany and mineralogy, however, were often treated, in the Hellenistic world, primarily as a part of pharmacology. But before the works on these subjects, or indeed the classic ones of Aristotle and Theophrastus, could be used in Rome at all it was essential to decide on the Latin equivalents for Greek names of plants or minerals and to see if the same kinds were to be found in Italy. This seems to have been one of the preoccupations of Pompeius Lenaeus' obviously very loosely translated version of Mithridates' work (or works in Mithridates' possession) on the properties of plants, which Pliny reckons as the first Latin contribution to pharmacology.<sup>50</sup> We saw how Lenaeus was concerned to describe and distinguish different varieties of the same plant. He added a third variety of laurel, which he called *mustax* because it was cooked with 'mustacean' cakes, to the two named by the Elder Cato (the Delphic and Cyprian) and seems to have described all three carefully; Pliny says many more varieties have been

<sup>45</sup> Pliny *NH* 20.152; 22.114, 141, and probably other passages; see U. Capitani, *Maia* (1972) 120.

<sup>46</sup> p. 161.

<sup>47</sup> Frag. 98 Card. (cf. the Satire *Testamentum*, frag. 543B, birth in the eleventh month *kata Aristotelēn*), with A. Gellius 3.16.1.

<sup>48</sup> F. Ritschl, *Opuscula* III.403. *De LL* 9.11 mentions putting children's legs in splints to straighten them; and there are unlocalised fragments that may have a medical context.

As evidence of lay (though Greek) interest in medical matters note DS 32.10-12, a humane excursus on hermaphrodites, refuting Aristotle's view that some animals were true hermaphrodites, and recommending surgical intervention to help humans who appear to be such. Posidonius has been seen as the source; but at all events attempts to identify him with a doctor Posidonius sometimes quoted are probably wrong.

<sup>49</sup> Varro *De RR* 2.1.21, 5.18; stress on causes, but only obvious ones like overwork. 7.16 suggests recognition of symptoms in and ways of treating horses were more developed.

<sup>50</sup> Pliny *NH* 25.5.

added since. He called tamarisk a kind of heather, and compared it to Italy's 'Amerian broom'. And he reproduced, it seems, Mithridates' own description of a plant identified by himself, and probably also of its powers as a medicine and antidote. The work of Lenaeus may have been useful enough; but it was perhaps frivolous to make a version of the king's work, if this is what it was (and to preface it with sensational tales about his immunity to poison and amazing linguistic gifts) rather than go to the writings of his learned rhizotomist Crateuas, whose illustrated herbal was to become a standard authority.<sup>51</sup> We have also met Cloatius Verus' *Ordinata Graeca*, which was perhaps more than just the lists of all the varieties of different fruits, nuts and maybe other plants, including Italian ones, that it seems at first sight, since a fragment of another work of Cloatius (on words borrowed from Greek) reveals that he was a student of Theophrastus' botanical writings. But the *Ordinata Graeca* may well be one of the works to which Pliny objects that they neither describe nor illustrate the plants they mention.<sup>52</sup>

We know that new varieties of plants and trees were introduced to Italy in our period, the most famous case being Lucullus' importation of a kind of cherry from Pontus.<sup>53</sup> The poet, M. Suetius, who is certainly pre-Augustan, is the author of a 'idyll' called *Moretum*. The making of this vegetarian dish is the subject of the surviving poem of this name falsely attributed to Virgil; it shows that *moretum* is a concoction of cheese and herbs. Suetius' recipe seems to have been more varied; the sole fragment concerns the walnut, and its discovery by Alexander's army in Persia. Suetius is significantly called 'very learned', and anxiety for correct identification is visible: the *persicum* is the Latin *mollusca nux*, just to make sure 'no one goes astray through ignorance'.<sup>54</sup> A work with strong botanical interests seems likely.

*Medicina metallica*, or the science of drugs of mineral origin, was a branch of medicine recognised by the Romans before our time. But though Varro may have made some reference to such drugs, neither Asclepiades nor Themison seems to have been much concerned with them, and probably no Roman of our period wrote specifically about them.<sup>55</sup> Where gem-stones are concerned, Pliny says that interest in them came in with Pompey's victories in the East;

<sup>51</sup> Id. ib. 15.127; 25.5, 63, A. Gellius 17.16. The story that Mithridates immunised himself against poison is not found in the true medical sources, which could not envisage such a process: G. Harig, *NTM* (1977) 104.

<sup>52</sup> *NH* 25.8-9: but illustrations are often miscopied. Pliny also complains that many plants are still unnamed and much herbal lore kept secret by its possessors.

The work by one Oppius, *De Silvestris Arboribus*, describing how these grew, where they were found, and what their uses were, *might* be by the *grammaticus* Oppius Chares, who *might* date to our period: *Macr. Sat.* 3.18.7. *NH* 24 is on drugs from forest trees.

<sup>53</sup> Pliny *NH* 15. 102, with *Olk, PW* 11.1 (1921) 511.

<sup>54</sup> *Macr. Sat.* 3.18.11 (*FPL* 53 Morel). The author may be the *equus* M. Seius, a friend of Cicero and Varro (not the earlier grammarian Sevius Nicanor, *Suet. Gramm.* 5). Suetius also wrote a poem called *Pulli*, chicks, probably didactic; Varro's friend raised fowl etc. in his villa at Ostia, *De RR* 3.2.14.

<sup>55</sup> *Cn. Gellius*, the late second-century historian, ascribed its invention to Sol, son of Ocean, *HRR* frag. 5. A couple of possible fragments of Varro's *De Medicina* (*NH* 33.85; 36.202) might come under this heading, but Pliny does not list Asclepiades or Themison as sources for his books on the subject.

and though this was largely a matter of new fashions in jewellery and decoration, Pompey's dedication on the Capitol of Mithridates' collection may have generated some more serious interest, and the Mithridatic Wars thus have had their effect in this field too.<sup>56</sup> Diodorus Siculus perhaps includes Romans among the readers who will, he thinks, be interested in speculation about the origin of Arabian gems, solidified by divine fire from pure water and given colour by the Sun.<sup>57</sup> But even in the Hellenistic world there had been little serious follow-up to Theophrastus, who had tried to classify minerals, naturally on criteria of appearance and behaviour rather than chemical composition; and the ancients never came to understand the principles of geology (which meant they could not prospect scientifically).<sup>58</sup> The supposed magical properties of earths, stones and gems were to prove the spur to more activity.

Nigidius' *De Hominum Natura* (if this was its proper title) was apparently a work on physiology that was definitely medical in approach: a reference to an *ars* and the material it needs to work with (vessels and iron instruments) must be to medicine. Fragments plausibly assigned to the work list the parts of the body and deal with menstruation, parturition and lactation. The contents go back, in part, to Aristotle (though Nigidius denies that a woman's milk is spoiled if she conceives again by the same man, as Aristotle had thought); none of the meagre surviving evidence reveals the Pythagorean influence that we expect in such an author on such a subject.<sup>59</sup>

We can form a better picture of Nigidius' outlook from the fragments of his *De Animalibus*. He was certainly concerned with the usefulness of animals for human health and well-being; but the identification of animals mentioned by Greek scientists was probably one of his purposes, as we have seen the identification of plants was for others. Possibly he sometimes proposed new Latin names; he is quoted as calling stag beetles 'Lucanian' beetles, a name Pliny does not seem to have found elsewhere and which perhaps meant 'elephant' beetles.<sup>60</sup> Pliny's careful description of the creature may be from Nigidius; if so, he also noted their use as amulets hung round children's necks – an observation Aristotle would probably not have made. Nigidius is also to be seen giving a formal definition or description of the *asilus* or *tabanus*, as a 'variegated fly', especially harmful to cattle, and noting that it was at first called by the Greeks *myops*, later because it was so dangerous *oestrus*. Aristotle, it is worth observing, had distinguished *myops* and *oestrus*; Nigidius seems to be bringing him up to date.<sup>61</sup> That there was real need for such activity is shown by the fact that Cicero, in the *De Natura Deorum*, dealing with the

<sup>56</sup> *NH* 37.11, 13-14. Sulla's stepson Scaurus had the first collection of gems, possibly engraved (*dactylothecium*); Caesar also dedicated a collection or collections. The lawyers had to find a definition of gems as contrasted with other valuable stones (it was based on translucency).

<sup>57</sup> *DS* 2.52.

<sup>58</sup> We may mention here Vitruvius' sole excursion into metallurgy, 7.8.4, on the recovery of the gold from worn-out embroidered cloth by a process using mercury.

<sup>59</sup> *Frag* 107-11 Swob., cf. *Arist. De Anim. Gen.* 777a14.

<sup>60</sup> *Frag.* 123 Swob.

<sup>61</sup> *Frag.* 114 Swob.

animal world from a Greek source and probably in a hurry, is sometimes unable to translate at all, and has to say 'pina, for this is its Greek name', or that he has read about a bird which the Greeks call *plataleia*.<sup>62</sup> Not that, in many subjects, the Greeks themselves had a completely unified terminology, for no single centre or institution had the authority to impose one; and this was true of all the life sciences.<sup>63</sup> This fact will have made things yet more difficult for the Romans.

Some of Nigidius' information would seem to be from Aristotle, at least ultimately: for example, the note on the friendship and enmity of wolf-fish and mullet at different times of the year, though the friendship of the wolf and the woodpecker is not.<sup>64</sup> But certainly the relations of different species were one of Aristotle's interests; an obscure reference to what Nigidius said about a bird that breaks eagles' eggs will be related to Aristotle's account of the birds that destroy other birds' eggs.<sup>65</sup> Equally, an interest in hibernation is Aristotelian, though Nigidius contradicts the great man by saying that night-owls hibernate for 60 days, rather than 'a few'. He adds that they have nine different cries, and this is an area of research that the *Historia Animalium* had not entered.<sup>66</sup> Some of Nigidius' information is sober enough. But his interest in the respectably Aristotelian subject of the effect of different seasons on animals can become extravagant: for ten days at the winter solstice piglets are born with teeth.<sup>67</sup> Cicero tells us that the Stoics have collected evidence for animals and plants changing nature with the seasons,<sup>68</sup> and Nigidius' own interest in astrology may also be significant. On several occasions when Pliny quotes him it is in the context of the views of the Magi, a reaction against whom, it will be recalled, had benefited Asclepiades: dogs will avoid for a whole day a man who has taken a tick from a sow's ear – so Nigidius, the Magi have similar views on the effect of ticks; Nigidius had great faith in the medico-magical powers of the cricket, the Magi yet more. And in the context of Magian remedies for snake-bite we learn that Nigidius held that a serpent returns 'by a necessity of nature' to the victim it has bitten – perhaps to die of remorse, as Pliny says some believe. It is clear that belief in far-reaching natural sympathies and antipathies was expressed in Nigidius' work.<sup>69</sup>

If his question, why do the sturgeon's scales face backwards unlike those of all other fish?<sup>70</sup> was a chapter-heading, as has been suggested, then the work may have been loosely organised as a series of questions; but this genre, which was used in Greece for scientific and antiquarian subjects and usually

<sup>62</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 2.123 (a shell-fish), 124.

<sup>63</sup> G.E.R. Lloyd, *Science, Folklore and Ideology* (1983) 149ff.

<sup>64</sup> Frags 118, 119 Swob; Arist. *HA* 610b10.

<sup>65</sup> Frag. 120 Swob. cf. Arist. *HA* 609a.

<sup>66</sup> Frag. 121 Swob. cf. Arist. *HA* 600a27.

<sup>67</sup> Frag. 116 Swob.

<sup>68</sup> *De Div.* 2.3.3.

<sup>69</sup> Frag. 126 Swob. (Pliny *NH* 29.69). Why should one clap a hen to a snake-bite, (frag. 112 Swob.)? Nigidius perhaps knew Bolus of Mende's work on sympathies and antipathies, falsely ascribed to Democritus.

<sup>70</sup> Frag. 113 Swob.

offers a choice of answers in a brief paragraph, does not seem suited to the descriptions of animals and discussions of their names that Nigidius obviously had. Aristotle had not on the whole progressed beyond the collecting and classifying of information to a search for causes. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Nigidius had a general taxonomy of the animal world, unless a fragment about cattle, which are basically wild but can be tamed,<sup>71</sup> is an echo of one of Aristotle's divisions into wild and tame creatures; nor is there any sign that he had a hierarchy of creatures, headed by man. It is possible that he had; but like Pliny and some later Greek authors on the animal world he may not have risen much above the anecdotic.

Nigidius' achievement then, as he perhaps saw it himself, was to make the zoological and physiological knowledge of Aristotle and Theophrastus accessible to the Romans, and to up-date it, especially with the oriental lore that had recently become popular, and possibly also to record some popular beliefs (as Aristotle and Theophrastus had themselves occasionally done). It would thus become of practical use. An eye for useful knowledge, this time of a prosaic rather than magical kind, is perhaps to be seen where, speaking of pigs in the *De Animalibus*, Nigidius describes the different varieties of acorn in great detail, telling us what the effect of each on the pig's meat is. Theophrastus had simply treated of the different sorts of oak and noted that it was not agreed which acorn was the sweetest for food.<sup>72</sup> The Romans, of course, ate more pig's meat than the Greeks. It is clear that there is more Nigidius in Pliny than can be certainly traced; and probably some in Cicero, especially the *De Divinatione* and *De Natura Deorum*, for he calls Nigidius a *physicus* or scientist and claims to have had many Carneadean, i.e. sceptical, discussions with him on natural philosophy.<sup>73</sup> It is understandable, however, that Cicero should be somewhat suspicious of the investigation of nature, and inclined to think its problems best left unexplored, when he saw the extravagances to which it could lead.

Varro seems not to have written any work specifically on zoology, though his aviary at Casinum, with birds 'of every kind' (but especially song-birds) may have been partly for study, not only, as he claims, for pleasure.<sup>74</sup> He was a great breeder of cattle, however, on which he has much to say in his agricultural work. In this context (and more specifically that of generation), one of the speakers describes him as a reader of Aristotle, but, rather curiously, the source he refers to most often is Archelaus, a third-century epigrammatist from Ptolemaic Egypt whose subject-matter was animal *paradoxa*: presumably he thought Archelaus' tales an adornment to a would-be literary work. We also know that his *Libri Navales*, perhaps identical with the *Ephemeris Navalis*, gave weather-signs from the behaviour of fish, and probably sea-birds.<sup>75</sup>

Finally, two problematic works which may date to the Ciceronian period

<sup>71</sup> Frag. 115 Swob.

<sup>72</sup> Frag. 125 Swob., cf. Theophr. *HP* 3.8.

<sup>73</sup> *Tim.* 1.

<sup>74</sup> Varro *De RR* 3.5.8ff.

<sup>75</sup> *Id. op. cit.* 2.5.13, 3.5; 3.11.4, 12.4, 16.4; Vegetius 4.41.

and may have medical interests. Calvus' *De Aquae Frigidae Usu* gave, according to Martial, *fontes et aquarum nomina*; the title suggests a perhaps Asclepiadean medical approach, and a fragment about the digestion ascribed to Calvus, if it comes from this work, might do the same. But whether this Calvus is the well-known poet and orator cannot be said for sure. Pliny used an Iacchus, who wrote in Latin, and may be Suetonius' Latin *grammaticus* Sescennius Iacchus, for one of his books on drugs from aquatic animals, and also for gems. It is possible that Iacchus was pre-Augustan, and that he was interested in drugs, but only possible.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Martial, 14.196; Charis. *GLK* I 81.24; Pliny *Index* to 32, 37; and 37.148.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

# Architecture and Allied Subjects

In the first century B.C. the attention of the upper class was inevitably drawn to architecture. There was more temple building in Rome than has sometimes been thought, and other important public buildings were put up (notably Pompey's theatre) or restored (like the Capitoline Temple and the Senate House). But what really characterised the period was the transformation in the palazzi and villas of the rich, which reached a totally new plane of luxury. Pliny tells us that what was regarded as the finest house in Rome in 78 B.C. was insignificant a generation later.<sup>1</sup> Gentlemen of lesser wealth emulated their betters as far as their means allowed. As in eighteenth-century England, which saw a similar development, numerous amateurs of architecture emerged, who wished to have a hand in designing their own houses; Vitruvius attests the class, perhaps unfairly saying that it resulted from the ignorance of modern professionals.<sup>2</sup> An interesting letter of Cicero's shows that his brother was making improvements to two villas on his estates near Arpinum; Cicero flings himself into reporting and advising, observing that he understands this business better than agriculture.<sup>3</sup> The Cicerones were probably more typical than Atticus, who was, says his biographer, no builder, in spite of his wealth; his refusal to modernise his uncle's old house in Rome, due to simple tastes and a love for the past, is singled out as remarkable.<sup>4</sup>

And yet the status of so practical a subject must be dubious. Opinions might vary, certainly; Posidonius held that the various crafts were invented by philosophers (the younger Seneca indignantly rejected the view, in great detail); and Cicero does once indulge in praise of the human hand and its skills.<sup>5</sup> But on the whole the generalisation stands, and yet more firmly in aristocratic Rome than in Greece.

These various facts form the background to Vitruvius' work. On the one hand, he appears to be writing for a predominantly lay readership, busy with public as well as private affairs, he says, which he tries to attract by literary embellishments of various kinds, and which is more interested in an overall picture than in really complete technical information. But on the other hand it is essential to assert the respectability of the subject – even though, as we recall, Cicero had said it befitted a free man and Varro made it one of his

<sup>1</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.109.

<sup>2</sup> Vitr. 6. *praef.* 6-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 2.6.

<sup>4</sup> Nepos *Atticus* 13.

<sup>5</sup> Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 90; *De Nat. Deor.* 2.150.

*Disciplinae*. Therefore the demand for a wide background in the architect, and therefore the frequent references to the great Greek scientists and mathematicians, and the tendency to hang such technical description as there is on to theoretical disquisitions (not always very accomplished). Even Vitruvius' fondness for abstract nouns has been traced to his predilection for a theoretical rather than a practical approach.<sup>6</sup> The architect, he claims, needs not only *fabrica*, craftsmanship, but *ratiocinatio*, theoretical knowledge.

He also needs to have a literary education, to be able to draw, and to understand geometry, optics, arithmetic, history, philosophy, music, medicine, law, and astronomy. For he must make notes and sketches, use rule and compass, understand lighting problems, assess costs and make measurements; he must know the history of various kinds of ornament (and as it proves, of warfare); philosophy gives high moral standards and scientific knowledge – for example, about the behaviour of water; music is relevant to acoustics and, somewhat surprisingly, to artillery; the architect must know what sites are healthy, law is clearly useful, astronomy especially so for constructing sun-dials (some of these matters we have already discussed).

All the disciplines the architect needs are linked, says Vitruvius, by their theory. Pytheos, who built the temple of Athena at Priene, wrote in his 'commentaries' on that building that the architect should excel all others in each subject. Vitruvius is not so unrealistic. How could an architect outdo Aristoxenus in knowledge of music, Myron and Polyclitus in sculpture, Apelles in painting, Hippocrates in medicine? Pytheos forgets that an art involves both practice and theory. The experts are skilled in the first, but any well-educated person may have the latter. The architect is left as the master of *ratiocinatio*.<sup>7</sup>

Vitruvius certainly held that education is the best possible possession and safeguard in life, enabling one to earn one's living anywhere, as Aristippus the philosopher found after a shipwreck, and as philosophers have insisted; also the Athenian comic poets – Vitruvius has to show off literary knowledge.<sup>8</sup> His work contains rather ostentatiously learned prefaces to the different books (though general prefaces in technical works were in the Greek tradition). The inevitable interest in *grammatica*, in spite of a style that veers awkwardly between the colloquial, the technical, and the elevated, is shown in a careful account of the different use made by the Greeks themselves, and the Romans, of certain technical terms: for example, male figures upholding an architrave, which we call *telamones*, why is not known, the Greeks call *atlantes*.<sup>9</sup> Not that Vitruvius wants to change the Latin usage, any more than he really wants to find Latin equivalents for Greek terms where they do not already exist: he uses Greek forms, keeping their original terminations, quite happily.

Vitruvius begins the work proper with a barrage of definitions that seem to add up to a fairly complete, if not very clear, aesthetic theory taken from the

<sup>6</sup> L. Callebat, *ANRW* 2. 30 1.696. Cf. Strabo 1.1.13; 2.5.1, the architect or engineer, fixing the site for a house or city, needs geography, geometry, astronomy.

<sup>7</sup> Vitr. 1.1.12-18.

<sup>8</sup> Id. 6. *prae*f 1-3.

<sup>9</sup> Id. 6.7.6.

Greek. Architecture is made up of, first, *ordinatio*, in Greek *taxis*, the rational relation in size of parts to each other, based on the use of a definite module. This creates proportion, *analogia*. Secondly, *dispositio* or Greek *diathesis*, which is planning, as seen in a ground-plan, elevation or perspective drawing, more dependent on taste than on strict measuring. Third, *eurhythmia*, which is an attractive appearance, caused by nice proportions, but also allowing for flattering the eye, which can be misled, by making changes in pure *symmetria* (thus for example columns are made thinner at the top than at the base); sometimes, also, lack of space makes true *symmetria* impossible, but beautiful effects not unlike true *symmetria* can still be obtained. *Decor*, suitability of style to place and purpose, or to tradition, and of parts to each other, comes from 'custom or nature': it comes from custom if the different parts of the building suit each other or, in a slightly different sense, if one does not mix the architectural orders; it comes from nature if the building is on a suitable site, its rooms look in the proper directions, and so on. It is also in accordance with *decor* for certain styles or orders to be associated with the temples of certain gods – Venus and Flora suit the luxuriant Corinthian – and for these temples to be in certain places in the city. *Distributio*, or Greek *oikonomia*, concerns the choice of materials and questions of cost. The words *taxis*, *symmetria* and *eurhythmia*, like considerations of what was fitting or suitable, had been in use from the early fourth century at least as a basis for beauty in the visual arts.<sup>10</sup>

The idea of truth to reality appears in discussion of the rules of the Doric order, which Vitruvius notoriously claims to be based on timber building (there are serious difficulties to the theory): to put dentils *under* a mutule would contravene the logic. But Vitruvius does not pursue the matter, though the idea of truth recurs when he criticises modern styles in wall-painting, and that of nature when he says that columns on upper stories should be slenderer than those below, as a tree tapers.<sup>11</sup> In one connection only there emerges the equally notorious idea of human proportion as the basis of at least some architectural forms. Nature has planned the well-made human body with consistent proportions, the head being one eighth of the total height, and so on. The navel is the natural centre, and if a man lies on his back with hands and feet outspread, a circle can be described around him, and similarly a square within it. 'Therefore if nature has formed the human body so that the members correspond to the complete figure, the ancients seem to have had reason in determining that in the execution of their works as well the measurements of the several members should have a relationship to the general pattern of the plan', and they used such natural units of measurement as the finger, palm, foot and cubit, and decided from the number of our fingers and toes that ten was the 'perfect' number (though six has been more recently regarded as perfect too, partly because a man's foot is the sixth part of

<sup>10</sup> J.J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (1974) 66ff. For *decor* cf. 7 5.5: statues of politicians in the gymnasium and athletes in the assembly are *indecentia*.

<sup>11</sup> Vitruv. 4.2; 7.5.3-7, 5.1.3.

his height and the cubit consists of six palms: we have met this sort of thing before).

Such being the human body, the Doric column at the archaic temple of Apollo Panionius in Asia was the first to be based on the proportions of a man, the diameter of the column, like the length of a man's foot, being a sixth of its height; subsequently the slenderer Ionic column was given the proportions of a woman, and the Corinthian, slighter still, those of a young girl. But this idea is not carried through to explain any part of any of the orders, except the column itself.<sup>12</sup>

Material of very different kinds thus lies side by side in Vitruvius. The question of his sources is a vexed one. He refers to, and implicitly claims to have read, a long list of Greek authorities, more particularly the *commentarii* by a number of famous architects on particular buildings of theirs; these were clearly much more than specifications, as we can see from the provocative remarks of Pytheos in his about the skills needed by the architect. There were also 'many' more general works on *praecepta symmetriarum*, the rules of the orders. Vitruvius complains that Roman architects had not left *commentarii* (perhaps from a feeling of inferiority to the great Greeks, though Vitruvius admired some of them); what the Roman sources who are mentioned, Fufidius, Septimius and Varro, were like it is impossible to say, but they may well, unlike the Greeks, all be amateurs; Varro, and almost certainly Septimius, were. But it has been unkindly held that Vitruvius used anonymous Latin manuals extensively, and that his knowledge of Greek and Greek sources was very superficial.<sup>13</sup> It is not certain that he had ever travelled in Greek lands.<sup>14</sup>

At all events, Vitruvius' attempts to fit his various sources into his systematic lay-out are not always happy. For example, books 3 and 4 proclaim that they will deal with temples, book 3 with those built in the Ionic order, book 4 with Doric and Corinthian. In fact book 3, probably based largely on Hermogenes of Alabanda in Asia Minor, an important authority to Vitruvius, deals with a number of general matters concerned with sacred edifices; the source or sources were concerned with temples in general, and, attached to their local traditions, maintained that Ionic was the proper style for these – a polemical position perhaps inspired by an infiltration of Doric into Ionia after the late fourth century. In book 4 however, which again has some general material, Vitruvius' sources are less anti-Doric, and he tells us that his teachers showed him how to get round the problem of the triglyphs at the angles, which Hermogenes had made much of.<sup>15</sup>

Vitruvius' approach is rigid and unhistorical. He was indeed not much interested in architectural history. He gives rather fanciful accounts of the

<sup>12</sup> Id. 4.1.6-10.

<sup>13</sup> Id. 7. *praeef.* 11-18. For a resumé of various unproveable theories, Pollitt, *op. cit.* in n. 10, 67.

<sup>14</sup> Vitr. 2.8.10 has a full description of Halicarnassus, but perhaps (8.13) from a literary source. Other references to Greek cities do not prove autopsy.

<sup>15</sup> P. Gros, *MEFR* (1978) 687. For Hermogenes, esp. Vitr. 3.3.9. Attempts to show Vitruvius was heavily influenced by Hermodorus of Salamis, who worked in Rome in the late second century, are unconvincing.

origins of the three orders; those of atlantes and caryatids may be less fanciful but are still misleading.<sup>16</sup> And at the beginning of book 2 there is an account of the origin of civilisation, and especially of building, that has contacts with Lucretius' book 5. But what he is interested in is systematisation, even if his types are not to be found in practice at all. He takes little account of the wealth of variation found in actual buildings; he feels that he stands at the end of a long development, and that it has now been established what is correct Ionic, correct Doric and so on. (This narrowness is not to be blamed on the wish to systematise in itself: that was just as likely to lead to a proliferation of sub-species.) Modern alterations, for him, are simply due to ignorance: thus the correct entablature for Corinthian is either Doric or Ionic, and there is no account of the development, taking place at Rome in exactly his own day, of the rich Roman-Corinthian system (he admits that Corinthian capitals may take different forms but refuses to describe them).<sup>17</sup>

Vitruvius' mixture of the descriptive and the normative is perhaps most puzzling when he comes to discuss temples in the Etruscan style (it is interesting in itself that he admits these). He deals at length with the 'araeostyle' temple, with widely spaced columns – where he got the Greek word we do not know – which he calls the 'Tuscanic plan' and sets beside Doric, Ionic and Corinthian. But his examples are from Rome itself – the Temple of Ceres by the Circus Maximus, the Capitoline Temple, restored after the fire of 83 on the traditional proportions, though in what Cicero thought a more splendid style, and, remarkably, Pompey's Temple of Hercules. The type of temple with triple *cella* which is in question is in fact by no means the commonest in Etruria or neighbouring areas; many buildings were closer to Greek forms. All Roman colonies, however, set up Capitolia dedicated to Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, and Vitruvius' ideal Tuscan type should, it has been suggested, be seen in a practical rather than a historical context. But Vitruvius' Tuscan temple has a wooden, not stone, architrave, which allows wide intercolumniation, and has 'Tuscanic' terracotta or gilt bronze ornaments. This sort of building, with rich and complex terracotta decoration, had been produced in abundance down to the second century at least, but was surely not used for Capitolia now; the ornament was Greek-influenced, but not in accordance with any of the classical orders. Vitruvius is probably producing a schematic type half-way between the programmatic and the historical.<sup>18</sup> It is not one he much admires: such buildings are too low and top-heavy, and the columns too far apart (probably a general reaction).<sup>19</sup>

On the whole Vitruvius does look back: what he regards as the four greatest marble temples are all in the Greek world, and all old: the Temple of

<sup>16</sup> Vitr. 1.1.5-6, dating the introduction of Atlantes and Caryatids to the time of the Persian Wars; to take this seriously requires the bold chronological changes in early Greek building history of E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *JHS* (1983) 49.

<sup>17</sup> Vitr. 4.1.2.

<sup>18</sup> Id. 3.3, 4.7.

<sup>19</sup> So Tac. *Hist.* 4.53.4.

Diana at Ephesus by Chersiphron of Cnossos and his son Metagenes, completed by Demetrius and Paeonius of Ephesus (Vitruvius, very properly, rarely refers to a building without naming its architect or architects); that of Apollo at Miletus by Paeonius and Daphnis of Miletus; Ictinus' Doric temple at Eleusis; and the Olympieium at Athens – not, be it noted, Ictinus' Parthenon. The Olympieium, still incomplete, had been worked on in the second century by the Roman Cossutius, and Vitruvius also admired Mucius, the architect of a temple in Rome dedicated by Marius, and even asserts that 'we have had as many fine architects in the past as the Greeks', and a large number in his own memory. If there is no reference to recent temples in the Hellenistic world, it is true that Greek architecture was not in that period most vital in this field, and for the present Vitruvius knows that the Greek world is impoverished and unlikely to create more masterpieces. This may have contributed to his feeling that architecture had finished its development.<sup>20</sup>

There is less about other types of public building: a fair amount on the forum and basilica, more on the theatre and its appendages (his 'Greek' and 'Latin' theatres are ideals, based on different geometric forms, not at all closely on actually existing buildings); little on baths, being developed in Italy at this time, on the purely Greek palaestra, or on harbours. Curiously, there is nothing here about walls or fortifications,<sup>21</sup> and many branches of civil engineering – roads, bridges, canals – are omitted.

When he comes to consider domestic architecture, Vitruvius has inevitably to give space to Roman styles of house, since these were very different from Greek ones (it is not seriously confusing that there are five types of *atrium* or central hall in the Roman house, some with Greek names, and that the Greek orders may of course be used in them). The Greek house-plan is finally considered for the sake of completeness: it dates back to the time when the Greeks were 'richer and more luxurious'. What does strike one in the treatment of Roman domestic building however is the extreme brevity of the account of the country villa – which is to all intents and purposes dealt with in a single sentence.<sup>22</sup> There is no reference at all to the sea-side villas, whose picturesque façades are to be seen on Pompeian wall-paintings, and which were a new development in the first century B.C.; Varro tells us something of the complex fish-ponds occasionally attached. There can be no doubt that Vitruvius was out of sympathy with much in his own time, often for moral reasons: wall-painting is in decay because ostentatious marble cladding is preferred and fantastic and impossible architectural representations are in fashion.<sup>23</sup> The words 'pleasure' and 'imagination' are not in Vitruvius'

<sup>20</sup> Vitr. 7. *praef.* 16; 6.7.4. He looks back also to careful old building techniques in stone, deploring modern brick and concrete, 2.8.7.

<sup>21</sup> Id. 5.1-12. The chapter on harbours describes the coffer dam (emptied by the water-screw or waterwheel) for building on the sea bottom, but there is no reference to lighthouses, perhaps not yet common outside Alexandria.

<sup>22</sup> Id. 6.6.5 *si quid delicatius in villis faciendum erit*, aim at *symmetria* without neglecting agricultural requirements. Concentration on planning and on public buildings may reflect Caesar's and Augustus' colonising and urbanising policies. (Nothing also on funerary monuments.)

<sup>23</sup> Id. 7.5; proponents of the new style clearly accuse the lovers of the old of *inertia*, dullness.

aesthetic vocabulary, and there is no doubt that he adheres to the classicising tendency in Rome that was to culminate under Augustus, and looked to Athens rather than further East.

Though we have no certain fragments of Varro's *De Architectura* we can see that he was strongly interested in the history of architecture in Rome as part of his investigation into her early way of life. He noted that all temples were small until the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was built in the late sixth century. He was particularly interested in the early Roman house, seeing strong Etruscan influence; indeed he derived the word *atrium* from the Etruscan city of Atria or Adria, and like Vitruvius he noted that one form of *atrium* is actually called *Tuscanicum*. The only building in Etruria that we know him to have described, however, is Lars Porsenna's tomb near Clusium. Unfortunately he appears to have taken his account from 'Tuscan fables', and unless Pliny is seriously misleading, Varro said that the tomb still existed, whereas Pliny is sure that there are no traces of it; and indeed the description is clearly fantastic (four pyramids set on a base, with resting on their points a bronze plate that supports a further set), though archaeologists have sometimes argued for a basis of fact, adducing a type of square Etruscan or Etruscanizing tomb with cippi or obelisks on it. We do not know Varro's context; it might have been not wholly serious.<sup>24</sup>

Vitruvius thought engineering an essential part of architecture. His last book describes various contraptions, beginning with cranes for building works, which he naturally thinks especially useful (there is some Roman terminology here, suggesting these devices were by now naturalised in Rome); the eye to machines used at public spectacles suggests that his readers might include magistrates. For odometers he seems to see no useful purpose, and indeed the maritime version he gives would only work in flat calm, with no currents; Vitruvius had probably never seen these things in operation. The water-organ we have met. Vitruvius announces that he is omitting the many merely amusing inventions of Ctesibius (the great Alexandrian engineer of, probably, the third century), driven by water-pressure, which can be looked up in his *commentarii*. More important is Ctesibius' force-pump, with pistons and cylinders, and we are also shown other methods of raising water, like the compartment wheel, the bucket wheel, the bucket and chain and the 'Archimedean screw', all in fact used in Egypt.<sup>25</sup> Naturally many readers would be interested in possible ways of irrigating land; it is interesting that there is no reference to mines, where pumping, in Spain at least, was well developed, but with which the senatorial class was not (it seems) directly concerned.<sup>26</sup> Vitruvius adds that the water-wheel is used for milling; this

<sup>24</sup> Varro *De Vita PR* frag. 13, cf. 39 Rip.; *De LL* 5.161; Pliny *NH* 36.91-3, cf. F. Messerschmidt, in *Das Neue Bild der Antike* (1942) 2.653. DS 5.40.1 (Posidonius) on Etruscan *atria*.

<sup>25</sup> Vitr. 10.4-7. It is odd that he only refers to the human treadmill (and water-power), not the use of animal-power. It is perhaps not so odd, as agronomy was a separate subject, that he omits other kinds of machinery using the screw in agriculture, though for example an improved Greek olive-press came in about this time, Pliny *NH* 18.317.

<sup>26</sup> DS 5.37 on the Spanish mines. Screws and wheels found there, T.A. Rickard, *JRS* (1928) 129; later at least, there were 'Ctesibian' pumps and water-driven crushing machinery.

seems to have been a first-century importation into Italy, so here at least he is up to date.<sup>27</sup>

Vitruvius' discussion of military engineering is very brief – only seven chapters. Here the survival of a number of Greek treatises enables useful comparisons to be made. Vitruvius tells us that he has taken a great deal of his discussion from Diades, who accompanied Alexander's expedition, and added what his own masters had taught him. In fact, the similarity of much of his discussion to that in the Greek treatise of Athenaeus, probably of about the same time, has suggested that both go back to what appears to be the latter's source, Agesistratus, who wrote earlier in the century.<sup>28</sup> Thus Vitruvius' artillery is up-to-date, incorporating recent (post-Ctesibian) advances. It is also purely Greek. In spite of his experience in the armies of (probably) Caesar and of Octavian, Vitruvius' only reference to a Roman military event is to Caesar's famous siege of Massilia, at which indeed he may have been present. On this subject, it is to be noted, there do not seem to have been Latin manuals for him to use, though in some cases there are Latin technical terms in existence, but he has perhaps been disingenuous about his sources. Vitruvius stresses that the construction of *ballistae* needs considerable mathematical ability, but he gives conversion tables for non-mathematicians; indeed his account of artillery consists largely of lists of detailed dimensions. He claims to have found his figures satisfactory in practice; but if there are no serious confusions, as some have thought, there is certainly a lack of clarity.<sup>29</sup>

It has been argued that, in spite of acquiring some acquaintance with Greek artillery and siegecraft in the late third and the second centuries, Rome's reliance on her predominance in manpower, and thus on her advantages in blockade, assault and pitched battle, like her reliance on a militia rather than professional troops, and the fact that her longest and hardest wars were against barbarians, caused her to remain somewhat backward in this field, at least until the earlier first century, when changes in the composition of the army and the experience provided by the Mithridatic Wars favoured a change. Here then are the Mithridatic Wars appearing as a turning point in an unexpected field. But such machines as Rome did have, whether captured from the Greeks or specially built, were up-to-date and efficient.<sup>30</sup> Caesar may have had rather more artillery as part of his regular force than had been usual,<sup>31</sup> and in his time and shortly after it seems to

<sup>27</sup> Vitr. 10.5.2, cf. Lucr. 5.515; *Anth. Pal.* 9.418; Strabo 12.C556 notes the water-mill at Cabeira in Pontus, where Mithridates had a palace, perhaps from his time: L.A. Moritz, *Grain-mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity* (1958) 131.

<sup>28</sup> Vitr. 10.10-16, cf. *Athen. Mech.* 8W. C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (repr. 1961) 271 argued that the Marcellus, Athenaeus' dedicatee, was Augustus' nephew.

<sup>29</sup> E.W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery (I: Historical Development (1969)) II. Technical Treatises* (1971) 2, 198ff.

<sup>30</sup> *Id. ib.* I 174ff.

<sup>31</sup> Caesar's account of his famous siege of Massilia, *BC* 2.1ff., is careful and gives catapult sizes, though otherwise untechnical. Some first-century historians seem particularly interested in sieges, such as Sisenna and perhaps Diodorus, see pp. 221, 226.

have been used at sea, perhaps again more than hitherto. It is possible that the Romans were inclined to look to the tradition at Rhodes in this field; Agesistratus or at least his master Apollonius had worked in this city.

Given their close connection with architecture, Vitruvius is markedly uninterested in painting and sculpture; he mentions a statue of disputed authorship at Halicarnassus, and claims that the most famous painters and sculptors became so by being lucky in patronage, while others equally 'perfect' remain obscure (and a list of mostly early artists is given).<sup>32</sup> It has been suggested, however, that much of Varro's obviously extensive writing on these arts was appended to his book on architecture; but a good deal of it may have been scattered over his antiquarian works. In Greece several kinds of writing have been distinguished: 'professional' writings by artists, such as Polyclitus' famous 'Canon' on human proportion, or the painter Apelles' work. Historians (perhaps first the anecdotic Duris of Samos) had written of the rise of various genres, with, as for philosophers, attention to master-pupil relationships. Philosophers themselves discussed the status, purpose and effects of the visual arts, usually ranked below literature, though Philodemus, for example, did accept that painting and sculpture were *technai* (unlike dancing).<sup>33</sup> Rhetors regarded description of a work of art as a literary embellishment, and the visual arts were often used as analogies in literary criticism. Perihegetic literature, that of the scholarly guidebook, necessarily dealt with individual works. Pasiteles' five books on Masterpieces of the World perhaps fell into this category; it is the only work concerned exclusively with the visual arts that we know to have been produced, almost certainly, in Rome, where Pasiteles was active as a sculptor. If it recorded the new location in Italy of many Greek works, it will have been very useful.<sup>34</sup>

Because they carried statues and paintings off as booty and dedicated them in public places, the Romans became familiar with some Greek art at an early stage, and perhaps found it easier to assimilate than Greek thought: their native art was after all based on Greek. In spite of some contempt, there was also interest: even Plautus' audience has heard of the painters Apelles and Zeuxis.<sup>35</sup> But though in Greece drawing had sometimes been ranked as one of the liberal arts, and though in the first flush of Hellenizing enthusiasm Aemilius Paullus hired artists as well as other teachers to instruct his sons,<sup>36</sup> probably few educated Romans in our period drew; and in public, politicians had to veil any interest in paintings or sculpture,<sup>37</sup> though Varro says anyone

<sup>32</sup> Vitr. 2.8.11 (the description of Halicarnassus, see n. 14), 3. *praef.* 2. Cf. 7.7.1, we learn *en passant* that the production of ochre at Laurium explains great use of yellow in early paintings.

<sup>33</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 1.44 Sudh.

<sup>34</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.39. Could *In Verr.* 2.4.135 be using it? Pollitt, *op. cit.* in n. 10, 78-9, for speculations on its nature. Signed works by his pupils are classicising.

<sup>35</sup> Plautus *Poen.* 1271, *Epid.* 626.

<sup>36</sup> Aristotle *Pol.* 8.3.1, 12: it enables one to see beauty and avoid being cheated in commerce; Pliny *NH* 35. 77: a liberal art, all others especially mathematics needed for it. Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 6.5. Varro thought girls should learn, so as to judge feathered embroidery and figured stuffs, *Catus De Lib. Educ.*

<sup>37</sup> Notoriously, *In Verr.* 2.4.4-5, Cicero pretends to hesitate over the names of Praxiteles, Myron and Polyclitus (though elsewhere in the speech producing obscurer names).

with any education knows about Praxiteles.<sup>38</sup>

Collecting on a large scale had perhaps been encouraged by the example of the kings of Pergamum (and writings on art history produced at their court, for example in all probability those of Antigonus of Carystus, were surely known in Rome). Quite apart from the great call for merely decorative art, there were a number of people ready to pay high prices for painting and sculpture in Rome.<sup>39</sup> Some well-regarded art was produced on the spot (especially by the sculptors Pasiteles and Arcesilaus), other new work was exported from Greece, especially Athens; but the Romans valued antiques possibly even more than the Greeks,<sup>40</sup> and continued to strip the provinces, by war, by purchase, by open robbery and by other methods. A joke of Cicero's, about selling statues to a pseudo-Damasippus if the dealer Damasippus will not take them, suggests an awareness of disputes about attributions.<sup>41</sup>

If we want to see works of art, says Cicero, we go to the Aedes Felicitatis, or the Monuments of Catulus, or the Porticus Metelli – all erected by triumphing generals – or we get into villas at Tusculum, or go to the Forum when it is ornamented with works the aediles have borrowed.<sup>42</sup> Such temporary exhibitions were common: Cicero speaks elsewhere of 'decorating the city with statues and lights, like an aedile'. C. Claudius Pulcher, aedile in 97, borrowed many works of art from his clients in Sicily and even the famous Eros from Thespieae; Cicero seems to imply the custom was then new. Claudius' nephew Appius was in Greece in perhaps 61, collecting works of art for an aedileship he in fact never held; Cicero professes outrage at his not giving them back as his uncle had. Elsewhere he speaks of a statue from Tenedos having been once seen in the Forum.<sup>43</sup> Two aediles even transported part of a fresco from Sparta; it was carefully cut from its wall and placed in a wooden frame, as Pliny says was often done. One doubts if that went home.<sup>44</sup> Certainly the works that Verres himself put on exhibition at one point did not.

As for getting into villas at Tusculum or elsewhere, Cicero more than once mentions this possibility, even if the owner is away. Perhaps one had to be of a certain class, or known to the household, to be allowed, for example, to see

<sup>38</sup> Varro, *op. cit.* A. Gellius 13.17.3; the *Sat. Menipp.* mentions an artist of the second rank, Polycles, 201B, and a cup by Mentor, 7B.

<sup>39</sup> *In Verr.* 2.4.13; Pliny *NH* 35.136, 156.

<sup>40</sup> The *Verrines* continually lay much stress on age, without further precision: but a speech was of course not the place to give accurate dates.

<sup>41</sup> M. Cotta carried off as booty from Heraclea statues including a partly gold Heracles (but may have had to return them), Memnon frag. 1.39 (*FGH* no. 434); Lucullus' many statues were partly booty, but partly bought, *NH* 34.36; Sicyon lost its important collections to Rome in 58 through debt, Pliny 35.127; statues owned by the king of Cyprus were sold by Cato when Rome took over, *NH* 34.92; Bibulus persuaded Antioch to present statues to Rome, Malalas 212.1-8 Dind. The early classical bronzes found in the sea off Riace were probably destined for a Roman collector, but the date of the wreck is not known. Damasippus, *Ad F.* 7.23.3.

<sup>42</sup> *In Verr.* 2.4.126; *De Or.* 3.92.

<sup>43</sup> *In Verr.* 2.133; 6; *De Domo* 111; *In Verr.* 2.1.49.

<sup>44</sup> *Vitr.* 2.8.9 (Varro and Murena were the aediles; perhaps Cicero's cousin Visellius Varro, known to have been aedile).

the shrine which Hortensius had made at his Tusculan villa for a fourth-century masterpiece. But Cicero tells us that Heius' chapel at Messana, with its famous statues, was open to all daily.<sup>45</sup> Lucullus, so generous with his libraries, will have been equally so with his galleries (Vitruvius of course could design a gallery – paintings need a north light, and will be spoiled by soot if kept in the heated winter apartments).<sup>46</sup> We saw that there was beginning to be a feeling, at the end of our period, that the public had a right of access to works of art.<sup>47</sup>

The position was then rather different from what it was for books. Works of art were to be seen mostly in Rome, and nearby; we do not hear of masterpieces in Campanian villas, though there was a mass of decorative sculpture and painting. A few Greek statues, especially from the Corinthian booty of Mummius in 146, had been scattered round Italian towns. But on the whole it was in the Greek cities of the East that sightseers would be interested. These were a well-known class, for whom Cicero uses the old Greek word *philotheoros*. They were at least as keen on literary and historical associations as on art for its own sake, and sought out the tombs of great men, and the sites of great events, even of cities that had been wiped from the face of the earth.<sup>48</sup> But it might be noted that the artificial arts of memory will often have encouraged the visual memory. Though copies suggest that there was a very restricted number of statues regarded as canonical and known to everyone, and though there is plenty of evidence, for example from composite statues from different originals of grotesquely disparate date and type, of shocking bad taste, there were doubtless some Romans with an educated eye; one such was surely Atticus.<sup>49</sup>

In general, Roman taste and thus no doubt knowledge ran on easily discovered lines. While there seem to be traces of a pattern for the history of sculpture and painting which culminates with Lysippus and Apelles, and stresses technical advances, there was also, it seems, one which perhaps emerged in Greece rather later than the other, holding that art went through a long eclipse between the late classical period and about 150 B.C., when there was a partial revival. This neo-classic theory, which stressed the spirit of a work and idolised Phidias, was probably widely accepted in Rome in our period, where the masterpieces most admired and copied were late archaic or classical (though Hellenistic portrait sculpture and Hellenistic-style

<sup>45</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.130, *In Verr.* 2.4.4-5, 126, *Pro Mil.* 54, *De Or.* 1.162. Varro *De RR* 3.2.4, Axis' villa at Reate *perpolitita*.

<sup>46</sup> Vitruvius 6.4.2.

<sup>47</sup> p. 114.

<sup>48</sup> *Ad F.* 7.16.1.; *De Fin.* 5.1-5. There were *mystagogi*, guides, in Sicily, *In Verr.* 2.4.132 (and doubtless elsewhere); probably ignorant.

<sup>49</sup> Copies of sculpture could be closer in our period, with the invention of the pointing system and perhaps already the use of plaster casts as models, but close and free copies may not have been carefully distinguished. Good copies came dear: Lucullus paid two talents for a copy of the fourth-century painter Pausias, made by one Dionysius of Athens (*NH* 25.125; to admire Pausias proved one a *subtilis veterum index et callidus*, Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.95). Old paintings were restored to freshen the colours, *De Rep.* 5.2. Both Caesar and Cicero seem to have preferred paintings to sculpture, it is interesting to note (Suet. *DJ* 47; *Ad F.* 7.233).

decorative work were acceptable).<sup>50</sup> Whether the Greeks were responsible for this change of taste, or whether it was a response to Roman pressure, is still disputed; but the change is now set earlier than it used to be, when Roman preferences are less likely to have been all-determining.

The Romans also had a mania for vessels of precious metal (the supreme artist in the field was thought to be Mentor, a figure of uncertain date; it looks as if there was dispute as to whether any of his vessels was extant – Varro perhaps thought not);<sup>51</sup> gold and silver were coveted, but Corinthian bronze work was a synonym for sought-after property.<sup>52</sup> Fine stuffs and embroideries were valued, ivories and gems likewise.<sup>53</sup> In 63 the conspirator Cethegus, when arms were found in his house, declared he had always been an amateur of fine weapons, and there is later evidence for such a taste.<sup>54</sup> There is tenuous evidence, for perhaps only a short period around 40 B.C., of interest in early Greek painted pottery.<sup>55</sup> But there is no sign of a literature on any of these minor arts.

We do not hear of collectors cataloguing their works of art as they catalogued their libraries, but inventories were certainly made, and indeed the censors had to list dedications in temples.<sup>56</sup> The base of a piece of sculpture at least would often be inscribed with the sculptor's name and the subject. Thus three bases at Ostia, of perhaps around 80 B.C., which once bore portrait statues, bear in Greek the name of the subject, with a brief description (Plato the poet of Old Comedy; Antisthenes the philosopher; Charite priestess of Delphi), and that of the sculptor. One is the fifth-century Argive Phradmon, one a leading artist of the Pergamene school, one is unknown to us. Since copies were signed, if at all, by the copyist (perhaps as a guarantee of competence) these statues were probably originals, or thought to be. This careful labelling appears in the late Hellenistic period, and is taken over by the Romans.<sup>57</sup> If copies had been inscribed with the name of the original artist, our knowledge of the history of Greek art would be a good deal more secure than it is. Some collectors put their names on works of art; 'Heius' on several

<sup>50</sup> Pollitt, *op. cit.* in n. 10, 74ff., 52ff.; see esp. Pliny *NH* 34.52.

<sup>51</sup> Pliny *NH* 33.154 (cf. 147); *In Verr.* 2.4.38 (perhaps not genuine).

<sup>52</sup> *Pro Rosc. Am.* 133; *Vitr.* 8.4.1; *Tusc. Disp.* 2.32; *De Fin.* 2.23, etc.

<sup>53</sup> Verres stole them all, *In Verr.* 2.2.50, 176; 2.4.1, 27, 58, 64-5, 103, 124. Fine stuffs were to be admired in great houses, *De Or.* 1.161, and Cicero thought his fabrics (and plate) might be sold in 47, *Ad A.* 11.25.3. High prices, Pliny *NH* 8.196. The lawyer Ser. Sulpicius advises on a case of a freedman sent to Asia to buy purple and other stuffs, frag. 52 Lenel.

<sup>54</sup> *In Cat.* 3.10.

<sup>55</sup> Strabo 8.C382, clay reliefs or pots, 'necrocorinthia', found by those digging the foundations for Caesar's colony at Corinth, had a brief vogue at Rome. Cf. perhaps Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.91, the accidental breaking of a bowl 'worn by the hands of Evander' might be cause for anger: ancient pottery found in Rome itself? There was no organised excavation, but sporadic finds (and possibly tomb-robbery) were exploited: e.g. the pottery found at Capua, Suet. *DJ* 81.1 – the relief ware from fourth- and third-century Caes., suggest R. Hampe and H. Gropengiesser, *Aus der Sammlung des Archäologischen Institutes der Universität Heidelberg* (1967) 80.

<sup>56</sup> *Phil.* 2.67 (private property). From Sulla to Augustus few censors were elected or served their terms; day-to-day responsibility was probably the aediles'. For the imperial bureaucracy running state buildings and works of art, D. Strong, in *Archaeological Theory and Practice* (1973) 247.

<sup>57</sup> F. Zevi, *Rend. Pont. Acc. Arch.* (1969-70) 95. Nb. historical knowledge was needed for decorative schemes such as Atticus designed for Pompey's theatre complex, F. Coarelli, *Rend.*

gems may refer to the Sicilian magnate known to Cicero, rather than to the engraver.

Many educated men must have got an outline of the history of Greek art from, or for, the traditional comparisons with literature and other subjects. Cicero has a version in the *Brutus* of the comparison between the development of Greek prose and Greek art, from the archaic to the classical, an advance in realism and grace.<sup>58</sup> The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, arguing that a rhetor should compose his own examples of the styles and figures, contends that the great Lysippus did not teach Chares (sculptor of the Rhodian colossus) by showing him a head by Myron, arms by Praxiteles and so on; Chares watched Lysippus himself making all the parts of a figure.<sup>59</sup> Similarly Varro, discussing the following of authority: we do not blame Apelles and Protogenes (the great painters) for not following earlier masters, nor did Lysippus copy his inferior predecessors. And he seems to have excused the small scale of a work by claiming that the miniature painter Callicles had a reputation, though he could not vie with the glory of Euphranor (whom we know to have sculpted colossi).<sup>60</sup> It would of course be possible to learn a number of facts about artists for this kind of purpose without ever seeing a work by any of them. In fact, when Philodemus mentions the caricaturist Pauson in his discussion of *mimêsis* in poetry, probably deriving the reference from Aristotle, it looks as if he thinks the man a writer.<sup>61</sup>

But Varro was interested in works of art in Rome, partly because they might have a commemorative and documentary role, and because they could mark the decline of morals and rise of luxury (especially where the applied arts are concerned). Most of Pliny's material on art has sometimes been traced to Varro; but we will confine ourselves to the certain notices.<sup>62</sup>

These are usually factual, and may do less than justice to Varro's critical vocabulary; for example, the anecdote of the *equus* who fell in love with one of the Muses in the Temple of Felicitas, or the praise of one Possis, whom Varro knew personally, for fruit and grapes in clay indistinguishable from the real thing. Even Cicero is less naive in his understanding of the purpose of art. Varro spoke highly of Pasiteles, and probably told of his nearly being mauled by a panther at the docks, while sketching a lion; he certainly said Pasiteles did nothing in bronze without making a preliminary model in clay, and praises Lucullus' friend Arcesilaus, whose clay models sold to artists at higher prices than the finished work of others to collectors. The interest in clay may tie in with Varro's interest in the history of sculpture in Italy, as we

*Acc. Pont.* (1971-2) 99.

<sup>58</sup> *Brutus* 70.

<sup>59</sup> *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.9. The author also quotes the well-known dictum that a picture should be a silent poem and a poem a speaking picture, 4.39.

<sup>60</sup> Varro *De LL* 9.12, cf. 5.31, 7.1; *De RR* 3.17.4, compartments in fish-ponds like the paintboxes of Pausias and others like him (perhaps famous for a wide range of colours). *De Vita PR* frag. 1 Rip. Cf. *De Off.* 3.10, Rutilius Rufus said that as no painter dared finish Apelles' Aphrodite of Cos, no philosopher dared complete Panaetius' *On Duty*. Nb. also DS 26.1.1.

<sup>61</sup> *Philod. Poet.* 4. col. 4 (in F. Sbordone, ed., *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanensi* I (1969) 323).

<sup>62</sup> Sometimes still thought to have mediated much of Pliny's information on Greek art; perhaps more probably the source for various notices on Roman works of art from the early annalists, as F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (1897) esp. 263.

shall see; but he also looked back to the classical period, to the famous Polyclitan stance, and valued the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnus, by a pupil of Phidias, above all others (a variation on the neo-classical apotheosis of Phidias).<sup>63</sup>

Since Pliny dates the lady to Varro's youth, Varro may also be the source for the information about Iaiia of Cyzicus,<sup>64</sup> who made much money by portraits, mostly of women, produced at high speed with brush or graver. Two other portrait painters of the same period are mentioned, but we are told nothing of the portrait sculpture of the late Republic, which we might expect Greek sources to neglect, but to attract interest at Rome, where there must have been a special taste for these naturalistic works, very different from most of the portraits Greek artists produced of Hellenistic rulers. Surviving examples, often splendid, are alas rarely labelled with the subject's name, and never with the artist's. But Cicero's references to painted or sculpted portraits of men long dead are not easily paralleled in Greek literature,<sup>65</sup> and Pliny tells us that in the first century B.C. there was a strong taste for portraits, neglected in his own day. He says that Atticus produced a volume on portraiture, but it is clear from Nepos' *Life* that this is not, at least primarily, a discussion of the art, but a collection of pictures.<sup>66</sup>

So was Varro's *Imagines*, a collection of portraits of 700 famous men, Greeks and Romans, including certainly poets, statesmen, philosophers and architects (and probably painters and sculptors). We have met its praises of the number seven; more interesting to us here is the fact that there seems to have been, at least sometimes, whether in an introduction or under each picture, a discussion of the evidence for these. Aeneas was portrayed in old-fashioned armour after an ancient statue at Alba Longa (which was doubtless not as old as Varro thought). Sculpture must have been the usual source – funeral masks or statues for the Romans, while series of portrait heads of famous Greeks were often set up in Italy (so philosophers in the Villa of the Pisones in Herculaneum), perhaps sometimes copied from pattern-books. Varro seems to have refrained from giving a portrait of Homer at all, simply showing a white goat, as sacrificed at his supposed tomb at Ios; this is suggested by the two lines of verse that appeared under the picture, as doubtless under each one; but Homer's date was somewhere discussed as well.<sup>67</sup> The work, which seems to have been on hand in the late forties, was a

<sup>63</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.39; 35.155; observe his simple astonishment at Arcesilaus' work, which he owned, of a lioness and numerous cupids, all from one block, 36.41; 35.155; he certainly noted high prices. 24.56 (Polyclitus); 36.17 (Rhamnus).

Cicero's ideas on art are not coherent (he is unclear on why he likes archaic art, which is 'imperfect', *Brutus* 70); *Or.* 9 is well-known for its reformed Platonic Idealism: artists imitate not nature but their conception of perfect beauty; Phidias' Zeus is adduced.

<sup>64</sup> Iaiia or Lala, 35.147-8; Sopolis and Dionysius, *ib.*, cf. *Ad A.* 4.18.4.

<sup>65</sup> *In Verr.* 2.4.123, *De Rep.* 6.10. But cf. *DS* 32.25 (in our period and a Roman context, however).

<sup>66</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.11; Nepos *Atticus* 18.5-6 (biographic verses under each portrait).

<sup>67</sup> Lydus, *De Mag.* 1.12, A. Gellius 3.11, Pliny *NH* 35.11. How far Varro's researches went we do not know; portraits were often mislabelled (Greeks re-used honorific portraits, and Mummius is said to have labelled a Philip II as Zeus and made even worse mistakes, Dio Chrys. 37.42).

success, though surely very expensive; Pliny says it diffused knowledge over the whole world. There was an epitome in four, instead of fifteen, books; possibly without pictures?<sup>68</sup> There is no certain Greek parallel for the work, and the combination of Greek and Roman subjects was as we shall see new at this time.<sup>69</sup>

Varro must also have broken largely new ground in his attempt to reconstruct the history of Italic art, at least as it appeared at Rome (there is little sign that much was said about other places). Again, it is not certain how much of what Pliny tells us comes from Varro, but it is plain he said that for over 170 years from the foundation of Rome the gods were worshipped without statues; this he approved on moral and theological grounds. And he said that all statues in Roman temples were 'Tuscanic', until the Greeks Damophilus and Gorgasus, modellers in clay and painters, decorated the temple of Ceres (traditional foundation 496 B.C.); his source of information about them was obviously the Greek verse inscription in the temple, and he discussed later alterations to the building and the dispersal of the old decorations.<sup>70</sup> One would like to know the origin of the adjective 'Tuscanic' – also, as we saw, used by Vitruvius; it does not seem to be found outside an art-historical context.

'Tuscanic' sculpture was of bronze or terracotta, the latter little used in marble-rich Greece. *Plastice*, the art of clay modelling, was indeed, Varro seems to have said, developed in Italy. He gave information (alas, from what source we do not know) about the archaic Etruscan sculptor Vulca of Veii, who made cult statues for Rome.<sup>71</sup> A fragment of the *De Vita Populi Romani* contrasts the poverty of Rome's past, with its terracotta Jupiters, to the wealth of the present, which makes them of marble, ivory and gold.<sup>72</sup> If there were no statues of gods in the earliest times, Varro would seem to have admitted those of the Roman kings, though he does not seem to have held, as some in his time did, that the wooden statue in the Forum Boarium represented King Servius Tullius rather than Fortuna (he did think it clad in a robe woven by Tanaquil for the king).<sup>73</sup> He may well have continued his historical scheme by stating that the first bronze statue in Rome was set up to Ceres from the confiscated property of the would-be tyrant Sp. Cassius in the fifth century; and he perhaps gave dates for the first statue on a column, and the first equestrian statue, in Rome. But we cannot be certain that these and similar notices in Pliny are his.<sup>74</sup>

This is partly because Cornelius Nepos was also interested in the history of

<sup>68</sup> F. Ritschl, *Opusc.* III 528.

<sup>69</sup> *Ad A.* 16.11.3 seems to refer to the *Imagines* as a *peplographia*; it is uncertain if this was a recognised term for such collections, see D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *CQ* (1962) 164.

<sup>70</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.154.

<sup>71</sup> *Ib.* 35.157.

<sup>72</sup> Varro, *De Vita PR frag.* 15 Rip. Cf. Calcidius, *Comm.* on Plato's *Timaeus* 337.20, if Apollonius' chryselephantine Jupiter on the Capitol dates from this period.

<sup>73</sup> Varro, *ap.* Nonius 278L, and *ap.* Pliny *NH* 8.194 (and Tanaquil's spindle and distaff in another temple).

<sup>74</sup> *NH* 34.15, 20. Much of the information in these chapters about old statues at Rome may be from Varro.

the arts in Italy. Pliny quotes him for a Corinthian painter Ecphantus, who followed the exiled Bacchiad noble Demaratus (supposedly the father of Tarquinius Priscus) to Etruria. It may also be from Nepos that Pliny has three workers in clay, modellers as well as potters, who accompanied Demaratus: Eucheir, Diopus and Eugrammus.<sup>75</sup> This represents another attempt to get early art-history straight, naturally over-personal in expression. Modern scholars have thought these men imaginary *heurêtai* or inventors, such as the ancients loved, though the name Diopus resists attempts to find a symbolic meaning. But since an archaic sculptor in clay with this unexampled name has turned up in Sicily, his historicity is not impossible, while for the other two, where crafts ran in families meaningful names were easily imposed. Nepos or another may have found ancient signatures in Etruria, though the date and origin assigned are probably arbitrary. He also noted that Hermodorus of Salamis built the Temple of Mars in the Circus Flaminius. Among other writers who may at times have deviated into art-history are Fonteius, who wrote on cult-statues, with theological speculation to the fore,<sup>76</sup> and Cincius, who wrote on dedications in Roman temples, though with a bias to inscriptions and linguistic matters. Both were active at the end of or just after our period.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>75</sup> *NH* 35.16 (cf. 152): Priscian *Inst.* 8.17. From the *Chronica* or *Exempla*? (see pp. 227, 246).

<sup>76</sup> Lydus *Mens.* 4.2.65W.

<sup>77</sup> *GRF* 375 (*Mystagogicon libri*).

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

# Law

The study of law was the intellectual activity most common among, and held in the highest respect by, the Roman upper class (and probably by a good many lower down the social scale too). It is hardly surprising that a rare glimpse of aristocratic boys at their games shows them playing at trials.<sup>1</sup> In Greece circumstances were different, and law was not one of the subjects of the *enkuklios paideia*, nor, as a result no doubt, one of Varro's *Disciplinae*. Vitruvius regards it as needful for the architect, and Cicero makes L. Crassus argue that it is essential to the orator.<sup>2</sup> But in practice there was obviously no question of the subject losing its place, even as, for many, the most important of all. Though intimately Roman, from the second century B.C. it was however influenced by the three basic Greek subjects, *grammatica*, dialectic and rhetoric. The extent and nature of this influence have been hotly debated, but can hardly be doubted by anyone who has seen at what a fundamental level these three subjects affected the Romans. They did not, perhaps, think that thinking was the most important thing in life; but they did realise they needed to learn to think – and law was the subject many most wanted to think about. So wretched however is our knowledge of the work of the distinguished lawyers of the late Republic that disputes can probably never be entirely resolved. Our legal sources date from the later Empire, indeed largely from the very last period of antiquity, and their references to and quotations from Republican authorities may often be far from reliable. We have, however, a brief account of the history of Roman jurisprudence by Pomponius, a writer of the second century A.D., which has been prefixed to the Justinianic *Digest*; and Cicero, as so often, is there to shed a (possibly sometimes distorting) light on the subject.

The Roman juriconsults were primarily concerned with civil law. This was not wholly true, especially in the earliest period: the Twelve Tables covered some aspects of criminal and even constitutional law, and their study was the foundation of early jurisprudence. The *pontifices*, believed to have been the first legal experts, were much concerned with sacral law, which was intertwined with the *ius civile*. There were indeed writings on sacral law by lawyers in our period, but constitutional law, in so far as it did receive literary treatment, was dealt with by writers who were not necessarily regarded as primarily jurists. Criminal law did not arouse great interest. There may however have been much legal literature of which we know nothing. For

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *Cato Min.* 2.5.

<sup>2</sup> Vitruv. 1.1.3; *De Or.* 1.166ff.

example, Cicero claims that Pompey had great knowledge of international law, or (since there was not really such a thing) of ‘treaties, agreements, pacts with states, kings and foreign peoples, in fact the whole law of peace and war’, which he had acquired both from experience and from books.<sup>3</sup> What these books might be we have little idea.

The main activity of those learned in the law had always been to sit in their high chairs at home, or walk in the Forum, to answer the questions put to them by those anxious for practically useful advice; their *responsa* had great *auctoritas*, if no actual binding force. They also acted as judges, or assessors to judges, in civil cases; they drew up legal documents, and one imagines they helped to draft the edicts of magistrates, especially those of the praetors, by which the *actiones*, formulae for procedure, were gradually extended to cover new areas and other changes made, for example the reduction of savage archaic penalties. (Statute law was of secondary importance in the creation of the civil law.) This practical background did tend to limit the lawyers’ interests. For example, there was little concern with the theory or philosophy of law: when Cicero, not primarily a lawyer, wrote on natural law as the foundation of human law, he had to turn straight to the Greek philosophers. Comparative law, for which the Peripatetics had collected material, never really interested the Romans either; they were convinced that the civil law at least of all other nations was puerile compared with their own<sup>4</sup> (though Cicero does try to find Greek precedent for his constitutional and religious laws in the *De Legibus*). This is not to say that Roman writers on the history or ethnography of foreign peoples would not occasionally register legal peculiarities in the security that their readers would find them of particular interest; this is true, for example, of Caesar on the Gauls. And we shall see Ser. Sulpicius noting points of old Latin, as opposed to Roman, law. But there was never anything systematic.

Rome had had a legal literature from the early second century B.C. (and indeed there had been bare collections of, for example, the *actiones* – formulae for procedure – earlier still). About 200 B.C. Sex. Aelius Catus produced his *Tripertita*, consisting of a text of the Twelve Tables, a commentary, and the *actiones* relevant to each provision. This ‘three-part’ work was certainly not an example of Greek classification; probably each provision of the Tables had its commentary, and its *actiones*, immediately subjoined to it.<sup>5</sup> The Twelve Tables may really have dated from the fifth century, though at some stage there was some, at least linguistic, modernisation. But we know that Sex. Aelius, and another, probably early, commentator, tried to explain the obsolete word *lessum*, with not very happy results;<sup>6</sup> from the start, antiquarian

<sup>3</sup> *Pro Balb.* 15. *De Leg.* 1.14 refers to the existence of numerous *libelli* on raindrops and party walls, and on formulas for contracts or court procedure. Val. Max. 8. 7.4 records the otherwise unknown legal works of a Livius Drusus, perhaps late second century (probably the blind jurisconsult of *Tusc. Disp.* 5.112, C. Drusus).

<sup>4</sup> *De Or.* 1.197.

<sup>5</sup> Pomponius, in *D.* 1.2.2.38: *iungitur ... subtexitur*.

<sup>6</sup> *De Leg.* 2.59: they thought it might be a mourning garment (for L. Aelius Stilo’s view, see p. 120).

and 'grammatical' problems were crucial for the lawyers.

Legal books came down to a later age with the name of Cato attached, though it is not entirely clear what was the work of the famous censor and what was that of his son. We have a fragment giving a fanciful origin for the word *mundus*, a sacred pit.<sup>7</sup> Around the middle of the second century came three men described by Pomponius as founders of the civil law: P. Mucius Scaevola, the *pontifex maximus*, M<sup>?</sup>. Manilius and M. Junius Brutus.<sup>8</sup> They all held high office. Cicero was told on good authority that only three of the books attributed to Brutus were genuine; they were all addressed to his young son, and apparently set in the writer's different villas in the country.<sup>9</sup> This has suggested that they were dialogues, probably of an elementary and educational kind, like Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*, also addressed to his son. There was then Greek influence, if only formal, on Brutus' work. The individual books were brief – Cicero calls them *libelli*; one would dearly like to know how the material was divided between books. As for P. Scaevola's work in ten books and Manilius' in three, they were probably collections of *responsa*, such as were to form the staple genre of Roman legal literature; Vitruvius can equate knowledge of *responsa* with the education in law needed by the architect.<sup>10</sup> The *iuris consulti* were not bound to give reasons for their decisions, but it would seem that they increasingly did so. In developing such arguments writers of this period may already have shown some Greek influence; it was an area in which this was likely to become great.

In 67 Cicero expects the jurors in the trial of Cluentius to know the books of Brutus.<sup>11</sup> But by this time the works of the three founders may to an extent have been superseded by the treatise in eighteen books on the *Ius Civile* by Q. Mucius Scaevola, the *pontifex maximus*, descendant of the great legal family. It is almost certainly via this that several references to the views of the earlier generation have come down to us.<sup>12</sup> But Cicero in the forties could write that we do and shall peruse P. Scaevola, Manilius and Brutus with pleasure, and Manilius was clearly still in use when Varro wrote the second book of his agricultural work, which shows that part of it dealt with contracts of sale, recommending different clauses in different circumstances.<sup>13</sup> By the Augustan period, however, they were only read for antiquarian interest.<sup>14</sup>

In spite of this established literature, the oral traditions of Roman jurisprudence were by no means dead. Cicero tells us that he committed to memory many of the learnedly argued or brief and pithy *responsa* of Q. Mucius Scaevola the Augur, whom he attended as a youth, and he has reminiscences also of his greater cousin the Pontifex, to whom he passed on

<sup>7</sup> Festus 144L, connecting it with *mundus*, the heavens.

<sup>8</sup> *D.* 1.2.2.39.

<sup>9</sup> *De Or.* 2.224.

<sup>10</sup> *Vitr.* 1.1.3.

<sup>11</sup> *Pro Clu.* 141.

<sup>12</sup> *Ad F.* 7.22 (Cicero has just looked up his Q. Mucius); cf. Nigidius Figulus frag. 34 Swob.

<sup>13</sup> Varro *De RR* 2.3.5, 7.6. *De Fin.* 1.12. The young seem to have been expected to learn *Mantilianas venalium vendendorum leges* by heart, at least in Cicero's youth, *De Or.* 1.246.

<sup>14</sup> A. Gellius 6.15.1, from Labeo.

the Augur's death.<sup>15</sup> Cicero and others sometimes tell us that earlier authorities 'used to say', on occasion in explicit contrast with what others 'have written'.<sup>16</sup> The oral tradition may have gone back a long way: Pomponius says that the *responsa* of Ti. Coruncanus, a great figure of the early third century, were *memorabilia*, and this may mean that the first legal writers recorded *responsa* handed down orally for nearly a hundred years.<sup>17</sup> Sex. Aelius' *responsa* were perhaps not published by him. Even in our period it was often pupils who published a master's *responsa*, though probably from notes rather than memory. But however strong an oral tradition may be, the switch to writing leads to greater precision of record and argument. When it took place in law, the reasons were at least in part educational: the Elder Cato may have written in the first instance for his son, and as we saw M. Brutus probably did so too. Cicero, discussing the study of law in the *De Oratore*, set in 91 B.C., envisages books playing an important part in it, though claiming that they are not very many or very long (and tend to repeat each other).<sup>18</sup>

It is hard to suppose that Cicero, who attempted to recreate the *milieux* in which he set his dialogues with fair accuracy, and who talks of the works of Brutus and Manilius in this scene, would not have referred to Q. Mucius' *De Iure Civili* if it had been in existence in 91; it must surely have been a work of its author's last years, of the unhappy eighties when his position was insecure and he was probably in partial retirement, until his murder in 82.<sup>19</sup> It was clearly a work of great importance and influence – it attracted more than one commentary as late as the second century A.D. – and it undoubtedly marked a step forward intellectually. But there has been disagreement as to what, actually, it did.

According to Cicero in the *De Oratore*, Cato and Brutus had recorded in their *responsa* particular names and circumstances (Cicero holds that this depresses students, who feel they need to learn an infinite number of different cases).<sup>20</sup> It is likely that Mucius abandoned this habit, and made great efforts toward a higher level of generalisation. It also appears that he tried to introduce more in the way of definition and division. There seems little reason to suppose that the *Book of Horoi* (the Greek word for definitions) which is attributed to him, consisted only of extracts made after his death, as some have supposed, and Pomponius tells us that he was the first, in his great work on the civil law, to treat it *generatim*, by classes.<sup>21</sup> Obviously, definition and division are connected with generalisation – they must lead to the conception of abstract ideas. Mucius perhaps only got part way: a passage in the *Digest* may suggest that he could talk of *quidque contractum*, what has been

<sup>15</sup> *De Amic.* 1.1.

<sup>16</sup> A. Gellius 3.2.12; 6.15.1.

<sup>17</sup> *D.* 1.2.2.38; but some were perhaps preserved in the minutes of the pontifical college, which Cicero says showed Coruncanus' intelligence, *Brutus* 55.

<sup>18</sup> *De Or.* 1.192.

<sup>19</sup> He perhaps attended the Senate, at least sometimes, *Ad A.* 8.3.6, but the period was *sine iure* and as a lawyer he may have been under-employed.

<sup>20</sup> *De Or.* 2.142.

<sup>21</sup> *Index Florentinus* 3; *D.* 50.17.73 and elsewhere. *Ius Civile*, Pomponius in *D.* 1.2.2.4.1.

contracted, and of different ways to contract, which was a new and general idea, but that the abstract noun *contractus* still eluded him.<sup>22</sup> (Of course there were already some abstract nouns in Latin.) And he became confused over the idea of a part: he thought that leaving part of a property to someone meant instituting common ownership, for if a part was split off it became a whole.<sup>23</sup>

It is sometimes said that the Roman lawyers must have got their acquaintance with classificatory techniques from grammar or rhetoric. It is clear that there was a close relationship between grammar and law. The lawyers were frequently concerned with elucidating texts, which might include obsolete words, might, like so many archaic documents, be elliptic and laconic, or might simply be badly drafted. From as early as we can see, legal debates turned on the meaning of words and phrases (as indeed in all legal systems they are bound often to do); Manilius held that *subruptum erit* in a law was to be taken as a future tense, while Brutus held the reverse.<sup>24</sup> The grammarians' favourite procedure of etymology was often called to assistance. One hardly knows whether to call grammatical or legal the work of the unknown Aelius Gallus, probably late Republican or early Augustan in date, who wrote *On the Meaning of Words relevant to Civil Law*.<sup>25</sup> Grammarians, like Varro or Nigidius, often used old legal documents; they used early legal literature too, and a number of our fragments derive from Varro's *De Lingua Latina* or later grammarians.

As for rhetoric, it is certainly true that by Q. Mucius Scaevola's time all those concerned with law at a high level would have studied rhetoric in Greek, if not necessarily very thoroughly. In fact, Pomponius counts the historian Coelius Antipater among the lawyers of this time, though saying he was really more interested in rhetoric, and we know from his awkward efforts at rhythmical prose that he was a self-conscious student of the Greeks.<sup>26</sup> Scaevola, says Cicero, was 'the most eloquent of lawyers', and he was a close friend of L. Crassus.<sup>27</sup> (Conversely all those known primarily as orators had some legal training and often had to argue legal points.) Hermagoras' distinction of *thesis* and *antithesis* should surely have helped the lawyers to see the general principle of a case and discard the particular circumstances. And it is rather hard to believe that Hermagoras' doctrine of *stasis* would not have affected them. We should remember that Hermagoras had not only the four kinds of *stasis* arising from the facts, which were so important to the orators, but four arising from law: in which the wording and the intention of a law might clash, in which laws themselves might conflict, in which a law might be ambiguous, and in which it might be claimed that there was a gap in the law, to be filled by analogical reasoning. Quintilian says that the first of these was often an issue among legal consultants.<sup>28</sup> In the *De Inventione* Cicero puts

<sup>22</sup> D. 46.3.80. A. Schiavone, *Nascita della Giurisprudenza* (1977) 123.

<sup>23</sup> D. 50.16.25.1.

<sup>24</sup> A. Gellius 17.7.

<sup>25</sup> Id. 16..5.3.

<sup>26</sup> D. 1.2.2.40; *Brutus* 102.

<sup>27</sup> *Brutus* 145.

<sup>28</sup> Quint. 7.6.1.

ambiguity first, and adds definition, problems arising from the meaning of a word, at the end; he gives numerous arguments for use in each of the issues he lists.<sup>29</sup> (The examples most relevant to Rome concern legal documents, notably wills rather than laws proper, which as we saw were not very important to the civil law in Rome; but a mass of litigation there arose from disputed wills and questions of succession.) The pupils of the rhetoricians were also accustomed to practise arguing for or against reliance on the letter of the law as opposed to equity. While Roman lawyers may well have moved towards a freer interpretation of the law as a result of general development away from archaic severities, the actual arguments they used may often have come from the rhetors' arsenal.<sup>30</sup>

The distinguishing of ambiguities was strictly the province not of the rhetors but of *dialectici* (though the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* complains of their hairsplitting).<sup>31</sup> And though in his late *Topica* Cicero tried to give the lawyer Trebatius access to materials that came from the rhetorical tradition (and included definition),<sup>32</sup> he seems to have put advance in legal skill down to a direct knowledge of philosophy, or more strictly dialectic. Thus in a fragment of his lost work *On Reducing the Civil Law to an Art* he noted that Q. Aelius Tubero not only equalled his ancestors in *scientia iuris*, knowledge of law, but brought greater *doctrina*, learning, to the subject. Gellius explains, doubtless correctly, that Cicero is referring to Tubero's knowledge of Stoicism (in fact his contempt for rhetoric is attested).<sup>33</sup> If Q. Scaevola really did talk of the three different sorts of theology, poetic, philosophic, and civil,<sup>34</sup> then he knew something of Stoicism too, as in fact we are told he did, though we should not expect a more than superficial acquaintanceship. Two distinguished lawyers of the early first century were Sex. Pompeius, also devoted to Stoicism and geometry, and L. Lucilius Balbus, probably one of the Stoic Balbi.<sup>35</sup> True, Aquilius Gallus, the chief teacher of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, had not studied philosophy; as a result he lacked 'subtlety and carefulness', and Cicero is contemptuous of an unrigorous and indeed poetical definition of his.<sup>36</sup> And Cicero's uncle Visellius Aculeo, whom he calls a clever lawyer, was ignorant of other disciplines.<sup>37</sup> But neither of them wrote books.

At all events, whatever Q. Scaevola's knowledge of Stoicism, when Cicero in the *De Oratore* puts into L. Crassus' mouth the famous passage concerning the necessity of making law easier to learn by turning it into an *ars*,<sup>38</sup> Crassus

<sup>29</sup> *De Inv.* 2.116.

<sup>30</sup> The very archaic Twelve Tables suffered extreme interpretation, A. Watson, *Law Making in the Later Roman Republic* (1974) 114.

<sup>31</sup> *De Or.* 2.111, *Rhet. ad Her.* 2.11.16.

<sup>32</sup> *Topica* 1 – but the rhetorical works of Aristotle.

<sup>33</sup> A. Gellius 1.22.7.

<sup>34</sup> See p. 300. Athen. 6.274c-e for his Stoicism (not surprising in one of his Scipionic background).

<sup>35</sup> *D.* 1.2.2.40. Pomponius links with Tubero P. Rutilius Rufus, certainly a Stoic, and A. Verginius, possibly one (*De Amic.* 101, coeval and perhaps friend of Rufus).

<sup>36</sup> *Topica* 32.

<sup>37</sup> *De Or.* 1.191.

<sup>38</sup> *De Or.* 1.186ff.

gives no sign that the task is likely to be shortly undertaken by his great friend Scaevola, though such a hint would be very much in Cicero's manner. And indeed it is clear from the *Brutus* that Cicero thought the task had been left to a later generation. Here he sets his friend Ser. Sulpicius Rufus above all the lawyers of the past, including explicitly Q. Scaevola: these had great *usus*, experience, he alone has *ars*. 'He has learnt the art of dividing a whole subject (or the whole subject – *rem omnem*) into parts, explaining implications by defining, first observing and then distinguishing ambiguous matters, finally commanding a standard for judging true and false what follows or does not follow from a proposition. For he brought this art, the greatest of all arts, like a lamp to the disorganised *responsa* or *actiones* of others.' 'You seem to me to mean dialectic', says Brutus. 'Yes; though he also brought style and eloquence.'<sup>39</sup>

Servius, 'a student of every kind of learning', demonstrates his eloquence in the two famous letters to Cicero, and there can be no doubt that he had a philosophic education (if in less measure than his son, as a letter of Cicero's shows). He may have been an Academic like his friend; his early interest in rhetoric shows he was no strict Stoic, but Stoic dialectic was probably more accessible than Peripatetic in his youth.<sup>40</sup> It has been argued that the *Brutus* passage is only concerned with Servius' use of dialectic in individual *responsa*.<sup>41</sup> And certainly his *responsa* go beyond the immediate case at issue, often moving from the particular to the general, and being rich in illustrations and variants, while they are strictly and skilfully argued.<sup>42</sup> He cleared up Mucius Scaevola's muddle about *pars* – and dialectic was specifically concerned to explain what parts and wholes were.<sup>43</sup> Cicero might well have regarded as the fruit of a knowledge of dialectic his insistence that a law with two negatives permits and does not forbid.<sup>44</sup> It is also true that Servius wrote no large-scale systematic work, like that of Scaevola; though he may have applied the classificatory method over the whole of a fair-sized work in several books. Of the almost 180 volumes attributed to him some were certainly monographs, and many, if the figure is not wildly exaggerated, may be *responsa*, though many of his *responsa* seem to have been handed down by his pupils.

But the fact seems to be that Cicero and Sulpicius thought Scaevola's overall system defective. It is hard to reconstruct this system reliably, though

<sup>39</sup> *Brutus* 152-3. Unfortunately we know practically nothing of Cicero's book *De Iure Civili in Artem Redigendo* (A. Gellius 1.22.7, frag. on the *scientia iuris* and Stoic *doctrina* of Q. Tubero, surely the pupil of Panaetius). Quint. 12.3.10 suggests it was not finished but perhaps published posthumously. It might date from the late fifties, where there are few letters and *De Or.* shows concern with the problem, which by the *Brutus* (46 B.C.) Cicero seems to think Servius has solved. (It is unlikely that Pomponius' history of jurisprudence is closely based on this work or Varro's *De Iure Civili*, see D. Nörr, *ANRW* II 15 (1976) 497.)

<sup>40</sup> *Ad F.* 4.5 and 12; 4.3.4. Servius could even have studied dialectic with the Stoic Diodotus, like Cicero, *Brutus* 309.

<sup>41</sup> A. Watson, *op. cit.* in n. 30, 160.

<sup>42</sup> M. Bretone, *Labeo* (1970) 7 (and in his *Techniche e Ideologie dei Giuristi Romani* (1971) 73).

<sup>43</sup> Mart. Cap. 4.339; cf. *De Inv.* 1.12, where the young Cicero wrongly attacks Hermagoras for confusion on this point.

<sup>44</sup> *D.* 50.16.237.

what we know of the later commentaries on it gives us some basis to work on; for example, the first books dealt with wills and inheritances. The best reconstruction is probably Watson's, and it is clear that there was no very obvious reason for the order in which subjects were treated, and that there were probably some striking omissions, for example dowries.<sup>45</sup> It may be that the omissions, as Watson argues, were primarily due to conservatism: Scaevola dealt with the subjects treated in the Twelve Tables, or otherwise known to be old, and left out various branches of law that had developed more recently, notably all that had been created by the praetors, even though it could now be claimed that most people thought it was the praetor's edict, and no longer the Twelve Tables, which was the source of law.<sup>46</sup> The edict dealt in part with business arrangements; it has been pointed out that there is nothing in Scaevola's fragments about letting and hiring (*locatio conductio*) or about trade, though land figures prominently.

Within each subject, Scaevola did no doubt try to treat it 'dialectically'. We know for example that he held that there were five *genera* of tutorship, and possibly that there were as many *genera* of possession as there are 'causes' for acquiring the property of others (the *Digest* complains that one of his kinds, possession granted by a magistrate for safe-keeping, is 'most inept').<sup>47</sup> Of the fragments of the *Book of Horoi* some do seem to fall into the shape of definitions: what are *ruta caesa*?<sup>48</sup> While the second century writers seem often simply to have listed examples when trying to fix the meaning of a word, Scaevola does come up with something more general, if not always very satisfying: to act *vi*, by violence, he says, is to do something that has been forbidden; this seems altogether too wide.<sup>49</sup> But Cicero appears to find adequate the definition of *gentiles*, members of the same *gens* or clan: they must have the same family name, be of free-born descent, and have suffered no loss of citizen rights.<sup>50</sup>

Scaevola was able to sum up the list of exceptions to the rule forbidding work on holidays by formulating them as any work the omission of which would cause damage.<sup>51</sup> And where M. Brutus 'was accustomed to say' that it was usual for those who took a borrowed horse further or elsewhere than had been agreed, to be condemned for theft, Scaevola could write that anyone who uses something which he has agreed to keep safe, or uses it for another purpose than arranged, is liable for theft.<sup>52</sup> This could have been yet further generalised. And Cicero criticises him for his treatment of the law on the inheritance of family cults. Scaevola may have given both a list of those responsible, in order, and also the basic principle that the cult devolves on whoever inherits the largest part of the family property. But Cicero comments

<sup>45</sup> Watson, *op. cit.* in n. 30, 153.

<sup>46</sup> *De Leg.* 1.17.

<sup>47</sup> *D.* 41.2.3.21-3.

<sup>48</sup> *D.* 18.1.66.2: Scaevola complains of tautology in legal documents referring to this.

<sup>49</sup> *D.* 50.17.73.2.

<sup>50</sup> *Topica* 29.

<sup>51</sup> *Macr. Sat.* 1.16.11.

<sup>52</sup> *A. Gellius* 6.15.

that from the basic principles ‘many points arise which any intelligent person can solve for himself by reference to the heading, *caput*.’<sup>53</sup> It looks as if he thought Scaevola gave too much unnecessary discussion. He had said in the *De Oratore* that the study of law could be simplified and shortened by the introduction of dialectic.<sup>54</sup> Perhaps he could also have dispensed with Scaevola’s registration of *responsa* by the older authorities. At all events, eighteen books probably seemed too much to him; not everyone perhaps could own so large a work. Indeed, did even Trebatius have his own copy? Cicero once sent him an extract from it.<sup>55</sup>

Similarly, Cicero took Scaevola’s provincial edict as his model in 51, as the Senate expected him to do; but he reorganised and shortened it, he claims, by using *divisio*. Thus one part was specially concerned with the province (presumably he means Cilicia in particular), one contained the usual material of a governor’s edict, while he simply referred back to the part identical with that of the praetor at Rome.<sup>56</sup> As many people in the province would probably want a copy of the governor’s proclamation, brevity was doubtless a desideratum.

Servius probably also had many criticisms of Scaevola to make. His books on dowry were perhaps meant to fill one of the striking gaps in his predecessor’s work, and he was the first to write on the praetor’s edict, though briefly (in only two books, to Brutus).<sup>57</sup> One of his works was called *Reprehensa Scaevolae Capita*, and it may be that he was not criticising the contents of some of Scaevola’s chapters, but the headings themselves, and thus the organisation of the work. Surviving fragments turn on the definition of words, and Servius’ definition tends to be more general, but more accurate, than his predecessor’s: for example, *penus*, stores, is not confined to eatables and drinkables.<sup>58</sup> We also know that he reduced Scaevola’s five kinds of tutorship to three, though of his own four kinds of theft later lawyers in their turn impugned two.<sup>59</sup> We recall that Plato said that dialectic ‘is not hard to explain, but is very hard to operate’.<sup>60</sup>

In the *Ninth Philippic* Cicero singles out Servius’ most notable quality as a

<sup>53</sup> *De Leg.* 2.51. E.F. Brock, *Seminar III* (1945) 1 believes Cicero is misunderstanding Scaevola here; but he may be following Servius’ *De Sacris Detestandis*. Scaevola’s discussion may have been in the work or works on religious law suggested by Vell. Pat. 2.26.2.

<sup>54</sup> *De Or.* 1.190.

<sup>55</sup> *Ad F.* 7.22. but he may be simply trying to save Trebatius trouble, as it was hard to look things up in a roll.

<sup>56</sup> *Ad A.* 6.1.15; I am not, given the intellectual background, convinced by A.J. Marshall, *Phoenix* (1964) 206, who holds that Cicero’s classification ‘may represent only a mental process preliminary to actual composition’.

<sup>57</sup> Pomponius *D.* 1.2.2.44. This must be M. Brutus, the Liberator, and may date from shortly before 44, when it was known that Brutus was to be urban praetor for the year. P. Stein, *Regulae Iuris* (1966) 44 argues that many of Servius’ works were written in the years after his failure to become consul (in 63), during which we do not hear of him in Rome (till 51).

<sup>58</sup> A. Gellius 4.1.20; *D.* 17.2.30.

<sup>59</sup> Gaius *Inst.* 3.183: *manifestum* and *nec manifestum*, *conceptum* and *oblatum* – Labeo said the last two were rather species of actions (where the stolen object is sought and found on a man’s premises, or on those of another); Gaius agreed.

<sup>60</sup> Plato *Philebus* 16c.

lawyer: his regard for equity. 'He was as much an expert on justice as on law, and so he always referred the implications of the law to what was generous and equitable, and would rather remove quarrels than institute proceedings.'<sup>61</sup> His preserved *responsa* bear this out. For example, he tended to support the actual intention of a testator. On one occasion he admitted that *instrumentum agri*, farm equipment, does not properly include spinning women, but in the case on hand, since the owner had lived on the farm and they were part of his *familia*, the widow to whom the farm was left should have them.<sup>62</sup> We do not know if his love of equity was affected by his study of rhetoric, with its readiness to contrast law and justice; his teacher Aquilius, who was no philosopher and perhaps no orator, had stressed *aequitas*. Nor do we know if other aspects of philosophy than dialectic – for example ethics – had influenced him; certainly in the *De Legibus* Cicero implies that Servius is in the old tradition of practical lawyers compared with himself, who is investigating the philosophic basis of all law in Natural Law.<sup>63</sup>

But his fragments attest to Servius' broad, and especially historical, interests. The latter were natural where lawyers were also upper-class Romans. Cicero indeed claims that the attraction of the study of law lies in the picture it can give us of the way of life pursued by our ancestors.<sup>64</sup> Varro can talk of Mucius and Brutus, the early legal writers, as patiently attempting 'to recover from oblivion what it had taken from our ancestors',<sup>65</sup> and professed antiquarians often used legal documents. We know that in his treatise on dowries Servius remarked that written undertakings about a wife's property only began to seem necessary after Sp. Carvilius Ruga divorced his wife for barrenness in the third century; the immediately following remark in A. Gellius' account, that Carvilius was fond of the woman but felt bound by his oath to the censors that he kept a wife 'for the purpose of getting children' probably comes from Servius too.<sup>66</sup> For certainly his is Gellius' next chapter, a longish account of the legal implications of betrothal in Latin communities before their acquisition of Roman citizenship. He had also noted the late introduction of *cautiones rei uxoriae*, these written guarantees, in Latium as well as Rome; one would like to know how common these comparisons were in his works. Elsewhere, it has been thought, Servius treated the word *municeps* historically, pointing out its early as opposed to its present meaning.<sup>67</sup> And though a *vir bene litteratus*, a man with a good grammatical education, he wrote to Varro for an explanation of a term he had found in a censor's records.<sup>68</sup> If he had discussions with M. Brutus at Samos

<sup>61</sup> *Phil.* 9.10-11.

<sup>62</sup> *Ad Sab.* 20.

<sup>63</sup> *De Leg.* 1.17.

<sup>64</sup> *De Or.* 1.193.

<sup>65</sup> Varro *De LL* 5.5.

<sup>66</sup> A. Gellius 4.3.2.

<sup>67</sup> Festus 126L – but *Servius filius* can hardly be the great Ser. Sulpicius, *pace* M. Humbert, *Municipium et Civitas sine suffragio* (1978) 7; on the son, R. Syme, *CQ* (1981) 421 – a fine orator and a poet.

<sup>68</sup> A. Gellius, 2.10.

during the civil war, as the *Brutus* claims, about the relation of pontifical to civil law,<sup>69</sup> this vexed question was largely a historical one. It is not clear if he wrote a commentary on the Twelve Tables – such works, by the first century, were bound to be primarily antiquarian; and so, entirely, must have been his essay ‘On not leaving the table’, which dealt with old Roman customs and superstitions.<sup>70</sup>

The *vir bene litteratus* liked arguments from etymology. Gellius rebukes him for deriving *testamentum*, a will, from *mentis contestatione*, an affirmation of the mind, as support for his view that the testator’s intention was paramount: this was to ignore the fact that formations in *-mentum* are a large class and obviously have nothing to do with *mens* (on another occasion he committed the opposite fault, holding that *-liminium* in *postliminium* is a mere suffix).<sup>71</sup> Gellius is equally severe on Trebatius, for explaining *sacellum*, a shrine, from *sacer* and *cella*, instead of seeing it as an ordinary diminutive; probably Trebatius was also looking for a significant etymology, though he was no Stoic, rather an Epicurean.<sup>72</sup> Gellius also reproves Servius’ pupil Alfenus Varus for his comments on the language of an early treaty with Carthage; he has not realised how common a certain old phrase is.<sup>73</sup> Numerous other examples of lawyers making use of grammatical procedures and grammatical learning could be adduced. Indeed, if we advance to the Augustan period, Gellius remarks that the great lawyer Labeo was particularly learned in *grammatica* (and dialectic), and made a great deal of use of etymology in his legal work.<sup>74</sup>

During the first century, changes were probably taking place in legal education, the subject about which Cicero felt so strongly. The old pattern of the expert giving *responsa* was far from dead; indeed Cicero envisages himself in this role in his old age.<sup>75</sup> But he explains extremely carefully that the *maiores*, and Q. Scaevola in particular, did not actually teach; their pupils just listened to the *responsa* they gave.<sup>76</sup> This suggests that by now something rather more organised was going on. Cicero gives the impression that Lucilius Balbus, one of Ser. Sulpicius’ mentors, was not active in giving *responsa*; and if part of what Servilius learnt from Aquilius was learnt while staying with him on the island of Cercina, off the African coast, there would hardly have been many would-be litigants there.<sup>77</sup> Pomponius appears to distinguish between

<sup>69</sup> *Brutus* 156; *Brutus*’ historical interests are attested, see p. 96.

<sup>70</sup> *D.* 50.16.237, Pliny *NH* 28.26, Festus (180, 232, 430, 516L) notes Servius’ interpretation of various words from the Twelve Tables. The famous letter to Cicero on Tullia’s death (*Ad F.* 4.5) suggests a sense of the past; to lament the decline of great Greek cities was a *topos*, but not one Servius had to choose.

<sup>71</sup> A. Gellius 7.12.1.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.* 7.12.5; *Ad F.* 7.12.

<sup>73</sup> A. Gellius 7.5 – though Alfenus was *rerum antiquarum non incuriosus*.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.* 13.10.1.

<sup>75</sup> *De Leg.* 1.10.

<sup>76</sup> *Orator* 142-4, cf. *Brutus* 306.

<sup>77</sup> *Brutus* 154; Pomponius, *D.* 1.2.2.43. It is doubtful whether there was a Roman colony on Cercina.

those whom Servius 'heard', and those by whom he was taught or formed, but it is rash to build on this, as *auditor* is a normal term for pupil. It is, however, perhaps significant that the *responsa* by Servius and himself, collected and published by Alfenus Varus, are sometimes obviously to hypothetical questions, and possibly reflect discussion with pupils. In fact, the *responsum* may have become a literary form; but it is hard to suppose that it was so in earlier days, as some have suggested.

The reorganisation of legal knowledge desired by Cicero was not however simply to be of benefit to the young. It is hard to tell how close the programme which Cicero sketched out in the passages we have discussed and in the lost *De Iure Civili in Artem Redigendo* was to the proposals for a codification of the law entertained by first Pompey and then Caesar: presumably they did not envisage discussion and argument in the *libri* that they planned. Pompey is said by a very late source to have wished as consul to *leges redigere* into a definite compass, but to have given the plan up from fear of his enemies.<sup>78</sup> There can be little doubt that the reference is to 52 B.C., the year of Pompey's sole consulship and of his attempts to shore up the collapsing fabric of the Republic by various reforms, one of which made criminal trials quicker and more compendious. Whether either Cicero or Varro was at his elbow we do not know (Varro's unknown fifteen books *De Iure Civili* suggest he had an interest in legal systematisation);<sup>79</sup> there was certainly plenty of opposition to his speeded-up procedure, largely on political grounds, and Caesar later refused to recognise condemnations of this period altogether. The reference to *leges* might suggest that Pompey was indeed concerned in his plan of codification with criminal law, which at this period did depend largely on statute; but one can hardly press the language of a seventh-century bishop for legal implications.

Caesar as Dictator took up what was perhaps a related plan, and proposed to 'reduce the civil law to a definite measure and select the best and most necessary from the vast mass of laws to include in a very few books' – in other words, the plan covered both the ordinary *ius civile* and statute law.<sup>80</sup> There has been speculation over the lawyer or lawyers to whom he would have entrusted the task: Ser. Sulpicius Rufus himself, who rather unwillingly governed a province for Caesar, or one or more of those to whom he was more closely bound, such as Cicero's young friend Trebatius or, most notably, Ofilius? Caesar's murder cut short these plans. But Ofilius does seem to have had systematic interests. Pomponius says that his many works on civil law laid a basis for every part of the subject, and explains that where jurisdiction was concerned, he was the first to write a full work on the praetor's edict, and (though the passage is probably corrupt), that he also wrote about the laws.<sup>81</sup> It was suggested long ago that this might have had something to do with

<sup>78</sup> Isid. *Etym.* 5.1.5.

<sup>79</sup> Varro's *De Gradibus*, only known from Serv. *Aen.* 5.412, has been thought to be a legal work about degrees of relationship; the fragment defines *germanus*, uterine brother. Cf. the lawyer Paulus' later *Liber singularis de gradibus et adfinibus et nominibus eorum*.

<sup>80</sup> Suet. *DJ* 44.2.

<sup>81</sup> Pomponius *D* 1.2.2.44: *de legibus vicensimae primum conscribit*.

Caesar's plans. The legal tradition also knows of his *Libri iuris partiti*, however precisely this is to be translated. But it is worth noting that Cicero tells us that the parts of civil law are laws, *senatus consulta*, verdicts, the *auctoritas* of the legal experts, the magistrates, edicts, custom and equity.<sup>82</sup> Did Caesar intend to cover all this?

The new generation of lawyers continued to be mostly men of wide interests. Trebatius, 'not the man to take pleasure in nothing but the law', is the recipient of letters from Cicero that quote poetry and make jokes about Stoics and Epicureans.<sup>83</sup> Cascellius was more eloquent than he (and Ofilius more learned than either). The younger Tubero wrote on both public and private law, after turning away from oratory; he was very learned and used an affectedly archaic style, so that his works were not popular – he was also, as we saw, a historian and a friend of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>84</sup> Granius Flaccus wrote *De Iure Papiriano*, probably on a collection of sacral law extracted from pontifical documents and thought to be a collection of laws of the regal period made by a *pontifex maximus* of that time called Papirius; this must have been at least primarily antiquarian in purpose.<sup>85</sup> Pomponius lists a number of pupils of Ser. Sulpicius, as well as Ofilius, who published, many of them perhaps from the Caesarian period.<sup>86</sup> The most notable was Alfenus Varus, who became consul in 39, whose *Digesta*, a large collection of *responsa* by Servius and others, we have already mentioned. Its organisation appears to have been an improved version of that of Q. Scaevola, grouping together for example rules concerning contracts, as well as those about succession or property.<sup>87</sup>

It has been thought that it was not till the time of the great Augustan lawyer Labeo, a man of wide learning, that the techniques of division were wholly acclimatised in Rome;<sup>88</sup> he was certainly still involved in polemic against Servius' four kinds of theft, and other matters. Thereafter there appears to be less controversy about *genera* in the classical lawyers than there had been among what were now known as the *veteres*. The whole of the civil law had certainly been organised into a single system for educational purposes in Gaius' *Institutes*, which date from the second century A.D.. There is no reason to suppose that he was himself responsible for the arrangement, being indeed unwilling to enter into controversy about, for example, the kinds of tutorship. The actual argument into which lawyers entered continued to be affected by philosophy and other intellectual disciplines.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>82</sup> D. 32.55.1; *Topica* 28. F. D'Ippolito, *I Giuristi e la Città* (1978) 91.

<sup>83</sup> *Ad F.* 7.6, 16, 12.

<sup>84</sup> A fragment in A. Gellius 6.9.11 (addressed to Caesar's friend Oppius?) does use archaising language.

<sup>85</sup> A. Watson, *JRS* (1972) 100. Papirius and his collection were apparently not known to Cicero, see esp. *Ad F.* 9.21 on early Papirii.

<sup>86</sup> D. 2.1.1.44.

<sup>87</sup> A. Watson, op. cit. in n. 30, 163ff.

<sup>88</sup> M. Talamanca, in *La Filosofia Greca e il Diritto Romano II*, *Ac. Naz. dei Lincei* (1977) 103, 145, 156.

<sup>89</sup> There is a vast literature; perhaps note J. Miquel, *ZSS* (1970) 85, F. Wieacker, ib. (1953) 93, and esp. Talamanca, op. cit. in n. 88.

There can be little doubt that in many respects the late Republic was the most creative period in Roman jurisprudence, and in certain ways deeply imbued with Greek influence. Yet on actual provisions and principles of the law there seems to have been very little impact from outside.<sup>90</sup> It is this compromise, unique in its nature, that for centuries stood as perhaps the most influential legacy of Rome.

<sup>90</sup> Those who drafted legal documents, perhaps often *scribae*, might still betray incompetence in logical organisation: E.G. Hardy, *Three Spanish Charters* (1912) 12, notes the 'absence of any intelligible order and arrangement of the chapters' in the charter of Caesar's colony of Urso in Spain, though religious regulations are roughly grouped together. He thinks Caesar cannot have lived to revise it. On the other hand individual chapters were clearly marked out, and often numbered, in Roman laws.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

# Historiography and Allied Subjects

It is clear enough that the writing of history, though it could be an intellectual activity, could not take the form of an *ars*, any more than the actual writing of a speech could; but while there was an *ars* of rhetoric, and historiography could be seen as a part of, or closely allied to, rhetoric, the rhetors did not deal with its laws in detail, as Cicero's M. Antonius remarks in the *De Oratore*.<sup>1</sup> None the less, there were rules, of Greek origin, of course, some of which Antonius enunciates; many recur in the prefaces or *obiter dicta* of various historians, and were to be collected in the second century A.D. by Lucian in his *How to Write History*. Presumably they were discussed by Varro in his *logisticus* entitled *Sisenna de historia*, which must have introduced Sisenna, the most significant Roman historian of the first half of the first century B.C., and of which there remains one completely uninformative fragment.<sup>2</sup>

In theory, historiography proper was a deeply serious genre, traditionally in the hands of individuals of social standing and political independence (though naturally in the Hellenistic period the dependent historian in the service of the king or great general had emerged). Everyone paid at least lip-service to the idea that the historian told the truth and wrote frankly and for posterity, not contemporaries. The first law of history, says Antonius, is that there shall be 'no suspicion of hostility or of favour'. What this means is that one must not tamper with the facts. But one must make one's opinions of individuals clear, like one's interpretation of events, for how else can history, the *magistra vitae*, teach future generations? By the fourth century it had been established in Greece that such teaching was largely moral, by the provision of *exempla* of noble and evil conduct to emulate or avoid. But education in politics and warfare was also emphasised, in words at least. Tacitus complains that recent histories have been unreliable because people are now inexperienced in politics, all power having passed to the Emperor;<sup>3</sup> and Lucian says firmly that the historian needs 'political intelligence', political doubtless being meant in a wide sense.<sup>4</sup> The natural reader of history was the aspiring politician and soldier, as its natural writer was the finished one.

Historiography was also one of the most approved subjects for rhetoric, that is, for the writing of artistic prose. It was thus in the literary sense too a

<sup>1</sup> *De Or.* 2.62. Of the works called *peri historias* by Theophrastus and Praxiphanes nothing is known, but they may have been influential (DL 5.47, *Orat.* 39, *Marc. Vita Thuc.* 29)..

<sup>2</sup> A. Gellius, 16.9.5.

<sup>3</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.1.

<sup>4</sup> Lucian *How to Write History* 34.

serious genre. No wonder then that though it had no special place in education, it was in fact considered an important part of it; both *grammatici* and rhetors often encouraged the reading of histories.<sup>5</sup> Cicero thought it an essential study for his orator-statesman. The author of the *Ad Herennium* said that those ignorant of past events, who cannot find an *exemplum* for every action, easily fall into error through inexperience; those who know what has happened to others can exercise foresight in their own plans.<sup>6</sup>

This author planned to write both *De Republica Administranda* and on military science.<sup>7</sup> But in fact an aversion to such abstract works seems to have made the Romans particularly dependent on historiography. As far as we can see, there was nothing on political theory apart from Cicero's *De Republica* and *De Legibus*, though there were perhaps political pamphlets of the kind that Cicero found he was not allowed to write to Caesar, and that Sallust probably did not write to him.<sup>8</sup> A cousin and officer of Caesar, L. Cotta, wrote a work on the Roman constitution of which we would like to know more,<sup>9</sup> and there were essays on particular offices or jobs – Varro's for Pompey on the duties of a consul (not published), Cicero's letter to his brother on those of a provincial governor, and perhaps that ascribed to Q. Cicero on electioneering.<sup>10</sup>

As for treatises on military affairs, there seems to have been nothing in Latin to supplant the Elder Cato's *De Re Militari*, which changes in the legion must have made obsolete by our time. But Cicero claims that the reading of *res gestae* was how Lucullus, en route to Asia, prepared himself for generalship, and he probably elsewhere made Lucullus say that reading *annales* educates the soldier as well as the statesman.<sup>11</sup> The claim was not wholly convincing; Sallust's Marius sneers at *nobiles* whose only military experience came from reading histories, and Diodorus' promise that his work provides useful experience for soldiers and public men is fairly risible.<sup>12</sup> It had been less ridiculous in Diodorus' favourite Polybius. The Romans did read Greek works on military science, as Marius further notes; for example those of king Pyrrhus and Cineas, though the arms and formations discussed were not their own.<sup>13</sup> Pyrrhus and Cineas were men of experience, but not all authors of such works were, since tactics, owing in origin to the claim of the

<sup>5</sup> Quint. 2.5.

<sup>6</sup> *De Or.* 1.158; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.9.13.

<sup>7</sup> *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.2.3.

<sup>8</sup> I am assuming that the Sallustian letters to Caesar are not genuine, but cannot argue it here. Varro's *Trikaranos* is a notorious puzzle: can it, given his devotion to Pompey, really have been an attack on the so-called First Triumvirate? It may have been too personal to count as a serious work on politics.

<sup>9</sup> Athen. 6.273b describes it as a *peri politeias* (and shows it was in Latin). Cf. *Ad A.* 13.44.3, also mentioning Libo (probably his *Annales*) and Casca, perhaps a political work.

<sup>10</sup> A. Gellius 14.7.2; *Ad Q.F.* 1.1; *Comm. Pet.*

<sup>11</sup> *Acad.* 2.1.2; *Hort. frag.* 13Gr. Special collections of *stratagemata* had perhaps not yet been made.

<sup>12</sup> Sall. *Jug.* 85.12, cf. *Pro Font.* 43, generals whose knowledge of military matters came not from books but experience; DS 1.5.

<sup>13</sup> *Ad F.* 9.25 (cf. Aelian *Taktika* 1.2). The Romans would naturally be interested in these figures.

fifth-century sophists to equip a man completely for public life, counted in some quarters as a part of philosophy. Philodemus says the failed philosopher may take up teaching tactics. And Asclepiodotus, who wrote perhaps in our period, is described as a philosopher, whether failed or not;<sup>14</sup> he simply lists the subdivisions of the phalanx and their names. The Romans ridiculed such works, and Cicero knew the story of the foolish lecture by a philosopher which the elderly Hannibal had to sit through in Asia.<sup>15</sup> But for centuries soldiers read Caesar's *Commentaries* with what they were sure was great profit.

It should certainly not be forgotten that historiography aimed at pleasure as well as usefulness. Herodotus, the Father of History, had introduced the telling of attractive and amusing stories, often about exotic places, into the genre. Other early sources had retailed the mythical as well as the historical past of their own states. Myth and marvels became an almost essential ornament even to basically serious works and, like rhetorical elaboration of more recent events in order to bring out pathos and drama, and to give vividness, they often ran riot. In a society in which there was a limited amount of prose fiction (in Latin, at the beginning of the first century, perhaps none at all) some historiography probably presented the best light reading available.<sup>16</sup>

The time of Cicero has been described, most unfairly, as one in which Clio was dumb, and, more convincingly, as fertile in mediocre historical work.<sup>17</sup> But its very fertility is remarkable, when it is compared with the previous age, and considerable advances were in fact made, though it is true that Cicero and his friends were dissatisfied with Roman achievements, and thought that the great history, to set beside the famous Greek works, would only be provided by Cicero himself.<sup>18</sup> Much of what was produced, particularly in the genres of biography and the memoir, which are to be distinguished from historiography proper, had a valuable purpose in its time, as the journalism of the day, or as works of reference or tools of research. And the only large-scale historiographical work of the period to survive, at least in large part, Diodorus of Sicily's Greek *Bibliothêkê* or *Library of History*, seems to have been meant as a useful compendium of all the historical narratives of most interest at the time.

In the second century Roman senators had taken it on themselves to

<sup>14</sup> Philod. *Rhet.* 2.159-60 Sudh; Asclepiodotus *Taktika*, ed. Oldfather (Loeb). For the two philosophic Asclepiodoti in our period, see *Index Stoic.* ed. Traversa, 93. Ours is probably the pupil of Posidonius, Diels *Doxogr. Gr.* 19.

<sup>15</sup> *De Or.* 2.75. Cincius' *De Re Militari* (A. Gellius 16.4), perhaps just in the Ciceronian period, is the work of a *grammaticus* and antiquarian, and perhaps not meant to be useful. Our fragment explains why cavalry units are called 'wings'. There were no doubt technical and anonymous *commentarii*, notes of procedures or regulations, such as that for military tribunes which I have argued lies behind Polybius 6 on the legion (*PBSR* (1971) 13).

<sup>16</sup> But T.P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), which is devoted to the historiography of our period, is wrong to see the fictional and rhetorical strain as the dominant one of the time. Sisenna, a complex figure, is more important than Valerius Antias – and the latter did have much material that was documentary in origin, or at least claimed to be, and quite unrhretorical.

<sup>17</sup> E. Badian, in *Latin Historians* ed. T.A. Dorey (1966) 26.

<sup>18</sup> *De Leg.* 1.5; cf. perh. *De Fin.* 1.1 (history is what a man of C.'s *dignitas* should be writing); Nepos *HRR* II frag. 18.

record, first in Greek and then in Latin, the tradition of their past. At the outset, writing largely for Greek consumption, they were concerned with the legendary origins of the city – to show its antiquity and its foundation by heroes of Hellenic legend, whether Trojan or Greek; and with recent wars in Italy or beyond – to demonstrate Rome's power and *fides*. Historiography was thus an extension of diplomacy. Gradually, in the hands of those who wrote Latin, the reconstruction of Rome's internal history became important, especially where it seemed to prefigure the domestic problems of the later second century. Greek scholarly techniques such as etymology and aetiology (the finding of origin-stories for surviving institutions and monuments) were enthusiastically but naively employed. Towards the end of the century, indeed, contemporary events and the influence of Polybius gave an impulse to the writing of recent political and military history that should explain and judge, rather than merely record, events. Polybius, who was so self-conscious about the historian's task, may have made the Romans aware of some of its problems (though he was not concerned with stylistic ones). It was perhaps under his influence and in the 90s that Asellio complained that to say under what consuls a battle took place, but not why, and to omit political events (while registering prodigies) was to write not *res gestae* or *historia*, but only *annales*.<sup>19</sup> At the same time a serious attempt to write elegantly, which means rhetorically, was made, though without much success yet, by Coelius Antipater. And antiquarianism, developing in scope and to some extent in sophistication, was largely taken over by professional or near-professional scholars who used the learned monograph, rather than the continuous annalistic narratives of the historians.

The results, for the first century, were three. One was that the traditional annalistic history, starting with the foundation of the city (or with Aeneas, or even Saturn himself), after, perhaps, an interval of silence, fell into the hands of inferior writers, mostly lacking social standing, seriousness of purpose, and scholarly interests, though not, now, some rhetorical training. The second was that recent and contemporary history attracted the most distinguished figures, mostly uniting public experience with rhetorical expertise. The third consequence was that scholarly research and antiquarianism continued to develop separately, to culminate in Varro's huge *Antiquitates*; it was more closely linked with *grammatica* than with rhetoric. We will trace this third current in a separate chapter.

The annalists of the early first century all wrote at greater length than their predecessors, doubtless elaborating their narrative with invented detail and frequent formal speeches. The first two, much used by Livy, Cicero seems to disdain to mention, though they probably wrote in the years after Sulla, beyond which their fragments do not go. C. Claudius Quadrigarius had some naive attractions of style for archaising imperial critics, but can be seen to have been brief on periods or subjects of political interest, and to have concentrated on battles – not that he seems to have understood war; a *pièce de résistance* is the duel between Manlius Torquatus and a huge Gaul (such duels

<sup>19</sup> *HRR* I Aselliofrag. 1.

seem to have been favoured by historians of the time).<sup>20</sup> He had some notion of source-problems; he based himself to some not very clear extent on one of the earliest historians, a senator writing in the early second century in Greek, and if he omitted the period before the Sack of Rome by the Gauls in the early fourth century, as appears to be the case, and if in particular he was the Clodius who denied, in an *Investigation of Dates*, that any genuine documents of that period survived, those passing as such having been forged in the interest of families later pushing themselves forward, he was capable of excessive scepticism; the Sack does not seem, from archaeological evidence, to have been disastrous, and most modern scholars regard the early *Fasti* as largely reliable, in spite of the names which later belonged only to plebeian families.<sup>21</sup>

Valerius Antias, presumably from Antium on the coast south of Rome (this is perhaps relevant to his hostility to the Etruscans), was shown up for a shameful liar even by the ingenuous Livy. He exaggerated numbers wildly, especially those of troops and casualties, probably to make the Rome of the past a great power and her struggles gigantic in scale, though on occasion, as Livy points out, Claudius could be an even worse offender,<sup>22</sup> and of course accuracy in such matters was impossible to attain in antiquity. Valerius' precise lists of the Senate's decision about commands, the prodigies reported to it, and so on, give an impression of detailed research in the archives, by Valerius or a predecessor, and though they fit the rhetorical call for *akribeia*, apparent precision, hardly make lively light reading. Sceptics have impugned their reliability, but both their sources and their role in Valerius' work as a whole are still problematic.<sup>23</sup> Unlike Claudius, Valerius seems to have been devoted to the great patrician family whose name he bore, and he probably adorned the early Republic with generous and conciliatory Valerii (usually contrasted with stiff-necked, reactionary Claudii).<sup>24</sup> This may reflect the political outlook of the two families in the Sullan period, and the fact that nobles were always expected to emulate their own ancestors makes some sort of excuse for this throwback technique. Later political history, such as the attack on the Scipios in the early second century, was equally fictionalised.

Licinius Macer, however, like the second-century annalists, was a senator and had a political point of view. He probably claimed descent from the Licinii prominent in the Struggle of the Orders, which he recounted from the plebeian side, reflecting in it aspects of the political situation in his own time, the seventies, when he was active in attacking Sulla's narrow constitution and pressing for the revival of the tribunate. Such an attempt to understand

<sup>20</sup> *HRR* I Claud. Quad. frag. 10b (cf. A. Gellius 9.11, not explicitly attributed to Quadrigarius).

<sup>21</sup> For Clodius, possibly a Clodius Paulus, see Plut. *Num.* 1 (and *HRR* I 178).

<sup>22</sup> Livy 38.23.8.

<sup>23</sup> I still think it unlikely that they came from the *annales maximi* (based on notes kept by the *pontifex maximus* and set up in public, till, probably, the later second century), see *CQ* (1971) 158, but possibly the *senatus consulta* were consulted at some stage in the tradition.

<sup>24</sup> Wiseman, *op. cit.* in n. 16, esp. 57ff.; but his late date for Valerius does not convince me, see p. 91.

the past in the light of the present is forgivable in an age when the extent and nature of historical change are ill-understood. But the depth of Macer's scholarship is disputed. He used an earlier historian, Cn. Gellius, whose standing is not high; perhaps, like Livy (and possibly Claudius Quadrigarius) following his chosen author closely except for noting a few variants and making some additions from other sources. It is clear that he did not abjure the impossibly detailed account of the regal period that most annalists felt bound to give. He claimed to have discovered an ancient list of magistrates in a temple, his *libri lintei*, and to have used it, possibly only for part of the fifth century. In fact his information about early magistrates is alarmingly detailed and sometimes suspicious for other reasons, and some scholars have been sceptical of his 'linen books': Macer might have been trying to ward off the scepticism of Claudius about a period in which he was specially interested. But he adduced some documents, like an early treaty with the town of Ardea, which are probably genuine.<sup>25</sup> Cicero, who had read Macer, complained of his *garrulitas* (implausible detail and/or lengthy speeches?) and his lack of Greek learning;<sup>26</sup> in fact he had probably attended the school of *rhetores Latini*.

The fourth of Livy's late-annalistic sources, Aelius Tubero, may be Cicero's friend L. Tubero, who was writing a history in 60 B.C., but Livy once calls his source Q., which would point to his son, the distinguished legal and literary figure, probably writing in the thirties. The annalist used his predecessors, and does not seem to have been superior to them.<sup>27</sup> The tradition handed on to Livy was thus fairly coherent; unfortunately it was not true, except in outline and in patches. Strikingly contradictory and subversive pieces of evidence surface now and then from the early historians, and, as we shall see, from the antiquarian tradition. The latter was produced by scholars who certainly went to old documents, and often discussed their problems seriously, if not usually in a way to satisfy modern standards; and who were exempt from the temptations of rhetoric, if not always of patriotism and moralising. In fact, it was impossible in the late Republic, as it is now, to write a connected and lively narrative of early Rome that should also be a responsible work of scholarship. The later annalists chose not to try. By the time of Q. Tubero, let alone Livy, Varro had made a mass of antiquarian material accessible; the refusal of the annalists to use it is dramatic.<sup>28</sup> It may also be noted how parochial they were; the form was influenced by that of the Greek local chronicle, dealing with a single city, which was clearly an inadequate one for Rome, and there is no attempt to make any sense of the history of the peninsula as a whole.

Other works from our period described as *Annales* are probably either briefly annotated lists of dates, like those of Atticus and possibly those of

<sup>25</sup> *HRR* I 298, with R.M. Ogilvie, *JRS* (1958) 40, perhaps over-favourable.

<sup>26</sup> *De Leg.* 1.7, *Brutus* 238.

<sup>27</sup> *HRR* I 308. He referred to the *libri lintei*, but reported a different pair of consuls than those Macer had given for one particular year; he probably used Valerius extensively.

<sup>28</sup> One or two exceptions in Livy (notoriously 8.8, on the early army, for which see p. 240) only make this the more striking.

Varro, or contemporary histories with a shortish introduction on earlier events. Tanusius Geminus, probably a senator, may belong to the second class; he wrote perhaps after Caesar's death an anti-Caesarian work of this title which Seneca found long and tedious.<sup>29</sup> The form was in fact unsatisfactory from a literary point of view; Cicero in his letter to Lucceius urges that monographs on a single war, or encomia of individuals, are more unified and exciting than any sort of *perpetua historia*.<sup>30</sup> A. Furius' *Annales*, at the beginning of the century, were in epic verse, covering perhaps only recent wars, in at least eleven books. The *Annales* of Volusius, for which Catullus foresaw a speedy death, may have been in verse, as some think those of the orator Hortensius were, though he is quoted as a serious source for events of the Social War.<sup>31</sup> Q. Cicero in 59 asked his brother to correct and 'publish' his *Annales*;<sup>32</sup> these may also have been in verse, as Quintus, a fluent poet, on the whole left prose to his brother. Caesar's Gallic victories were celebrated in the style of historical epic, as we saw; so were Cicero's achievements as consul, at least by himself, since the Greek poets Archias and Thyillus did not carry out their promises to him.<sup>33</sup> The role of verse is unsurprising, for Ennius' *Annales* were still greatly admired.

The serious historians, as we saw, were contemporary historians. The most important writer of the period was L. Cornelius Sisenna, who produced an account of the Social and Civil Wars, down to Sulla's dictatorship or possibly death. Sallust praises the work, and his own lost *Histories* began where Sisenna's ended; as we saw Varro's *logisticus* on the writing of history bore Sisenna's name, and Cicero twice described him as easily the best of Latin historians, though he thought him far from perfect.<sup>34</sup> Our fragments are numerous but very brief, and it is easy to forget how important and how influential on our tradition he was.<sup>35</sup>

He seems to have been of remote Etruscan descent, or so his name suggests, and to have had sympathy for the aspirations of the Italians, in spite of being optimate in connections and probably underplaying Sulla's ill-treatment of parts of the peninsula. It appears that he was full on military and naval events, and on political ones, especially political trials. He had almost certainly fought in the Social War, he was praetor in 78, and possibly governed Sicily; he was to die as one of Pompey's legates against the pirates. Cicero, discussing him as an orator, calls him experienced in political matters (though rather lazy). A 'pragmatic' tendency, to use Polybius' term – that towards a useful type of history with stress on causes – is made likely by these

<sup>29</sup> *HRR* II 49 (two fragments), and T1 from Sen. *Ep.* 93.11.

<sup>30</sup> *Ad Fam.* 5.12.2. Biography, as we shall see, is not a branch of history, but the monograph is, though perhaps it often involves stress on the literary side of things.

<sup>31</sup> Cat. 36 and 95; *HRR* II 9 (quoted by Velleius; and possibly by Cicero, calling him *bonus auctor*).

<sup>32</sup> *Ad A.* 2.16.4; but in 59 he was asking his brother if he should write history, *Ad Q. F.* 2.12.4.

<sup>33</sup> *Ad A.* 1.16.15; possibly only epigrams were expected from them. Archias did eulogise a number of great Romans, including Lucullus.

<sup>34</sup> Sall. *Jug.* 95.2; *Brutus* 228; *De Leg.* 1.7.

<sup>35</sup> As I argued in *CQ* (1979) 327.

facts and by the title *Historiae*, which may hark back to Asellio's definition. He also tried to avoid problems caused by the annalistic form by grouping events of different areas together, perhaps even across different years. But this was combined with the rhetorical and 'tragic' style that Polybius so despised, for Sisenna almost certainly retailed vivid, and doubtless not always truthful, anecdotes; indeed the famous scenes of Marius' flight and exile may be due to him. And he also wrote in an elaborate style, influenced by what Cicero called 'Asianic' rhetoric, but also, as we saw, by the grammatical ideal of analogy. There was also scepticism, at least as regards prophetic dreams, that Cicero suggests was Epicurean (but he recorded portents). Cicero describes Sisenna as copying Cleitarchus, the popular Alexander-historian, and his 'puerile' and inflated style;<sup>36</sup> and Cicero was aware that Cleitarchus subordinated truth to drama. But he grants Sisenna the adjective *doctus*, learned, which he explicitly denied to the 'rustic' efforts of Coelius Antipater.<sup>37</sup> We may accept that Sisenna assimilated Roman historiography to the level of one particular Hellenistic type (not that which we find most admirable), and was indeed markedly superior, stylistically and intellectually, to his forerunners, as is likely in a period of rapidly increasing sophistication. In spite of his rather incongruous collection of Greek influences, the fusion of 'pragmatic' and 'tragic' history, of experience and rhetoric, made him the true predecessor of Sallust and Tacitus.

We know nothing of Lucullus' history of the Social War, in Greek, or of the (so he claimed) serious and unbiassed history of the same period that Pompey's and Cicero's friend Luceius had more or less finished in 56.<sup>38</sup> In talking of the monograph on his own consulship that Cicero wanted Luceius to write, the orator stressed the attractions of artistic unity, but also Luceius' opportunity to show his insight into revolution, its causes and remedies, and to make frank moral judgments on those Cicero felt had betrayed him. We are also ill-informed about several other works mentioned in the ancient sources, either in Latin or Greek.<sup>39</sup> In neither language did Romans write full-scale histories of Greek affairs. This was not because they were not interested in them – Cicero says that the orator should know not only the history of Rome but that of earlier imperial nations (no doubt this includes Athens and Sparta) and of famous kings;<sup>40</sup> it was no doubt because they could not compete with, but could many of them read, the great historians of Greece. Thucydides admittedly was by now hard to understand, even for Greeks, but there was even a fashion for him and his style in Rome in the fifties. The figure of Alexander had been of interest to Romans as early as

<sup>36</sup> *Puerile* is the equivalent of *meirakiôdes*, a technical term for frigid and elaborate affectation.

<sup>37</sup> *Brutus* 228; *De Or.* 2.54 (cf. *De Leg.* 1.6.).

<sup>38</sup> Plut. *Luc.* 1.5. *Ad A.* 1.19.10; *Ad F.* 5.12.2; Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.* thinks it must have been in Greek, as Cicero does not list Luceius among Roman historians in *De Leg.* 1.7: but he had perhaps not yet published his work. Possibly he never did. (Or Cicero may be omitting living men.)

<sup>39</sup> For example the Greek history of the blind *praetorius* Cn. Aufidius, written in Cicero's boyhood, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.112, and the violently anti-Caesarian work of T. Ampius Balbus, *HRR* II.

<sup>40</sup> *Orator* 120.

Plautus' time, and his historians Cleitarchus and Callisthenes were probably both much read, especially the former – Cicero pretends it is a favourite work of his correspondent Caelius, though implying that he himself deprecates it.<sup>41</sup> He lists the regular canon with words of high praise:<sup>42</sup> Herodotus, Thucydides, probably Xenophon, Philistus, Theopompus, Ephorus, Callisthenes and Timaeus,<sup>43</sup> the great historian of the western Mediterranean; Cicero admired Polybius, in spite of his lack of literary qualities, but there is surprisingly little sign of the continuation of Polybius written by Posidonius being influential in Rome on anyone other than Diodorus Siculus, except perhaps for its ethnographic portions.

Diodorus devoted thirty years of his life, from about 60 B.C., to working on a 'Library' that should record the traditions of all the peoples now united under Roman rule and in the brotherhood of mankind preached by the Stoics.<sup>44</sup> The title suggests a mere handbook, though the preface makes all the grand historiographical claims. In fact Diodorus follows his main sources closely (even to taking over remarks in the first person), though sometimes supplementing them with secondary ones and adding comments of his own.<sup>45</sup> He is not really the true, if imperfectly realised, Stoic historian that some have tried to make him. A vague reference to the Stoic Fate crops up once, but on the whole he is content with an imprecise notion of Tyche, Fortune, sometimes seen as just and sometimes as capricious, while it is clearly praise to say of Philip II of Macedon that he owed his success not to Fortune but his own qualities. Nor can he keep up the idea of the brotherhood of man; indeed he is fond of describing barbarians as beastlike. He is also eclectic enough to quote Epicurus on the perturbed life of the unjust; the occasional conventional reference to the gods and the interest in astrology would not be impossible in a Stoic. But disparate ideas lie side by side even in his prefaces, which reflect the common historiographical ideas of the day.<sup>46</sup>

Some serious influence may however have been exercised on him by Polybius, whom he certainly copied out on the subject of Fortune. Polybius had thought Universal History, first practised by Ephorus, particularly suited to the period in which the *oikoumenê* was united under Roman rule; Diodorus projects this conception back over the whole past. Perhaps Polybian is the distrust of the over-use of rhetorical speeches in a history – readers tend to skip, or even be so disgusted they throw the work down; besides, they break

<sup>41</sup> *Ad F.* 2.10.3. Pliny *NH* 10.136 calls Cleitarchus a *celebratus auctor*.

<sup>42</sup> *De Or.* 2.55; *Hort.* frag. 15Gr. Cicero praises Philistus, the early fourth-century Sicilian historian, as 'almost Thucydides in miniature', and admires Thucydides and Timaeus for learning, accuracy, and interpretation and comment as well as style in the narrow sense. He even respected the quite unliterary Polybius. But Callisthenes is criticised for writing 'practically in the style of oratory', doubtless exaggeratedly laudatory epideictic rhetoric.

<sup>43</sup> Cicero, Atticus, Nepos and Varro certainly all knew him.

<sup>44</sup> At work by 56 (1.44.1-4 with 17.49); last event noted 36, the refounding of Tauromenium, 167.1, while 1.44.4. does not know of the Roman conquest of Egypt.

<sup>45</sup> J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (1981) 23ff. has an excellent account of Diodorus' treatment of his sources but is perhaps harsh in thinking the claims in the preface are consciously meant to deceive.

<sup>46</sup> Rather than being closely based on those of Ephorus, as used to be thought.

the narrative and interrupt curiosity.<sup>47</sup> In fact, Diodorus' style is unpretentious and fairly unrheterical, and we can trace him cutting or omitting speeches, though he sometimes indulges himself with an antithetic pair of orations on a moral issue. Possibly influenced by Polybius, too, is his claim to have travelled widely in preparation for his work, a claim which (apart from an early visit to Egypt) has been doubted, for his geography, especially of Asia, is uncertain.<sup>48</sup> Diodorus' criticism of the captious Timaeus is perhaps also drawn from Polybius, like his reference to Odysseus, though not as the ideal potential historian Polybius thought him, but as the man whose hard-won experience the reader of history can more cheaply acquire. So too his passing attack on the 'usual artificial tragic style' of historians; the sensitive reason for the attack may be his own – pity for victims of a disaster should prevent exploitation of it.<sup>49</sup> The usefulness of history is, as with Polybius, its justification; only the barest lip-service is paid to the idea of the reader's enjoyment, or even avoidance of boredom. Though Diodorus claims to provide vicarious experience for soldiers and statesmen, lawgivers and inventors, in fact his lessons, unlike those of the practical soldier and public man Polybius, are almost entirely moral. In particular he is penetrated with the idea of History's power to immortalise good and bad deeds as *exempla*, and repeatedly stops to moralise over distinguished men, attacking arrogance and praising pity and clemency. The real advantage of Universal History is that it involves the largest number of edifying situations.<sup>50</sup>

Where he does not follow Polybius is in aversion from myth, but Diodorus advertises his suspension of belief here by announcing what he is doing and also by putting his accounts into indirect speech – 'they say', 'it is said'.<sup>51</sup> (Theopompus was praised for making it clear when he was dealing with myth as opposed to history.) Though he was much concerned with the form of his work, it is notoriously unsatisfactory. For the historical period he establishes an annalistic framework based on Athenian archon-years, Olympic years, and Roman consul-years (which began on the first of March, and later January, while the other two started in the summer, so confusion was already endemic)<sup>52</sup> and then jumps from area to area, usually bunching together the events of several years in each region in an attempt at continuity, once getting quite cross with History for not letting him tell several stories simultaneously. After making havoc of the Peloponnesian War, he hankers after the united and organic monograph, as he says Ephorus, the founder of Universal History, did, and tries to concentrate the career of Philip II in a single book, but has to interrupt repeatedly to follow Dion's expedition to Syracuse and events in Asia. He manages better in the next book, with Alexander, by dint

<sup>47</sup> DS 20.1-2.

<sup>48</sup> He puts Nineveh on the Euphrates, not the Tigris 2.3.2.

<sup>49</sup> 19.8.4 (Agathocles' massacre in Syracuse).

<sup>50</sup> 1.3.2.

<sup>51</sup> Even *mythologousi*, e.g. 3.64.1.

<sup>52</sup> He probably uses a Greek chronographer for this framework (but not Castor of Rhodes, who is known to have included Roman events, according to F. Cassola, *ANRW* II 30.1 (1982) 799).

of ignoring other theatres of activity completely.

Attached to the chronological scaffolding are brief notices on the *floruit* or death of some writers, and notes of the points at which historians' work begin and end (a few are unusual ones, but we cannot be sure Diodorus used them); and, in the fourth century, of the accession of Spartocid kings in the Cimmerian Bosphorus and tyrants of Heraclea Pontica, of whom the narrative says nothing. The claim to be writing world history is a farce, in spite of a bold opening with three books of barbarian myth and 'history' (balanced by the Euhemerizing account of Greek myth that now allowed the Greeks a remote past to set against that of the otherwise shamingly ancient East), and in spite of a few later digressions on various barbarian peoples. Lydia is only referred to; some fourth-century Persian and Egyptian history gets in *via* Ephorus, only where Greeks and Greek mercenaries are involved. Diodorus had unfortunately given up Ctesias' history of Persia after the first books (where he ought instead to have used the Chaldaean priest Berossus, for Assyria) and never got to grips at all with post-mythological Egypt, though the work of the Egyptian priest Manetho, whose framework of dynasties we still use, might have been available to him.<sup>53</sup>

Carthage similarly is only dealt with in connection with her wars in Sicily and against Rome. We may be grateful for Diodorus' parochial interest in Greek Sicily, even though controversy still rages<sup>54</sup> as to most of his sources here, many of them no doubt local. Roman readers may also have found this material interesting, though less than they would have done earlier, when Sicily was more important to them. But Diodorus takes little interest in Greek Italy, except for an excursus on Pythagoreanism, and none in the rest of the peninsula; there is no reference, for example, to the archaic Etruscan hegemony over much of Italy, though some to Etruscan piracy and Etruscan mercenaries in Sicily. Possibly his belief that the recent 'Marsic' or Social War was the greatest war ever led him to talk of Italian history; his text is here fragmentary. In fact, early Roman history is also inadequately treated; after some account of foundation legends and the regal period, in which the name of Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian, who wrote in Greek, is mentioned, we get little till some sporadic notices of the wars of the late fourth century. It is perhaps unkind to disbelieve Diodorus' claim that he knew Latin, but little can be deduced from his extremely compressed account, certainly not that his original was very brief, and so early in date, as used to be thought.<sup>55</sup> Even where some outlying Greek states are concerned Diodorus fails us entirely – Massilia, say, or Bactria; but the second half of the work is admittedly not preserved complete.

<sup>53</sup> Both Berossus and Manetho wrote in Greek in the third century B.C. Unfortunately Diodorus had learnt, perhaps from Ctesias, to distrust Herodotus, who is not used for Persian or other Eastern history, 1.69.7.

<sup>54</sup> The dispute rages especially in Sicily itself. Diodorus cites Timaeus a number of times and probably used Philinus of Acragas for the First Punic War (Jacoby, *FGH* III 598).

<sup>55</sup> Recent discussion by Cassola, *op. cit.* in n. 52; the chronological information, perhaps from a fairly old source, is of different origin from the narrative, for which several sources may have been used in succession, and then Polybius and finally Posidonius.

Diodorus thought history should tell the truth; but he was too uncritical to have much chance of putting this maxim into practice. He could see (or repeat) that Timaeus was too hostile to the Syracusan tyrant Agathocles, and another source too favourable. But he could not see, as Cicero and Atticus did, that Thucydides was vastly preferable for the fifth century to the convenient and readable Ephorus (he has the story about Themistocles' suicide from drinking bull's blood that they scorn – it is interesting to find some Romans now far more sophisticated than some Greeks),<sup>56</sup> nor could he foreshadow the later Arrian in eschewing all but the soberest accounts of Alexander's life, turning instead to the popular but unreliable Cleitarchus. He innocently supposed that Scipio's return of a statue of a bull after the sack of Carthage to Acragas proved the story of the tyrant Phalaris' brazen bull; Polybius had not been quite so simple.<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, some of the well-known works that formed his preferred sources were authoritative ones; he could hardly in our eyes have done better for the main lines of Hellenistic history than Hieronymus of Cardia, Polybius and Posidonius (though the first two at least markedly failed to live up to the stylistic demands of antiquity), and he supplements them with a number of specialised sources.

Closely as Diodorus follows his models, he compresses or excerpts so drastically that his own interests can be surmised, as they can from his insertions from other sources. It may be a sign of his civilised outlook, for example, that he gives two full and appalled accounts of conditions in the mines of Ptolemaic Egypt and Roman Spain, and retails Posidonius' balanced narrative of the slave revolts in Roman Sicily.<sup>58</sup> He dilates on the cultural glories of Athens' great age, attributing them too simply to the wealth and glory won in the Persian Wars; on the other hand, there is rather little idealisation of Sparta. A long pair of speeches considers the justification for the treatment of the Athenian prisoners at Syracuse.<sup>59</sup> If Diodorus seems pious at times, he objects to cruel superstition.<sup>60</sup> He likes generals to be intelligent and takes some interest in technical military achievements, such as sieges.<sup>61</sup> But there is obviously no real understanding of war or politics; his admired Polybius would have been scathing on him.

His history continued till Caesar's consulship of 59; perhaps from Posidonius he draws a hostile portrait of Gaius Gracchus, and in general of a Rome much corrupted since earlier times, especially by luxury, and punished by the civil wars of the eighties – though the early first century, he observes, still saw some upright governors in Greek provinces. Perhaps also from Posidonius, he praised young Pompey highly; his own must be the equally

<sup>56</sup> DS 11.58.3; *Brutus* 42-3. On Alexander, there is no sign of the philosophers' hostile presentation.

<sup>57</sup> DS 13.90.5; 32.25; Polyb. 12.25.1, with Walbank's comm.

<sup>58</sup> DS 5.38.1; 3.12-14; 34/35.2, 8-11; 36.1-11.

<sup>59</sup> DS 13.20-32.

<sup>60</sup> DS 32.10-12.

<sup>61</sup> Supplementing Hieronymus' good account of the siege of Rhodes with a Rhodian historian, probably Zeno, Hornblower, *op. cit.* in n. 45, 58. We saw there may have been a special interest in military engineering at this period, p. 192.

high opinion of Caesar, his eloquence, integrity and victories, which have earned him the title of divine.<sup>62</sup> He applauds Caesar's restoration of Corinth. Though referring to and doubtless welcoming the gift of Roman citizenship to Sicily (by Antony in Caesar's name) he still writes as a Greek, not one who has in any real way identified himself with Rome. That was to come under the Empire. But we notice a Greek praising a Roman's eloquence.

It was only in the Christian period that Diodorus was widely used. But the fact that his work was pirated before publication suggests a demand for it; he observes, doubtless rightly, that it was hard to obtain the various works covering the subject, or get an overall view of it (not that he really gives one). We should count him as one of the historians useful in his time, who tried to combine Greek and Roman chronology and traditions, as we shall see other quasi-historical works did, and to write for a public, perhaps both Greek and Latin-speaking, that would find his clear and indeed repetitive style<sup>63</sup> trouble-free and share his wide and humane, if superficial, interests. A little later, a historian took the ultimate logical step; Pompeius Trogus, an enfranchised provincial, was to produce a perhaps better-balanced universal history – stronger on Parthia and the East, though he was himself a Gaul from the West – in Latin. For Diodorus' epitomising of earlier writers, perhaps we may compare the résumés of Fannius, Coelius and Polybius made by Brutus, and where his concentration on *exempla* is concerned, Nepos took the logical step of compiling a work consisting of nothing else, using in all probability mainly historical sources.

It is not true that the Greeks did not write autobiography, but it is true that there is no parallel among them to the outburst of memoir-writing in the late Republic, due to immensely ambitious and competitive politicians to whom their *dignitas* in life and death was vital. Such works had roots in the apologetic speech or letter, and also in the unpretentious journals, *ephémérides*, sometimes called *hypomnēmata*, or in Latin *commentarii*, kept by or in the name of kings or generals, the bare factual style of which had been seen by Asellio as similar to that of the annals he so despised. In Rome autobiographical memoirs continued to be mainly subliterate, often claiming to be mere notes for others to write up. The first real example seems to be that of M. Aemilius Scaurus, the great Leader of the Senate who 'ruled the world with his nod'<sup>64</sup> at the turn of the century, but was much attacked and prosecuted. 'It took a ruthlessly ambitious and socially impregnable man to write openly *de vita sua*.'<sup>65</sup> The solemn archaising language of this three-volume work has led some to think it claimed the rank of serious historiography, but was probably simply the expression of his personality, as Cicero records it. None the less, though Cicero tells us the work was little read, it was 'very useful', a better guide to politics than Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*, because reflecting Roman conditions.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> DS 32.27.

<sup>63</sup> J. Palm, *Über Sprache u. Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien* (1955).

<sup>64</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 24.

<sup>65</sup> E. Badian, *op. cit.* in n. 17.

<sup>66</sup> *Brutus* 112.

Around the same time apologetic memoirs in an easier style, Xenophontian in flavour, were written by Catulus, Marius' colleague as consul in 100, who felt his share in defeating the barbarians had been underestimated.<sup>67</sup> Though Catulus had literary aspirations, the work was dedicated to the poet A. Furius and was perhaps supposed to be material for an epic by him. And, probably in the eighties or early seventies, the unjustly exiled Rutilius Rufus wrote in Asia an embittered account of his own career, and, in Greek, a history probably covering the same period. Both were doubtless plain in style, for Rutilius was a strict Stoic, and we have seen how he may indeed have attacked the whole conception of rhetoric as normally practised at Rome. Fragments also suggest disgust at modern luxury and corruption – the usual approach to Rome's problems – and reveal his hatred of Marius and of Pompey's father. He refused to return to Rome when his sentence was revoked, so disillusioned was he.<sup>68</sup>

Sulla definitely proclaimed that he was only writing what a more polished author might elaborate; he seems to have thought of Lucullus.<sup>69</sup> Such modesty is, paradoxically, a sign of sophistication. The work was not modest in length,<sup>70</sup> but seems to have dealt with Sulla's campaigns, not his political work, in a style that lacked the peculiarities of vocabulary and morphology to make the late lexicographers quote him, as they so frequently did Sisenna. It will not do to make him a close model for Caesar, for Sulla's work was full of dreams and portents (and so clearly not based on documents, we may note) while Caesar's was strictly rational. But Caesar too called his work *commentarii*, and the highest compliment that Hirtius and Cicero could pay it was to say that it had in fact frightened off historians.<sup>71</sup> The simplicity and rigour of style was clearly the result of choice, for Caesar was a fine orator and needed to feel no hesitation about writing history proper. Perhaps he disliked certain aspects of rhetorical historiography, with its moralising and often pompous elaboration; though in fact as he went on he moved nearer to full-scale historiography, with ethnographic digressions such as were almost *de rigueur* in the genre, and a fine short speech put into the mouth of the Gaul Critognatus. And there was precedent for a pure and rapid style in history; Cicero, speaking of Caesar's work, in fact says nothing is more attractive in a historian.<sup>72</sup> Of course Caesar's work was apologetic; no one would have expected it to be anything else.

Cicero was even less capable of keeping to the limitations of the *commentarii* form, as the rhetorically elaborate memoir in Greek he sent to Posidonius shows – its elegance put Posidonius off, he claimed; and his secret memoir in Latin seems also to have threatened to turn into what he regarded as real

<sup>67</sup> *Brutus* 132. Xenophon's third person memoir, the *Anabasis*, was perhaps an influence as it was written *mollis et Xenophontio genere sermone*.

<sup>68</sup> *HRR* I 187; and see above p. 151. Oddly, Cicero seems not to know the *De Vita Sua*.

<sup>69</sup> *HRR* I Sulla, frag. 1.

<sup>70</sup> Books 21 and 22 are mentioned (frags 20, 21).

<sup>71</sup> (Hirtius) *BG* 8 *praef.*; *Brutus* 262. Suet. *DJ* 56 says Pollio held Caesar intended to rewrite the commentaries himself – perhaps in the light of fuller information.

<sup>72</sup> *Brutus*, *ib.*

history.<sup>73</sup> Apart from Caesar and Cicero, the greatest figures of the dying Republic left celebration to others. Crassus cared more for power and wealth than for glory, Cato more for virtue than any of these; Pompey's apologists we have met already. His loyal lieutenant Varro wrote a *De Vita Sua* which was probably not the intellectual autobiography we should like, but an account mainly of his campaigns under Pompey.<sup>74</sup>

One would have supposed that among the roots of political biography in Rome must be the funeral *laudatio* that every great man received at his death, but even in the first century this highly traditional genre seems still to have been bare and unrhetoical.<sup>75</sup> Writings about distinguished men drew rather on the Greek *encomium*, a literary form for which a complicated schema had developed; and they were inspired by the struggles of the dynasts to flourish, as autobiography did, more than they had ever done in the Greek world. The younger Cato became a focus for eulogy and abuse even before his death; after it, Cicero and Brutus wrote the one, Caesar and his officer Hirtius the other. Cato's friends Munatius Rufus and M. Fabius Gallus wrote memoirs of some kind, perhaps more influenced by the tradition of the *commentarii* than that of Greek epideictic oratory.<sup>76</sup> Brutus' role in the Ides of March was described (presumably in Greek) by his friend the rhetor Empylus; his death at Philippi by another friend, the philosophic P. Volumnius, without the famous ghost but with a plethora of portents, and by his step-son L. Calpurnius Bibulus.<sup>77</sup> These accounts were detailed and intimate. Caesar's friend Oppius was responsible, presumably after the Ides, for a work, apparently biographical, on Caesar, and works on Cassius (presumably hostile) and on Scipio Africanus, who was perhaps regarded as a type and precursor of Caesar.<sup>78</sup> Even young P. Crassus, whose death at Carrhae in 54 cut short lofty ambitions, was probably commemorated by his freedman Apollonius.<sup>79</sup>

Cicero's biography was written by his freedman Tiro, who was perhaps more concerned with his patron's personal life and literary achievements than with his political career, on which a freedman could not speak with authority. Indeed Hellenistic biography was basically scholarly or semi-scholarly, not political. It was normally practised by writers influenced by *grammatica* or philosophy; it was written in an unpretentious, unrhetoical style; it might quote documents, but it liked apophthegms by its subject, and it could be gossipy and irresponsible. It most typically issued in strings of brief lives of

<sup>73</sup> *Ad A.* 2.1.2; He offered to send Luceius *commentari* too, *Ad F.* 5.12.10; E. Rawson, *LCM* (1982) 121.

<sup>74</sup> *HRR* II 25. One unhelpful frag.

<sup>75</sup> *De Or.* 2.341.

<sup>76</sup> In 56 or soon after Metellus Scipio published a 'book' attacking Cato, Plut. *Cato Min.* 57. Posthumous literature, *HRR* 2.42; *Ad F.* 7.24.2, 25.1. For Munatius, J. Geiger, *Athen.* (1979), 48; Plutarch calls it a 'writing', and it had vivid detail on Cato's family life and his *mores*.

<sup>77</sup> *HRR* II 51, 52, Plut. *Brut.* 2.3, 13.2 (Bibulus' 'little book of memoirs', cf. 23.4; his mother Porcia was prominent in it).

<sup>78</sup> *HRR* II 46. The work on Cassius has been suspected.

<sup>79</sup> *Ad F.* 13.16 with Plut. *Crass.* 25; A. Lintott, *RhM* (1976) 368.

poets, philosophers and scholars, though also other categories of person, including orators, lawgivers and tyrants.<sup>80</sup> It delighted in a subject's idiosyncrasies, while historiography characterised individuals only along general lines. Such biography was written not for statesmen and generals, but for what the Romans called *curiosi*. If there was any didactic intention, it would be that of showing its readers different kinds of character, or drawing moral lessons therefrom; but there might be no such purpose.

Suetonius, himself a representative of it, was thinking of this kind of work when he indicated that among notable biographers of writers were, in Rome, Varro, Nepos, Hyginus and Santra.<sup>81</sup> Varro may be included on the strength of his *De Poetis*, for it is not clear that the 700 portraits in the *Imagines*, each with its epigram, were also associated with anything that could be called a biography, though there seems to have been information about the source of the portrait and perhaps other notes. A late author, referring to the epigrams, says Varro touched with brief praise not only on the Greek philosophers but also on the great heroes of ancient Rome, frugal and hardy. Atticus, using four or five lines only beneath his portraits of Roman public figures, managed according to Nepos to work in an amazing amount of information about their deeds and offices.<sup>82</sup>

Nepos wrote at least one biography on a large scale, that of the Elder Cato. His set of short lives, the *De Viris Illustribus*, must have covered several hundred figures, if not quite as many as Varro's *Imagines*; it had at least sixteen books. The book on foreign generals survives, together with the lives of Cato the Censor and Atticus from the section on Roman historians. Poets, probably orators, and other categories were also treated (even women have been suggested, though the main Greek precedent would probably have been the lives of famous courtesans). A couple of remarks throw light on the way biography was regarded by Nepos. In the life of Pelopidas, he is worried about the lack of knowledge of fourth-century Boeotian history that many of his readers will suffer from, but fears that if he gives too much background information he will burst the bounds of the *vita*-form; while in his preface to the book he is nervous that the details he will give may seem to some readers unworthy of the great public figures he is treating.<sup>83</sup> It has been thought that in the book on foreign generals he drew on earlier biographic literature in Greek, but the names he drops are all those of famous historians – Thucydides, Theopompus, Dinon who wrote on Persian history in the fourth century, Timaeus, Polybius. For Cato he used his friend Atticus' chronological survey (and the unknown Sulpicius Blitho).<sup>84</sup> He quoted documents, perhaps only for Roman subjects, though the letters of Cornelia,

<sup>80</sup> A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (1971) 65ff.

<sup>81</sup> Jerome *De Vir. Ill.* 2.821 Vull.

<sup>82</sup> Above, p. 198. Symm. *Ep.* 1.4, Nepos *Att.* 18.6.

<sup>83</sup> Nepos *Pelop.* 1.1; *praef.* 1.

<sup>84</sup> Thucydides is the best source for Themistocles, as a contemporary (?) and compatriot, *Them.* 9.1; Xenophon is used for Agesilaus, *Ages.* 1.1, Hieronymus of Cardia and some more popular author for the few Hellenistic biographies, Hornblower op. cit. in n. 45, 67.

the mother of the Gracchi, have been thought to be too rhetorical to be genuine. It is perhaps because he had this kind of interest in the vivid details of the past that he was able to say that Cicero's letters to Atticus were almost a substitute for the history that he never wrote.<sup>85</sup>

But Nepos was not a careful scholar; he even manages to confuse the two Athenian statesmen called Miltiades and get Cicero's age wrong. We have seen, however, how valuable his life of Atticus is, with its rich detail about its subject's social and economic position and his personal habits – things below the dignity of historiography proper. This life is partly apologetic; several of the Greek lives are close to the encomiastic style in which the Greeks had usually treated political figures, and in many the chief concern is with virtuous actions: vices and virtues are balanced against each other, and moral comments interposed.

What is perhaps most important about both Varro's and Nepos' works is that for the first time Greek and Roman subjects are placed together on a level (in a second edition Nepos added to his Greek generals two Carthaginians and a Persian). Brief comparison of Greek and Roman heroes goes back to Cato the Censor at least, usually with the implication that the Romans are at least as good as the Greeks, who owe their greater fame to eloquent historians. But Varro and Nepos were doing something more, and their works have a key position in the history of Latin literature. Of Santra, probably a *grammaticus*, as a biographer we know nothing, and he may be triumviral in date or, like Hyginus (another literary scholar), even Augustan.

The first century B.C. is the age of the prepotent individual. But family pride, which according to Cicero and the mysterious Clodius had corrupted the evidence for early history, reinforced individual pride.<sup>86</sup> We have seen how some of the annalists might cater for it. Atticus wrote a family history of the Junii at the request of his friend M. Brutus and also, on that of other friends, histories of the Claudii Marcelli, Fabii and Aemilii, establishing relationships, careers and dates; it seems from a letter of Cicero's that Brutus had a family tree based on Atticus' work painted in one of his houses.<sup>87</sup> Atticus doubtless used material from public and private archives, and as we may guess from what Nepos says of his hatred of untruthfulness and Cicero of his disdain for flattery, and from the care with which he and Cicero tried to establish who had been in Greece with Mummius in 146, for a projected

<sup>85</sup> Nepos, *Att.* 16.3-4. These letters were probably not actually published till considerably later, presumably mainly from historic and biographic interest. The collection of letters *Ad F.* may have been published by Tiro (if so not impeccably; there are chronological confusions). Apart from the letters by various persons to Cicero, the first century A.D. could also read collections of letters by Brutus and Caesar, probably genuine (unlike Brutus' extant Greek letters). Cicero knew letters attributed to various famous Greek statesmen from Philip II on, *De Off.* 2.48; even if genuine they are not likely to have been unstudied like his own. He had of course considered publishing a careful selection, from literary motives; Varro's letters may have been a collection, each to a different friend, dealing with literary problems, not unlike his *Epistolicae Quaestiones*, H. Dahlmann, *Mus. Helv.* (1950) 200.

<sup>86</sup> *Brutus* 62; *HRR* I 178.

<sup>87</sup> See p. 96.

dialogue of Cicero's,<sup>88</sup> he probably worked scrupulously even in this very tricky field. The works in fact may have been almost or entirely biographical, consisting of sets of very brief lives; we have a papyrus fragment attesting the existence of biographic notices of the third-century Ptolemies in a genealogical framework.<sup>89</sup> If so, here is another field in which Roman nobles were assimilated to Hellenistic kings. The importance of family history is also documented by the *De Familiis* of M. Messala Rufus, consul in 53, which was inspired (we are told) by anger at genealogical confusions; we know it recorded the yearly sacrifice of the Servilii to a magic coin, which still took place in his own time.<sup>90</sup> But here at least we would seem to be moving away from biography into the antiquarianism to which we shall now turn.

<sup>88</sup> *Nepos Att.* 15; *Ad A.* 12.3.1, 13.30.2, 32.3, 33.3. etc.

<sup>89</sup> Momigliano, *op. cit.* in n. 80, 85.

<sup>90</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.8., with 34.137. Date and authorship of a *Liber commentarius de familia Porcia*, A. Gellius 13.20.17, are unclear but it could be of our period.

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

# Antiquarianism

Historiography, as we have seen, usually aims at a serious didactic goal, moral or practical or both, and at literary elegance; it may have a documentary underpinning at times, but this is generally unobtrusively indicated. But antiquarianism is a scholarly genre; it is presented in the learned treatise, usually descriptive rather than chronological in structure, which owing to its lack of literary pretension can quote documents, argue about their interpretation and retail the views of other authorities at more length than the historian can (though in Rome it can also have a moral purpose, as we shall find). Momigliano<sup>1</sup> has traced the distinction between the two subjects back to the fifth century B.C., where some of the sophists developed what they called *archaiologia*, covering in the first instance writings on early genealogies, foundation stories of cities, and lists of eponymous magistrates, on which chronologies were based. The name changed its meaning somewhat, and the subject developed and expanded, with the historical research of Aristotle and his followers and with the rise of perihegetic literature, describing the monuments of a city or a sanctuary. It could now cover almost any aspect of the life of the past, though there was a bias to religious customs and political institutions. It moved close to *grammatica*, especially to its branches of etymology and glossology, and it was thus less unliterary, in one sense, than Renaissance and post-Renaissance antiquarianism was often to be, since it was happy to use old poets and other writers as evidence. It also stressed, more than its later descendant did, the giving of causes or origins: if the poetic equivalent of historiography was one kind of epic, that of antiquarianism is the genre invented by Callimachus with his work called *Aitia*, or *Origins*, a title that may in later times have been used for treatises in prose too, though antiquarian verse was taken up in Rome, perhaps in the Ciceronian period and certainly in the Augustan one.<sup>2</sup> Propertius was then to define its subject matter as 'rites and the calendar and the ancient names of places'.<sup>3</sup> These were certainly subjects central to the prose antiquarians of the Varronian and immediately subsequent period who

<sup>1</sup> In his classic essay, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', reprinted in *Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici* (1955) 67.

<sup>2</sup> Can Varro's *Aetia* have been in verse, as sometimes thought? It dealt with old customs of private life and according to Servius, *Aen.* 1.408 once at least followed Callimachus (who had had a couple of anecdotes about Rome). Butas, who wrote *Aitia* in Greek verse on Roman cults may (the name is rare) be Cato's freedman, Plut. *Cato Min.* 70.2; the date of Simylus, author of the same sort of work, is uncertain.

<sup>3</sup> Propertius 4.1.69 *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum*; cf. Ovid *Fasti* 1.1, *tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum*.

formed the Augustan poets' sources.

The Roman calendar, with the complex and sometimes no longer readily understood annotations indicating religious observances and what might or might not be undertaken on particular days, had attracted scholarly attention from the early second century. 'Rites and the ancient names of places' were closely allied. If the ideal historian travelled widely, the ideal antiquarian used his eyes in the shrines and streets of his home. It is true that the Roman annalists, in quest of vividness or irony, and the descriptions of place that Cicero says are demanded of a historian, often set their tales carefully within Rome itself.<sup>4</sup> And, as we saw, the early Roman historians did use antiquarian methods, if in unsophisticated fashion – perhaps influenced by Timaeus, who united a fondness for inscriptions and monuments with rhetorical aspirations, especially in his speeches. The elder Cato's history appears from a couple of fragments to have drawn on old inscriptions, and in the late second century the annalist L. Piso seems to have been particularly strong on the topography and monuments of the city, and to have carefully adapted old stories to fit what could actually be seen.<sup>5</sup> Some but by no means all of this material was inherited by the later annalists, who appear to have thought of the occasional antiquarian digression as a form of ornament but on the whole divorced themselves from its methods and results. On the other hand, for Varro and his followers the early historians had themselves attained the status of ancient documents, and are used as such – often valuably for their own age, but when they are employed for earlier times, frequently to confusing effect.

In late-second-century Rome there may have been improved acquaintance with Greek antiquarian work, both that of Aristotle and his pupils and that of the more recent Polemo of Ilium, a keen student of inscriptions, who wrote on the antiquities of various Greek cities, including south Italian ones, and also perhaps that of other Pergamene scholars. It is also obvious that the first great political crisis of the late Republic, during the Gracchan period, contributed to the emancipation of antiquarianism from historiography. This is clear from the nickname and subject-matter of Junius 'Gracchanus', a friend of Gaius Gracchus (perhaps to be identified with Junius Congus), who wrote a lengthy *De Potestatibus* on the traditional (and so to Roman eyes proper) powers of the different magistracies. Atticus' father was the dedicatee of this work and doubtless shared its author's interests.<sup>6</sup> L. Aelius Stilo, primarily a student of *grammatica*, was learned in the 'institutions and history' of early Rome as well as in its writers, and used his historical learning in writing speeches for his optimate friends. For a speaker in the *De Oratore*, set in 91, antiquarian interests were seemingly defined as 'these studies of Stilo's', which could make vivid the learning of the civil law by illustrating the way of life and the

<sup>4</sup> *De Or.* 2.63; see for a nice case T.P. Wiseman, *Historia* (1979) 32, where Livy gets into difficulties.

<sup>5</sup> E. Rawson, *Latomus* (1976) 689.

<sup>6</sup> *De Leg.* 3.49. Junius Congus was still alive in 91, *De Or.* 1.256: M. Antonius turns to him for legal and historical instruction and especially *exempla*.

language of the ancients. Stilo had commented on the Twelve Tables himself, doubtless at least in part with such objects in mind.<sup>7</sup>

The late annalists on the whole assume no very great change throughout the centuries in the Roman way of life, though paying lip-service to the idea that it was once simpler, poorer and more virtuous. But there were men in Rome who had little difficulty with the lesson that had to be learnt again at the Renaissance – that the past had been different; and living as they did in a period of galloping change, affecting every aspect of life, in which the old ways of the ancestors were continually held up either for admiration or to contempt, they came to feel some contrasts perhaps more strongly than the Greeks ever did.<sup>8</sup> Ennius' famous line about the excellence of ancient customs was hardly meant to encourage investigation into, say, ancient table-manners, but such an interest could arise. Atticus for one had a great sense of the past, refusing to alter his uncle's old house because of its *sal*, its character.<sup>9</sup> In fact Rome was an antiquarian's paradise, in spite of floods and fires; on every hand the ancient, preserved by respect, lay alongside the new. And often, if the past in Rome had after all vanished, one need only go to the quiet and decayed towns of Latium to see what it had been like. Whatever the local stimulus, however, Cicero and Atticus at least seem to have drawn their antiquarian standards largely from the Greeks, notably Dicaearchus of Messene, the distinguished pupil of Aristotle, and a man whom both greatly admired, above all perhaps for his *Bios Hellados*, the first approach to a social and cultural history of Greece.<sup>10</sup>

After the death of Stilo, and perhaps not unconnected with the settlement of Sulla, with which conservatives were fairly satisfied, there seems to have been something of a lull in antiquarian research that stretched on into the fifties. Cicero once says that now Congus is gone there is no one to tell us about such matters, and he thinks Stilo had no real successor except his pupil Varro, whose chief antiquarian works did not emerge till the late fifties at the earliest.<sup>11</sup> A number of Varro's writings, however, from the early *De Antiquitate Litterarum* on, will have had some antiquarian leanings; the *Menippean Satires* contrasted older with modern and corrupt habits; the three books on the Roman tribes may have been fairly early, and so possibly the three books of *Legationes* which may have dealt with the duties and traditions of that office.<sup>12</sup> Even the handbook written for Pompey as consul in 70 probably joined historical justification to practical advice. The way that these went hand in hand for Varro from his earliest days is shown by his own account of how, in his very first public office, knowing that the tribunes had

<sup>7</sup> *Brutus* 205; *De Or.* 1.193 (*Aeliana* for *aliena* is Madvig's surely right conjecture).

<sup>8</sup> Greek *grammatici* were however much concerned with the customs of Homeric Greece.

<sup>9</sup> *Nepos Atticus* 18.1, 13.2.

<sup>10</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 1.77 *deliciae meae Dicaearchus*; cf. *Ad A.* 2.2.2, 12.4, 16.3; 6.2.3 *historikôtatos*.

<sup>11</sup> *Pro Plancio* 58; *Acad.* 1.2.8.

<sup>12</sup> The books on the tribes are quoted in *De LL.* 5.56; note that the Athenian tribes had been a subject of antiquarian research. Caesar, *BC* 2.17 might contain a sardonic allusion to the *Legationes* – it describes Varro in Spain agonizing over his course but claiming to know his duty as Pompey's legate.

historically no right to summon anyone to appear before them, he refused (on the advice of leading men, of course) to obey such a command; and later as tribune himself took care not to claim such a right, or enforce it when his colleagues tried to do so.<sup>13</sup>

It certainly seems to be true that no other antiquarian scholars came forward in this period, unless Procilius be one, a man whom Cicero describes as immensely inferior to Dicaearchus.<sup>14</sup> Since it is Dicaearchus' *Constitution of the Pellinaeans* that Cicero seems to have been reading when moved to this outburst, Procilius may have written something on political or legal antiquities. Varro quoted him a couple of times, and on the basis of these fragments it has been thought that he wrote, rather, a perihegetic work about Rome.<sup>15</sup> He certainly gave as an 'origin' of the name of the Lacus Curtius in the Forum the story, later canonic, of Manius Curtius leaping into a chasm to placate the gods (other versions existed), and he produced an improbable explanation of the name of the place *ad Murciam* by the Circus Maximus from *urcei*, jars (it was the potters' quarter).<sup>16</sup> If Procilius was, or was related to, the tribune of 56, his work might have had *popularis* leanings; it is always at least worth enquiring whether a Roman antiquarian has political views.

In the late fifties Cicero was using 'Varro's books' for the *De Republica*, and it is tempting to suppose that the, or part of the, *Antiquitates Humanae* were among them. At any event, when these had fully appeared, Cicero was (or professed to be) immensely impressed by them. It was Varro's antiquarian achievement to which he gave the highest praise in the *Academica* (though it is true that the *De Lingua Latina*, which Vitruvius most prized, was not yet finished).<sup>17</sup> In a famous passage he writes that Varro has taught the Romans, who previously wandered as strangers in their city, who and whence they were: he has revealed the precise age of the fatherland, the calendar it used, the rules governing rites and their priests, the discipline kept in the household and in war, the location of regions and places, 'the names, kinds, functions and origins of everything divine and human'. This summing up is very significant; one notes the stress on *nomina*, names, and *genera*, kinds; also on *officia*, functions or duties that still operate, or should; and *causas*, origins.

For the moment we will put off consideration of the *Antiquitates Divinae*. Of the *Antiquitates Humanae*, in twenty-five books, we know too little, though St Augustine tells us something of their structure,<sup>18</sup> and they have not been comprehensively studied for over a century. Their certain fragments are surprisingly few, though there can be no doubt that many statements

<sup>13</sup> A. Gellius 13.12.5-6.

<sup>14</sup> *Ad A.* 2.2.

<sup>15</sup> F. Münzer, *PW* XXIII.1.

<sup>16</sup> Varro, *De LL* 5.148, 154.

<sup>17</sup> *Ad A.* 4.14.1 (Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.* thinks they were bought (or borrowed) from Varro); *Acad.* 1.9 – but this work was addressed to Varro and Cicero's praise may be exaggerated.

<sup>18</sup> *De Civ. Dei* 6.3: an introductory book and six groups of four? The familiar division *de hominibus, de locis, de temporibus, de rebus*. We know of a book *de diebus* and probably other divisions of time, up to the *saeculum*, on which Etruscan lore was reported, Pliny *NH* 3.109. Discussion of *bello et pace* came in a book *de rebus*.

attributed solely to 'Varro' come from this famous work, and for a number indeed this can be shown with little doubt. But it is difficult to judge a scholar's way of working from brief fragments, and with due account taken of his purposes in that work it is in some ways easier to get a picture of Varro's antiquarian approach and standards from the *De Lingua Latina*, of which several books survive. This certainly has many echoes of the only slightly earlier *Antiquities*, to which it more than once explicitly refers.

Augustine points out that by 'human' Varro really meant Roman. It is instructive to observe how, in Book 5 of the *De Lingua Latina*, the promise to give etymologies of names of places is largely fulfilled (as indeed is the later account of 'things in places') by a discussion of the toponymy and topography of Rome – perhaps unsurprisingly in the circumstances, not very clear, complete or well-focussed. This discussion is based on the names of the hills of Rome. That she was the city of seven hills (which is not and never was true) is a notion popularised, though probably not invented, by Varro, to whom we also owe the canonical list of seven.<sup>19</sup> There was, as we know from another source, a festival called the Septimontium in which sacrifices were offered up on various heights in a small area of central Rome. But Varro says that Septimontium was the original name of the larger region later enclosed by the 'Servian' walls; it is not clear if he had any evidence for this. He sets out to establish the names of the seven hills in this wider area from an ancient document listing the Shrines of the Argei, which in fact does not touch the Caelian or Aventine and proves that various other hills in Rome had once had their own names. Varro believed that these shrines had been established by *Argeioi*, the Argive followers of Hercules, before the Trojan War (and long before the foundation of Rome). Of course he will not have thought his Latin document due to them, but he does not explain just how old he thinks it is, and quotes it in presumably heavily modernised Latin, at least where spelling and morphology are concerned.<sup>20</sup> Though it would be unfair to accuse Varro of having a completely 'block' view of the past, we shall find that uncertainty as to the exact date of his *veteres*, *antiqui* or *maiores* often overtakes us; and also that, though he may often have thought of himself as recording tradition rather than necessarily asserting its truth, he does seem to have been credulous about the legendary period.

The *De Lingua Latina* also shows us Varro quoting other scholars in a way that the scattered fragments of other works cannot do. We will not expect his references to be other than, by modern standards, imprecise. Particularly interesting are the occasions on which he turns to Greek sources. One is Aristotle's *Nomima Barbarika* (*Barbarian Institutions*) which had mentioned Rome; two are to the poems of Callimachus (one suspects the *Aitia*, especially in the second case, which concerns the Mysteries at Samothrace).<sup>21</sup> One passage suggests knowledge of a work on Athenian cults, and indeed one can

<sup>19</sup> R. Gelsomino, *Varrone e i sette colli di Roma* (1975), with review in *JRS* (1978) 225.

<sup>20</sup> Varro *De LL* 5.41ff. In the same way Bk 6, considering the etymologies of words dealing with time, begins as a list of Roman festivals.

<sup>21</sup> *De LL* 7.70 (on the *praefica*, a hired female mourner at festivals); 5.113; 7.34.

hardly doubt that Varro had some acquaintance with the extensive antiquarian writings on Athens, even though a couple of references in later Latin literature to Polemo of Ilium, who wrote about Athens a hundred years or so before Varro's time, cannot be proved to come direct from the latter.<sup>22</sup> In Latin he often mentions the views of Stilo and other grammarians and antiquarians.<sup>23</sup>

Learned Varro certainly is. He uses the early poets, often well – modern historians sometimes neglect this weapon. But above all, he knows ancient documents, mostly religious or legal. There was clearly no bar to his consulting the books kept by the augurs and pontifices, though he was a member of neither college. He quotes from some of these documents at considerable length – the censors' tables on preparations for the *lustratio* (the rites closing their period of office); the consuls' *Commentarii* showing them how to go about summoning the 'army', the centuriate assembly; and a document which had perhaps been kept privately rather than in the office of the quaestors in the treasury, the 'old commentary' on the prosecution by a certain M'. Sergius M'.f., while quaestor, of one T. Quintius Trogus on a capital charge before the people; the document takes the form of precise instructions to Sergius about summoning his opponent.<sup>24</sup> The whole lengthy passage is there to explain the word *inlicium*, and must be said to reveal Varro's defective sense of proportion, while he hazards no suggestion as to the date, even a rough one, of the document (late third or early second century?). More briefly, he can make interesting deductions from private legal documents concerning houses on the Capitol: the fact that their back walls, properly *parietes*, are called *muri Saturnii* suggests that they were once part of the city walls of an early settlement (though that it was a city called Saturnia we may think more than doubtful).<sup>25</sup>

That there were a lot of ancient documents to be found in Rome cannot be doubted. In early times no doubt archival arrangements were poor, and if written, as opposed to engraved and publicly exposed, copies of important laws and treaties were kept, they may often have disappeared in the course of time, being on perishable materials; while out-of-date documents on bronze may themselves have been removed and melted down for re-use. Some really ancient laws and treaties were however to be seen in various parts of Rome. For a more recent period, arrangements were better. It has been, but ought not to be, doubted that laws, like senatorial decrees, lists of jurors and diplomatic documents, went to the treasury, or rather now the annexed *tabularium*.<sup>26</sup> The censor's documents appear to have been kept in the Atrium

<sup>22</sup> Ib. 5.97, Athenian *libri sacrorum*. Polemo, Festus 439L, Macr. *Sat.* 5.19.26.

An interest in Greek antiquarianism by some Romans is suggested by the collection of Attic inscriptions which formed part of the cargo of the Mahdia wreck, sunk perhaps c. 80 B.C. en route for Rome. Two at least are fourth century (decree of the Paraloi and lists of gifts to sanctuary); A. Merlin and L. Poinssot, *CRAI* (1911) 206.

<sup>23</sup> *De LL* 5.18, 21 etc.

<sup>24</sup> Ib. 6.86, 88, 91, 92. Greek scholars also quote at length.

<sup>25</sup> Ib. 5.42.

<sup>26</sup> E. Rawson, *ANRW* I.4 (1973) 334. *De Leg.* 3.46 does not even mean they were carelessly kept, though they may have been; the quaestors took their duties lightly.

Libertatis. Defective bureaucracy however, perhaps primarily in the earlier period, seems to have led censors and perhaps other magistrates to take many papers home when their year of office expired.<sup>27</sup> They may then have often been kept indefinitely as memorials of an ancestor's distinguished career. Private archives would also preserve the *laudationes*, the funeral orations to which Cicero and others ascribed much falsification of history.

Such a disorganised mass of material, probably often physically in poor shape, would cry out, to us, for proper cataloguing and editing in their original language. Apart from the Twelve Tables and the *Carmen Saliare*, on which commentaries were produced, none of it got it. To our eyes Roman antiquarianism omitted the essential preparatory stages; there was not even a counterpart to Craterus, who had published a collection of early Athenian decrees.<sup>28</sup> The books mentioned by Cicero, with the *senatus consulta* of a given year in them, were no doubt for practical purposes, and may not have gone further back than the later second century.<sup>29</sup> A work based on the boards traditionally set up by the *pontifex maximus* each year and recording at least some, perhaps mostly religious, events had been produced in the late second century under the title of *Annales Maximi*. But this work expanded and wrote up, at least for the earlier period, the documents it was founded on, and was probably little used by Varro or, as far as we can see, other antiquarians (let alone historians). The boards themselves were perhaps destroyed when the *Annales Maximi* were written.<sup>30</sup>

Varro certainly observed the occasional inscription; for example, the *De Lingua Latina* mentions a sundial at Praeneste, which shows that the ancients spelt *meridies*, midday, *medidies*, so making its derivation plain; an inscription on a gate at Tusculum, referring to rites on the occasion of the new vintage; and notices in shrines, which say (as do documents with directions for cult, notes Varro) that no dead thing may be brought into the sacred place.<sup>31</sup> On the whole Varro makes it clear that he has seen these himself, just as he makes it clear when he is depending on memories of his boyhood, which went back to the late years of the second century,<sup>32</sup> or oral tradition (that of distinguished men, Q. Scaevola or the *flamen Martialis* Flaccus – humble persons are not considered).<sup>33</sup> The distinction between personal experience and information taken from others is probably a legacy, and a valuable one, from Greek scholarship.

<sup>27</sup> Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.74.5 – a document supposedly of the early fourth century preserved in this way.

<sup>28</sup> We do not know how far Craterus' decrees were derived from the archives and how far from exposed copies. Note also Philochorus' *Epigrammata Attika*.

<sup>29</sup> *Ad A.* 13.33.3.

<sup>30</sup> E. Rawson, *CQ* (1971) 158.

<sup>31</sup> *De LL* 6.4 (he goes on to mention the first water-clock set up in Rome, also clearly from autopsy); 6.14; 7.84, cf. *Macr. Sat.* 1.13.21; *De RR* 2.11.10, an inscription or document at Ardea about the introduction of barbers to Italy.

<sup>32</sup> *De LL* 5.125: a rectangular table, *cartibulum*, was placed near the *compluvium* and bronze vessels placed on it.

<sup>33</sup> *De LL* 5.83, 6.21, 30. Probably not fiction, as in more literary genres reference to oral tradition may be (where use of a written source could seem pedantic).

But it must be doubted how far Romans in the first century, when the form of the letters of their alphabet had stabilised, were able to make out Latin documents older than the third century, though a knowledge of the Greek alphabets used in early Italy and those of Etruscan and Oscan would have helped.<sup>34</sup> Certainly if in Polybius' time 'the most learned of the Romans' could translate, even though only in part, a treaty with Carthage dating to the late sixth century, they must have had, or thought they had, some palaeographical as well as strictly linguistic expertise.<sup>35</sup> Varro's early *De Antiquitate Litterarum* said something about the alphabet used by the *maiores*, which had only sixteen letters instead of twenty-three,<sup>36</sup> and he knew for example that G had been represented by C (as it still was in the abbreviations of the *praenomina* Gaius and Gnaeus);<sup>37</sup> but the work was certainly not an epigrapher's handbook, and it is very doubtful if Roman antiquarians could date a document to within a century or more.<sup>38</sup>

We may now take a couple of subjects of antiquarian investigation and see what Varro makes of them. The first is the Roman army. We do not know what Varro thought about the army of the regal period and the early Republic, though the next generation of antiquarians believed, to a considerable extent correctly, that the Greek-type phalanx with round shields and thrusting spears had once been in use.<sup>39</sup> Where the manipular army of the Middle Republic, with its looser formation, is concerned, Varro distinguishes its three lines, the *hastati*, *principes* and *triarii*, all (he thinks) armed with different weapons.<sup>40</sup> The *triarii* – a quotation from Plautus is well adduced – are used as reserves and sit while waiting for action. Here the antiquarian tradition is revealed as better than the annalistic: Livy – except in a notorious antiquarian digression<sup>41</sup> – follows his late annalistic sources in their blithe assumption that the three lines had not only been in existence from the regal period on, but that they had always all used the weapons of the classical epoch, the *pilum* (a throwing weapon) and sword (at least they do preserve knowledge of the three-line system, which disappeared in the later second century). Varro does know that at some time not all three lines were armed alike, but he seems to have got the development wrong. Awareness of

<sup>34</sup> G. Radke, *Archaisches Latein* (1981) 101 thinks Varro misread the inscription on the altar of Consus (*consilio* for *consivio*).

<sup>35</sup> Polyb. 3.22. Radke, op. cit. in n. 34, 100 thinks they might have been helped by a Punic version (there was certainly some knowledge of Punic in Rome at the time).

<sup>36</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 2. Caesar, ib. frag. 4 seems to have said in the *De Analogia* that there were only eleven.

<sup>37</sup> Varro *De LL* 5.64. He also knows that the augurs' books spelt *terra* with one *r*, but is not led on to formulate rules about the introduction of gemination in consonants, 5.21.

<sup>38</sup> Later, Quintilian 1.7.12 is unworried by the very dubious archaic Latin of the restored Duillius inscription.

<sup>39</sup> Festus, s.v. *Classes clipeatas*, 48L, Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.21 (and perhaps implied in Diod. Sic. 23.2, Sall. *Cat.* 51.38 on later borrowings from the Samnites). C. Saulnier, *L'Armée et la guerre dans le monde étrusco-romain* (1980) argues that only the richest citizens will have had a full hoplite panoply (though all will have had thrusting spears).

<sup>40</sup> *De LL* 5.89.

<sup>41</sup> Livy 8.8: see E. Rawson, *PBSR* (1971) 13.

Polybius, if nothing else, should have showed him that the *triarii* were the last, not as he thinks from their name *pilani* the first, to give up thrusting spears for *pila*. The *principes* are hardly, as he supposes, so-called because they fought with swords *a principi pio*, from the start. He eludes problems by saying that as tactics changed the names became less applicable. His problem is, as ever, too much reliance on etymology. Elsewhere he is doubtless right to note that 'the ancestors' often used leather caps rather than helmets.<sup>42</sup> It is odd that in book 7 he discusses several military terms under the heading of poetic words.<sup>43</sup> He produces as evidence for the meaning of *ferentarii* as light cavalry with javelins an old painting in the Temple of Aesculapius that labelled such cavalry so; for *accensi* as military servants he quotes Cato, again convincingly; he further seems to be correct on *rorarii* as light infantry or skirmishers, though his etymology is dubious; his view of *adscriptivi* as men who take over the arms of killed or wounded soldiers and replace them in the lines is more doubtful. These passages probably reflect the full discussion of the army in the *Antiquitates*, of which a few fragments remain. There was also an account of the army in the *De Vita Populi Romani*, probably written rather later. Here he reports the view of 'some people' that *ferentarii* were not cavalry but light-armed foot; whether he now agreed with them (and there is a little evidence suggesting that they were right) is unclear. To identify them with *adscriptivi* and *accensi* is surely wrong.<sup>44</sup> There are a few fragments describing weapons, but it is not clear who is supposed to have used them; the difficulty of working with fragments is apparent.

The second subject we may consider is the history of Roman coinage, though perhaps it is unfair to take a subject that was regarded as central by students of antiquities in the Renaissance and later but was never far developed by the Romans, let alone the Greeks. Coins, beautiful as so many were, were not it seems much collected, though Augustus gave ancient Roman and foreign ones as gifts at the Saturnalia.<sup>45</sup> In fact, on the early history of Roman coinage reasonable, though still not complete, unanimity has only recently been achieved by numismatists, who have been bedevilled by the views of Roman antiquarians as reflected in Pliny.

The *De Lingua Latina* shows that Varro knew that at one time fines in Rome were assessed in cattle, not in coin.<sup>46</sup> Here again he is better than the late annalists, who tell us precisely the sum, in bronze, imposed on those found guilty at public trials from the start of the Republic, though they are aware that silver coins were not in use. Varro probably based himself on old documents: a quotation from the *Antiquitates*, 'I impose a fine of one sheep on M. Terentius, who has not appeared when summoned', may be an extract from a document rather than an imaginary illustration, in spite of the name

<sup>42</sup> *De LL* 5.116.

<sup>43</sup> *Ib.* 7.56-8.

<sup>44</sup> *De Vita* frag. 87 Rip; cf. 88 Rip. on *optiones* (see *De LL* 5.91).

<sup>45</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 75.

<sup>46</sup> *De LL* 5.95.

M. Terentius.<sup>47</sup> But Varro only thought that the use of money in these early times was rare;<sup>48</sup> he probably accepted what appears to be Timaeus' view, that Servius Tullius was the first to coin bronze, and thus held that what modern numismatists call *aes signatum* and date to the early third century, a rectangular ingot of bronze, with a mark on it, was datable to the regal period.<sup>49</sup> And his view that it was marked with the image of cattle, *pecus*, whence the word for money, *pecunia*, is probably simply a theoretical etymology: we know the bull as only one among various marks. If, however, Varro only reckoned with the first true coinage of Rome, that known as *aes grave* to numismatists (and Augustus certainly gave as presents what he thought were coins of the regal period), then he is wrong in supposing it was marked with cattle at all. But at least he realised that the *as* once weighed a pound (so one had, he says, to keep one's money in a strong-room, not a chest) and that it was weighed out rather than counted, as shown by the scales still kept in the treasury, the Temple of Saturn.<sup>50</sup> He was probably not always consistent; in the *De Vita Populi Romani* he describes the bride arriving at her new home bearing three asses for symbolic purposes, one of which she balances on her foot and one of which she takes from her purse – with liberal asses, not easy to do. But perhaps this was described as the custom of a later date, as, rightly, was the storing in the treasury of gold and silver rods to be used in coining (possibly in connection with the second Punic War).<sup>51</sup> Perhaps Pliny drew on Varro in saying that silver was first coined after the First Punic War, and it is true that the first silver coins actually struck in Rome date to this period. But Pliny is wrong to think such coins were already *denarii*.

The fragments of the *De Vita Populi Romani* show us one of the purposes of all this wide but imperfect learning. This work was dedicated to Atticus and written perhaps in the late forties, certainly after the Civil War.<sup>52</sup> It aimed for brevity, and indeed four books for the social history of the whole past of Rome was tight measure, though Dicaearchus' *Bios Hellados*, which must have been

<sup>47</sup> A. Gellius 11.1.4, from the *Antiquitates*; it is doubtful if Varro uses imaginary illustrations. He may have known the Lex Aternia Tarpeia, supposedly before 480, which established equivalencies of bronze and animals: *De Rep.* 2.60 and the later antiquarian knowledge of this law may derive from Varro. In fact it does not refer to coinage, though Varro may have thought it did, and the date, with the status of Aternius and Tarpeius, is uncertain.

<sup>48</sup> He accepted the money qualification for the Servian classes as original.

<sup>49</sup> Pliny, *NH* 33.43. I see no need to try and rescue Timaeus' reputation by claiming he said Servius was the first to weigh out bronze; this is not what *primus signavit aes, antea rudi usus Romae* means (M.H. Crawford, *RRCI* 37).

<sup>50</sup> *De LL* 5.169, 183. He knew early coins were not stamped but cast (*De RR* 2.1.9, cf. A. Gellius 2.10.3), but this could easily be deduced from the moneyers' title *Illiviri aere argento auro flando feriundo*. *De Vita PR* frag. 11 Rip. for cattle stamps.

<sup>51</sup> *De Vita PR* frag. 25, 103 Rip. Into the vexed later history of Roman coinage, with the progressive reductions in weight of the *as*, we cannot here go, but we may note that *De LL* 5.44 seeks to explain a phrase of Lucilius, *quadrans ratitus*, as a small coin used for the Tiber ferry. Two perhaps slightly later scholars, Tarquinius and Oppius (Chares?) thought *ratitus* referred to the stamp of a prow, according to a very fragmentary passage of Festus, 340L. It is not clear which if either view was right.

<sup>52</sup> *HRR* II 10-24.

a model, had only three. Varro was perhaps looking to a wider public than would read the lengthy *Antiquitates*. Even in our scanty fragments we can see the Roman moralist in full flight. Whether there was a continuous thread of narrative we cannot say, but the first book dealt with the regal period, the second with the early Republic, the third with the Punic Wars and the second century down to the Gracchi, and the last with the recent past. The first book treated the different kings and the institutions they set up, but then turned to private life, with the minutest details of food, drink, domestic architecture and dress, on which Varro has much that is interesting to relate, even if it cannot all go back as far as the regal period.<sup>53</sup> The unrelenting stress on poverty and simplicity seems overdone to us, who know that in the later part of the period the wealthy were using elegant imported Greek pottery and depositing rich grave goods in their tombs; Rome became more austere afterwards. But a moralising approach is likely to oversimplify the complexities of historical change, as does the biological schema of growth and decay, which Varro probably adopted in this work.

The second book, on the early Republic, seems to have held, or at least mentioned, the view, highly heterodox by annalistic standards but probably found in Ennius,<sup>54</sup> that the Gauls actually captured the Capitol (in spite of the geese). It had much on the political institutions of the Republic (stressing the censors' severe measures against luxury) and on the military ones (stressing that Rome only wished to wage just wars, her great sacrifices in wartime, and the unanimous refusal of Pyrrhus' gifts). Book 3 noted Rome's gratitude to states that aided her, and the cruelty of the Carthaginians. Book 4 can be seen to deplore Gaius Gracchus, who split the state; the wretched case of Italy, the selfish greed for office of recent times; the corruption of all classes, and the final disaster of civil war. There was vivid illustration of modern luxury in doubtless first-hand descriptions of the fish-ponds of Lucullus and of Hortensius' enormous store of Greek wines.<sup>55</sup>

Here was antiquarianism which, like historiography, inspired to emulation and thus, Cicero would have said, was worthy of *ingeniosi*, not mere *curiosi*.<sup>56</sup> It has often been observed that the fragments of the Greek antiquarians show no sign of moral fervour. Indeed, Polemo was rather fond of piquant tales about courtesans, and admired certain obscene paintings (he was interested in painting, as Varro was in the arts in general). He tended to the marvellous rather than the edifying. Earlier, the rise of Athenian antiquarianism was not to be entirely divorced from contemporary events in Athenian history, and may betray nostalgia for the great past, but seems to have more rarely tried to recover it to determine the present. This calmer approach was probably

<sup>53</sup> Compare *De LL* 5.105, for example: the Romans at first baked their bread in flat sheets.

<sup>54</sup> N. Horsfall, *CJ* (1981) 298.

<sup>55</sup> Varro has been accused of refusing to accept the savagery of early Rome by explaining the proverb *sexagenarios de ponte* as referring to the 'bridge' leading to the voting urn, and the disfranchisement of those over sixty. In fact, he only says 'some' think this is the explanation; and it is hardly likely that all sixty-year-olds really were thrown into the Tiber, as indeed he elsewhere accepted (Klotz, *PW* IIA (1923) 2025).

<sup>56</sup> *De Fin.* 5.49: *omnia quaedem scire cuiusquemodi sint cupere curiosorum.*

united, in the best representatives of the genre, with more sophisticated scholarly equipment. Incomplete as our knowledge of Varro's work is, it is interesting that nowhere, as far as we can see, does he discuss method; the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw great debates on the superiority of documentary evidence over that used by the traditional type of historian (it is much safer to quote a medal than an author, wrote Addison) and saw also numerous writings on the proper use and interpretation of coins, inscriptions, charters and works of art. There may be much that is deplorable in scholarly controversy; but accuracy and rigour of thought are both advanced by criticism of one's predecessors. Varro quotes these often enough, and rejects them too, but again, as far as one can see, usually without argument. The Greek antiquarians were fertile in polemical works – Polemo attacked Eratosthenes' work on Athens, which he said was so inaccurate that Eratosthenes could never have been there. And Greek scholars could argue over the date of a document: the philosopher Panaetius said that choregic tripods supposedly dedicated by Aristides the Just had been misdated by Demetrius of Phaleron and belonged to a later Aristides; he based himself on the alphabet used and on the known date of the poet who wrote the inscription.<sup>57</sup>

Varro dealt with the most remote past above all in the *De Gente Populi Romani*, which set the origins of Rome in a wider, especially a Greek, context. In fact, he began with the wholly uncertain period before the first Flood. Next came the 'mythical' period, which gave way to the 'historical' one with the foundation of the Olympic Games in the early eighth century.<sup>58</sup> The mythical period was structured by the traditional lists of kings, those of Sicyon (believed to be the earliest of all), Argos, Athens and other Greek states, probably from the recent work of the pro-Roman chronicler Castor of Rhodes; and for Latium, the Laurentine kings, those of Alba Longa, and then Rome. Varro quoted Castor for the view, attributed to two Greek astronomers, that at the beginning of the mythical period, in the time of King Ogygus, the planet Venus changed its colour, size, shape and motion. There was probably a good deal of astronomical discussion; a late source says that for the historical period Varro solved the discrepancies of six or seven years found in the sources not only by comparing the chronologies of different states but by calculating eclipses and the intervals between them, so that he could give (some) dates accurate not only to the year but the day. If a passage of Cicero is to be pressed, second-century authorities had already, on the basis of notices of eclipses preserved in Rome, fixed on a date for Romulus' death or disappearance, which was supposed to have happened during a darkening of the sun; but Varro perhaps made use in the *De Gente* (if not, he did so elsewhere) of his friend the philosopher and astronomer L. Tarutius Firmanus, who calculated the date of Romulus' very conception, which, by a sort of reverse horoscope, starting from the supposed events of his life, he seems to have put in another eclipse (on 24 June 772 B.C. before dawn).

<sup>57</sup> Plut. *Arist.* 1.3.6.

<sup>58</sup> HRR II, Varro *De Gente* frag. 3.

Tarutius used the Egyptian months for dating purposes, as we saw many Greek astronomers had done because of their regular length. He has been (it seems wrongly) accused of gross inaccuracy and incompetence, because the Parilia, a festival celebrated in April which was always thought to commemorate the founding of Rome, did not fall in the Egyptian month Pharmouthi in 754 B.C., to which Tarutius dated this event, and his account of the configuration of the heavens at that point (with the moon in Libra) was also far out.<sup>59</sup> The *De Gente* reported the view of some *genethliaci*, astrologers, that after a certain period (440 years, we are told, but this is surely too short a time) history repeated itself and individuals were born again, and this has been seen in the context of the time of writing, with its hopes and fears of a new age;<sup>60</sup> perhaps Tarutius is reflected here too. Quite how Varro arrived at his date, slightly earlier than usual, for the foundation of Rome as 754 B.C. is not clear. Atticus had it also, but although his *Liber Annalis* was earlier than the *De Gente*, it is perhaps unlikely that Varro borrowed from him; he may have put it forward in an earlier work which Atticus used.

Varro's main tool for dealing with the mythical period was *ratio*, reason: that to us unsatisfactory rationalism which simply strips tradition of the obviously fabulous, without asking what its real nature and value is. In particular, Varro accepts the theory of Euhemerus that many gods were by origin great kings of early times who were given cult and festivals after their deaths (and that the immoral tales about them were subsequent inventions). A reference to the year 43 B.C. has suggested that the work was being written then,<sup>61</sup> and if so it is true that the numerous euhemerising references can hardly have been written without awareness of the movement that year to deify Caesar. The work has been seen as having as its immediate purpose the justification of his cult (and perhaps a bid for the favour of Octavian).<sup>62</sup> But all this can only have been a part of the purpose of the work, which also dealt with the wanderings to Italy of various Homeric heroes, and perhaps collected a mass of variant stories of Aeneas and his vicissitudes, which it is likely that Virgil knew and used. It certainly also treated of Rome's borrowings from other peoples.<sup>63</sup>

Varro was also concerned with later Roman chronology, a subject which aroused much interest at this time. Roman historians had been very weak on tying Roman to foreign history. It had taken probably till the end of the second century to kill the notion that King Numa had been a pupil of Pythagoras, who lived long after the date ascribed to the Roman king. And several annalists, including Macer, cheerfully made an embassy of the early

<sup>59</sup> Aug. *CD* 21.8, Cens, *De Die Nat.* 21.5; *De Rep.* 1.25; Plut. *Rom.* 12.5. Kroll, *PWIVA* (1932) 2407 – but Prof. A.T. Grafton tells me that Tarutius is working on a recognised Mesopotamian chronological system.

<sup>60</sup> *HRR* II, Varro *De Gente* frag. 4.

<sup>61</sup> *Ib.* id. frag. 9.

<sup>62</sup> L.R. Taylor, *CP* (1934) 221.

<sup>63</sup> Similar in interest, and perhaps date, was Varro's *De Familiis Troianis*, *HRR* II 9, tracing the founders of some aristocratic families to companions of Aeneas (probable reflection in Virgil *Aen.* 5.116). It is not clear how far the family histories were brought down.

fifth-century present itself, almost a century too early, before Dionysius of Syracuse (no wonder Cicero deprecated Macer's lack of Greek learning). Now a number of authors tried to provide a coherent chronological framework for both Roman and foreign history. Nepos in his *Chronica* 'dared alone among Italians to expound the whole past in three learned and industrious volumes', as his friend Catullus wrote,<sup>64</sup> and the work as its title shows must have been concerned with chronology. Atticus' *Liber Annalis* dealt primarily with Roman history from the foundation, registering consuls, laws and so forth, with some literary history, but Cicero makes it clear there was also reference to events abroad.<sup>65</sup> He used it extensively. Scribonius Libo's *Annals* are also quoted by Cicero for the date of a praetorship. Sulpicius Blitho's work of unknown name by Nepos for the date of Hannibal's death, on which Polybius, Atticus and Blitho all disagreed,<sup>66</sup> probably in part owing to difficulty in turning Greek dates, resting on eponymous magistrates who may enter office at various points in the year, into Roman consul-years. But early Republican chronology provided yet more serious problems. A few basic synchronisms with events in Greek history (due to Greek authors), some traditional dating by intervals, and the (to some extent variable) lists of the colleges of supreme magistrates in the traditional *Fasti* did not exactly fit together. Various systems, resulting in slightly different dates for the foundation of Rome among other things, had been produced in the second century. Varro, possibly in his *Annales*, had a version that lengthened the Republican *Fasti* by inserting four 'dictator-years', in which no consuls (or consular tribunes) were recorded. These were unknown to the annalists (who had their own variations), and are highly implausible, since dictators were normally appointed for six months and co-existed with the other magistrates. One wishes one had Varro's discussion of them. There was obviously a need to lengthen the period of the Republic, for we can trace other expedients, such as giving the Decemvirs who held power in the mid-fifth century a third year of office, or introducing a period of 'anarchy' when no magistrates were elected. The problem seems only partly to have been that the Greeks synchronised the Sack of Rome by the Gauls with the Peace of Antalcidas, (487/6 B.C.) and that, with the canonical date for the foundation of the Republic at the end of the sixth century, the *Fasti* did not stretch quite so far. Though we cannot wholly understand it, Varro's system became highly authoritative.

As Momigliano observes,<sup>67</sup> no Hellenistic antiquarian scholar seems to have been so broad and systematic in his scope as Varro; his impact on Rome was profound – it has been said that the Augustan restoration is inconceivable without him. But he does not seem to have been original in his approach, unless in his moralising attitude, nor even as critical as some in his time were capable of being. It is interesting to see Cicero, perhaps inspired by

<sup>64</sup> Catullus 1.5-7.

<sup>65</sup> *Brutus* 14; *Orat.* 120; *Brutus* 72 for Atticus' date for the foundation of Rome. On the work, F. Münzer, *Hermes* (1905) 50 – though its choice of sources was perhaps better than he allows.

<sup>66</sup> Nepos, *Hann.* 13.1.

<sup>67</sup> *Op. cit.* in n. 1, 72.

Varro, turning occasionally in his later dialogues to write antiquarian digressions: the modest and personal turns of phrase suggest that they are truly his own.<sup>68</sup> He is far less learned than Varro; his sources can be seen to be very limited. But his powers of argument are better. The passage in which he proves that inhumation rather than cremation was originally in use in Rome hits the nails more steadily on the head than the partly parallel passage in the *De Lingua Latina*.<sup>69</sup> Cicero also eschewed all but the rare and cautious appeal to etymology. He also seems to have had absolutely no interest in the mythical period, and probably doubted whether anything useful could be said of it. He did know that documents might challenge the annalistic tradition, noting for example that they show that the dictator was really originally called *magister populi*.<sup>70</sup>

Varro certainly stimulated antiquarianism in others. Whether any of his contemporaries or immediate successors criticised his work seriously we do not know. The date of the interesting grammarian and antiquarian L. Cincius is not certain, and from his reference to an ancient inscription which *fixa fuit* (was once fixed) to the side of the Capitoline Temple, possibly until the fire of 83, he has been thought to belong to the early part of the century;<sup>71</sup> but the silence of Cicero and Varro about his various works makes this unlikely. The law from the Capitol concerns the *praetor maximus* (a title unknown to the annalistic tradition, which has created much trouble in modern times) and his annual duty of driving a nail into the temple as a chronological record.<sup>72</sup> Cincius compared nails which he had seen in the temple of Nortia at Volsinii in Etruria, and Livy calls him a careful authority for such monuments. Cincius recorded that both the language and the lettering of the Capitoline inscription were archaic, but this remains to our mind hopelessly vague. The notice probably occurred in his *Mystagoga*, which means little more than 'Guidebook', in at least two volumes, which may have dealt with all the temples of Rome. In this he discussed an inscription, also on the Capitol, about a gold crown dedicated to Cincinnatus; he explained an ancient phrase giving the weight of the offering.<sup>73</sup> We are probably justified in seeing inscriptions and their language as his primary interest in this work; he also wrote a *De Verbis Priscis*, for which however he certainly used information about early customs as well as strictly linguistic material.<sup>74</sup>

But he also wrote on political antiquities – a *De Comitibus*, in which he stated that 'patrician' in the past had meant no more than 'freeborn' now does (which must refer to a very remote period to have any plausibility);<sup>75</sup> and a

<sup>68</sup> E. Rawson, *JRS* (1972) 33.

<sup>69</sup> *De Leg.* 2.55; cf. *De LL* 5.23 – but Varro is right that burial in pits used to be practised, 5.25.

<sup>70</sup> *De Rep.* 1.63; cf. Varro *De LL* 5.82.

<sup>71</sup> J. Heurgon, *Athenaeum* (1964) 432 (L. Cincius is to be distinguished from the early historian Cincius Alimentus).

<sup>72</sup> Livy 7.3.5.

<sup>73</sup> *GRF* 375, frag. 11.

<sup>74</sup> *Ib.* 372, frags 1ff.

<sup>75</sup> *Ib.* 374, frag. 5.

*De Consulum Potestate*, from which there survives a fascinating fragment on the praetor who in some years was sent at the order of the Latin League (meeting in council at the *Caput Ferentinae* in the Alban hills) to take command of its forces; he describes the taking of auspices to determine who this was to be.<sup>76</sup> This probably gives us a picture of the relation of Rome and the League before the mid-fourth century which is quite different from that presented by the patriotic annalists, where Rome always provides the leadership. Cincius may well have had good evidence. Interestingly, there was also a work *De Officio Iurisconsulti*, a fragment from which explains a mysterious word used by the Twelve Tables, *sanates*, as people 'healed' by King Tarquin's generous policy to the colonies of the *prisci Latini* after their revolt; there was clearly dispute about the word, and Cincius is not unexpectedly relying on dubious etymology.<sup>77</sup> Finally (apart from the work *De Re Militari*), he wrote *De Fastis*, on the favourite subject of the calendar, from which we have a number of fragments on the names of months and their origins. Some of his remarks are good; April cannot have anything to do with Venus (Aphrodite) as often supposed, for there is no old-established rite for her in this month, and she is not referred to in the *Carmen Saliare* and so cannot have been anciently worshipped in Rome; May is derived from Maia the wife of Vulcan, who does receive sacrifice on 1 May; June, *Iunius*, used to be *Iunonius*, a form long preserved in the Latin cities of Aricia and Praeneste; November used to be *Mercedinus*, from the commercial transactions involving pay, *merces*, that took place then, but was renamed as the ninth month, which in the old days it was (the Roman year did long begin in March).<sup>78</sup> Some of this looks better than Varro, who in the *De Lingua Latina* produced unlikely derivations of May and June from *maiores* and *iuniores*, older and younger citizens; but a late source ascribes to him the very views Cincius held, and the argument about April is also his.<sup>79</sup> Cincius might in fact therefore be dependent on him.

It has been thought that, since Cincius knew Volsinii and his name could be Etruscan, he might have been primarily concerned with Etruria. A consideration of all his fragments, however, makes it clear that he was a typical Roman antiquarian in that his Italian and Latin information was employed to explain Roman institutions. He also had the usual Roman bias towards *grammatica* and law, and interest in political and religious traditions. We do not know if he had Varro's concern for social history, which went with his conviction of moral decline. But he is an interesting representative of a subject which was perhaps more central to the life of the Ciceronian and immediately subsequent period than it has been in almost any other place or time.

A few Greeks had for a long time read, or written, Roman history, often

<sup>76</sup> Festus 276L. Was the Roman commander ordered out every year when there was a war (probably most years) or was there a system of rotation? The latter would revolutionise our view of the relations of Romans and Latins.

<sup>77</sup> GRF 376 frag. 13 (cf. 12).

<sup>78</sup> GRF 374 frags 6-10.

<sup>79</sup> Varro *De LL* 6.33 (also on April); Censorinus *De Die Nat.* 22.12; Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.13.

with a focus on mythological origins and/or on recent war and conquests.<sup>80</sup> Cicero pointed out that one could not get Roman antiquarian knowledge from the Greeks.<sup>81</sup> But this was probably beginning to change. Apart from the chronologically uncertain Butas and his verse *Aitia*,<sup>82</sup> Alexander Polyhistor's work on Rome was perhaps basically antiquarian; fragments and possible fragments deal with myth and origins, and it is true that his sources may often have been Greek historians.<sup>83</sup> Those Greek scholars who argued that Homer was Roman, or that early Roman customs were Pythagorean, must have known something about the Roman way of life in early times.<sup>84</sup> In the next generation the learned King Juba of Mauretania was to produce a notable work on Roman antiquities in Greek.

<sup>80</sup> Notably of course Polybius and Posidonius; but observe also, in our period, Alexander of Ephesus, orator, poet (see pp. 44, 167), statesman and historian (Strabo 14. C642), who wrote on the 'Marsic' or Social War, *Origo Gentis Romanae* 9.1.

<sup>81</sup> *Acad.* 1.8.

<sup>82</sup> p. 233

<sup>83</sup> *FGH* no. 273 frag. 70, and perh. 109-11; cf. p. 256.

<sup>84</sup> pp. 55, 293.

## Geography and Ethnography

The subjects of geography and ethnography were not strictly defined in antiquity, and were often combined. Strabo was to claim that geography was a philosophical investigation, needing a wide background in other subjects; the results being useful for public men, but also for the scientist – the zoologist, botanist and astronomer alike.<sup>1</sup> The geography that he wrote was separate from his history; but geography and ethnography were often treated in substantial digressions within a work of history, on the pattern first set by Herodotus. On the other hand, mythological and historical elements might be part of a work theoretically devoted to geography, and might sit somewhat ill with the mathematical ones that formed its basis (but which might themselves, as we have seen, be reckoned as part of geometry). The *paradoxa* or *admiranda*, natural marvels, especially concerning flora, fauna, rivers and springs and other features of the landscape, to which many historians were addicted, were often those of exotic lands, especially with and after the Alexander-historians, and thus also served to link the historian and the geographer.<sup>2</sup>

When our period opens, both geography and ethnography were enjoying something of a golden age in the late Hellenistic world. True, a strictly mathematical geography had come more or less to a standstill, with Eratosthenes, who had worked in the late third century, remaining in spite of criticism the great authority; the Greeks were able to fix latitude astronomically (and the doctrine of the *klimata*, parallel zones of latitude, did develop in the late Hellenistic period),<sup>3</sup> but longitude was a more difficult business, for which they lacked the necessary instruments. A more empirical approach, however, was proving fruitful. This was more properly called chorography.<sup>4</sup> In the later second century Polybius devoted a whole book of his history to the subject of geography and superseded Timaeus (also a historian) as the recognised authority on the West;<sup>5</sup> his descriptions of Spain, Gaul and the north-western coast of Africa were based on his own travels in Roman service. Weak on mathematical theory, he gave distances mostly based on itineraries and not all accurate; he scouted myths and marvels, but took Homer *au pied de la lettre* and sought to fix the route of Odysseus'

<sup>1</sup> Strabo 1.C1.

<sup>2</sup> Special collections of *Paradoxa* draw partly from the historians, and partly from Aristotle and Peripatetic scientists.

<sup>3</sup> D.R. Dicks, *CQ* (1955) 248.

<sup>4</sup> P. Pédech, *La Géographie des Grecs* (1976) 87.

<sup>5</sup> Polybius 34 (12 is devoted to criticism of Timaeus).

wanderings, as Strabo would do. At about the same time Agatharchides of Cnidos, not apparently himself a traveller, used good Ptolemaic sources, including official documents, for his account of the coasts of East Africa and Arabia. He too was no mathematician (but also wrote history); but he was much more than a mere describer, trying to explain and evaluate strange customs in accordance with the philosophical standards of his day. An intelligent and unprejudiced man, he held that only children should be frightened at a black skin, and was especially interested in the psychological character and technological level of the tribes bordering the Red Sea. Like Polybius he eschewed myth and rhetoric, but he was not immune to marvels.<sup>6</sup> Thirdly, in about 100 B.C. Artemidorus of Ephesus, who visited Rome, Gaul and Spain, wrote in Alexandria eleven books of *Geographoumena*, again on the old model of the *periplous* or coastal voyage; he seems often to have contradicted Polybius and was regarded as a good authority for the distances he gave (which were not always superior to his predecessor's).<sup>7</sup> Information on Spain was also transmitted by the *Perihégêsis* or *Guide* to Spain of the contemporary grammarian Asclepiades of Myrleia, who taught among the Turdetani of the south; he was interested in traces of Greek settlement, often in all senses mythical.<sup>8</sup> But mythology was as we saw a part of geography; Strabo was to admit that it was not very useful, but held it gave pleasure to those interested in the regions that were its scene; the myths were famous and delightful – but they should not take too much space.<sup>9</sup> Finally, a little later Posidonius' *History* provided brilliant and influential descriptions of peoples of the West (and, though here it is sometimes harder to trace him, the East too); he also, in a special treatise on the Ocean, did original and valuable work on tides (which like the great traveller Pytheas of Massilia, but unlike Aristotle, he rightly connected with the moon), and studied volcanoes and earthquakes. As we know, however, his computation of the circumference of the Earth was, unlike that of Eratosthenes, much too small.<sup>10</sup>

Polybius believed that modern geographers were likelier to be correct than the old ones, since the conquests of Alexander and the Romans had opened up East and West; Diodorus noted that Caesar had subjected a vast area in the north to the scope of enquiry;<sup>11</sup> Strabo was to be able to speak even more confidently, after the conquests of Augustus (and, before him, of Mithridates and the Parthians).<sup>12</sup> Philosophy gave stimulus: Agatharchides is called a Peripatetic, though this may mean little but that he had the heritage of Aristotle's spirit of enquiry; Posidonius was a Stoic, of a school that preached the brotherhood of man and had (like to some extent the age in general) a

<sup>6</sup> A. Dihle, in *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* VII (1961) 205.

<sup>7</sup> Much used and criticised by Strabo.

<sup>8</sup> Strabo 3. C157, 166; we saw that the Suda said he taught in Rome but is probably confused, p.69.

<sup>9</sup> Strabo, 1.C11.

<sup>10</sup> See p. 157.

<sup>11</sup> DS 3.38.3.

<sup>12</sup> Strabo 1.C14. (There were plenty of Greeks in Parthia and at Mithridates' court to take advantage of the conquests).

certain openness to foreign cultures, while its physical theories, which stressed the interrelation of everything in the universe, were obviously relevant to the work on tides, but also to Posidonius' views on the influence of climate, and especially the sun, on men, animals and probably even plants and minerals (not that the idea was itself new); Strabo in fact thought he underestimated the effects of education and tradition on men.<sup>13</sup> Posidonius also discussed the extent of Homer's knowledge, and possibly the scene of Odysseus' voyages, but is not likely to have shared Strabo's obsession with the problem.

After Augustus, new conquests were to be less dramatic, though some fresh information accrued, about Britain and (as a result of trade from Egypt) about Arabia and India. Philosophy, becoming more otherworldly, gave less new inspiration; the descriptive geographers tended to be mere compilers, though there was to be some revival of the mathematical, map-making approach among the Greeks.

The Roman conquests were thus indirectly responsible for part of the late Hellenistic flowering, but we have seen that it is not clear that they themselves were sensible of an urgent need for the information that geographers and ethnographers provided. At all events, the authors working in Rome who made the most determined attempts to assimilate and propagate Greek geographic and ethnographic knowledge were themselves Greeks, Diodorus Siculus and Alexander Polyhistor. Their works at least suggest that plenty of books on the subject were available in the city.

As we saw, Diodorus' Stoic views do not go deep, but they may reinforce his wide interests. He begins by searching for the origin of civilisation, which plunges him into a study of Egypt – the place, its natives held, of the origin of life itself.<sup>14</sup> A great deal of his material is drawn from Hecataeus of Abdera, who in the early Hellenistic period put ethnography on a newly systematic footing, in spite of idealising Egyptian civilisation.<sup>15</sup> There is some more recent material, and Diodorus had visited Egypt (soon after 60 B.C.), though signs of autopsy are limited. Much of his account of Egypt concerns its gods; where myth is involved, he as usual avoids responsibility for the truth, introducing the tales with a non-committal 'they say'. As his preface to Book 3 underlines, he pays special attention to the Nile, the products of the land, the extraordinary animals, topography, and the customs of the people, including their lawcourts.<sup>16</sup>

Book 2 recounts the history of Assyria, with the wars and conquests of Queen Semiramis (this allows a description of Ethiopia, its wonders and odd burial customs). Most of this comes from Ctesias, too highly regarded in antiquity because of his opportunities as doctor at the Persian court around 400 B.C. There is an account of Chaldaean astrologers from a later source (to which we will return),<sup>17</sup> and a brief description of India, ultimately from

<sup>13</sup> Strabo 2.C103.

<sup>14</sup> DS 1.10.

<sup>15</sup> O. Murray, *JEA* (1970) 141.

<sup>16</sup> DS 3.1.1.

<sup>17</sup> p. 308.

Megasthenes, who was there at the end of the fourth century; India in this period still meant the India of Alexander and his immediate aftermath, though Egyptian trade direct to South India was probably already accelerating. We hear of India's rivers, its fertile soil (a problem for the ancients, as it lay on the latitude of the African and Arabian deserts), its elephants and its caste system, with a euhemerizing account (in *oratio obliqua*) of Dionysus and Hercules who civilised and ruled it.<sup>18</sup> Another brief description, of Scythia, leads up to an account of Amazons and Hyperboreans; the stories of the former are 'similar to myths', and for Hecataeus of Abdera's Utopian account of the Hyperboreans Diodorus remains cautiously in indirect speech.<sup>19</sup> For Arabia, however, Diodorus turns to a source, possibly Posidonius, that tried to give a scientific explanation of the wonders of the land, its strange animals and gems, in terms of the power of the sun.<sup>20</sup> Finally Diodorus returns to Utopian romance (and *oratio obliqua*) for the Island of the Sun in the Indian Ocean, supposedly visited and described by Iambulus. The inhabitants have bones that bend and ears that can be shut; the animals are so extraordinary that Diodorus becomes explicitly sceptical.<sup>21</sup>

This book shows Diodorus' characteristics clearly; sources of disparate date and value lie side by side, variants are rarely adduced (Herodotus, not used directly, is once set beside Ctesias). It also shows his humane standards – Utopian societies without slaves are applauded.

Book 3 is almost all ethnography, though it too slips at the end into romance. It begins soberly on Ethiopia: writers often accept false reports designed to entertain, but Agatharchides, Artemidorus and others who lived in Egypt are usually accurate, and Diodorus associated with the priests there, and with Ethiopian envoys, inquiring carefully into the truth of the historians' accounts.<sup>22</sup> Diodorus is interested in Ethiopian kings and the restraints on them, and especially in the king who in the time of Ptolemy II studied Greek philosophy and refused to commit suicide in the usual way at the behest of the priests of Meroe. This is seen as a victory for reason.<sup>23</sup> He then moves on to other, less civilised Ethiopian peoples, and then, mainly from Agatharchides, the tribes on both sides of the Red Sea, briefly described and not precisely located. Constant interests are food (whence come most of the names by which the Greeks know them), dwellings, sexual customs, dress, arms and means of disposing of their dead; also animals, especially when in some sort of symbiosis with man. There is little on language or religion, or political institutions (the Troglodytes have tyrants); Agatharchides'

<sup>18</sup> DS 2.35-42.

<sup>19</sup> Id. 43-7.

<sup>20</sup> 2.48-54. Jacoby *FGH ap.* no. 87 frag. 114 is for Posidonius, but he was not the only person to think the power of the sun great, and the part about the Nabataeans, still seen as nomads, seems earlier.

<sup>21</sup> DS 2.55-60.

<sup>22</sup> 3.11 (3.38.1, consultation of official documents at Alexandria, and of eyewitnesses, is also probably lifted from Agatharchides).

<sup>23</sup> DS 3.6.

psychological and technological interests show through to some extent. Something is said of climatic conditions and visible constellations, but Agatharchides was no scientist. It is apparent that his sources had not stayed long among the peoples he mentions; and marvels are not completely ignored.

After another short account of Arabia (there is much repetition in Diodorus) we turn to Libya and soon to the work of Dionysius Scytobrachion,<sup>24</sup> who spans a great yarn about Libyan Amazons who dwelt in the remote past on an island in the Tritonian Lake, and the people of Atlantis among whom the gods (the Greek gods, and all local names given are Greek) were born. This is typical Hellenistic mythography, designed to be new and piquant, and Diodorus retails it as such.

Book 4 embarks on Greek mythology proper, admitting confused traditions and uncertain dates and that the best historians have despised it.<sup>25</sup> But it involves great and inspiring deeds, so Diodorus cannot eschew it. He looks back over the first three books, in which he has recorded the deeds of the mythical period in foreign lands, 'also the topography, the wild beasts and other animals and in general everything worth mention and surprising'; a clear statement of his programme.

Book 5 is mainly geographical and ethnographical again. It is supposed to be 'On Islands', in emulation of Ephorus' habit of devoting individual books to special topics. Islands fascinated by their sudden birth or disappearance, and as places where wonders were prone to exist; most Utopias were set in islands.<sup>26</sup> Timaeus is used for those of the Western Mediterranean (the virtues of the often simple insular societies are evoked) and perhaps for a few remarks on Britain (an account of Cornish tin-miners and traders, civilised by foreign contacts). Then comes a treatment of Gaul and Spain, Liguria and Etruria – hardly islands! – from that account of Posidonius which has been described as above praise.<sup>27</sup> In particular, the section on the Gauls, with its careful distinction between druids, bards and prophets and their roles in society, is invaluable. There are vivid descriptions of the Gauls' bright clothes and emotional behaviour, for example at feasts, where warriors are touchy on points of precedence (symbolised in special pieces of meat) and even issue challenges to mortal combat; they use no chairs, and entangle their moustaches in their food. (Feasts are often described by travellers; they tend to be invited to them.) Posidonius thought the Gauls intelligent, and rightly noted that their shields were handsome – a rare appreciation of non-Greek taste. Strabo tells us that he at first found disturbing the custom of decorating the house with the severed heads of enemies, but became used to it; this suggests that he went beyond the Roman province, where the habit would be discouraged, perhaps under the escort of Italian traders, who as he observed provided the wine which the Gauls loved but did not yet produce. He must

<sup>24</sup> See now J.S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982).

<sup>25</sup> DS 4.1. Scytobrachion's other work, on the Argonauts, is used here (40ff.), with more usual versions as variants.

<sup>26</sup> E. Gabba, *JRS* (1981) 50.

<sup>27</sup> Dihle, *op. cit.* in n. 6, 226.

have listened carefully to interpreters, for he is aware not only that the Gauls have bass voices and use few words, but that they like to speak in riddles and boast much. He even records a phrase from a bardic panegyric: 'from the wheel-tracks beneath the hero's chariot spring gold and benefits to his people.' All this was probably bound together by Posidonius' belief that the Gauls are typical of northern peoples, strong and spirited; but Diodorus omits all theory, and Posidonius' more strictly geographic observations must also be sought elsewhere, in Strabo.

Posidonius also gave a memorable account of the hardihood of the Ligurians, but he does not idealise their 'old-fashioned' but painful and unhappy way of life. By contrast, the people of fertile Etruria live softly. This last passage, with the account of what Rome borrowed from the Etruscans, may rest on Roman informants rather than observation.<sup>28</sup>

After this, in Diodorus' text, Arabia pops up again, as preface to the account, from Euhemerus himself, of its neighbour Panchaea, an island all right, but an imaginary one.<sup>29</sup> Unlike Eratosthenes and Polybius, Diodorus seems to be deceived by this account of a society divided into three castes and run by priests. Then, confusingly, we come back to the islands of the Aegean, with mythology mainly from Greek local historians. Book 6, very fragmentary, seems to have gone up to the Trojan War, with some odd Assyrio-Italian mythology (Ninus was brother to Picus, the father of Faunus or Hermes). There are still geographic and ethnographic digressions in the later books: Book 19 (partly duplicating Book 2) deals with the nomadic Nabataean Arabs and the Dead Sea, from the excellent but out-of-date Hieronymus of Cardia<sup>30</sup> (the Nabataeans were no longer nomadic, but settled at Petra and elsewhere). Book 40 considers the Jews, *à propos* of Pompey's campaign but from the far earlier Hecataeus of Abdera, and so from the Egyptian angle, with stress on the Exodus. Moses was a wise law-giver, though the way of life he instituted is unsociable; there is perhaps an implicit comparison with Sparta. A fragment of Book 24/5, perhaps from Posidonius, appears more hostile to the Jews, but the unfavourable portrait is put in the mouth of unsuccessful advisers to a Seleucid monarch, and it is sometimes thought that Varro's admiration for Jewish monotheism and abhorrence of idols comes from Posidonius. There existed anti-Jewish works, however, that were known in Rome, notably that of Cicero's teacher Apollonius Molon.<sup>31</sup> Finally, Diodorus' main account of Britain came in connection with Caesar's campaigns, and is unfortunately lost.

We have seen the somewhat dubious contribution made by Theophanes and perhaps other Greek historians of Pompey's campaigns to knowledge of the remote marches of Asia Minor;<sup>32</sup> he had reached the Caucasus, and

<sup>28</sup> DS 5.25-40.

<sup>29</sup> Id. 5.41-6. Renaissance Utopias such as Denis de Veiras' *Histoire des Sévarambes* (1667) were also sometimes taken as true.

<sup>30</sup> DS 19.94-5 (see J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (1981) 145).

<sup>31</sup> Quoted by Alex. Polyhistor, *FGH* no. 273, frag. 19.

<sup>32</sup> p. 108-9.

almost the Caspian (an area Alexander had left aside) as well as provincialising Syria and intervening in Judaea and Nabataean Arabia. It may have been partly under the influence of these events, even if not primarily for Roman use, that Cornelius Alexander, known as Polyhistor, produced his accounts of numerous eastern countries, from Lydia to India (there is a fragment on Brahmins).<sup>33</sup> Ominously, he also produced a special collection of Marvels. He was a sedentary scholar, and there is no sign of autopsy, unless conceivably in his note that Choinoboschia, in Egypt, has no geese in spite of its name, but a great regard for crocodiles.<sup>34</sup>

The sort of thing he wrote is made clear by the fragments in Christian sources of his works on the Jews and the Chaldaeans or Babylonians. He was a compiler – his titles are sometimes given as, for example, ‘Collection of Materials on Phrygia’ – but perhaps an unusually careful one, naming sources religiously and quoting *verbatim*, using recent as well as older Greek writers, and commenting as he went. Not all his sources were scholarly, but some were unusual: for his work on the Jews he used a number of Jewish authors writing in Greek, including the poet Ezechiel whose tragedy on the Exodus survives; also the bogus correspondence of Solomon with the kings of Egypt and Tyre, the latter of whom sends a half-Jewish architect to build the Temple. (But it seems to be in a work on Rome that he retailed a tradition replacing Moses with a lady called Moso.)<sup>35</sup> A good deal of Biblical history appears in familiar form, but though the Septuagint was doubtless available in Rome, where there was a well-established Jewish colony, it was not known to the Greek reading public and it has been doubted whether the Biblical references in our Christian sources go back to Polyhistor himself. He seems to have been neither pro- nor anti-Jewish, though he used Apollonius Molon’s work.

Most of our quotations from his works deal with legendary history – for the Chaldaeans, the Flood and the Tower of Babel, with a list of kings from the priest Berossus (whose work, as we saw, Diodorus should have used). But there was some reference to more recent events, the Macedonian and Parthian conquests.<sup>36</sup> There was also usually a good deal of geographic description, much listing of names and peoples (but not distances?), and not surprisingly the grammarian in Alexander was anxious to explain every name by reference to an eponymous founder or a local word – not that he will have known Eastern languages, presumably. Unoriginal as his works were, they no doubt served a useful purpose in collecting and digesting the material available in Greek on different areas. For the West, he wrote on Illyria, and possibly, as we saw, on Italy.

What then of the Romans themselves? In spite of Polybius’ Atlantic voyages, undertaken with the aid of Scipio Aemilianus and, in the nineties, the venture of a governor of further Spain, P. Crassus, to the ‘Tin Islands’

<sup>33</sup> *FGH* no. 273, frag. 18.

<sup>34</sup> *Ib.* frag. 5.

<sup>35</sup> *Ib.* frags 19, 70.

<sup>36</sup> *Ib.* frag. 81.

(wherever these were),<sup>37</sup> the Romans did not organise anything to compare with the exploratory expeditions dispatched by a number of states during the Renaissance. Apart from the fact that Rome was basically a land power, it must be remembered that the Renaissance voyages were powered by the strongly felt economic need for gold as well as spices, by competitive nationalism, and by the possession of ocean-going ships superior to those of all non-European nations, both in sailing capacity and defence; they had the compass and other navigational aids, and they had guns – and they needed comparatively small crews. The states concerned also professed a proselytising religion, which led some priests in particular to learn strange languages, and to engage seriously with strange cultures in order to make their teaching assimilable. The relations of merchants and sea-captains were less despised as those of ignorant men than they were in antiquity, when contempt and scepticism often greeted the accounts of Pytheas' voyage to the north and Eudoxus' attempt to circumnavigate Africa.

Strabo, writing of Spain, was to complain that though the voluminous Greek authors are not always reliable or well-informed about the West, the Romans tend simply to copy the Greeks, and that only 'to a certain extent', for they lack curiosity.<sup>38</sup> (It is unclear how much Roman literature Strabo had actually read; he mentions Caesar's *Commentaries*.) In fact there seem to have been no special studies in Latin of any barbarian people, though perhaps a couple of attempts at a general 'chorography'; while Cicero at least rapidly got out of his depth on the mathematical side of geography.<sup>39</sup> One reason for the limited interest in other peoples was perhaps the overwhelming importance for the Romans of finding their identity in the face of the Greeks and taking over what they thought proper of Greek civilisation; there was little time left for the barbarians. But the Romans held that they ruled the whole inhabited world, and were extremely proud of the fact: there was a lively pleasure in foreign peculiarities, to which references are scattered all over the literature of the period. It was fed by the institution of the triumph, with its picturesque prisoners, piles of conquered weapons and other artifacts, paintings of the sites of battles and sieges. Even exotic trees were carried in triumphs, says Pliny, talking of the ebony and Judaeon balsam seen at Pompey's Eastern triumph.<sup>40</sup>

Exotic animals were often exhibited at festivals by the aediles, or produced for slaughter in the arena. Varro tells us that strange birds such as parrots were often put on display.<sup>41</sup> In 58 B.C. M. Scaurus arranged for the skeleton, from Jaffa, of Andromeda's monster (forty feet long, with a spine eighteen inches thick, perhaps in reality that of a prehistoric animal) to be exhibited in

<sup>37</sup> Strabo 3.C176; perhaps just off the Spanish coast.

<sup>38</sup> Id. 3.C166.

<sup>39</sup> *Ad Att.* 2.4.1, 6.1, 7.1; he was using Eratosthenes, also Serapio and Hipparchus; and the poem of Alexander of Ephesus, 20.6, 22.7. There seems to be a suggestion that Tyrannio is writing on geography, Shackleton Bailey, *Ad Att.* 2.6.1.

<sup>40</sup> Pliny *NH* 12.20, 111.

<sup>41</sup> Varro *De RR* 3.9.17 (and curiosities like white blackbirds).

Rome.<sup>42</sup> A hippopotamus was seen at his games for the first time, with five crocodiles in a temporary canal.<sup>43</sup> Pompey's games first showed Rome the *chama*, or lynx, from Gaul, and *cephi*, perhaps baboons, which Pliny said had not been seen in the city since.<sup>44</sup> Elephants had appeared much earlier, but at Pompey's games the public was sad to see the intelligent creatures killed. He also had a rhinoceros for the occasion.<sup>45</sup> It seems to have been at Caesar's games when he was dictator that giraffes first appeared.<sup>46</sup> There was a vogue for accurate records in art of strange beasts; the sculptor Pasiteles was almost mauled by a panther when sketching a lion at the docks.<sup>47</sup> One feature of the fashion for Egyptian landscapes in art that was already coming in was their display of extraordinary animals – crocodiles, hippopotami, ibises; on the Palestrina mosaic the various strange creatures are all carefully labelled (in Greek; and various other Egyptian peculiarities are illustrated in what is a panorama of the whole country).<sup>48</sup> In some villas there were menageries kept for pleasure, though naturally no Roman zoo rivalled that of Ptolemy II, who had organised expeditions in Africa to fill it, or probably that of King Mithridates either.<sup>49</sup> But all this Roman interest was superficial; there seems to have been little attempt to observe the animals closely, and many would probably soon have died in captivity.

Some Romans must have read the distinguished Greek authors we have discussed; Catullus may have got from Artemidorus (it was certainly in that author's work) the charming information that some Spanish tribes washed their teeth in urine.<sup>50</sup> Travellers were interested in major geographical features: Cicero says that people think it an achievement to see the mouth of the Pontus, where Argo passed, and Ocean at the point where Africa and Europe join (and here he adduces no mythological association).<sup>51</sup> It was accepted that the world was a sphere (it appears as such on coins). And maps of the world, the commonest sort of map, may have been widely familiar. There was also a map of Italy in the temple of Tellus, one of Sardinia in another shrine, and perhaps others of individual provinces set up by triumphators.<sup>52</sup> It is interesting, however, that books in antiquity seem rarely to have been illustrated with such things. Strabo merely advises a geographer to make a map of the world for himself,<sup>53</sup> and seems uninterested in those of

<sup>42</sup> Pliny *NH* 9.11; cf. 7.73 and Solinus 1.91, huge bones discovered during Metellus Creticus' campaign in Crete and visited by him and his legate (also Philod. *De Signis* 4).

<sup>43</sup> *NH* 8.96. Strabo 17.C815 perhaps refers to a later visit.

<sup>44</sup> *NH* 8.70.

<sup>45</sup> *Ad Fam.* 7.1.3; *NH* 8.71.

<sup>46</sup> Pliny *NH* 8.69.

<sup>47</sup> Pliny *NH* 36.40, cf. Varro *De LL* 5.100, recently brought from Alexandria; he claims that the tiger ('striped lion') had not yet been taken alive.

<sup>48</sup> The Palestrina mosaic is often now dated c. 100 B.C.: see F. Zevi, *Prospettiva* (1979) 2.

<sup>49</sup> Mithridates' zoo, Strabo 12.C556.

<sup>50</sup> *Cat.* 37.17-19. His friend Veranius is expected on his return from Spain to be (as usual) full of tales about the places he has been to, 9.6-7: *Hiberum/narrantem loca, facta, nationes/ut mos est tuus.*

<sup>51</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 1.45.

<sup>52</sup> Varro *De RR* 1.2.1 (some have taken it as a personified figure of Italy); Livy 41.28.8.

<sup>53</sup> Strabo 2.C116 (if he cannot make a globe).

smaller areas. Historical works, in spite of the importance given to topographic descriptions, do not seem to have been illustrated with maps, even the picture-maps we know were later popular. The ancients may have been less able than ourselves to read maps easily, and tended to think in the linear terms fostered by the itinerary and the *periplous*, while generals often remained surprisingly dependent on local guides. The Romans' awareness of distances would have been fostered by their unGreek habit of recording them on milestones; but their surveyors, the *gromatici*, were perhaps not, in our period at least, capable of the accurate, fairly large-scale maps that would have been useful for military operations; there is no evidence for anything approaching proper charts of seas or navigable rivers, and though a *periplous* might give some information about navigation, local pilots must have been crucial.

Perhaps governors reported briefly to the Senate on expeditions to little-known parts, as they certainly did under the Empire, or even published their reports; what we know about P. Crassus and the Tin Islands might come from such a report.<sup>54</sup> More literary is the ethnographic material in Caesar's *Commentaries*. It was long accepted, especially in Germany, that much of this, including the account of Britain and part of that on Germany, consisted of later interpolations into Caesar's work. But it has more recently been forcibly argued that there is nothing that cannot be Cæsarian in the language of these digressions, given that the sources and subject matter differ from those of the main narrative, and that there are no provable anachronisms. And it would be surprising if Caesar, especially after saying that he found it difficult to gain any knowledge of Britain before invading, should not have repeated what he did discover while on the island – indeed, if Plutarch is right, he had a lively dispute to settle, as to whether Britain existed at all.<sup>55</sup> It might also be recalled that if Caesar began the *De Bello Gallico* in the unpretentious form of *commentarii*, he did gradually come to treat the subject more in a historiographical fashion; and apart from 1.1, the geographic introduction, the second half of which has been impugned, the digressions all come in or after Book 4.

In fact, the narrative itself reveals from the start Caesar's interest in the peoples among whom he found himself, and his expectation that his readers would share it. The East might have prestige and romance, but the Romans had always been somewhat obsessed by the Gauls, never forgetting that they had once sacked the city, and probably supposing that the recent menace of the Cimbri and Teutones defeated by Marius had come from the same people – Posidonius seems to have thought that Celts and Germans were basically the same.<sup>56</sup> There was certainly excitement about Caesar's discoveries in Rome. Cicero, in the admittedly panegyric speech *De Provinciis Consularibus*, declares that Caesar has conquered regions and peoples totally unknown

<sup>54</sup> Or perhaps from Posidonius, whom Strabo is using for Spain in this part of his work.

<sup>55</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 23.2; cf. Philod. *De Signis* 5.33-6: even the British, if there are any, are mortal – taken as an example of men outside our experience. Dio 39.50.3, disputed whether it was island or continent and writers of all schools dependent on surmise.

<sup>56</sup> *FGH* no. 87 frag. 22, with commentary, noting DS 5.24 has no real German ethnography.

before, and in a letter to his brother in Gaul (possibly meant for Caesar's eye?) rhapsodises about his campaigns as the subject for a poem – what sites, what customs and peoples, as well as what battles and what a general!<sup>57</sup> One wonders how much ethnography there was in the *De Bello Sequanico* of the poet Varro of Atax, himself from Narbonese Gaul.<sup>58</sup> For Catullus, Britain and the Rhine are 'the monuments of great Caesar'.<sup>59</sup>

Caesar opens his work by introducing the geography of Gaul from scratch; his account would be clearer if a simple map with the main rivers had been appended, but there is no sign that it was. (Some think he is using Posidonius here.) His subsequent narrative may sometimes simplify or distort things Gallic, as scholars have argued, but he often gives more information than is strictly necessary, for example about the Helvetian migration, and it is splendidly vivid. The Roman reader was likely to be interested in legal procedure; he is told how the Helvetian Orgetorix was, as custom demanded, forced to plead his cause in chains, with burning alive as the penalty if convicted; and how the *vergobret*, the annual magistrate, had power of life and death over his tribe.<sup>60</sup> Equally, Roman attention would be roused by institutions resembling clientship: we are told how Orgetorix' clients, retainers and debtors (carefully distinguished) broke up the trial, and later Caesar goes into detail about the *soldurii* of Western Gaul, who devote themselves to live and die with a chosen leader.<sup>61</sup> Military practices are of course taken note of: the German Ariovistus' mixed horse and foot, and his fortification of waggons in the battle; the characteristics of the ships of the Veneti; British chariots and British *oppida* (fortified places rather than towns).<sup>62</sup> Polybius had specially pointed out how useful his own description of Gallic warfare might be to his readers; a nice example of Caesar drawing on his own experience is seen when, in Spain during the Civil War, he made boats of hide, such as he had seen in Britain, in order to get across a river.<sup>63</sup>

Caesar was less familiar with Britain and Germany than he became with Gaul. He declares that the invasion of the former was undertaken partly as a reconnaissance, and it is not easy to tell where his information in the British digression rests on autopsy, on traders or natives, or on literary sources. There is little dogmatism; statements are more than once qualified by an 'it is said' or 'they are supposed'. The subjects treated are those traditional in ancient ethnography: the position and shape of the country; the origin of the tribes, as they report it; the size of the population, the products of the land (crops, trees, livestock, metals). On the island's size and shape Caesar seems to improve on previous Greek sources, still followed by Strabo. The similarity of the inhabitants of Kent to those of Gaul is noted, while other Britons are

<sup>57</sup> *De Prov. Cons.* 33; *Ad Q.F.* 2.16.4.

<sup>58</sup> *FPL frag.* 23.

<sup>59</sup> *Cat.* 11.10. Furius and Aurelius are hardly imagined as going there merely to sightsee, however.

<sup>60</sup> Caesar *BG* 1.4, 16.5.

<sup>61</sup> *Id.* *BG* 1.4.2; 3.22.2-3 (cf. *ambacti*, 6.15, *clientes* 7.40.7).

<sup>62</sup> *Id.* *BG* 1.48.5-7, 51.2-3; 3.13; 5.16, 21.3.

<sup>63</sup> *Id.* *BC* 1.54.

less civilised, living off flesh and milk, dressing in skins and, like the rest, indeed, painting themselves blue, with a group of relatives often holding wives in common. (The division is schematic and does not correspond to the facts.) A surely authentic touch comes in the remark that ‘we could not find out by enquiry about the tale that in smaller islands beyond Britain night, in winter, lasts for a month, but by exact measurement with water-clocks we found that nights [while we were there] were shorter than on the continent’.<sup>64</sup> However, if Caesar had studied his Posidonius properly he ought perhaps to have anticipated the danger to his fleet from the high tides at the equinox.

Book 6.11 begins the comparatively long digression on Gauls and Germans, most of which has not been suspected (there are some repetitions from 4.1-3 about the Suebi, but perhaps Caesar had merely discovered more by now). Here the interest is social rather than military, and we may, perhaps fancifully, trace the special interests of the Roman noble, the *popularis* politician, and even the *pontifex maximus*, as well as the student of Greek ethnography. The way in which Gallic society is split vertically into *factiones*, with the humbler putting themselves under the protection of powerful individuals, is explained; the poor are of no account and often, oppressed by debt, taxation, and the wrongs inflicted by the influential, give themselves into slavery to the rich. Of the classes that matter, Caesar is curiously brief on the warriors or *equites*, but gives considerable space to the Druids, their origin in Britain, their legal powers, their sacrifices (including human sacrifice) and their schools, which stress learning by heart, though Greek letters are used for most purposes; also their gods, which are of course assimilated to Roman ones (the less assimilable are passed over), their doctrines of reincarnation, and their interest in astronomy and cosmology. Nothing is said of the bards, and it is possible that Caesar’s choice of material is affected by a desire to supplement and correct Posidonius, though he may be using written sources for some of his observations. It has been remarked that the Druids are surprisingly absent from Caesar’s narrative, and suggested that the picture of internal factions recalls the account of Posidonius. But the picture of society is simplified, compared with that of the philosopher. However, there may have been changes in the previous half-century, as archaeology and numismatics suggest.

It seems clear that Caesar is contradicting Posidonius when he insists that the Germans – all the tribes beyond the Rhine, and a few now this side, including those led by Ariovistus – live in a quite different fashion from the Gauls (elsewhere he insists that the Cimbri and Teutones are Germans, and indeed that most of the Belgae are of German origin).<sup>65</sup> They have no Druids or sacrifices, and only such gods as the Sun, Moon and Fire – this account of early German religion appears to be seriously incomplete and is perhaps influenced by theoretical ideas about primitive beliefs.<sup>66</sup> Huge and brave, the Germans care for nothing but war and hunting, admire chastity even in men,

<sup>64</sup> Id. *BG* 5.13.4.

<sup>65</sup> Id. *BG* 1.40.5; 2.4.1.

<sup>66</sup> G. Walser, *Caesar und die Germanen* (1956) 65.

own no land save in common, and move each year to fresh territories; they elect magistrates for the whole tribe only in wartime. But we know from archaeological evidence that the nearer tribes on the right bank of the Rhine were much influenced by Gallic civilisation, if not at least partly of Gallic descent (Caesar admits this for the Volcae Tectosages), with permanent *oppida*; they shared in the Celtic La Tène culture, if in a poorer way than their neighbours.<sup>67</sup> Caesar implies that Ariovistus' Germans speak a different language from the Gauls;<sup>68</sup> but place-names suggest that at some stage at least there had been Celts on the right bank, and Ariovistus' own name may be Celtic. It is not true that the admittedly wilder Suebi imported no foreign goods, as Caesar tries to insinuate.<sup>69</sup> His picture may be reasonably accurate for the more distant tribes, though how would he have known about them? It has been suggested that he maligned Ariovistus' people and the tribes near the right bank to show that he was justified in throwing savages alien to the Gauls beyond the river, but not himself trying to conquer poverty-stricken nomads in their impenetrable fastnesses;<sup>70</sup> just as he claimed that the Britons of the interior he was unable to reach were hopelessly primitive.

Finally, there is the disputed passage on the Hercynian Forest. We are told that Eratosthenes and other Greeks knew of it, calling it 'Orcynian' (but not that Posidonius used the form 'Hercynian' – is he being silently used?).<sup>71</sup> It is followed by the even more notorious passage on the fauna of Germany, especially elks and aurochs. The former are said to have legs without joints, so that once down they cannot rise; to sleep they lean on trees, which hunters surreptitiously cut through so that tree and elk collapse together. Can the sceptical Caesar be responsible for this tale, told of elephants in Africa by Agatharchides?<sup>72</sup> Perhaps even Caesar felt he had to pander to the desire for information about exotic animals so clearly felt by readers; but the narrative has few or no marvels.

On the whole Caesar does not pass judgment on the peoples he describes, though he uses vivid details of warlike customs and superstition to build up a picture of the savagery of Ariovistus' Germans; and he once remarks on the Germans' lack of any training in duty and discipline.<sup>73</sup> As for the Gauls, he notes their faults, their traditional infirmity of purpose in particular, with excessive dependence on rumours, but recognises their great courage and their quickness to learn, and does not stress that they are barbarians (though the wilder they are, the braver); the Romans are more disciplined and skilled.

<sup>67</sup> For a convenient summing up of the archaeological evidence, C. Wells, *The German Policy of Augustus* (1972) 14. It has been argued that the Celtic tribes on the right bank were the original 'Germans' and Caesar extended the term to the Suebi and other even wilder peoples. (*BG* 6.24 for some Celts on the right bank.)

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* *BG* 1.47.4: Ariovistus has learnt the language of the Gauls.

<sup>69</sup> *Id.* *BG* 4.2.1 (no wine or horses imported and merchants admitted so that the Germans could sell rather than buy).

<sup>70</sup> *Id.* *BG* 6.22.4: institutions prevent the amassing of wealth so the poor may feel equal to the most powerful.

<sup>71</sup> *BG* 6.24.2; cf. Posid. frag. 272.2 E and K.

<sup>72</sup> *ap.* DS 3.27. Pliny *NH* 8.39 tells this story of the *achlis*, like the elk but never seen in Rome.

<sup>73</sup> Caesar *BG* 4.1.9.

But the Gauls are seen to be fighting for their freedom, and Vercingetorix above all is a heroic figure. It has been suggested that Caesar was less prone than many Greeks or Romans of his time to find the traditional city-state culture perfect.<sup>74</sup> On the other hand, he did not idealise the noble savage, as some did (the tension between these two views had often made Hellenistic ethnographers fairly balanced). He ignores myth; we are very notably not told that Heracles founded Alesia and that the Gauls are descended from his son Galates, as Diodorus says, or from Galatea, or from Celtus, another son of Heracles by Celteine the daughter of Bretannus, as Parthenius recounted (Britain however was largely beyond the scope of Greek myth, as Diodorus admits: 'neither Dionysus nor Heracles nor any other of the heroes invaded it').<sup>75</sup> Caesar also ignores explanations of national character in terms of climate, or of custom and adaptation to environment; perhaps a sign of his limited interest in philosophy.

Caesar's ethnographic achievement has been diversely judged, even by those who accept the genuineness of all or most of the disputed chapters. It might be fair to say that had he had no apologetic purposes, he might have been one of the better authors of straightforward descriptions of remote peoples.

Caesar's approach contrasts strikingly with that of Cornelius Nepos. In his life of the elder Cato Nepos complains that though, in his *Origines*, Cato described the marvels of Italy and Spain, in spite of his industry he lacked learning;<sup>76</sup> meaning probably knowledge both of Greek geographical and scientific theories and of the mythology enshrined in the poets. His own geographical fragments have been thought to come from the preface to his *Chronica*, written while Caesar was in Gaul but before at any rate the later books of the *Commentaries* were published; but some at least may derive from a not explicitly attested work on the subject. To prove that the inhabited world was surrounded by water he produced a story that when Q. Metellus Celer was governor of Gaul<sup>77</sup> in 62 B.C. a Suebian king presented him with some Indians who had, as questioning discovered, been driven by storms from the Indian Ocean, past the 'Caspian Gulf' to Germany (who these unfortunates really were is hard to say; it is worth noting *en passant* that there was apparently less uprooting of natives as ethnological specimens than in the Renaissance – though slaves might serve as such). Nepos also claimed that Eudoxus had circumnavigated Africa in the late second century from the 'Arabian Gulf' (our Red Sea) to Gades in Spain. In fact this is a wildly inaccurate account of Eudoxus' adventures, of which Strabo, himself sceptical of them, gives a version condensed from Posidonius: Eudoxus only claimed to have found a Gaditane wreck on the East African coast, and himself perished on a second attempted circumnavigation from, not to,

<sup>74</sup> A.N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (1967) 21.

<sup>75</sup> DS 5.21.2, 24.2-3, Parthenius 30.

<sup>76</sup> Nepos *Cato* 3.4.

<sup>77</sup> Celer probably governed Cisalpine Gaul, which makes the story odd. H. Bengtson, *Historia* (1954) 229 notes that Indus is a Gallic personal name.

Gades.<sup>78</sup> But we know from his *Lives* how careless Nepos could be.

Pliny also exclaims at his gullibility in believing tales about the city of Lixus on the Moroccan coast, described as more powerful than Carthage ever was, and as lying on the same meridian, at a huge distance from Tingi (Tangier). When Augustus made Lixus a colony such tales were laid to rest. Nepos also placed the island of Cerne (which was as moveable as Thule in the north) on the same meridian as Carthage, off the African coast.<sup>79</sup> This derives ultimately at least from the famous account of the voyage of the Carthaginian Hanno, supposed to have been recorded in the temple of Moloch in Carthage, of which what purports to be a Greek version has come down to us; but Hanno's Cerne is smaller than that of Nepos.<sup>80</sup>

Pliny also shows that Nepos held to the old view that Istria on the Adriatic was so called from a branch of the Ister (Danube) which flows into the Adriatic Sea, opposite the Po, and that their colliding waters make the sea fresh. Pliny is appalled that one who was born on the banks of the Po should believe this, and supposes that the old story of the Argo sailing by way of a river from the Black Sea to the Adriatic is responsible;<sup>81</sup> indeed, Apollonius of Rhodes, the author of the *Argonautica*, was long held, like Homer, to be a serious geographical source; and the geography of the Balkans was probably ill-known till Augustus' conquests. Nepos also connected the Eneti of Paphlagonia with the Veneti of northern Italy, no doubt by means of the emigration of Antenor from Troy,<sup>82</sup> and probably had the tales of Hercules' wanderings in the West: it might be relevant that the chronicle of Apollodorus, which Nepos probably used for his *Chronica*, had such notices. For the rest, we know that Nepos gave distances for the width of the Alps, for the neck of land from the Black Sea to the Caspian (much too low) and for the circumference of the Black Sea.<sup>83</sup>

Thus it looks as if Nepos' geographic material tended to the literary and mythological, as was certainly the case with the digressions in Sallust's historical works (which we shall not here discuss), both the surviving *Jugurthine War* and the lost *Histories*, where there was a famous description of the tribes on the Black Sea in connection with Lucullus' campaigns. Marvels seem to have been prominent in other historical works; the anti-Caesarian Tanusius Geminus recorded remarkable things of elephants in his *Annales*.<sup>84</sup> More serious work would seem to have been done by Varro, though as we

<sup>78</sup> Pliny *NH* 2.169, Strabo 2.C98-100.

<sup>79</sup> *NH* 5.4; 6.199.

<sup>80</sup> Its genuineness has been doubted, but is asserted by J. Blomqvist, *The Date and Origin of the Greek Version of Hanno's Periplus* (1979).

<sup>81</sup> *NH* 3.127.

<sup>82</sup> *NH* 6.5.

<sup>83</sup> *NH* 3.132; 6.31; 4.77.

<sup>84</sup> *HRR* II frag. 1. When at war with mankind they send out scouts; they sometimes hold out branches as suppliants.

P. Pédech, in *Colloque Histoire et Historiographie Clio*, 3ed. R. Chevallier (1980) 23 is wrong to suppose Roman lack of interest in geography betrayed by the fact that Livy and Tacitus have little in the way of geographic digressions; these were probably not expected in annalistic history (basically local history).

saw it is uncertain from what work or works the geographical fragments embedded in Pliny's *Natural History* come.<sup>85</sup> Apart from the book on geometry in the *Disciplinae*, the second hexad of the *Antiquitates Humanae*, that *de locis*, may have had relevant material. The fragments of the *De Ora Maritima* are concerned with the voyage between Sicily and Sardinia, and the nature of shoals, winds and so on; the *De Aestuarius* was about tides, surely using Posidonius (it, and the *De Litoralibus*, might simply be parts of the *De Ora Maritima*). The *Ephemeris Navalis* dedicated to Pompey dealt with the voyage to Spain, weather signs and so on. There could have been geographic notices in the account of Pompey's campaigns. A *logistoricus*, the *Gallus Fundanius de Admirandis*, was devoted to marvels.

Pliny's references to Varro include some mythological history of Spain, and its invasion successively by Hiberi, Persians, Phoenicians, Celts and Carthaginians. There are notices about Dalmatia (89 tribes used to congregate at Narona), the Aegean (fine cloth from Ceos; Delos free from earthquakes – Varro should have known this was untrue), and about the East (the circumference of the Black Sea, the shape of the Sea of Azov; the sweetness of the water of the Caspian, drunk by Pompey's soldiers – this presumably was used to prove it was not a gulf of Ocean, as Nepos still thought later; the trade routes to India elucidated by exploration under Pompey's command).<sup>86</sup> And St Jerome praised Varro's studies of the Celts; in which it seems that he said that Latin, Greek and Celtic were all used in Massilia.<sup>87</sup> Varro had doubtless passed through the town on his way to serve Pompey in Spain, and indeed may have spent some time in southern Gaul, perhaps collecting supplies. If he went to the East with Pompey too, he was better equipped than many to write on geography and ethnography, and if we had more of his work our final assessment of the Roman approach to these subjects would be based on better evidence.

There was also, in verse, the *Chorographia* (if we have the title right) of the poet from Gaul, Varro of Atax. It had, perhaps at the start, a vision of the whole cosmos, with the gods rejoicing in the music of the spheres; geographers might often begin with the universe as a whole. On the earth the land was 'stretched out', surrounded by Ocean. Five zones encircled the earth, only the two intermediate and temperate ones being habitable (seven are more usual in Greek geographic theory, for example that of Posidonius). One book seems to have been devoted to Europe, one perhaps to the other continents; there is a description of Africa, encircled by Ocean, the 'Libyan Sea' and the Nile (the right bank was often reckoned as part of Arabia and so Asia). There is a fragment on Indian sugar-cane.<sup>88</sup> The relation, if any, of this to the recent geographic poem of Alexander of Ephesus is unclear. This was a work read but not admired by Cicero when he was considering writing

<sup>85</sup> There is no good evidence that Varro wrote a big geographical work organised as a *periplous*: K.G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie des Alteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (1971).

<sup>86</sup> *NH* 3.8, 142; 4.62, 66, 78; 6.38, 51-2.

<sup>87</sup> Hieron. *in Gal.* 7.425 Vall.

<sup>88</sup> *FPL* frags 14-20.

on geography – as he may conceivably have ultimately succeeded in doing, while a work on *Admiranda*, marvels, is also once attributed to him.<sup>89</sup> We know as little of the *De Terra* of Nigidius Figulus, unless a passage in Pliny about the seven zones or *climata* comes from this rather than the astrological work on the heavenly *Sphaera*; the *climata* were regularly used in astrological theory, however.<sup>90</sup>

The weaknesses of ancient geography and ethnography are clear. The subjects were too often treated as adjuncts to the writing of history, or in the form of a *periplous* or *perihêgêsis* covering too large an area to avoid superficiality. The desire for *paradoxa* bedevilled serious enquiry; Strabo was to say we ought to forget how to marvel. In spite of the connection with historiography, there was little concern for the recent history of most foreign peoples, nor in the way their institutions might have changed over the years. If there was interest in their mythical origins, it was not for the light their traditions might throw on their ways of thought, for the myths were often wholly Greek ones, designed to fit foreign peoples into the classical scheme of things. Discussion of religion was vitiated by naive syncretism. And of course native languages were rarely learnt, though Eudoxus, who was a merchant, had learnt some African words on one of his first voyages, and claimed to have found a tribe on the other side of the continent using the same ones. But without the language it was impossible to get to grips with a strange people.<sup>91</sup> One will look in vain to ancient authors for information on the favourite subjects of modern anthropologists, kinship systems, inheritance rules, economic organisation and so on. There was little eye for foreign artifacts; if they reached Rome to be carried in triumphs, they were not collected or studied there. There was little attempt to compare societies and so make generalisations. But with the best authors there was an effort to describe a foreign social and political structure, and to take it on its own terms, that can be respected.

<sup>89</sup> *Ad Att.* 2.22.7, cf. 20.6. Priscian *GL* II 267.5 may quote a *Chorographia* by Cicero, Pliny *NH* 31.12 quotes a *De Admirandis*: only the marshes of Reate harden the hooves of cattle; cf. 31.51, also Italian.

<sup>90</sup> Frag. 88 Swob.

Staius Sebosus, surely a paradoxographer rather than a genuine traveller (blue worms 40 cubits long in the Ganges grip elephants' trunks and drag them into the river), if he is the Sebosus known to Cicero, *Ad Att.* 2.14.2, 15.3, comes into our purview: *NH* 9.46, cf. 6.201 (voyage to the islands of the Hesperides).

<sup>91</sup> Some Romans in the third and second centuries had learnt Punic, unsurprisingly. Equally unsurprisingly, Sertorius knew a little of a Celtic language, Plut. *Sert.* 3.2 (for military purposes).

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### *Grammatica:* 'the part dealing with writers'

The exposition and evaluation of literature, and especially poetry, was the highest task of the *grammaticus*. But (apart from a mass of glosses) we have little of the work in this field of late Republican scholars compared with their pronouncements on such matters as morphology and etymology. The main reason, perhaps, is that at the very end of our period there was a great revolution in taste, such as the Greeks never had to face,<sup>2</sup> by which on the whole the poets admired by the last generations were replaced by those of a newer vintage; the commentaries that survive are on Virgil, Horace and some of their successors. Terence is the exception, but though we do, partly for this reason, have some information about Republican ideas on him and his work, as also to some extent on Plautus, it seems possible that it was not till imperial times that Terence became a staple author for schools, and that there were no actual commentaries on him in the earlier period.

We saw that many *grammatici* were Greeks, or 'half-Greeks', and taught in that language. Traces of their instruction remain; it seems probable that Cicero used the Greek *scholia* to Aratus when translating the poet; it seems certain that Virgil knew the *scholia* to Homer.<sup>3</sup> Some of the Greek *grammatici* in Rome obviously continued to write on the subjects of traditional interest to them, but on the whole we do not know what works were actually composed in Italy, though we can be fairly sure that this was so with Alexander Polyhistor's work on geographical names in Alcman and (this is not certainly attested) his commentary on Corinna, and also with Tyrannio's work, probably that on Greek accents, read to Atticus, and that on metre requested by Caesar, while we may suspect it with the works of various authors on Latin as a dialect of Greek.<sup>4</sup> As for the Romans, it will be clear that while none of them dealt with Greek literature except where it was directly relevant to Latin imitations, they followed very closely in the tracks of their Greek models, adapting their procedures to Latin as closely as possible. Literary scholars

<sup>1</sup> Sextus Empiricus *Pros Mathêmatikous* 1.91ff. distinguishes three parts of *grammatikê*, the technical (with which we dealt in Chapter 8), the historical (factual information necessary for the understanding of poetry) and 'the part dealing with writers'.

<sup>2</sup> Because Greek scholarship only developed fully when the poetic literature was already mature, not the case in Rome (the late first-century rejection of Hellenistic prose in the name of Atticism is another matter).

<sup>3</sup> J.E.G. Zetzel *AJP* (1978) 332 (noting Varro Atacinus also knew the *scholia* to Apollonius Rhodius). R.R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid* (1974).

<sup>4</sup> *FGH* no. 273, frags 95-7; *Ad A.* 12.6.2 (see p. 102); Suda s.v. *skolion*.

today, generalising about the Hellenization of Rome, often base themselves almost exclusively on this subject; but we have seen how different the pattern was in different fields.

In this area at least, there was much activity from the late second century, though the character and date of some of the main works involved is disputed. For example, were Accius' *Didascalica* (at the start of or just before the first century B.C.) in verse, or in mixed prose and verse? Were they in dialogue form? Certainly other late second- or early first-century writings on literature, that by Porcius Licinus, and the *De Poetis* of Volcaci Sedigitus, were in verse, while Lucilius had recently discussed literary and grammatical questions in some of his *Satires*. It may be that the two classes of poets and scholars were not yet felt to be separate (to some extent they were always to overlap as in the Hellenistic Greek world) or it may be that scholars still distrusted the limited reading public and wished to smear its cup with honey. During the first century it became usual to discuss poetic literature in prose, although Cicero's *Limon* and Caesar's poem of unknown name and date, both of which passed judgment on Terence and surely other figures, continued the old tradition, while literary subjects are often treated in Varro's *Menippean Satires*, in mixed prose and verse – a useful combination, conducive to parody.

It is also not clear whether Accius' *Didascalica* dealt with epic and other forms of poetry as well as drama, to which alone the title would seem to point. In other words, does the discussion of the relative dates of Homer and Hesiod, which Aulus Gellius was to find seriously wanting, and do other fragments concerning Homer, come from a preface or digression, like the reference to the existence of numerous *genera*, kinds or genres of literature?<sup>5</sup> (Ancient *grammatici* – and librarians – were inevitably concerned with classification; practising authors may have been less so.) The fact that Accius regarded Hesiod as earlier than Homer probably suggests Pergamene influence; as we recall, Suetonius held that *grammatica* proper began in Rome with Crates of Mallus, who worked at Pergamum, though the branch with which we are here concerned was dominated by the Alexandrians. It may be relevant that Accius' Pergamene contemporary Carystius wrote a *Peri Didaskaliôn*,<sup>6</sup> presumably more discursive than Aristotle's *Didascalica*, which was basically a list of information extracted from the public documents that dealt with theatrical productions. The adjective *Didascalica* must mean something akin to *Peri Didaskaliôn*. Certainly Accius' work covered a wide field and included, for example, his personal judgments.

It seems not unnaturally to have been the real *grammatici*, the teachers who read Latin literature with their pupils, rather than the distinguished men with an interest in the subject, who wrote commentaries. Though Livius Andronicus' primitive version of the *Odyssey* was still used in school, as Horace attests,<sup>7</sup> it was apparently not of much interest to scholars, but commentaries on Naevius' slightly less primitive *Bellum Punicum* were

<sup>5</sup> *GRF* Accius frags 1-3, 8.

<sup>6</sup> Athen. 6.235e.

<sup>7</sup> Horace *Ep.* 2.1.69-71; it is possible that its Saturnians had been re-written as hexameters at some point.

produced by Cornelius and Vergilius, both known to Varro,<sup>8</sup> who are unidentifiable unless Cornelius be Sulla's freedman Cornelius Epicadus. (Ateius Philologus' work devoted to the question whether Aeneas loved Dido is likely also to have been mainly about Naevius' poem, for Ateius was probably dead before the publication of the *Aeneid*.)<sup>9</sup> Antonius Gniphos wrote a commentary on Ennius' *Annales* (a piece of information about the flora of the island of Cercina near Africa is quoted from it).<sup>10</sup> Pompilius Andronicus' so-called *Elenchi* of the same work may have been a 'scrutiny', or possibly an 'inventory', i.e. a glossary.<sup>11</sup> Ennius was generally revered, and the comparison with Homer, which he himself had initiated, was made as Horace knew by the *critici*.<sup>12</sup> But it was impossible to see Ennius, comparatively recent and dealing with a limited and local subject-matter, as the source of all knowledge and morality, as Homer was to many Greeks. Nor could he dominate education to the extent that Homer did in the Greek world; for one thing, educated Romans had to read Homer himself as well. The Romans as far as we know did not with Ennius go through the intellectual contortions of allegorisation that the Greeks practised in order to prove Homer's omniscience and moral perfection (they were soon, however, to find allegory in Virgil). The Greek view of Homer was as we saw familiar to them from the *scholia*; and Philodemus' *On the Good King according to Homer*, dedicated to L. Piso, belonged to the same tradition.

Commentaries on the Hymn of the Salii and other very ancient pieces of verse are more relevant to antiquarianism than literature. It is not certain that the *equus* Aelius Stilo wrote commentaries to more modern works as well, but if we may trust the late source that says that he, like Varro and Ennius (hardly the poet, even if the name is correctly preserved)<sup>13</sup> used the Aristarchan critical signs to indicate interpolated or otherwise problematical passages, texts marked by him possibly survived (unless he merely used the signs when quoting verse). To talk of 'editions' in the modern sense is anachronistic,<sup>14</sup> though before Varro's time texts of Plautus had been organised according to Alexandrian principles of colometry in the *cantica*; very little later, in the Gallus papyrus, the elegiacs are carefully laid out, the first letter of the line is larger, the pentameters are indented, and what are probably divisions between poems are marked with signs as well as a space. By Varro's time too, texts of Naevius' comedies probably had them in

<sup>8</sup> Varro *De LL* 7.39 (*GRF* 105). *De LL* 7.36 shows that the name Saturnian was already applied to the early verse-form used by Naevius; certainly a learned name.

<sup>9</sup> *GRF* Ateius test. 9; N.H. Horsfall, *Proc. Virgil Soc.* (1973-4) 1. There were various versions of the Dido story, from Timaeus on at least. Varro knew a version in which Aeneas loved her sister Anna.

<sup>10</sup> *GRF* Antonius Gniphos frag. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 8.

<sup>12</sup> Horace *Ep.* 2.1.51.

<sup>13</sup> *Anecdota Parisina* (*GRF*, Stilo, test. 21) *Varros Hennius Haelius*. S.F. Bonner, *Hermes* (1960) 354 reads *Varro Servius Aelius*, Servius being Ser. Clodius, Aelius Stilo's son-in-law. But there seem to have been grammatical works by an Ennius who was probably not the poet; see S. Timpanaro, *Contrib. di fil. e di stor. della lingua lat.* (1978) 84n.

<sup>14</sup> J.E.G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (1981) 10ff.

alphabetical order.<sup>15</sup> Archaic language (unless metrical questions were involved) and spelling were usually modernised: Cicero notes that *old* texts of Ennius write Bruges, Burrus, for Phryges, Pyrrhus<sup>16</sup> (if copies were often produced to dictation, modernisation is not surprising). There was limited interest in strictly textual problems, though Varro is aware that an apparent linguistic illogicality may be due either to Plautus or a copyist.<sup>17</sup>

If Stilo did produce texts of a sort, he probably did not emend extensively; the Stoics, by whom we know him to have been influenced, did not often emend Homer, being able to explain peculiar statements away as allegory. We do know that Stilo was prone, like Greek scholars, especially biographers, to read too much autobiographical information into an author's work; he stated that Ennius' description, in the *Annals*, of the humble friend of a great man, was a self-portrait, something that is not very likely, or at any rate that it is unlikely he could have known.<sup>18</sup> At least the information that we are given by Roman scholars on the lives of Roman poets, even if dubiously reliable, tends to be less fantastic than what we find in the biographies of many early Greek poets.<sup>19</sup>

More than Ennius, Lucilius was a focus for scholarly discussion – only recently dead at the start of the century, but clearly in need of explanation, for both contemporary and learned allusions. Immediately after, perhaps even before his death, his 'friends' Vettius Philocomus and Laelius Archelaus lectured on him.<sup>20</sup> If Pompeius Lenaeus made known that he had read Lucilius' works with Archelaus, and Valerius Cato claimed to have done so with Philocomus, it was no doubt to validate works of their own on the subject.<sup>21</sup> Curtius Nicias' books on Lucilius were well thought of by Santra, probably in the thirties or early Augustan age;<sup>22</sup> the author of the lines prefixed to Horace *Satires* 1.10 represents Valerius Cato as a great defender of Lucilius, who smoothes his verses by emendation.<sup>23</sup> Either the commentators, or authors of special collections of Lucilian glosses, explained various words and phrases; Varro seems to use these in the *De Lingua Latina*, and one for example appears to have collected the names of fish mentioned by the poet.<sup>24</sup> Varro himself wrote *De Compositione Saturarum*.<sup>25</sup> This was a genre, of course, without complete Greek precedent.

<sup>15</sup> F. Leo, *Die Plaut. Cantica u.d. hellenistische Lyrik* (1897) 6; C. Questa, *R.Fil.* (1974) 58 and 172 on the way the *cantica* were laid out on the papyrus, with varying margins. Gallus, R.D. Anderson etc, *JRS* (1979) 125. Alphabetic order, Varro *De LL* 7.107-8, and Daly op. cit. on p. 141, 52

<sup>16</sup> *Orat.* 160.

<sup>17</sup> *De LL* 9.106: one or the other has written a passive form next to an active one, where both have an active meaning.

<sup>18</sup> *GRF* Stilo frag. 51.

<sup>19</sup> See M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (1981).

<sup>20</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 2.4; they sound like freedmen.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* *ib.*

<sup>22</sup> Suet. *Gramm.* 14.3.

<sup>23</sup> The lines near-contemporary to the Satire, according to E. Fraenkel, *Hermes* (1933) 392.

<sup>24</sup> F. Marx, *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* I 53.

<sup>25</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 89.

We know more about the attention which Roman scholars directed to their theatrical literature. The scholarly work on the Athenian theatre by Aristotle and his pupil Dicaearchus had been followed up by numerous Alexandrian and Pergamene students, who had worked on the language of the dramatic poets, and had discussed the genuineness or otherwise of plays attributed to these, judging largely on grounds of style. Euripides and Menander, in particular, were also much read in school.<sup>26</sup> The Romans, towards the end of the second century, turned a similar kind of scrutiny on to their own theatrical tradition, little more than a century old but already thoroughly confused. If this was in reality immensely less glorious than the Greek one, it did represent a large part of their poetic heritage, and the theatre, to Varro as to Cicero, was still in the first century an important element in the life of an educated man. Revivals of old plays were common, but presumably not undertaken on scholarly grounds, which would not be appreciated by most of the audience.

Accius' *Didascalica*, in at least nine books, were doubtless, as we have seen, at least predominantly about the theatre. They may have used official records of productions at festivals in Rome, but did not confine themselves to these; fragments deal with Euripides' awkward use of the chorus, the problems (most probably) of *stichomythia*, and the dress of actors, perhaps as traditionally fixed by Aeschylus.<sup>27</sup> In other words, there was something on the Greek theatre which was the model of the Roman one. Gellius also quotes Accius on plays which he denied were by Plautus.<sup>28</sup> It may have been in the *Didascalica* that Accius committed the famous howler in which he placed the first production of a play by Livius Andronicus after the second Punic War. Here there can be little doubt that Varro (like Atticus and Cicero, probably in his wake – Cicero refers to 'ancient *commentarii*') was right in restoring Livius to the middle and later third century and putting his first production in 240; for one thing Cicero, no bad judge, found Livius' work far more primitive than that of Naevius, whom Accius had perhaps seen as the *inventor* of Roman poetry in Livius' place.<sup>29</sup> The fragments of Accius' *Pragmaticon libri* seem also to be in verse and to deal with the stage, though the meaning of the title is unclear.<sup>30</sup> Here Accius blamed the public for most of the poets' failures, and complained that the derivation of the Greek word *Sicinnistae*, dancers in the satyr-play, was obscure; a fragment further suggests that he may have discussed the question of personal allusions to contemporaries made on the stage.<sup>31</sup>

The *De Poetis* of Volcacius Sedigitus arranged the comic poets of Rome in order of merit, with Caecilius Statius first and Terence only sixth, which last at least may be thought to betray a lack of sophisticated taste;<sup>32</sup> he stresses

<sup>26</sup> There was also some interest in the dramatic authors of Sicily and Magna Graecia.

<sup>27</sup> *GRF* Accius frags 1-10.

<sup>28</sup> *Ib. id. frag. 19*. He *may* have distinguished Maccus or Maccius from Plautus; see p. 277.

<sup>29</sup> *Ib. id. frag. 18; Brutus 72*.

<sup>30</sup> *GRF* Accius frags 11-14. Something to do with content, *pragmata*, opposed to style?

<sup>31</sup> A subject of interest to Greek scholars, especially in Old Comedy.

<sup>32</sup> *GRF* Volcacius frag. 1.

the antiquity of Ennius, which might suggest shaky chronology still, as Ennius was not older than Plautus, as well as revealing the ancient and especially Roman regard for antiquity *per se* (though scholars often operated with the concept of growth). Volcacius perhaps called Terence's *Hecyra* a thin play, *exilis*;<sup>33</sup> a good deal of Greek critical terminology had already been adapted into Latin, or was in use in its Greek form, as the fragments of Lucilius show, while Volcacius is also clearly influenced by the Alexandrian tendency to establish lists, what we call canons, of approved authors – he says that the question of who was the best comic poet was much canvassed in his time. He also apparently noted that the *Hecyra* was Terence's sixth play – critics were greatly concerned with the precise number produced by each dramatist – and probably asserted that it was doubtful whether Terence wrote his own works, suggesting Scipio Aemilianus as the real author.<sup>34</sup> He stated, probably inaccurately, that Terence at the end of his life set out for Asia, though it is now usually supposed that his goal was really Athens and its theatrical traditions and, no doubt, manuscripts (though Accius was to visit Asia, perhaps for general intellectual reasons as much as theatrical ones). It is clear from the different versions given that nothing was known of Terence's end, as indeed Volcacius admits: 'after he had gone on board ship, he was seen no more.'<sup>35</sup> Q. Cosconius (a writer quoted by Varro)<sup>36</sup> said he died at sea on the way home, apparently with translations of 108 plays by Menander in his baggage – this would be Menander's entire output. It is interesting at least that the special relationship between the two poets was recognised.

Porcius Licinus, again in verse, also occupied 'himself with the life of Terence, and his relation to the great nobles who, as his own prologues to his plays show, were widely supposed to have helped him to write. Here for once biographical deductions are not unjustified; but Porcius was perhaps in error, on chronological grounds, in identifying the nobles as the younger Scipio and his friends Furius and Laelius, who were very young at the time.'<sup>37</sup> Porcius' wrath at these great men for leaving Terence in poverty hints at *popularis* feelings, though his own name suggests he was an aristocrat; not all thought that Terence left nothing at his death, and if his daughter could marry an *eques* it is unlikely.<sup>38</sup> Porcius' version of Terence's end was that he died in Arcadia. He also described the dramatic poet Atilius as a *ferreus scriptor*, meaning hard and awkward, perhaps à propos of his version of Sophocles' *Electra*. This severe judgment was one in which Cicero was to concur.<sup>39</sup> Porcius seems also to have noted the location of Ennius' house in Rome,

<sup>33</sup> *Ib.* id. frag. 2; the reading is uncertain.

<sup>34</sup> *Ib.* id. frag. 3; Accius, A. Gellius 13.2: was his goal the library at Pergamum, or the theatrical life that certainly existed in Asia?

<sup>35</sup> *Ib.* id. frag. 4 (emendation gives it to Volcacius).

<sup>36</sup> *Ib.* Cosconius frag. 3. There are Cosconii in public life in Rome; the one Varro quotes in *De LL* 6.89 (= frag.1) wrote *De Actionibus*, probably a legal work.

<sup>37</sup> *GRF* Porcius Licinus frag. 4.

<sup>38</sup> Porcius claims he had not even a hired house to which his slave might bring news of his death; but Don. *Vita Ter.* 6 gives him *hortuli* of twenty *iugera* outside Rome.

<sup>39</sup> *GRF* Porcius frag. 3; *De Fin.* 1.5. *Ferreus* is not common in its Greek form in criticism.

something that may have been remembered.<sup>40</sup>

Aelius Stilo, who as a writer of speeches and antiquarian commentaries naturally used prose for all his work, is known to have declared to be genuine twenty-five out of the *circa* one hundred and thirty plays ascribed to Plautus.<sup>41</sup> He doubtless did so on grounds of style; Cicero describes Stilo's son-in-law Ser. Clodius as able to pronounce on the Plautinity of a single line of comic verse.<sup>42</sup> Everyone in fact had a crack at the Plautine problem: Aulus Gellius tells us (from Varro) that Volcacius Sedigitus, Stilo, Claudius (perhaps Ser. Clodius), Aurelius (Opillus), Accius and Manilius all made lists of dubious plays.<sup>43</sup> Aurelius' list may have been in the work entitled *Pinax*, perhaps a catalogue of Roman authors and their works modelled on the famous *Pinakes* of Callimachus; Ateius Philologus also produced *Pinakes*.<sup>44</sup> It is not clear whether anybody produced a commentary on Plautus, though there had been commentaries on Aristophanes at Alexandria to serve as a model. But Stilo admired Plautus' language intensely, saying that if the Muses wished to speak Latin, they would speak like Plautus, while a number of his fragments deal with difficult Plautine words.<sup>45</sup>

Varro developed further the tradition of interest in the theatre, though the certain fragments, and the many probable reflections of his views, cannot usually be associated with a particular work. Apart from the *De Poematis*, supposedly theoretical, and the *De Poetis*, biographical and chronological, we have to reckon with the *De Scaenicis Originibus*, the *De Comoediis Plautinis*, five books *Quaestionum Plautinarum*, mainly it seems on linguistic points, and *De Personis*, about masks, the *De Actis Scaenicis*, *De Actionibus Scaenicis* and the *logistoricus* entitled *Scaurus* (the younger Scaurus gave exceptionally grand shows as aedile) and perhaps the *Imagines*, not to mention the *Antiquitates Divinae* (of which Book 10 discussed the festivals where plays were given) and of course the *Menippean Satires*; quite apart from Varro's tendency to repeat and quote himself in all manner of works.

The *De Scaenicis Originibus*, much used indirectly by Tertullian, certainly discussed the foundation of various festivals, and derived *ludi*, and the old word *ludius*, a dancer, from *lusus*.<sup>46</sup> The theories on the origin of drama proper, both in Attica and Rome, which appear with annoying variations in Horace, Livy and other later sources, probably go back in their general lines to Varro, and suggest that he made much of its rural origin, in Attica as in Latium, and the licence given at rustic festivals to attack individuals by name (which seems to be rather awkwardly linked to the emergence of Lucilian satire at Rome, a non-dramatic form with doubtful connections with rural

<sup>40</sup> Porcius frag. 2.

<sup>41</sup> *GRF* Stilo frag. 4.

<sup>42</sup> *Ad Fam.* 9.16.4.

<sup>43</sup> A. Gellius 3.3; Manilius is perhaps the self-taught senator who wrote on the phoenix and conceivably a poet quoted by Varro, see *GRF* 84.

<sup>44</sup> *GRF* Aurelius Opillus, test. 4; Ateius Philologus, frag. 1.

<sup>45</sup> Quint. 10.1.99.

<sup>46</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 435, cf. *De Vita PR* frag. 27 Rip.

junketings).<sup>47</sup> The picture, where Italy is concerned, seems to be largely a theoretical construction on the Attic model; in fact, real drama was simply an import. We know that Varro gave the usual etymology of the word tragedy from the Greek *tragos*, a goat, and said that the young men in Attica had been accustomed to go round the villages singing scurrilous songs about individuals for profit (comedy was derived from *kômê*, village).<sup>48</sup> Somewhere he talked of Euripides' few victories at the festivals – with only five of his seventy-five plays; and perhaps of Menander being unfairly defeated by the inferior Philemon, through intrigue; possibly too of the number of plays Menander left.<sup>49</sup> Again we see a readiness to discuss Greek literature if it is in obvious relation to Latin; the relationship is closer than it was, for example, in historiography or antiquarianism. On the other hand, no real Greeks yet wrote, in Greek and for Greeks, on Latin literature, as they were beginning to do on Roman history and antiquities.

For the Roman drama, Varro as we would expect distinguished various *genera* and explained their names: the *palliata*, a play adapted from the Greek and set in Greece, with characters wearing the *pallium* or Greek mantle; the *togata*, set in Italy or Rome, where the toga was worn. The latter perhaps included what was later called the *praetexta* or *praetextata*, from the magistrate's bordered toga, which dealt with historical subjects; and *palliata* may have included tragedy as well as comedy.<sup>50</sup> Whether these and other names were already traditional, or are due to Varro, we do not know. He clearly also worked out a careful chronological frame; apart from the case of Livius Andronicus, Cicero tells us that Naevius' death had been dated to 204, where an old 'commentary' put it, but that Varro extended his life further, possibly to make him die in Utica in 201, as Suetonius does, an exile owing to his attacks on Roman nobles, particularly the Metelli.<sup>51</sup> This may be one of the dubious biographic constructions we have noticed, though a passage of Plautus does suggest that a *poeta barbarus* had been put in prison for some reason.<sup>52</sup> We may believe Varro however when he tells us that Naevius said himself in the *Bellum Punicum* that he had fought in the first Punic War; it seems that the previous generation of scholars may have put Naevius' date a little too low (as well as Livius' much too low), for Porcius Licinus said that poetry entered Rome in the Second Punic War.<sup>53</sup> Varro also gave a date of birth for Ennius based on the poet's own remark in *Annals* 12 that he was now in his sixty-seventh year.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Horace *Ar. Poet.* 208ff., Livy 7.2.

<sup>48</sup> *GRF* Varro frags 304, 305.

<sup>49</sup> A. Gellius 17.4.

<sup>50</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 306.

<sup>51</sup> *Brutus* 60.

<sup>52</sup> Plautus *Miles* 211. One might accept that Naevius got into hot water, but be sceptical of the details as reconstructed by scholars of c. 100 B.C. Cf. A. Gellius, 7.8.4, lines of Naevius which may well have contemporary reference – Gellius thinks to an early amorous escapade by Scipio Africanus.

<sup>53</sup> *GRF* Porcius Licinus frag. 1.

<sup>54</sup> *Ib.* Varro frag. 61.

This was very likely in the *De Poetis*, as the statement about Naevius' military service certainly was; the work was known to Cicero when he wrote the *Brutus*, in early 46. Aristotle's *De Poetis* had been a dialogue, like some later Greek incursions into the biography of poets, but there is no evidence that Varro copied him in this. We do know that he quoted an epigram on the death of Plautus, and almost certainly others on Naevius and Pacuvius (possibly also Ennius), attributing them to the poets concerned; which is not very likely, for epigrams on the deaths of great men, supposed either to be their own work or inscribed on their tombs, were a recognised feature of Hellenistic biography, and often invented by the biographer. Varro may have had them from an earlier source, though real biographers there do not seem to have been in Rome before his time.<sup>55</sup>

He clearly also, somewhere, had much consideration on methods of production and especially on scenery; here there may have been some moralising on the growth of luxury, though elsewhere we do not find Varro obtruding this into literary history. He mentioned the *scaena ductilis*, in which boards were changed to show different sets, and probably the alternative *scaena versatilis*, which swung round to reveal a new scene. It is likely that, as usually supposed, the numerous notices on similar subjects in Pliny also go back to Varro – for example, those on the famous aedileship of C. Claudius Pulcher in 99 B.C., in which painted scenery was first introduced.<sup>56</sup>

The *De Personis*, on masks, may have dealt in part with Greek conventions; we are uncertain how much masks were originally worn in Rome. In Atellane farces, played by amateurs, they were, but in tragedy and comedy may have been – or Varro may have thought they were – a recent Hellenizing introduction.<sup>57</sup> The subject was traditional; the great scholar Aristophanes of Byzantium had written on it. Perhaps from this work comes Varro's note that the old man of comedy is supposed to be sixty-five years old.<sup>58</sup> It also seems likely that Varro treated the *Heqyra* and other plays of Terence as made up of five acts, as he believed Greek ones were or should be; though he pointed out that it was not essential in Greek any more than in Latin plays that the acts should consist of an equal number of scenes or be equal in length.<sup>59</sup> Scholars now hold almost unanimously that Roman comedies of the second century were designed to be played continuously and that the authors did not think of separate acts when constructing them, and also that few Greek plays have five parts (i.e. four choral interludes). But ancient theorists, obsessed with *divisio*, were bound to look for the parts of an entity, and it may be relevant that a rhetorical speech was consciously made up of several parts.

For the history of the theatre Varro has used earlier writers (many of our references to them come through him), and probably his own experience,

<sup>55</sup> A. Gellius 1.24.3.

<sup>56</sup> GRF Varro frag. 315 and frags printed as Varro \*309-14, cf. \*316-17.

<sup>57</sup> Festus, s.v. *Personata fabula*, 238L.

<sup>58</sup> GRF Varro frag. 318 ascribes it to the *De Quaestionibus Scaenicis*. Accius frag. 22 gives an etymology for *mirio*, a word for a grotesque mask.

<sup>59</sup> Varro frag. 307.

especially for recent changes in production, but doubtless also the documents of the aediles or other magistrates responsible for the games; hence the 'old *commentarii*' referred to.<sup>60</sup> The theatrical companies, which will have continually changed and re-formed around the figure of an actor-manager, and spent much of the year on the road, would be unlikely to preserve records, and in fact the probably Varronian tradition gives us little on actors and their companies; there is no evidence that the *collegium poetarum* or the *parasiti Apollinis*, partly and wholly associations of actors, kept documents, though one would expect them to do so. A result of perhaps both Greek tradition and the nature of Varro's sources, as well as the usual Roman concentration on Rome, is that in spite of laying stress on the rustic origin of drama, and noting the birthplace (often outside Rome) of the poets, as was accepted scholarly procedure, Varro is probably still too Romanocentric; whereas to be Athenocentric had been justifiable. But we need to know more of the theatrical traditions of Magna Graecia and Campania, and of southern Latium, where most *togatae* were set – were they first produced there? Official documents similar to those at Rome probably existed in many country towns. Varro was however interested in Atellane farce, which was of Campanian origin, and gives the Oscan name of one of its stock characters;<sup>61</sup> and he did know the early comic poets of Sicily and Magna Graecia, for they were recognised literary figures.<sup>62</sup>

Some of Varro's judgments on comedy survive. He said in the satire *Parmeno* that Caecilius was supreme in plot, Terence in character, and Plautus in dialogue (*sermonibus*); the categories are Aristotelian. Aristotle had thought plot vital; it is perhaps relevant that Cicero (like Sedigitus) put Caecilius first among Roman comic writers, even if tentatively and holding that his Latin was impure. Elsewhere Varro said that Titinius ('originator' of the *togata*), Terence and Atta were alone consistent drawers of character, while Trabea, Atilius and Caecilius moved the emotions.<sup>63</sup> Where Terence is concerned, this may be related to the view of Cicero and Caesar that Terence lacked *vis*, force; it is this that moves the passions.<sup>64</sup> Caesar noted however Terence's elegant Latinity. If we learn so much less about Caecilius than about Plautus and Terence, it may be because there was a Plautine problem (of attributions) and a Terentian one (biographical) but not a Caecilian one; also because Caecilius' language did not arouse interest. He probably acted better than he read. As for Terence, Varro actually preferred the start of his

<sup>60</sup> The origin of the *didascaliae* prefixed in our MSS to Terence's plays (and two of Plautus') give date, occasion of production, the name of the main actor or actors, and of the composer; they look as if they rest on documentary evidence, but this has been doubted; their authorship and date in their present form are unknown.

<sup>61</sup> *De LL* 7.29; cf. 95.

<sup>62</sup> Donatus, *Ter. Ad. prol.* 7 puzzlingly looks back to *fabula Rhinthonica* as a form of Roman drama, perhaps meaning the sort of Atellane that involved mythological burlesque; we do not know if a direct link was postulated. Varro frag. 60 connects somebody with Sicilian writers, but this is usually thought to be Ennius in non-dramatic works.

<sup>63</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 99 (*Sat. Menipp.* 399B); *De Opt. Gen.* 1.2, *Brutus* 258; *GRF* Varro frag. 40.

<sup>64</sup> *GRF* Cicero frag. 4; Caesar frag. 31.

*Adelphoe* to that of Menander's, perhaps an over-patriotic judgment, but one which suggests that close comparisons of Roman versions with their Greek originals, such as Aulus Gellius later made for a long passage of Caecilius, were sometimes made.<sup>65</sup> Caesar's judgment of Terence as 'Menander halved' is another example, if one less flattering to Rome, of the anxiety to compare Greek and Roman writers. It is likely that Varro followed the Peripatetic biological schema and regarded Livius as the founder, Naevius as the *auctor*, and Plautus, Caecilius and Terence as representatives of the *akmê*, of the comic art; in this field, as in tragedy and epic, a theory putting the culmination of Roman literature in the second century might pass muster, as it could not have done in other genres or in prose.

Varro quoted, apparently with approval, Stilo's remark about the Muses and the language of Plautus; and he set out systematically to deal with the question of attributions. The twenty-one plays that he listed as indubitably Plautine, being impugned by no one, were later known as 'Varronian', and are probably the twenty-one we possess, the last only in part. Our MSS have them in alphabetic order, which may or may not be due to him. He also listed those he thought genuine because of the texture and humour of the language, though attributed to others; here he put the *Boeotia* ascribed to one Aquillius, which Accius had rejected. He, and others, also said that Plautus wrote three of his plays (the two names we are given are not among the 'Varronian' plays, if these are what we have) when working in a mill as the result of losing his theatrical earnings in business; this may be a doubtful deduction from passages in the works, or one of the works, concerned.<sup>66</sup> To explain the ascription to Plautus of plays he did not consider genuine, Varro seems to have dug up or invented a poet called Plautius, whose name in the genitive could have caused confusion, and he perhaps also suggested that Plautus revised the plays of others.<sup>67</sup> In fact, there are problems even with the 'Varronian' plays: for one thing, some are attributed in the prologue to a Maccus (once Macci in the genitive) and some to a Plautus, and it is not self-evident that they should be conflated to form a T. Maccius Plautus. While Maccius is a rare, though attested, name, Maccus was a stock figure of Atellane farce and might be an actor's nickname, as some think Plautus could be too.<sup>68</sup> It has been queried whether most early Roman comic writers were not working in so strict a tradition, with stock scenes and characters, that strong idiosyncrasies could hardly emerge. But this is to go against the ancient accounts of the different qualities of the different poets, perhaps elaborated by Varro in his *De Proprietatibus Scriptorum* (and the one fragment

<sup>65</sup> Ib. Varro frag. 301.31-2. With the originals to hand the question of 'Plautinisches in Plautus' should have been easier to solve than it is for us, but Pliny *NH* 18.107 suggests that the only recourse, when faced with a reference to bakers written before these were used in Rome (it was thought) was to declare the line interpolated (possibly from Varro's *De Vita PR*).

<sup>66</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 88.29-36.

<sup>67</sup> Id. ib. frag. 88.19-22, 25-9.

<sup>68</sup> Plautus, 'flat-foot', has been thought to refer to the actor of comedy with his flat shoe, or better the mime who wore no special foot-gear, as opposed to the actor of tragedy with his high boots.

of the *Peri Characteron* is about Plautus' liking for comic superlative formations). Plautus and Caecilius, though nearly contemporary, were obviously felt to be very different. To judge by what Cicero says about Ser. Clodius' ability to pronounce whether a line was by Plautus or not, the scholars relied on intuition developed by experience, rather than systematic argument.<sup>69</sup> Whatever the weaknesses of Roman work in this field, however, it should be remembered that the Alexandrians were often unreliable in their attributions, partly because of limited interest in minor poets. But doubtless neither Varro nor any other Roman scholars were in the class of Aristarchus, who was renowned for his penetrating judgment.

Comedy meant much to Varro, whose style in the *Menippean Satires* has points of contact with Plautus, while there are many references to comic authors and plays in the work. We know less of his views on tragedy, with which the Alexandrians had been less concerned, but it has been pointed out that in the *De Lingua Latina* he quotes Pacuvius more than any other tragic poet. Pacuvius' extravagant language perhaps suited Varro's Asianizing taste; Cicero once calls him Rome's best tragedian, but seems to quote plays by Ennius more often, and has an interesting passage envisaging one man saying that he likes Ennius best because his language follows common usage, another preferring Pacuvius' ornate and carefully worked style to Ennius' frequent carelessness, and a third placing Accius first.<sup>70</sup> Varro neglects the tragedies of Livius and Naevius, perhaps as too primitive. He probably regarded the genre as having reached its *akmé* with Pacuvius and Accius.

One judgment of Varro's that covers several genres is his statement that Pacuvius represents the high style, Terence the middle, and Lucilius the low – such rhetorical categories were not surprisingly sometimes applied to poetry, just as poets were much influenced by rhetoric.<sup>71</sup> We have nothing of Varro's views on didactic verse, elegy, iambus and epigram, in which his contemporaries were beginning to excel. He seems rarely to have mentioned poets even of the earlier first century (and never it seems Lucretius, whose actual style he ought not to have disliked)<sup>72</sup> and it is probable that it was his authority that reinforced the over-valuation of archaic Roman poetry against which Horace protested. But the great Alexandrian grammarians too had been largely concerned with preserving and expounding the heritage of the past.

Of the other scholars active in Varro's later years we know very little. A Maecius who distinguished Terence from an obscure Terentius Libo, from the Latin colony Fregellae, may as we saw be the Sp. Maecius who is referred to by Horace as a judge of drama and who chose plays for Pompey's games; these included an *Equus Troianus* which might be that of Livius Andronicus, which could only be of historical interest, but might well be by a later

<sup>69</sup> n. 42.

<sup>70</sup> *Orat.* 36. *Vitr.* 9. *praef.* 16 picks out Ennius and Accius as admired by lovers of literature.

<sup>71</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 322.

<sup>72</sup> The *De LL* quotes some minor poets, such as Sueius (see p. 180) who may come from the earlier first century.

author.<sup>73</sup> Santra, perhaps still in our period, denied with the new chronological sophistication that Scipio and his friends could be the nobles supposed to have helped Terence write his plays, and suggests two consulars of the right age who, he says, wrote poetry.<sup>74</sup> But the often careless Nepos insisted that Terence, Scipio and Laelius were of an age, and that he had it from a good source (perhaps oral tradition) that Laelius' wife once interrupted him when writing a passage of the *Heautontimoroumenos*.<sup>75</sup> Both these notices doubtless come from biographies of the poet; and Nepos probably found that he could already write brief biographies of Latin as well as Greek *grammatici*, though these, no more than Suetonius' *De Grammaticis*, which used Nepos, will have added up to a history of scholarship.<sup>76</sup> It was perhaps also in the late Ciceronian period that a L. Cotta distinguished the strictly grammatical works attributed to 'Ennius' from those of the great poet, ascribing them to a more recent *grammaticus*, almost certainly rightly.<sup>77</sup>

Abstract discussion of problems of literary aesthetics was something for which the impulse came on the whole from philosophy. There was a certain amount of this in Latin. Q. Laelius Archelaus, perhaps around 100 B.C., wrote *De Vitiis Virtutibusque Poematorum*.<sup>78</sup> Little is known of Varro's *De Poematis* (it was later observed that analogy would have counselled *De Poematibus*), in spite of attempts to reconstruct it.<sup>79</sup> It may date from the forties, for in the *De Lingua Latina* Varro says that when he comes to write *De Poematis* he will show that the early poets called themselves *vates*.<sup>80</sup> This has suggested that he followed in his introduction the division often found in a Greek *technê* between the art and its practitioners, with discussion of the proper name for the latter. He may then have dealt with the origin, aims, effects and so on of the art. In the *Menippean Satires* at least Varro (like Lucilius) had distinguished *poema*, a work in verse that could be as short as a two-line epigram, from *poesis*, a work with a plot, like the *Iliad* or Ennius' *Annals*.<sup>81</sup> The *De Poematis* perhaps went on to deal with the different *genera*, distinguishing primarily, no doubt, between narrative and dramatic poetry in the usual way. A fragment mentions feasts, and so perhaps the poetry sung at them, whether in Greece or Rome; a reference to Olympia suggests that Greek poetry was discussed, as we should

<sup>73</sup> p. 39. *GRF* Sp. Maecius Tarpa (Horace's scholiasts give the cognomen); *Ad F.* 7.1.1.

<sup>74</sup> *GRF* Santra frag. 13.

<sup>75</sup> *Ib.* Nepos frags 10-11.

<sup>76</sup> Books 14 and 15 of Nepos' *De Viribus Illustribus* may have been on *grammatici*.

<sup>77</sup> *GRF* 411 (Suet. *Gramm.* 1). Perhaps the L. Cotta who was Caesar's officer and wrote a political work, p. 216.

<sup>78</sup> *GRF* Laelius Archelaus test. 5.

<sup>79</sup> H. Dahlmann, *Varros Schrift De Poematis u.d. hellenistisch-römische Poetik* (1953), who thinks it might be a dialogue (the second person singular appears in frag. 64).

<sup>80</sup> *De LL* 7.36. He is almost certainly basing himself on a single line of Ennius which proves nothing of the kind; *vates* seems to have been until the Augustan period a deprecatory word for soothsayer. The etymology *vates a carminibus viendis* Varro says he will give is modelled on the Greek interpretations of *rhapsodes*. An alternative derivation from *vis* or *vesania mentis* recalls Greek *mantis* from *mania*.

<sup>81</sup> *GRF* Varro frag. 96 (*Sat. Menipp.* 398B); Lucilius 338-46 Marx.

expect.<sup>82</sup> The work then was by no means wholly theoretical.

Varro's distinction of *poema* and *poesis* is perhaps related to, though not identical with, the Greek definitions which link the first with style and the second with content. Thus Posidonius, in his introductory work on diction, which was surely read in Rome: *poiēma* is diction that is metrical, and more elaborate than prose, *poiēsis* is poetic diction that is significant, and portrays, 'imitates', things human and divine.<sup>83</sup> This is not wholly unlike the usage attributed by Philodemus to the third-century Peripatetic Neoptolemus of Parium (whom we are told Horace later followed in the *Ars Poetica*). But Philodemus himself did not think style and content could be separated; for him, it appears, *poiēsis* meant a whole work, *poiēma* a passage from it.<sup>84</sup>

His work *On Poetry* is one of his most interesting productions; Book 5 is not too badly preserved, and work continues on the other fragments dealing with the subject. As usual, his approach is strongly polemical; he attacks especially the Peripatetics and Stoics, and those he calls 'the critics'. He was of course a practising poet himself, but in spite of Epicurus' lack of interest in literature there were Epicurean works on poetry by Zeno of Sidon and others, which Philodemus used.<sup>85</sup> As often, the Epicureans diverged from the dominant ancient tradition. Poetry as such, it is argued, is not moral or educational, not even Homer's: he knew his facts, but did he set them down for didactic ends? Thus allegorical interpretation is unnecessary, and Philodemus rejects it; the poet need not be a repository of learning on all subjects. Poetry also does not imitate life: reality and the fabulous can be represented with equal vividness, though myths should be carefully chosen, as they were by Homer and Sophocles. The great geographer and polymath Eratosthenes, as we know, had also rejected usefulness as the object of poetry, saying that this was *psuchagôgia*, enchantment or psychological domination (not quite equivalent to pleasure). This was a theory that Philodemus certainly discussed, though it is not entirely clear what his attitude to it was.<sup>86</sup>

His other important recoverable contention was, as we saw, that style and content cannot be divorced. A subject becomes different if the expression is different, as in plays by Sophocles and Euripides on the same myth. Even to change the order of words changes the whole poem. Poetry, *poiēma*, involves style, thought, action, characterisation. Attempts to isolate a single quality as essential to poetry – brevity, magnificence, euphony – are on the wrong track. In particular, Philodemus deplors the critics who put too much stress on euphony, as he thinks the Stoics also do (perhaps this was partly the result of their belief that words imitate reality). The cynicising Stoic Aristo of Chios

<sup>82</sup> GRF Varro frags 64, 67.

<sup>83</sup> Frag. 44 E and K.

<sup>84</sup> Philod. *On Poetry* 5 ed. C. Jensen, 11; *Ad Q.F.* 2.10.3, *Lucreti poemata* has been taken to refer to technique in the Posidonian sense; Shackleton Bailey thinks it could refer to 'passages', extracts, in the Philodemian.

<sup>85</sup> Including Demetrius of Laconia. Many of Philodemus' butts, including Neoptolemus, whose handbook on poetics seems to have popularised Aristotle's views, were probably only known second-hand.

<sup>86</sup> Philod. op. cit. 13.10; cf. Strabo 1.C15.

thought 'arrangement of words', *synthesis*, and *euphonia* are judged by the ear; and Crates held that the thought or ideas of a poem, the *dianoia*, are really the business of the philosopher, not of the poet as such. Philodemus on the other hand was convinced that poetry was a true *technê*, and was to be judged by the reason or intelligence.<sup>87</sup> He tries to give rules – the ideas of a poem should not be too abstruse or too commonplace, the style, it seems, should be straightforward (his own epigrams, usually erotic, could be seen as answering to these demands, especially as to the rejection of moral or didactic content; he can hardly have approved of Lucretius' work, if he knew it). The preference for simplicity of language perhaps links up with his views on the naturally beautiful style for literary prose, but the *On Poetry* and *On Rhetoric* are not closely related. One also remembers his insistence that music had no moral effects, though he gives disappointingly little analysis of the pleasure it gives.

Philodemus also dealt with the subject of the imitation of earlier models, which was becoming crucial in the Hellenistic period, with its tendency to erudition and nostalgia. He sensibly remarks that one should imitate earlier poets only with discretion, and perhaps that one should try to improve on them. He ridicules those who define good poetry as poetry like Homer's – this leaves his excellence unexplained; and he points out that no poet, however great, is great all the time or great in all different genres.<sup>88</sup>

Cicero knew that style and content cannot be split, and there have been attempts to argue that he may have known either Philodemus' work or other Epicurean treatises on poetry, though he claims that no one save adherents of the school reads Epicurean writings;<sup>89</sup> but the to our eyes rather attractive refusal to insist on poetry being improving never caught on among the Romans – Horace's famous formulation, of mixing the useful with the delightful, was found preferable. The insistence that even word-order makes a poem what it is and cannot be split from content is also a wise one; but the form/content antithesis was too tempting to be done away with.

On the whole, ancient literary criticism may seem to us to be disappointing, too concerned with categorisation and with attempts to find rules for what, if it was to be defended, had to be claimed as a *technê* or *ars*. This is so even with most of the best Greeks (Longinus' famous work *On the Sublime* is often felt to stand alone, among what survives to us, for its sensitivity). But there have been other periods, most notably the Renaissance, when critics have been able to do no sort of justice to the immense achievements of contemporary poets, and have shown no real comprehension of what they were trying to do, let alone been able to create a satisfactory framework for literature as such.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Philod. op. cit. 20, 21, 24.

<sup>88</sup> *Ib.*, op. cit. 30, 34.

<sup>89</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.8. Cicero admired Theophrastus' work on style. There have been inconclusive efforts to show that Varro and Catullus also knew Philodemus' work.

<sup>90</sup> There seems to have been little work on prose authors from a grammatical point of view, but the *Anecdoton Parisinum* (see n. 13) says that *Varros Henniuss Haelius* also used the *notae* for works by *historici*; there had been Alexandrian commentaries on Herodotus and Thucydides. Bonner, op. cit. in n. 13, tries to argue that the *historici* are the dramatic poets.

## CHAPTER NINETEEN

# Philosophy

Philosophy was not usually regarded as one of the basic subjects of the *enkkyklios paideia*, though it could not be denied that it was a discipline suited to a free man. If studied at all, it was usually studied after the other subjects had had their turn, and they were often regarded as a necessary, or desirable, preliminary – particularly by the Stoics, though not by the Epicureans nor, obviously, the Cynics, to whom all worldly leaning was valueless. Varro must have accepted this pattern, for it is certain that his *De Philosophia* was not one of the nine books of his *Disciplinae*. Vitruvius boldly turned the system upside down (hardly without Greek precedent) asserting that philosophy was one of the subjects ancillary to architecture. But Cicero cannot formally devalue philosophy, for all that he regards the orator, or rather the true statesman, as the highest type of man: for him, oratory and philosophy – which means ethics and politics as well as dialectic – are the two parts, now sadly split, of a single whole, to which the earliest philosophers had devoted themselves.<sup>1</sup> In this he diverged, perhaps not from Philo, but from his teacher of rhetoric Apollonius Molon, who wrote a book against philosophy – and was not the only distinguished rhetor to do so.<sup>2</sup> But we have seen something of the long quarrel between rhetoric and philosophy, and the attempts to resolve it.

It may seem that a discussion of philosophy in late Republican Rome is bound to be very barren if we pass over, as we must do here, Cicero's attempt to provide a serious introduction in Latin to all its main branches, which while it reflected primarily Philo's still somewhat sceptical Academy, though sometimes hankering, where ethics were concerned, after the heroic views of the Stoics, should also draw a broad picture of the doctrines and arguments of the other schools, presented with the open-mindedness that a Sceptic ought to show. But there was perhaps more philosophic writing in Latin, even if mostly untechnical, before Cicero than is always remembered, and its character is perhaps rather different from what might be expected. In particular, there was enough interest in *physica*, natural science, which still counted usually as a branch of philosophy, to make the common generalisation about the Romans' philosophic interests being confined to ethics not wholly fair (quite apart from the position of *dialectica*, which we have already looked at). And there are serious and interesting problems as to what was happening among those writing at Rome in this period in the Greek language.

A good deal of general knowledge about the tenets of the various schools,

<sup>1</sup> *De Or.* 3.56ff. I am not sure if 3.127 explicitly counts philosophy (science, ethics and politics) among the *liberales doctrinae*, as it does the literary and mathematical arts.

<sup>2</sup> DL 3.34.

which is of course by no means the same thing as an ability or desire to engage in philosophic argument, had seeped into Rome by the middle of the first century B.C., in the first instance through the poets, both the satirist Lucilius and the dramatists – the authors of comedy and mime could name individual thinkers as the tragic poets could not.<sup>3</sup> The first work in prose, or partly in prose, to set beside them was probably Varro's *Menippean Satires*, which date from fairly early in his career (perhaps the seventies) and which seem to have contained a good deal of philosophy suited to the *minus docti*, the not specially learned (though probably the upper class).<sup>4</sup> The philosophy concerned was mainly ethical, in accordance with the moral aim of the *Satires*, but there was reference also to physical theories (was the universe created and will it perish?) and to logic (a comic battle between two sorts of syllogism).<sup>5</sup> By no means all the satires were primarily concerned with philosophy, but it is clear that Varro (whom we would hardly guess from this work to have been a loyal adherent of the 'Old Academy' of Antiochus of Ascalon) affects the Cynic posture of Menippus, the third-century philosopher whose writings were his model; this is most obviously shown by the number of titles of individual satires involving dogs, and the frequent references to Diogenes.<sup>6</sup> Varro's Cynicism is superficial; he is more concerned with the simple life in accordance with *mos maiorum* than the simple life in accordance with nature, is not preaching to the humble, and holds that the good citizen must obey the law and worship the gods. Cynic literature had often mocked other philosophical schools, and Varro's work does so too; but he valued learning highly, saying that Truth was the foster-daughter of Attic philosophy. The Epicureans made an easy butt, but Varro or a speaker points out that Roman debauchees misinterpret Epicurus' idea of pleasure.<sup>7</sup> The paradoxes concerning the perfect Stoic sage are ridiculed, but his power to bear either good or evil fortune is brought out, and Stoic ideas about suicide, and about the passions as Furies, seem to provide Varro with material, while he retails Stoic theory about *pneuma* and the soul, and about the periodic destruction of the world.<sup>8</sup> Both Stoic and Epicurean ideas about the gods are laughed at, like the monstrosity of the views some philosophers are capable of holding, and the pretensions of some bearded members of the profession. One satire was called *Peri Haeresiôn*, though it is not clear whether this should be translated *On the Sects*, as by this date it could be, or simply *On Choices*: it dealt with the various possible 'ends' in life, using the image of roads diverging to different destinations, which Varro also used elsewhere, speaking of the road made by Carneades, and the noble road of Zeno the founder of Stoicism.<sup>9</sup> A

<sup>3</sup> See p. 53.

<sup>4</sup> *Acad.* 1.8, also for the date, and note *multa dicta dialectice*.

<sup>5</sup> *Men. Sat.* 84B and cf. the title *Kosmotorunê* or *Peri phthoras kosmou*; 291B.

<sup>6</sup> K. Mras *NJA* (1914) 390 for the relation with Cynic literature. Diogenes, 281, 444, 469, 517B. Menippus, 516, 542B.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* ib. 265, 141, 315B.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* ib. 245, 172, 170ff., 222ff.

<sup>9</sup> 583, 122, 419B: Glucker, *op. cit.* on p. 7. 189n. 67; 402, 483-4B; probably cf. the *Triodites Tnipulios* or *peri aretês ktêseôs*, 560B (based on an account of the Pythagorean Empedotimus of Syracuse).

couple of satires are set among quarrelling philosophers, in the best attested case Stoics and Epicureans, and at least one seems to have involved an imaginary voyage round the land of philosophy. A number of particular figures are evoked: Socrates' distinctive appearance and way of life are described, and he was probably praised for bringing philosophy down to earth and valuing knowledge of the self above all else; Empedocles' theory on the origin of man appears, so do Heraclides Ponticus and Democritus, and two mentions of Aristotle are preserved (though by curious chance none of Plato).<sup>10</sup> The genre being informal, Greek terms are freely retained. Perhaps it is partly thanks to the *Menippeans* that Cicero can say that the paradox of the *Sorites* (how many grains make a heap?) is quite familiar in Latin under its original name.<sup>11</sup>

The first straight treatises in Latin on philosophical subjects would seem however to be the Epicurean works of which Cicero was so contemptuous, those of Amafinius, clearly the earliest,<sup>12</sup> of Rabirius (perhaps as we saw Campanian)<sup>13</sup> and, lately dead in 46, Catius, the Insubrian Gaul from northern Italy.<sup>14</sup> It is to be noted that the Epicurean Cassius in his letter to Cicero makes no effort to defend these authors, and indeed it is he who calls them unsatisfactory translators, perhaps especially of philosophic terms, which echoes Cicero's complaint that they were untechnical and so hard to understand; though one can never be sure that Cicero is being quite as fair as he claims to be where the school is concerned.<sup>15</sup> He also says that being Epicurean, and being Latin, they were only read by Italian adherents of the school.<sup>16</sup> In fact Quintilian tells us that Catius' work was not unattractive, though it lacked authority; it seems to have consisted of four books, on physics (*de rerum natura*) and ethics;<sup>17</sup> physics and ethics are of course closely linked in the Epicurean system, and knowledge of the workings of nature will free man from fear of the gods and of death.

It seems possible that there were even less serious works on Stoicism, which Cicero in the *Academica*, justifying his decision to write philosophy in Latin, does not deign to refer to at all; for the *rustici Stoici* put forward by Cassius as still less polished and Attic than Catius are most naturally taken as writers rather than simply teachers – though even teachers of Stoicism in Latin in 46 would be interesting. In fact, as we noted earlier, the Stoics who appear in Horace's *Satires*, notably Stertinius, might already have been active.<sup>18</sup> Nepos

<sup>10</sup> *Logomachia*, 242-3B; *Skiamachia*, 506-10B; *Periplous* (Book 2 was *peri philosophias*); perhaps the *Sesculixes*. Socrates, 6, 99, 490, cf. 207; Empedocles, 163; Democritus and Heraclides, 81; Aristotle, 128, 543. Also Antipater the Stoic, 291.

<sup>11</sup> *De Div.* 2.11.

<sup>12</sup> *Acad.* 1.5, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.6; 2.7; 4.6. Amafinius the first, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.7.

<sup>13</sup> See p. 23.

<sup>14</sup> *Ad Fam.* 15.16.1.

<sup>15</sup> *Ad Fam.* 15.19.1-2.

<sup>16</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.8.

<sup>17</sup> Quint. 10.1.124; Porph. *ap. Hor. Sat.* 2.4.1 – it is still disputed whether the Catius in this satire is the Epicurean.

<sup>18</sup> See p. 53. I am not clear if *Hort. frag.* 21Gr. (set before 61) implies the existence of a short work *De Officiis* in Latin (philosophic colour unclear).

says that before Cicero philosophy in Latin was unpolished – not that there was none at all; but he might have been referring simply to the Epicureans, and possibly Varro.<sup>19</sup>

The first surviving philosophic work in Latin is of course Lucretius' great poem, which dates from the fifties, but while it was admired and influential as literature, it cannot be shown that it was authoritative as philosophy; Lucretius is not mentioned in later philosophic writings, and as we have seen was perhaps not closely in touch with Epicurean or other philosophic circles in his own time. The other philosophic poem referred to by Cicero, Sallustius' unreadable *Empedoclea*, is obviously even less in the mainstream, but it is worth noting that, as its mention in the same breath with Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* suggests, it was probably based on Empedocles' *Peri Phuseôs* rather than his religious poem, and thus is another document of Roman interest in 'physics' and cosmology, and also of their interest in archaic Greek philosophers of the West (Empedocles, a Sicilian, is said to have moved to Thurii in Italy, a site now a Roman colony). The *Peri Phuseôs* of Empedocles was also an inspiration to Lucretius, as a poem on nature, but possibly also because its doctrine of the four elements, mingling and separating under the influence of Love and Strife, was a fore-runner of atomic theories; at the same time, Empedocles was influenced by Pythagoras and Parmenides, who worked in Italy. Yet another first-century poem, perhaps the earliest of all, was the *De Rerum Natura* of one Egnatius: the two fragments are mythologico-astronomical.<sup>20</sup>

The first dialogue on ethics in Latin may have been (it is not always remembered) the *De Virtute* of Brutus, dedicated to Cicero and referred to politely by him in 44 B.C.<sup>21</sup> We are already right at the end of our period. But it is uncertain if this could be one of Nepos 'unpolished' pre-Ciceronian works. Cicero insists in 46 that Brutus is an Academic, not a Stoic,<sup>22</sup> though as a follower of Antiochus and friend of Antiochus' brother Aristus his position was not far distant from that of the Stoics. Indeed, if Cicero's account of the matter is correct, Brutus held that virtue alone was sufficient to make life blessed, which was not quite what Antiochus thought, but was what the Stoics did. But Cicero, and Seneca who gives a similar impression, may be oversimplifying.<sup>23</sup> At all events, Brutus' work showed M. Marcellus living in exile in Mytilene, after the battle of Pharsalus, but leading none the less a life 'as blessed as human nature will allow', devoting his time to rhetoric and philosophy. Those who go into exile can take their virtues with them. Indeed

<sup>19</sup> Nepos, frag. cf. *De Historicis Latinis*. A possible Epicurean treatise by Atticus' friend Saufeius, see p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> *Ad Q.F.* 2.10.3 (54 B.C.); Sallustius is probably not the historian but Cicero's friend Cn. Sallustius, who had intellectual or literary interests. *Macrob. Sat.* 6.5.2, 12. O. Skutsch, *PW V* (1905) 1993 thinks Egnatius might be the grinning butt of Catullus 39, from Spain.

<sup>21</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.1.1. If it is as Hendrickson *AJP* (1939) 401 argues the letter of Brutus from Asia to Cicero in 47 that encouraged him to return to literary work (*Brutus* 10-11, 330) it is earlier; but this is dubious.

<sup>22</sup> *Parad. Stoic. praef.* 2.

<sup>23</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.12; *Sen. Ad Helv.* 8.1, 9.4-6.

Brutus said that in returning to Rome without Marcellus he felt that he was going into exile rather than returning from it, and added that Caesar had sailed past Mytilene without putting in because he did not wish to see Marcellus in disgrace.<sup>24</sup>

Quintilian put Brutus' dialogues higher than his speeches, noting their obvious sincerity.<sup>25</sup> But Seneca was to think his *De Officiis* unsatisfactory, on the grounds that it dealt in detail with individual duties, especially within the family and household, not with the nature of duty as a whole (the usual Roman difficulty in generalising?).<sup>26</sup> The chronological relation of the work to Cicero's of the same name is not clear. A *De Patientia* is also attested, and perhaps sounds Stoic;<sup>27</sup> it may be that towards the end of his life, under the influence of his uncle Cato and then of Cato's memory, Brutus came to feel that Stoic ethics were not the impractical system that Cicero, indicating Cato's isolation, suggests they were usually thought to be.<sup>28</sup>

Varro had more serious claims than the *Menippeans* towards being regarded as a philosopher. Jerome in fact calls him 'philosopher and poet', the historian Appian 'philosopher and historian'; more significantly he and Brutus are Cicero's preferred dedicatees for the philosophic treatises. His own specifically philosophic works, in view of what is said by Cicero in the preface to the *Academica*, must belong to the later part of his long life – though the *Academica* does claim that the philosophy in the prefaces of the *Antiquitates* was written 'for philosophers', unlike that in the satires.<sup>29</sup> Augustine reveals that in his *De Philosophia* Varro adhered closely to the doctrine of his old teacher Antiochus who, claiming to revive the Old Academy, took the retreat from the Sceptical development of the school, personified by Carneades, further than Philo had. This work of Varro's really did identify philosophy and ethics: philosophy's only object is to make man *beatus*, blessed. We have briefly noted the extraordinary fashion in which Varro establishes that there are 288 possible positions on the proper end of man, and then narrows the choice down to the one true view, that of Antiochus.<sup>30</sup> This is an elaboration of the *Carneadea divisio*, which Cicero says was much used by Antiochus; Carneades only reached six single and three composite ends. But Varro introduces four variables which he subsequently dismisses as unimportant – whether one believes life should be solitary or social, whether one holds one's views to be certain or probable, whether one lives like a Cynic or not, whether one prefers the 'theoretical' to the 'practical' life or wishes to combine them. To decide on the proper end of man one must consider what man is. Is he simply soul or simply body? No: he is both, and both must be taken into

<sup>24</sup> Sen. *ib.* 9.6.

<sup>25</sup> Quint. 10.1.123.

<sup>26</sup> Sen. *Ep.* 95.45.

<sup>27</sup> Diom. *GLK* I 383.8.

<sup>28</sup> *Parad. Stoic.* 2-4. Earlier in his work on Cato, there may have been a philosophical discussion of suicide, rejecting it on religious grounds; see Plut. *Brut* 40 (J. Moles, *Latomus* (1983) 763).

<sup>29</sup> Jerome *Chron.* 106 B.C.; Appian, *BC* 4.47; *Acad.* 1.8 (the *Antiquitates Humanae* may possibly date from the fifties, seep. 236, the *Divinae* perhaps from 46).

<sup>30</sup> Aug. *Civ. Dei* 19.1-3.

account. Thus the *summum bonum* is virtue, but associated with those bodily goods without which virtue cannot exist. Life is more blessed if it has a greater share of these goods, most blessed if it has them all. Such a life will be social: the virtuous man loves the good of his friends for its own sake, whether they be his family, his fellow-citizens, his fellow human beings, or all the inhabitants of the universe (for man should be a friend of the gods). The life most likely to provide opportunities for blessedness is a combination of the theoretical or contemplative and the practical or active.<sup>31</sup>

Varro also wrote three books *De Forma Philosophiae*; if *forma*, as has been argued, is to be taken in the sense it once seems to bear in the *De Lingua Latina*, it means 'nature', or perhaps 'outline'. The work will thus have been a general one.<sup>32</sup> Further, some of the *logistorici*, serious dialogues, probably of fairly late date, may have had philosophical subjects. It has been suggested that the *Orestes de insania* dealt not with clinical madness but the Stoic paradox 'all fools are mad', and the *Marcellus* might have been inspired by Brutus' dialogue on Virtue, in which a Marcellus played a leading role.<sup>33</sup>

To Vitruvius, the two aspects of philosophy which the architect should have studied diligently are ethics, which will make him high-minded, and *physiologia*. Study of the latter is needed partly so that he may understand the writings of Ctesibius and Archimedes on engineering, but primarily, it appears, to cope with problems of water-supply.<sup>34</sup> In Book 8 Vitruvius turns in due course to hydrology, starting with some primitive methods of finding water (lie flat on the ground at dawn and see where vapours rise), and with an attempt to explain precipitation: the vapours from the earth form clouds, which being driven by winds (themselves formed by the moisture, which drives air before it, leaving void behind it into which air is sucked) strike against the mountains and then fall as rain; the theory is obviously incomplete.

The different qualities of rivers and springs are attributed to the effect of the juices in the soil through which they flow, which also affects plants, animals and man; reeds are only aromatic in Arabia. The hand of Posidonius has inevitably been suspected, as the soils and juices are determined by the power of the sun, as well as the inclination of the firmament, but Theophrastus' *On Water* may be at the back of much of the passage. There is some rather confused discussion of the richness of the north in waters – all rivers are said to flow from the north, including the Rhine and the Po, and there are other geographical confusions.<sup>35</sup> Vitruvius then lists a great many springs and rivers with peculiar qualities, mentioned by Greek authors, mostly historians (he probably did not do the collecting himself), or else seen by him. He tries, perhaps on his own account, to get some order into the list and give causes for the different effects, which he says can be tried out

<sup>31</sup> Id. ib. 19.3.

<sup>32</sup> *De LL* 7.109; see H. Dahlmann, *PW Suppl.* VI (1935) 1261.

<sup>33</sup> And the *Imagines* must have had biographical information on selected philosophers.

<sup>34</sup> *Vitr.* 1.1.7.

<sup>35</sup> Id. 8.1-2.

in many cases by experiment; but a good deal in the way of mere *paradoxa* remains. He also gives simple recipes for testing the purity of water (boil it in a bronze vessel, and if there is no deposit all is well). While discussing the practical aspects of bringing water to a city (based on his own experience) and how to take an exact level, he reassures the reader that it is no obstacle that, as Archimedes thought, the surface of water is not truly level but follows the curve of the earth's surface. He rightly notes that lead pipes are harmful to health, but seems to assume non-existent problems with air pressure at the bottom of the pipe in an inverted siphon (a U-shaped pipe used to cross a valley).<sup>36</sup>

Winds and waters were, since Aristotle defined the subject, part of *meteorologia*, which discussed the physics of everything below the stars (which came under astronomy; but comets were sometimes seen as earthly exhalations). A more substantial account of a part of meteorology was given by Nigidius Figulus in his *De Vento*, in at least four books but with few fragments surviving. On the etesians (he keeps the Greek word), the steady north winds of summer, and the contrary *austri anniversarii* of winter, Nigidius is closely dependent on Aristotle's view that the sun, which causes winds by drawing up exhalations, approaches closer to the north in summer and the south in winter; but our admittedly inadequate fragments seem not to show knowledge of Aristotle's distinction between hot and dry exhalations (of which smoke is one) and watery, steaming ones – it is the first kind that causes winds; and Nigidius' probable reference simply to the 'thickening' of air as responsible for these may rest on post-Aristotelian sources. One might expect use of Posidonius at this period, but his meteorology is not as easy to reconstruct as has been sometimes thought. Nigidius is markedly interested, perhaps in Book 4 of the *De Vento* only, in the signs that presage particular winds or other kinds of weather: black marks on the upper horn of the moon mean rain, (probably) thickened air giving moon or sun a red tinge foreshadows storm.<sup>37</sup> He might have taken from the Aristotelian *Problemata* the view that a pale sun setting amid black clouds presages a north wind;<sup>38</sup> but this was not in the *Meteorologica*, and perhaps the interest in signs and weather, which we have already seen in Roman versions of astronomy and zoology, is a mark of their much-discussed practicality.

Varro clearly had much to say about meteorology; the *Ephemeris Navalis*, written for Pompey in the seventies, as well as its naval calendar seems to have perhaps had general discussion of the sea and winds, with much about weather-signs.<sup>39</sup> The work is sometimes identified with the *De Ora Maritima*, which in addition to information about sea-ways in the Western Mediterranean retailed the theory of the *docti* that wind is simply air in lateral movement, and dealt with individual winds, their names and seasons.<sup>40</sup> And

<sup>36</sup> Id. ib. 3-6; A.T. Hodge *PBSR* (1983) 174. Vitruvius does not discuss canals for transport, not unknown to the Romans in our period; it is not clear if locks were used.

<sup>37</sup> Nigidius frags 104-6 Swob.

<sup>38</sup> Id. frag. 106; Arist. *Probl.* 26.8 (not close).

<sup>39</sup> If they are identical with the *Libri Navales* of Vegetius 4.41.

<sup>40</sup> *Serv. Aen.* 5.19, cf. 1.108, 112.

Seneca reports Varro's views on the winds: one main and two subsidiary ones from each quarter of the horizon, defined in terms of where the sun rises or sets at different astronomical seasons of the year, such as the equinox, and so of the circles marked on the heavenly sphere. His sources are clearly Greek, as some of the winds have no Latin names; not all twelve are found in all countries, and there was probably a list of local winds and discussion of various names.<sup>41</sup>

As we saw, Vitruvius had trouble in setting up his rose of the winds.<sup>42</sup> His basic physical theory seems to be the atomism of Democritus, whom he clearly reveres, referring to him in various different contexts, and of Epicurus; he notes that the Romans have sometimes called atoms *insecabilia*, which is the term later found in Seneca and Quintilian, and sometimes *individua*, which is Cicero's word.<sup>43</sup> It seems likely that a rather vague atomism was widely held (but there is no evidence that Vitruvius knew Asclepiades' version of it).

Whatever the shortcomings of philosophy written in Latin, certain developments important to the history of Greek philosophy may have taken place in Rome, or at least in Italy. Even if, as we argued, Philo was not actually writing for his Roman pupils, the work that he produced in Rome in the eighties, stressing the unity of the Academic tradition and denying that recent sceptical developments were un-Platonic (he perhaps tried to argue that Plato was less hostile to sense-perception than he really was) at least caused a philosophical row, enraging his ex-pupil Antiochus, then in the East with Lucullus, who wrote his *Sosus* in rebuttal; Philo probably replied, calling Antiochus a Stoic, no true Academic. How important all this was hinges on the date at which Antiochus is supposed to have seceded from Philo's entourage – the *Sosus* was not necessarily the first occasion of his doing so – and how much importance Antiochus is thought to have had in influencing what we know as 'Middle Platonism', which was to emerge in the East. There is at present little agreement on these matters.<sup>44</sup>

Next, there is the revival of Aristotelian studies in our period. As we have seen, the library of Apellicon, which Sulla had brought from Athens to Italy, contained the books owned by Aristotle and Theophrastus; this much seems likely, even if the account of their earlier vicissitudes is over-dramatised, and though it is not true that the 'esoteric' works of Aristotle, as opposed to the more popular 'exoteric' ones, which included the dialogues, had fallen completely out of sight. Apellicon had published an edition of Aristotle's

<sup>41</sup> Sen. *NQ* 5.16-17.

<sup>42</sup> See p. 160.

<sup>43</sup> Vitruv. 2.2.1; 9 *praef.* 14, 5.4. Cicero and Lucretius refer repeatedly to Democritus; the mimographer Laberius mentions him (fr. 72 Ribb.).

<sup>44</sup> Glucker, *op. cit.* on p. 7, thinks Antiochus diverged from Philo in the nineties. Sedley, *op. cit.* on p. 58, in the early eighties, before he knew Philo's Roman work. Glucker minimises Antiochus' later importance, compared, for example, to Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (1977), 105. Glucker thinks Cicero's speech in *Acad.* 2.64ff. is based entirely on Philo's reply to the *Sosus*, Sedley only in part. (For the existence of this reply, Aug. *Contra Acad.* 3.41.)

esoteric works, unsatisfactory owing to his defective philosophical understanding; in Rome or Campania the grammarian Tyrannio, a 'lover of Aristotle' though no philosopher, ingratiated himself with the librarian and was able to arrange and catalogue the manuscripts; and another unsatisfactory edition or editions, for which careless commercial booksellers were responsible, came into circulation. But the philosopher Andronicus of Rhodes was subsequently able, with Tyrannio's help, to issue the famous edition which is, in fact, what we now possess. Andronicus probably worked in Campania, unless the books were moved to Rome, but there are still some who think that he could have done so in Athens (though the evidence for his being scholar of the Lyceum is very thin; the position probably did not now exist).<sup>45</sup>

Strabo, who tells us this, was a pupil of Tyrannio, and studied Aristotle in Rome with, or beside, Boethus of Sidon in the thirties; most of his story must be true. But though the Peripatetic school was certainly more or less in eclipse in the second and early first centuries, Panaetius, Posidonius and Antiochus – Stoics and a Stoicising Academic – all admired Aristotle. There was some interest in him among Romans too around the middle of the first century; Atticus, perhaps most inspired by Aristotle's political and historical work, had a bust of him presiding over his library, and Cicero, who considered Aristotle only less great than Plato, depicts himself in the *De Finibus* as going to Lucullus' library to find the *commentarii*, the technical or esoteric works. He owned the *Topica*, and probably also the *Rhetorica*, but he certainly studied these more closely than most of his contemporaries; indeed, he said that Aristotle was only known by a few professional philosophers.<sup>46</sup> He must have read these works in a pre-Andronican edition; this is also shown by the fact that he perhaps attributes the *Politics* to Theophrastus and thinks that the *Nicomachean Ethics* were probably by Nicomachus.<sup>47</sup> Some at least of Aristotle's works on scientific subjects, like those of Theophrastus, were probably known directly by Varro, Nigidius and possibly Cicero; but again, as we saw, Cicero's intention of using Cratippus to confute Nigidius in a projected dialogue suggests that few Roman nobles knew much of Peripatetic science.

Since Cicero never refers to Andronicus, the latter probably began his work after 43 B.C.; around 30 B.C. Dionysius of Halicarnassus knows it. Andronicus appears to have tried to organise the Aristotelian corpus as a system, inspired by Stoic ideas on the relationship of the different parts of philosophy, rather than with a regard for chronology. We do not have the work (in at least five books) in which he seems to have discussed the genuineness of the various treatises, on grounds of language, relation to other works, and methods of argument, and to have commented on their doctrines. We are told that he reproduced Aristotle's will, but there is no evidence of a full biography,

<sup>45</sup> Strabo 13.C609; Plut. *Sulla* 26. Lynch, op. cit. on p. 11, 146ff. Strabo as pupil and fellow student 12.C548, 16.C757.

<sup>46</sup> *Ad Att.* 4.10.1; *De Fin.* 3.10 (5.12 for *commentarii* as the esoteric works); *Topica* 1-3.

<sup>47</sup> *De Fin.* 5.11-12.

though he inserted a bogus series of letters supposed to have passed between Aristotle and his pupil Alexander the Great while the latter was in the East; this concerned the distinction between the 'esoteric' or 'acroatic' works, and the 'exoteric' ones, and the publication of the latter. The account of Aristotle lecturing on one level in the morning at the Lyceum and on the other in the evening, the 'morning walk' and the 'evening walk' of the Peripatos, may also come from Andronicus.<sup>48</sup>

The transfer of Aristotelian studies to Rome or Italy was temporary and far from complete, but among the authors of Aristotelian commentaries such as now began to appear both Boethius of Sidon and Nicolaus of Damascus were to work there. Andronicus also organised and published Theophrastus' works, though this naturally had somewhat less impact.<sup>49</sup> It seems that Italy had been the scene of an important philosophic event.

Even more problematic is the question whether the revival of Pythagoreanism was due to an impulse from Rome. This, basically a movement towards the fusion of philosophy and mystical religion, was to be of great importance in the intellectual history of later antiquity. In the preface to his incomplete translation of Plato's Pythagoreanising *Timaeus*, which seems to have been part of a projected dialogue, Cicero attributes the revival of the sect, after a long interval, to his friend Nigidius Figulus. Nigidius was recently dead, and the polite tribute need not perhaps be taken too seriously. Cicero is looking back, of course, to the break-up of the Pythagorean societies in Magna Graecia in the fifth century, and the extinction of Pythagoreanism as a serious philosophy in the fourth, late enough for it to have influenced Plato and for Aristotle and his pupils to have been able to record the views of the last members of the school (among whom indeed Aristoxenus of Tarentum could also count himself one); though historians of Magna Graecia, or of great philosophers, continued to take an interest in it, and at an unorganised and popular level some kind of Pythagoreanism, as we noted, survived in southern Italy.<sup>50</sup>

Nigidius' main claim to have revived the school rests on his foundation of some sort of society, as we saw, devoted to occult practices. Jerome calls him *Pythagoricus et magus*, and Nigidius seems to have interpreted the tale that Pythagoras studied in the East (which goes back to the fourth century – indeed Herodotus took him to Egypt) as showing that he practised the various forms of oriental magic becoming popular in the first century B.C. in Rome. But none of Nigidius' admittedly meagre fragments mention Pythagoras, and among his works there are none devoted to ethics or politics, mathematics, musical theory or arithmology, the genuine interests of the early Pythagoreans (Varro might seem the better Pythagorean of the two). Cicero however tells us that Pythagoras regarded the primeval sage who gave names to things as supremely wise, and the Pythagoreans took seriously the 'omens' in chance utterances; perhaps such a belief helped to justify Nigidius'

<sup>48</sup> I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (1957) 432. A. Gellius, 20.5.

<sup>49</sup> Porph. *Life of Plot.* 24.

<sup>50</sup> *Tim.* 1.1.

interest in language.<sup>51</sup> The old Pythagorean interest in astronomy, with the belief that Pythagoras must have met astrology on his travels, would warrant Nigidius' concern with the latter subject. Moreover the slight connection of early Graeco-Italian medicine with the school, and the probable existence of pseudo-Pythagorean writings on the virtues of plants and other natural objects, may partly explain the 'scientific' works of Nigidius. One fragment of Nigidius might deal with purification by fasting, though it could be merely physiological or medical: 'we ourselves break our fasts with light snacks.'<sup>52</sup> But even if Nigidius had written on more strictly Pythagorean lines, it is unlikely that Greek philosophers would have been able or willing to read him. The restoration of Pythagorean elements to serious philosophy seems to have taken place in Alexandria with Eudorus in the middle or late first century B.C.; he turned back to the fourth-century Greek sources.

It remains true that the Romans thought of Pythagoreanism as in a sense theirs, because it had been practised on Italian soil: the Greeks often called it 'the Italian philosophy'. Aristoxenus had actually said that Pythagoras had had Roman pupils, as well as many from the Italian tribes. Cicero claimed that there were many traces of Pythagorean influence at Rome, though he would only mention a few: the belief, now shown to be chronologically erroneous, as he points out, that King Numa had been a pupil of the great man; the statue of Pythagoras set up in the Forum in, it was thought, the fourth century; the Pythagorean tinge, as Cicero saw it, of the writings of Appius Claudius Pulcher around 300 B.C.<sup>53</sup> In the early second century there were Pythagorean elements in the works of Ennius, the elder Cato and Sulpicius Galus; probably from this period dates the claim by the Aemilii that they were descendants of Pythagoras himself.<sup>54</sup> Farce and mime, their roots in southern Italy, show that the public was aware of such basic doctrines as the transmigration of souls. In his youth Cicero was thrilled to visit the house at Metapontum where Pythagoras was believed to have died after leaving Croton, and when he came to write the *De Re Publica* he gave it, and especially the final Dream of Scipio, a Pythagorean colouring, partly perhaps to recall Plato's dialogue with its final myth, but also to evoke the Roman past.<sup>55</sup> In the late third or second century the Romans may have improved their knowledge of Pythagoreanism, or primarily of its political role, from the account given by the great historian of the West, Timaeus. It would not be surprising if, in the first century, when the mainstream Greek philosophic tradition had become more familiar, the Romans turned to this for information; Cicero's knowledge seems to rest on such sources as Heraclides Ponticus, Plato's pupil, and of course Plato himself.

But, even if we discount Nigidius, was the traffic all one way? There can be little doubt that interest in Pythagoras and his school was increasing in the

<sup>51</sup> Jerome *Chron.* 45 B.C.; *Tusc. Disp.* 1.62; *De Div.* 1.102.

<sup>52</sup> Nigidius, frag. 109 Swob. (from the *De Hominum Naturalibus*).

<sup>53</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 4.2-4.

<sup>54</sup> Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 1 (some of the authors who thought Numa was a pupil of his).

<sup>55</sup> *De Fin.* 5.4 (perhaps he knew this from Timaeus); *De Rep.* 6.9ff.

Greek world. Writers on musical theory could not escape, of course, but a number of Posidonius' fragments deal with Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism. For example, he attributed the old doctrine, familiar from Plato, of the tripartite soul, to which he returned from the unitary conception of the Stoics, to Pythagoras; he retailed 'Pythagorean' material on comets.<sup>56</sup> It may or may not be relevant that he had visited Italy. Cicero's Stoic teacher Diodotus practised music as a purification, in Pythagorean fashion; had he picked this up in Rome?<sup>57</sup> Alexander Polyhistor wrote a book on Pythagorean precepts, and in his history of the philosophers gave an account of Pythagorean doctrine which he claimed to have got from 'Pythagorean commentaries', the date of which has been much disputed, but which he probably found in Italy. Diodorus Siculus gave an account of the school, based mainly on Timaeus and Aristoxenus.<sup>58</sup> The pro-Roman chronographer Castor of Rhodes accepted that early Roman institutions had been influenced by Pythagoreanism.<sup>59</sup> Somewhat later, King Juba of Mauretania, who had been educated in Italy in the forties and thirties, became a great collector of Pythagorean documents, which were cheerfully forged for him. Anaxilaus of Larissa, who is described like Nigidius as *Pythagoricus et magus*, was exiled from Rome in 28 B.C. and might have spread a doctrine learnt while he was in Italy. If Octavian's tutor Areius of Alexandria really wrote a work *On Pythagorean Philosophy* one would like to know when and where he did so; he might already have been influenced by Eudorus.<sup>60</sup> In view of these various facts, it remains possible, though hardly to be proved, that increasing Greek interest in Pythagoreanism was affected by knowing that the Romans were conscious of a Pythagorean tradition of sorts, and even that Greek scholars working in Rome found and built on Greco-Italian Pythagorean sources not known previously in the East.

It is perhaps worth returning to the work of Alexander Polyhistor. *On Pythagorean Symbols* must have dealt with traditional precepts, *akousmata* or *symbola*, often of a primitive kind and explained allegorically (for example, 'don't stir the fire with a knife' is said to mean 'don't stir up the pride of the great').<sup>61</sup> The work was probably prefaced by a sketch of Pythagoras' life, for quoted from it is the statement that Pythagoras studied with 'Zaratus the Assyrian' (Zaratus or Zarathustra was not Assyrian but Iranian; but the implication is perhaps that Pythagoras knew astrology) and also with Druids and Brahmins.<sup>62</sup> We have already noted the mathematical cosmogony found

<sup>56</sup> Frags 140, 131a E and K; cf. Test. 91, 95. He probably did not write a commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, but had something to say about it.

<sup>57</sup> *Tusc Disp.* 5.113.

<sup>58</sup> Alexander, *FGH* no. 273 frags 94, 93; DS 10.12.3 probably says there are no Pythagoreans now (possibly taken over from his source).

<sup>59</sup> Plut. *QR* 10, cf. 76: Castor explains Roman usages as symbolic of Pythagorean ideas on the soul. So perhaps did Varro, for example *De Vita PR* frag. 20 Rip, and cf. *Tusc. Disp.* 4.3: both may have known Castor – or his source.

<sup>60</sup> See Dillon, *op. cit.* on p. 289, 115.

<sup>61</sup> DL 8.17-18.

<sup>62</sup> *FHG* no. 273 frag. 94 (*De Fin.* 5.87, visits Persian magi.)

by Alexander in his 'Pythagorean commentaries' and retailed in his *Diadochai* or *Successions* (of philosophers). He also apparently drew hence the Pythagorean doctrine that the heavenly bodies in the pure upper air or aether are gods, and among them the sun is that which quickens all things. The soul is tripartite, the highest and rational part being a torn-off fragment of aether and like it immortal. There is no definite reference to reincarnation, but we are told that after death pure souls wander in the air as heroes and *daimones*, who send men dreams and signs, while evil ones are imprisoned beneath the earth. The gods are to be worshipped after purificatory rites that include abstaining from certain foods, especially eggs, beans and white cocks. Everything that is not immortal is in perpetual flux, each of the four elements changing into each other.<sup>63</sup> This last was also a claim of Ovid's Pythagoras, in a long speech thought to derive from Varro, which urges complete vegetarianism and abstention from animal sacrifice, a position more extreme than that usually ascribed to Pythagoras, and which also preaches metempsychosis.<sup>64</sup>

We know a fair amount about Alexander Polyhistor's *Diadochai* or *Successions* (a literary form popular at this time). It covered the pre-Socratics, for apart from Pythagoras it registered the sixth-century Pherecydes of Samos, giving his father's name and perhaps calling him a pupil of Pittacus, who was one of the Seven Sages. It described Socrates as a pupil of Damon (the musician and friend of Pericles) though perhaps also of the more usual Anaxagoras. It came down to Carneades and perhaps to the present, if so superseding the second-century works of this type we know about. If we may judge by the case of Pythagoras, sometimes thought exceptional, it also gave considerable doxographic information.<sup>65</sup> Of course Alexander, who was a polymath, not a philosopher, was not a real historian of philosophy in the modern sense, someone who traces the development of philosophical ideas. Such did not exist in this period, though the Hellenistic age was interested in master-pupil genealogies and the biography of philosophers in general. We may adduce the Indices of Academics and Stoics from Herculaneum, possibly part of Philodemus' *Syntaxis tôn philosophôn*, and at all events works of his time; though these have only brief notes on the lives of the persons listed and nothing on their beliefs. They are grouped as pupils of particular teachers, though this may sometimes be an arbitrary or at least over-simplified pattern. Other biographical works were found in the library; Philodemus wrote lives of Epicurus and Socrates, and he or another wrote a life of the second-century Syrian Epicurean Philonides, who was involved with the Syrian court; though the quiet careers of most Epicureans might not seem to lend themselves to biography, from Epicurus' own time it had been usual to write

<sup>63</sup> Id. ib. frag. 93, and above, p. 161. This system, with the earth a sphere at the centre of a spherical universe, must if genuinely Pythagorean be earlier or later than Philolaus' famous system with a central fire – not the sun – round which earth and the visible bodies move. *De LL* 7.17, confusing and corrupt, has been made by emendation to refer to Philolaus' 'counter-earth' but seems to hold that the earth itself is central: P. Somville, *Rev. Hist. Rel.* (1964) 39.

<sup>64</sup> Ovid *Met.* 15.75ff.

<sup>65</sup> *FGH* no. 273 frag. 93.

memoirs that stressed in particular illness and death bravely faced.<sup>66</sup>

Philodemus is of course the Greek philosopher of whose activity in Italy in this period we know most. Some of the others who lived there for shorter periods were also productive, but we cannot be sure where their books were written – thus Athenodorus son of Sandon, Octavian's teacher, wrote a good deal, and made Cicero a résumé of Posidonius' *On Duty* in 44, this at least in Rome. Antipater of Tyre, who criticised omissions in Panaetius' work in the same subject, probably did so in a book, but again we do not know where it was written.<sup>67</sup> But Philodemus was in Italy for so long that we can be fairly sure that almost all his works were written there.

They cover a wide range, from the polemic and technical to (more commonly) the popular and general. Among the most polemic is the work on Stoicism, full of assaults on Stoic morality and politics. The most technical are those on logic, the best preserved being *On Impressions* (or *Appearances*) and *Significations*.<sup>68</sup> The first part probably dealt with the empirical epistemology of the Epicureans in general; the preserved portion deals with the way we make inferences, *via* 'signs', from the perceived to the imperceived. The Epicureans held, unlike Plato on the one hand and the Sceptics on the other, that sense-data, if clear and distinct, can be the basis of knowledge (even, they erroneously thought, of mathematical knowledge). Philodemus recounts, with much repetition, the arguments of his master Zeno of Sidon, of Demetrius of Laconia, and of Bromius, like himself a pupil of Zeno, against the Stoics, who argued that 'signs' were often unique, varying or otherwise unstable. The Epicureans insisted that we can infer the nature of unperceived objects by analogy with those in our experience, and used inconceivability as an important criterion. Philodemus promises also, if he has time, to consider the views of the Empiric school in medicine. The logic (and mathematics) of the Epicureans was a fairly recent development, unlike their physics, which went back to the Master and was thus very out of date. But unlike Catius and Lucretius Philodemus does not seem to have been interested in physics, though there was a handsome old copy of Epicurus' *Peri Physeōs* in the library (of course we cannot be sure that no books were added after Philodemus' death).

For all its devotion to the authority of Epicurus, the school was now to some extent split. It is not only in the books on rhetoric that Philodemus argues that other Epicureans misinterpret the words of the Master and his immediate disciples; the writings on logic, for example, appear to take issue with an Epicurean from Patara.<sup>69</sup> Some have thought that Zeno, Demetrius and others were called 'sophists' (irresponsible rhetoricians) by the orthodox Epicureans; but Cicero, a little unkindly, suggests that on the all-important subject of pleasure as the proper end of life Zeno's circle was strictly orthodox,

<sup>66</sup> W. Crönert, *Sitzb. Berlin* (1900) 942.

<sup>67</sup> *Ad Att.* 16.11.4; *De Off.* 2.86.

<sup>68</sup> Ed. P.H. and E.A. De Lacy, *On Methods of Inference*<sup>2</sup> (1978); diversely dated to 54 or 40 from a reference to Antony bringing pygmies from Syria (or Hyria), 4.

<sup>69</sup> W. Crönert, *Hermes* (1901) 548.

though others had watered down the doctrine.<sup>70</sup> Splits went back to the second century, if Nicasicrates and Timasagoras, who bear the brunt of Philodemus' disapproval in more than one work, are rightly identified as dissident Epicureans, possibly, like the villain in the work on rhetoric, from Rhodes.<sup>71</sup>

Many of the popular works on ethical subjects, misleadingly often called 'diatribes', were grouped into a large work on vices and corresponding virtues, and probably another on characteristics and ways of life. *On Anger* may come from the latter, and is fairly polemical, using technical terms and arguing that anger is not necessary and is an evil; it is, perhaps unusually, not identified with revenge, and its relation to reason is discussed.<sup>72</sup> The tenth book of *On Vices* included a summary of the advice of the third-century Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos on the way to avoid pride, and also a treatment of flattery.<sup>73</sup> *On Freedom of Speech*, a separate work, is frankly an epitome from Zeno; it argues that a teacher must be tactful and sympathetic, though frankness is necessary both from him and his pupil.<sup>74</sup>

The work called by modern scholars *On Economy* (household management) is relatively well preserved. Like so many of Philodemus' productions, it is distinctly backward looking; it discusses and confutes in order the main treatments of the subject, by Xenophon and that we know as pseudo-Aristotle's, here ascribed to Theophrastus. Both in this and in the more positive parts it may be heavily dependent on Epicurus' associates Metrodorus and Hermarchus.<sup>75</sup> The questions raised include matters of definition, where the Epicureans pride themselves on sticking close to ordinary usage; the importance of the wife's role; and how to manage one's bailiff and slaves. Philodemus seems on the whole more repressive than Xenophon: the wife is definitely less important than her husband, not all slaves should be offered freedom by a fixed date. Xenophon's agricultural remarks are dismissed as not the philosopher's business. As for 'Theophrastus', his discussions of the relation of domestic or political economy and on the nature of a *technê* are said to be either irrelevant or obvious, and he is accused of overstressing the amassing of wealth. It becomes clear that Philodemus is concerned with the philosopher's household alone; thus he rejects the idea that the master needs to spend most of his time keeping an eye on the estate. He will not wholly abjure the acquisition and preservation of wealth (as the Cynics did), but he will not spend too much time and trouble over it, as its purpose is to secure tranquillity of mind and ease the path of friendship. Wealth, like health and friends, may bring troubles: to be without them is worse. It seems that wealth may be to some

<sup>70</sup> DL 10.26; *De Fin.* 1.16, 2.119. Diogenes may be distinguishing Zeno and company from the sophists, against whom it has been conjectured that Pap. 1005 (certainly *Against* someone) was written: F. Sbordone, *Philodemi Adversus [Sophistas]* (1947).

<sup>71</sup> R. Philippson, *PWXVII.1* (1936) 281.

<sup>72</sup> Ed. K. Wilke (1914); cf. R. Philippson, *Rh. Mus.* (1916) 425.

<sup>73</sup> Ed. C. Jensen (1911).

<sup>74</sup> Ed. A. Olivieri (1914).

<sup>75</sup> R. Laurenti, *Filodemo e il Pensiero Economico degli Epicurei* (1973), *passim*.

extent administered in common, but real communism is not advocated. Only the sage uses wealth to true advantage. He will not gain it by war, mining is an unhappy business, to work the land in person laborious; but you may let others work it, or use the skills of your slaves to earn money, or let part of your house. The vital thing is to have leisure for serene philosophical discussion with friends. Friends are of incomparable value, and one must never grudge time spent on them. At death they may inherit one's possessions.<sup>76</sup>

Some of Philodemus' more popular works are reasonably lucid, and indeed *On Death* rises at the end to an eloquent climax, with poetic quotation, on the Epicurean sage who alone truly tastes life's bliss, because he lives with the idea of death, which cannot alarm him. And the frailty of man is evoked in the fine old Epicurean saying that we all live in a city without walls. It is not strictly Epicurean in its admission that grief is permissible if a young person dies, and that to leave one's family unprotected, to die abroad, to be totally forgotten, are terrible things.<sup>77</sup> But if this seems to have been one of Philodemus' most attractive works, none of them can be described as on a high philosophical level.

<sup>76</sup> Philod. *peri oikonomias*, ed. C. Jensen, (1907).

<sup>77</sup> Philod. *peri thanatou* D, ed. D. Bassi (1914) 55. M. Gigante, *Ricerche Filodemee* (1969) 63.

## CHAPTER TWENTY

# Theology and the Arts of Divination

We come finally to the study of the gods and of divination, not because theology was regarded as the Queen of the Sciences, as it was later, but because its links with philosophy and with knowledge of distant countries make it fitting to deal with it after these have been considered; and because it is a subject that points towards the future and the concentration of late antiquity on the other-worldly.

It was an article of faith with the Romans that they were the most religious of all peoples, and that this was the reason for their success. But their religion was by now a complicated amalgam. Early Rome seems to have known many gods, some of them bare hypostatisations of processes and functions of all kinds; there was little mythology, but complex ritual on which the welfare of the community, even more than of individuals, depended. Thus religion and politics were allied, and the same persons responsible for both. There was in augury a system for discovering the will of the gods by observation of the behaviour of birds, and also by noting the entrails of sacrificial animals and celestial phenomena such as thunder – though here native doctrines were less detailed than Etruscan, on which the Romans came increasingly to depend. These systems, like the rituals, needed to be recorded, and often interpreted. The identification of the main Roman gods with those of Greece, with their pullulating mythologies, created problems which might require much learning for their solution: for example what Greek or other divinities should one see in the *Di Penates*, or in the *Di Novensiles* (or were they *Novensides*? And was their name connected with *novus* or with *novem*?).<sup>1</sup>

Among the earliest written documents at Rome were the records and commentaries of the great priestly colleges, especially the *pontifices* and augurs. The second century B.C. saw individual writings on pontifical law, and, in the historians' accounts of early Rome, an effort to amalgamate Greek mythology with Roman tradition and turn it into history by means of Euhemerism, and to describe the institution, through the centuries (though much was attributed to King Numa), of Roman religious practices. Indeed much 'history' was, on the Greek model, the often fanciful aetiology of such institutions. At the same time, while Roman religion as a whole was not in the state of crisis some scholars used to discern, but rather vigorously developing, it is true that some old rites were in decay, and inspired perhaps by a reaction, however partial, against Greek influence, there were attempts to

<sup>1</sup> *HRR* Piso frag. 45; *GRF* Stilo frag. 22, Manilius frag. 2; Varro frag. 373, Cincius frag. 22, Granius frag. 3, Cornificius Longus frag. 8.

recover and revive these, doubtless to prevent danger to the state.<sup>2</sup>

The first century saw even more desire to preserve tradition for social and political purposes; the great documents are Cicero's *De Legibus* 2 and Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, the latter dedicated to Caesar the *pontifex maximus*.<sup>3</sup> Passing discussions were no longer adequate; there were numerous monographs on, for example, augury. As we saw, the decline of the Etruscan language and probably, with this and the loss of independence, of many Etruscan religious usages, led to the *disciplina Etrusca* being set down in Latin. At the same time it was becoming hard to ignore the attractions of Eastern religions and methods of divination. These often first reached Italy, no doubt, in the persons of slaves and foreigners, and gained most adherents in the humbler classes. The earliest references are contemptuous, and Cicero still speaks of the astrologers who hang round the Circus Maximus, and the *Isiaci coniectores*, soothsayers of Egyptian Isis, as cheap quacks.<sup>4</sup> But in the Greek world, especially since Alexander, the religions of Persia, Babylonia and Egypt had exercised considerable attraction on intellectuals. In particular, the astronomical learning of the 'Chaldaeans' (soon adopted in Ptolemaic Egypt), which became entwined with astrology, had affected many scientists and philosophers. Believers in all such systems regarded them as scientific: as Q. Cicero is made to say in the *De Divinatione*, the Druids are expert in *physiologia* or *naturae ratio*, the Magi in Persia meet to discuss their *disciplinam scientiamque*; the Etruscan discipline is *ars tanta*.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, astrologers were to be called *mathematici*, men of learning *par excellence*.

At Rome the Senate, guardian of the national traditions, sometimes opposed imported cults, though often because they were still unofficial and uncontrollable rather than because they were foreign; they were usually permitted outside the *urbs* itself. In the fifties (and later too) decrees were passed against the worship of Egyptian deities within Rome, and Vitruvius proposes that temples of Isis and Serapis shall be in the merchants' quarters of a town, where foreigners congregate.<sup>6</sup> For Greek religion there was respect: many Romans were initiates of Samothrace and Eleusis, and though Delphi was not now consulted by the state, the town was favoured and some Romans might be happy to read Alexander Polyhistor's book on the Delphic Oracle.<sup>7</sup>

Though thorough-going scepticism in religion was rarer than used to be thought in the upper class, this class was now aware of the philosophers' approach to theology. As Varro says, 'the philosophers have left many books, in which it is discussed who the gods are, where, of what kind, and what made of – whether of fire, as Heraclitus held, or of numbers, as Pythagoras, or of atoms, as Epicurus says',<sup>8</sup> – views not easily compatible with Roman

<sup>2</sup> E. Rawson, *JRS* (1973) 161.

<sup>3</sup> H. Jocelyn, *Bull. Ryland's Libr.* (1982) 148 denies Varro had this purpose, but perversely.

<sup>4</sup> *De Div.* 1.132 (in the mouth of the credulous Quintus).

<sup>5</sup> *De Div.* 1.90-2. Admittedly these are 'conjectural arts'; in 2.33 Marcus denies there can be any art *rerum incognitarum*.

<sup>6</sup> *Vitr.* 1.7.1.

<sup>7</sup> *FGH* no. 273 frags 83-4.

<sup>8</sup> Varro, *Ant. RD* frag. 8 Card.

tradition, as Cicero's Cotta points out in the *De Natura Deorum*.<sup>9</sup> Two notable pronouncements quoted by Varro may have been made near the start of the century. One is that attributed to the *pontifex maximus* Q. Mucius Scaevola on the three theologies, of poets, statesmen, and philosophers. He developed this Stoic *divisio* by saying that the fictions of mythology, told by Greek poets, are immoral; the teachings of the philosophers included things not necessary, even harmful, for the people to know (that many gods were men by origin, that the true god does not have human shape). There remained the theology of the statesmen, or civil theology. This doubtless encouraged men to fear divine punishment for crime. Significantly Roman is the way the state is represented by the *principes civitatis*, not as in Greek versions the lawgiver or the laws; and the stress on the dangers of philosophy.<sup>10</sup>

The second pronouncement comes in some lines by the learned Q. Valerius Soranus, addressing 'Omnipotent Jupiter, who both engendered and bore kings, things and gods [the last words may be corrupt], god of gods, who art both One and All'. Varro explains: Jupiter is the whole universe, and in particular Earth, the Mother, as well as Sky, the Father.<sup>11</sup> Such pantheism may be influenced by Stoicism; we wish we knew more of Valerius, whose famed learning may have been mainly exercised on religious matters – we are told that he incurred odium for revealing the secret name of Rome.<sup>12</sup>

It is not surprising then that in what was also a socially and politically anxious and unstable period there was much speculation on and study of religion and the occult. It is striking that there is not a great deal of interest in and anxiety about life after death; though the Epicureans felt it their mission to save men from fear of Acheron, Cicero says that no educated person believes the fables of punishment after death.<sup>13</sup> Augustine points out that Varro deals in minute detail with the gods to be invoked in every possible contingency; 'but he has pointed out and named no gods whom we should ask for eternal life.'<sup>14</sup> It was life on earth men wanted to foresee, or influence; eschatological expectation was simply of the fall of Rome and the opening of a new age, whether harsh or golden.

The writers' preoccupations range between, or try to combine, native, exotic and philosophic elements. There is tension, too, between the desire to record and understand (usually in order to preserve or revive) traditions, to find exotic parallels or explanations, and to establish a philosophic base for them.

We may deal first with the heterodox Epicureans. They did not deny the gods existed – they claimed to have more than usual.<sup>15</sup> They thought their

<sup>9</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 3.5.

<sup>10</sup> The notice comes *via* Varro, and B. Cardauns, *Varros Logistoricus über die Götterverehrung* (1960) 33ff., argues that it is from this dialogue, *Curio de cultu deorum*, and a speech fairly arbitrarily put into Scaevola's mouth.

<sup>11</sup> *Aug. Civ. Dei* 7.9 = *FPL* Valerius Soranus frag. 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Serv. Aen.* 1.277, *Plut. QR* 61, *Pliny NH* 3.65. His motive is unclear, but may have been political.

<sup>13</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 1.10-11, 48. But see below, pp. 303-4, on the *Etrusca Disciplina*.

<sup>14</sup> *Aug. Civ. Dei.* 6.9.

<sup>15</sup> Philodemus(?) *On Piety*, ed. T. Gomperz (1866).

existence shown by the fact that all peoples have impressions of the gods as immortal, blessed and of human form (these impressions being due to effluvia given off by the gods themselves) but held that they dwelt in tranquil beatitude in the interstices between world and world, had not laboured to create these worlds, and took no care for man. The fragments from Herculaneum belonging to what is probably a work *On Piety*, very likely by Philodemus, show it amassed in Book 1 mythological information from early poets and mythographers, displaying the gods of popular credence in an unworthy light: working, suffering, sleeping, loving, hating or in other ways ridiculous. The beliefs of the populace, and of other philosophers, are criticised (sometimes unfairly). All these conceptions of the gods clearly fail in true piety.<sup>16</sup>

Book 2 expounded Epicurus' views on that subject. The Master made it plain by his conduct as well as his teaching (his letters are quoted) that it is right to take part in traditional cults, even to be initiated, for if we meditate on the gods' happiness and virtue it will help us to become as like them as possible.

Philodemus' *On the Gods* sometimes adopts a lofty style suggesting it was written partly at least for a wide public.<sup>17</sup> The first book is mainly concerned with the Epicurean belief that the mass of mankind is unable 'as it were to breathe' owing to superstitious terror, from which knowledge of Epicurean science will free it. Do animals fear death? Fear of the gods and of death and the afterlife must both be banished. There is the usual polemic; divination is rejected, with a reference to astrology. Book 2 is very fragmentary; Book 3 discusses the gods and their life in heaven. All are equal; though self-sufficient they choose to dwell together in friendship (the Epicurean could not conceive happiness apart from friendship, but held that men cannot be friends of the gods as some philosophers wished). They do not sleep, for sleep resembles death and is a weakness; they take food, for that is a pleasure, but do not indulge in drinking-parties, dances or love-affairs. Do they move, breathe, speak? They speak Greek, the language of the wise who are most like the gods, which seems to be further praised for its clarity and wide use.<sup>18</sup>

There was little philosophic warrant for real atheism now; and the implausibility of these clusters of insomniac hellenophone gourmets in the illimitable distance was one reason for the weakness of scepticism about divine intervention; Cicero found them ridiculous: Epicurus said they were made of such fine atoms that they were transparent, the winds blew through them and they had to avoid the worlds where other atoms might damage them.

<sup>16</sup> Some of the information is at least ultimately from Apollodorus of Athens' great work *On the Gods*, possibly through Zeno of Sidon who is known to have written *On Piety*. Much of the argument is very close to that of the Epicurean speaker in *De Nat. Deor.* 1; Cicero might possibly have used it (or a common source, perhaps Zeno).

<sup>17</sup> Probably against Epicurean backsliders, Stoics, and even Cynics, as so often from earlier sources; thus when there is objection to astrology, there seems to be none to Posidonius. The date is lateish, as Antony is mentioned, 1.44 (Diels).

<sup>18</sup> There is also a fragmentary papyrus *On Providence*, attacking the Stoic belief in this, see *Chron. Erc.* (1972) 67.

Cicero describes divination by means of birds as Roman, by entrails and prodigies as Etruscan;<sup>19</sup> these were the three systems to which the Roman state had recourse, turning rarely, and only in earlier times, to the great Greek oracles. It is perhaps strange that we know so little about the numerous first-century works on augury – by Ap. Claudius Pulcher, L. Caesar, C. Marcellus, M. Messala and Cicero himself, all augurs, and Veranius, who was probably not.<sup>20</sup> They ranged in approach from Ap. Claudius, a believer in the art, to Marcellus, who thought it invented for political reasons. In the *De Legibus* Cicero claims the art existed but has now been lost; what he said in his lost work on augury we do not know. In a more philosophic context he gives himself the role of refuting his brother's defence of divination, taking on most of the philosophers except the great Sceptic Carneades and to some extent the unorthodox Stoic Panaetius (and the Epicureans, whose aid he would have disdained).<sup>21</sup> He may not have really been so incredulous; but such disbelief could co-exist with the philosophic deism to which, he had hinted in the *De Natura Deorum*, he was sympathetic.<sup>22</sup>

Ap. Claudius, immensely aristocratic and arrogant, joined to the profound knowledge of political antiquities that Cicero attests a wide religious horizon. He consulted the moribund Delphic oracle and erected a Propylaeum at Eleusis. But he had huge hereditary clientelae in Asia, and one of the nicknames given him for his notorious credulity was 'the Pisidian', in reference to the fame of Pisidian augury. One of his oriental friends was the King of Commagene who has left a striking monument of his devotion to astrology in the coronation horoscope set up on the mountain of Nemrudh Dag, and another was probably the King of Cappadocia in whose realm, says Strabo, there were many *magi*. One suspects his book on augury included comparison with foreign systems.<sup>23</sup>

But the fragments we have of these augural works are strongly antiquarian; unsurprisingly, given Cicero's remark that augurs are now ignorant of their own subject and augury is no longer used by generals on campaign, or in private life. Aulus Gellius gives us a piece of Messalla's work; it is based on old *commentarii* and is concerned with the early constitution and terms applying to it, and refers to a second-century author. But this may have been set in a quasi-philosophic frame: Messalla somewhere expounded a unique cosmogony in which Janus (not easily identifiable with a Greek god) is creator and ruler of the universe, binding together the heavy elements, earth and water, which tend downwards, with air and fire, which rise up, and surrounding them with the heavens to prevent them flying apart.<sup>24</sup> There

<sup>19</sup> *De Div.* 1.3.

<sup>20</sup> Note also the *De Augurandi Disciplina* of Ennius, probably the grammarian and certainly not an augur, and Macr. 1.16.19, Varro's *Augurum Libri*.

<sup>21</sup> *De Div.* 2.75, *De Leg.* 2.32-3; *De Div.* 2, *passim*.

<sup>22</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 3.95.

<sup>23</sup> *Brutus* 267; *De Div.* 1.105; Strabo 15.C733. See E. Rawson, *Hist.* (1973) 219. It has been thought Cicero may have used his work for the material in *De Div.* 1 on non-Roman systems of augury.

<sup>24</sup> A. Gellius 13.15, cf. 14.5. Messala was consul in 55 but lived to extreme old age and may possibly have written after our period. For his cosmogony, W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (1959) 97.

may be some Platonic influence here. There was certainly speculation in Rome about two- or even four-faced Janus; according to Varro some identified him with the universe, and the Etruscans with the heavens.<sup>25</sup>

Each book of Veranius' work was apparently devoted to a different aspect of his subject, one to the augur's role in political assemblies; archaic words and phrases were explained. In his *Pontifical Questions* (presumably an example of the *problema* genre) Veranius again based himself on the documents of the college concerned, and also used an early work on pontifical law. One book dealt with *supplicationes*, the rites of public thanksgiving for victory.<sup>26</sup> The *De Verbis Pontificalibus* may have been part of this work. We should also note the *De Indigitamentis*, dedicated by Granius Flaccus to Caesar, probably when Dictator; the word refers to the ancient books of the *pontifices* containing formulas of evocation to all the gods honoured in the Rome of their day (thought to be Numa's). We know the *Indigitamenta* mentioned many of the obscure gods mocked by the Christians. The reckless syncretisms are presumably Granius' own: Apollo is equated with Liber (usually thought to be Bacchus) and Minerva with the moon (for which a Greek source is quoted, and Varro knew the view); while whatever the *Di Noevsiles* were, it is unlikely they were the nine Muses.<sup>27</sup> Granius is also said to have written commentaries on the *Ius Papirianum* or so-called *leges regiae*, supposed to be a collection by a very early *pontifex maximus*, perhaps found in the archives of the priestly college.<sup>28</sup>

Scholars were less concerned with the third of the great colleges, that of the *XVviri sacris faciundis*; the Sibylline books, which it was one of their functions to consult, were probably more secret than other religious documents.<sup>29</sup> But as we shall see, Varro did devote a book of his *Antiquitates* to the *XVviri*.

In the second century B.C. the haruspices were perhaps despised as 'Etruscans and barbarians'.<sup>30</sup> But after the enfranchisement of Italy their origin seems to have aroused little prejudice, and their skills to have been regarded almost as part of the Roman tradition. As we saw, Etruscan was primarily a revealed religion, and a religion of sacred books, divided, according to Cicero, into *libri haruspicipi* proper, *libri fulgurales*, interpreting lightning bolts, and *libri rituales*, which seem to have covered the way to cope with portents and omens, rites for the foundation of towns, building of fortifications, allotment and division of land, establishment of constitutions and so on, with the doctrine of *saecula*.<sup>31</sup> Late sources also talk of *libri Acheruntici*, on the fate of the soul after death;<sup>32</sup> these perhaps come under the head of *libri rituales*, since good fortune after death could be ensured by

<sup>25</sup> Varro *Ant. Div.* frag. 201 Card.

<sup>26</sup> *GRF* Veranius frags 1-11.

<sup>27</sup> *GRF* Granius frag. 3.

<sup>28</sup> *Dig.* 50.16.144, *Macr. Sat.* 3.11.5. Cicero seems not to have known about this figure, see *Ad Fam.* 9.21 on the early history of the Papirii (date uncertain).

<sup>29</sup> *Tac. Ann.* 6.12.

<sup>30</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 2.11.

<sup>31</sup> *De Div.* 1.72 (some MSS read *tonitruales* for *rituales*). Cf. Livy 5.14.4 in *libris fatalibus*.

<sup>32</sup> *Arnob. Adv. Nat.* 2.62, cf. *Serv. Aen.* 8.398.

certain rites.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps the soul on the journey to the underworld that is shown in later Etruscan art could be helped to escape the terrible demons portrayed there.

Whether all this was included in the Latin translations or adaptations is uncertain. Much of this work is often attributed to Tarquitiu Priscu. Macrobiu gives u two fragments; his translation of an *Ostentarium Tuscum*, on portents, stated that if the fleece of a ram or sheep is spattered with gold or purple it portends good fortune to a leader; in the *Ostentum Arborarium* (perhaps a section of the previous work) it was explained which trees are in the care of the infernal gods and so *infelices*.<sup>34</sup> In 363 A.D. haruspices (who would certainly now only know Latin) were still using *Tarquitiiani libri*, which showed that when a meteor was in the sky battle should not be joined. We are told that (in good Euhemeristic fashion) Tarquitiu regarded Aesculapiu as a Messenian boy of uncertain parentage educated by Chiron; this might come from a work *De Viris Illustribus* as the quotation perhaps implies, but it is perhaps likelier that it comes from a preface to or a work on the *disciplina*.<sup>35</sup>

A statement of Pliny about snakes emerging from the entrails when a Caecina of Volaterrae was sacrificing might go back to A. Caecina, and a Virgilian scholiast refers to his account of the foundation of Mantua, the great Etruscan city of the Po valley. But it is on thunderbolts that we can best reconstruct his views, since his work underlies part of Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones* 2. This describes Caecina as a fluent writer who would have had a name for eloquence if he had not been overshadowed by Cicero.<sup>36</sup> Seneca tells us that he distinguished three kinds of thunderbolt, directed at those planning an action, those who had done it, and those 'neither doing nor planning anything'. Seneca doubts the importance of the distinction between the first and third kinds, and it looks as if he has to add to Caecina's discussion. Probably from the same source is the distinction between the three effects of thunderbolts, which penetrate, break up, or scorch, the last kind subdivided between those that scorch, burn up, and set on fire. How far Caecina found such *divisiones* in the Etruscan we do not know; he surely did find the three bolts of Jupiter, those sent of his own decision, which are monitory and harmless, those sent on the advice of his council, the twelve gods, which damage even when they signify good, and those only sent on the advice of the 'Higher and Hidden' gods which destroy what they strike (Seneca can only accept this doctrine in a symbolic sense). A further division is into those which refer to a man's whole future life, to a single point in time, or a time that can be delayed (in private cases for up to ten years, in public

<sup>33</sup> Arnob. 2.62 says the sacrifice of certain animals to certain gods ensures souls become divine and are freed from the 'laws of mortality'.

<sup>34</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 3.7.2, 20.3.

<sup>35</sup> Amm. Marc. 25.2.7, cf. 17.10.2 *ut in Tageticis libris legitur*; Lactantius *Div. Inst.* 1.10.2 (Aesculapiu had become an astrologer and magician in the Hellenistic world, as the old story that he angered Zeus by raising a man from the dead made inevitable; he becomes a pupil of Hermes Trismegistus and writings on iatromathematics, in which heavenly influences rule the parts of the body, are ascribed to him).

<sup>36</sup> Pliny *NH* 11.197; Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.200; Sen. *NQ* 2.56.1. We know he asked Cicero to correct his *Querelae*, perhaps in verse, *Ad F.* 6.6.8; Shackleton Bailey, *ap. Ad F.* 6.7.1 distinguishes these from a *liber*, perhaps on oratory.

ones for thirty) but not avoided. This Seneca rejects: the *divisiones* of his own teacher Attalus are better. An explicit quotation from Caecina then lists names for *fulgura* of the most disparate types: those that warn, mislead, bring disease, refer to kings, and so on. Far better than this hotch-potch is the arrangement of 'our friend Attalus, a distinguished man who combines Etruscan learning with Greek subtlety of mind'.<sup>37</sup>

Seneca quotes no other Latin source, so perhaps everything here on thunderbolts involving Latin technical terms is from Caecina. And if what 'the Tuscans' say means what Caecina says, he perhaps tried to reconcile religion and philosophy. Philosophers hold that lightning and thunder result from clouds rubbing together; 'the Tuscans' it seems do not disagree but say that they do so in order to give signs to man.<sup>38</sup> Chapter 25 treats Jupiter in distinctly Stoic fashion. Cicero claimed that he and Caecina shared studies together (if perhaps primarily oratory), and Caecina may have found sympathetic treatment of Etruscan religion by Greek philosophers, perhaps especially Posidonius.<sup>39</sup>

Some material similar to that in Seneca is to be found in compressed form in Pliny *NH* 2; Caecina was used for this book, but so perhaps were others, if only indirectly. Pliny also deals with various sorts of bolt and tells us that while Jupiter sends three kinds, he is only one of nine gods who may do so (in strictly Roman lore all thunderbolts were from Jupiter or a mysterious Summanus, active at night). Pliny's doctrine should probably be integrated in some way with the teaching, known from later sources, on the gods who dwell in the sixteen sectors of the sky (and, it has been thought, control the different sectors of the microcosmic liver of an animal).<sup>40</sup> Whether these sixteen sectors had things of other orders associated with them by ancient tradition or by more recent contamination with other magical ideas we do not know.

Of other writers on the *disciplina* sometimes attributed to our period little is known. We have a Greek version of a *Tonitruale* or thunder-calendar ascribed to Fonteius, but it only tells us crudely what thunder means, by day or by night, in different months, and is relevant to Egypt; it is related to the 'Brontology of Hermes Trismegistus', an Egyptian source perhaps of Ptolemaic date.<sup>41</sup> Some Etruscan lore on thunderbolts is attributed to one Grapus, for which it has been proposed to read Granius. If this is the Granius Flaccus we have already met it would be interesting to see a non-Etruscan and pro-Caesarian writer involved with the subject, as Caesar seems to have disbelieved in, and had trouble with, haruspicy.<sup>42</sup> Clodius Tuscus too has been held to be of Caesarian date. His calendar again is said to be from

<sup>37</sup> Sen. *NQ* 2.39.1, 49.1, 56.1. H. Hine, *Commentary on Seneca Naturales Quaestiones* 2 (1981) 62 thinks Seneca used Caecina direct.

<sup>38</sup> Sen. *op. cit.* 32.2. He certainly got from Caecina an old-fashioned Latin word for thunderbolts, *fulgetra*, and old-fashioned forms of the now usual *tonitrua*.

<sup>39</sup> *Ad F.* 6.9.1; *DS* 5.40.2 (possible visit to Etruria, p. 255). Weinstock sees the influence of astrology on Caecina's doctrine, *op. cit.* on p. 93.

<sup>40</sup> Pliny *NH* 2.138; *De Div.* 2.42 proves the sixteen regions are Etruscan.

<sup>41</sup> Lydus *De Ost.* 39.

<sup>42</sup> E. Rawson, *JRS* (1978) 132.

Etruscan sources, but looks more Egyptian; it incorporates weather notes and astrology.<sup>43</sup>

We cannot here describe the rest of the *disciplina* as it is known to us primarily from late sources, but it is unlikely that it continued to develop, and probably most of the material collected by Thulin was in the books translated in our period;<sup>44</sup> for example, in haruspicy proper, it was held disastrous if there was no *caput*, projection, on the liver, while a split in this, a *caput caesum*, portends great change.

The books seem to have been published in the usual way. Varro more than once shows knowledge of *Etrusci libri*. Vitruvius knows about the town-planning principles of the *haruspices*; Seneca and Pliny had Caecina to hand, later grammarians excerpt odd words. If Cicero talks of 'recondite studies' he does not mean secret ones, though there may in earlier times have been an impulse to secrecy among priests and diviners, partly for political reasons, and Augustus was to keep the prophecies of Vegoia with the Sibylline books in the temple of Palatine Apollo, probably, like them, only to be consulted by experts.<sup>45</sup> It is also worth drawing a contrast with the earlier Greek practice of learning the future from oracles. This hot-line to the deity does not require an apparatus of scholarship. Only the poorer classes in Italy sometimes had recourse to simpler expressions of the divine will; Cicero tells us that divination by lots at the temple of Fortuna at Praeneste was now practiced only by the vulgar,<sup>46</sup> while as we saw Italian traditions of magic were also largely the expression of backward areas and humbler elements in society.

One foreign method of learning the future was increasingly adopted. Astrology was not, as it claimed, a doctrine of vast antiquity; the first preserved horoscope from Babylonia dates from the late fifth century, and the system that still survives only took shape in the Greek world in perhaps the second, with the aid of Hellenistic astronomy (though some of the best astronomers deplored it). To Cicero, using its opponents Panaetius and perhaps Carneades or another Academic, the core of the doctrine is the belief that the signs of the Zodiac, the stars, and the planets (now associated, and soon identified, with major Graeco-Roman gods) by their movements and

<sup>43</sup> Lydus *De Ost.* 59-70; 'Caesius' followed Etruscan lore, Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 3.40, in identifying the Penates with Fortuna, Ceres, Genius Iovialis and Pales (the last being masculine - Pales' sex was a recognised problem).

It has been argued by M. Torelli, *Mélanges Heurgon* (1976) 1001 from the survival of Etruscan glosses in late Greek sources, which think they are Latin, that Latin works on the *disciplina* retained many Etruscan terms (perhaps hardly whole passages in Etruscan).

<sup>44</sup> C. Thulin, *Die Etruskische Disziplin* (1906-9).

<sup>45</sup> Cens. *De Die* 14.6; Vitr. 1.7.1; cf. *Liber Col.* 225 on the probably triumviral colony of Florentia in Etruria, where land was divided in accordance with haruspical rites (cf. *Grom. Vet.* 349); Serv. *Aen.* 6.72.

For early secrecy see the story in Val. Max. 1.1.13 about King Tarquin punishing a *Ilvir s.f.* who gave a book on *civilia sacra* to a Sabine, and stories about the Etruscan prophecies on the fall of Veii. There were some mystery cults in Rome, those of Bacchus (not eliminated in 183), Ceres and the Bona Dea.

<sup>46</sup> *De Div.* 2.86-7.

relationships settle the whole fate of those born at a particular time.<sup>47</sup> (He does not mention ‘catarchic’ astrology, which is less fatalistic and only advises the most favourable time for actions.) It is not clear to what extent earlier Stoics approved of astrology, but certain aspects of it were likely to attract them, and Augustine repeatedly notes Posidonius’ devotion to it; and Cicero found himself face to face with Stoicism when he produced (without an adequate technical grasp of the subject) arguments against what he here calls ‘utter madness’.<sup>48</sup>

‘Chaldaei’ had been expelled from Rome in 139 B.C.; even earlier the elder Cato had disapproved of them as acquaintances for his bailiff. But the first prominent men known to have accepted their teaching are Octavius, the consul of 88 (‘though a wise and virtuous man’), and Sulla.<sup>49</sup> Pliny however describes the slave Manilius Antiochus who came to Italy with the cousin who was to be Publilius Syrus the mime-writer, perhaps during the Mithridatic Wars, as ‘the founder of astrology at Rome’.<sup>50</sup> Manilius is otherwise unknown;<sup>51</sup> we have a little more information on Tarutius of Firmum in Picenum, who as we saw wrote *On the Stars* in Greek (being concerned with a learned subject) and calculated the date of Romulus’ conception, working back from what was known of his life (many astrologers based horoscopes on conception rather than birth), giving this date, and that of Romulus’ birth, according to the Egyptian calendar, much used by astronomers and astrologers. And he tried to cast the horoscope of Rome itself, which Cicero declared the height of absurdity, though in fact city horoscopes were not uncommon.<sup>52</sup> It should be noted that one of the best-known treatises on astrology from the Hellenistic period is that attributed to the Pharaoh Nechepso and his priest Petosiris, which may well have circulated in Rome; it had a horoscope of the entire world. ‘Nechepso’ probably also formulated botanical and pharmaceutical astrology, by which different plants came under the influence of the 36 decans (the gods presiding each over ten degrees of the Zodiac). It is probable that astrological texts were also already ascribed to the Egyptian god Thoth or Hermes

<sup>47</sup> Ib. 2.89. Cicero finds it hard to believe the Chaldaeans have studied the skies for hundreds of thousands of years.

<sup>48</sup> Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 5.2, 5; *De Div.* 2.88, 90; A.A. Long, in *Science and Speculation* (1982), ed. J. Barnes *et al.*, 165.

<sup>49</sup> Plut. *Mar.* 42.4, *Sull.* 5.5-6 (but the Chaldaean is not in Rome and his art here is divination by *physiognomonía*, study of a subject’s physical traits, a genuinely old Mesopotamian practice). I am not convinced by all M.H. Crawford’s attempts to see astrological signs on Roman coins from this period (e.g. *RRC* nos. 389, 392, 420, 422): zodiacal signs might merely refer to the calendar, and few are involved.

<sup>50</sup> Pliny *NH* 35.199.

<sup>51</sup> Unless it is he quoted for a partly Etruscan piece of fulgural lore, Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 3.38 (the *Di Novensiles* are the nine gods Jupiter lets wield his thunderbolt); but this may be the senator Manilius, p. 4. The relationship to the later astronomical poet Manilius is also obscure, but the art ran in families.

<sup>52</sup> Pliny *NH* 2.18; *De Div.* 2.98; Plut. *Rom.* 12.5. The name may be Etruscan (*HRR* Licinius Macer, frag. 1: *Tarutio cuidam, Tusco diviti* in Romulus’ time). Presumably Tarutius accepted – unless he originated – Varro’s date for the foundation of Rome. The Parilia, Varro *De RR* 2.1.9.

Trismegistus. If Cicero describes Tarutius as skilled in the theories of the Chaldaeans, the word now had little racial significance, and astrology was clearly often mediated by Egypt.

Strabo was to say that the Chaldaeans differ greatly in their opinions. Certainly Diodorus, describing Babylonia, gives an account of astrology that differs from Cicero's and may rest on a third-century source.<sup>53</sup> The Chaldaeans believe that the world is eternal and ruled by divine providence, which means in fact by the five planets: four are called after Ares, Aphrodite, Hermes and Zeus (i.e. Mars, Venus, Mercury and Jupiter) as they are with us, but Saturn is called 'the star of the Sun'. They foreshadow especially natural calamities. Lower in rank are the thirty stars known as the 'Gods of Counsel', half overseeing the area above the earth (which is shaped like a hollow boat) and half that below it; every ten days one of those above is sent as a messenger to those below and *vice versa*. Twelve of them hold the chief authority, each ruling one month and one sign of the Zodiac. Twenty-four other stars, half in the northern part of the heavens and half in the south, are called the Judges of the Universe, those visible being assigned to the world of the living and those invisible to that of the dead. This probably struck Diodorus' readers as astronomically primitive and not of practical relevance.

He adds that the Chaldaeans were also skilled in prophesying from the flight of birds, dreams, portents and entrails;<sup>54</sup> no wonder the various national systems of soothsaying began to affect each other. He also lays weight on the way the lore was passed down from father to son, and claims an early start led to deep learning. He does not stress secrecy. In fact the special astronomical and mathematical skills needed for casting a horoscope no doubt protected adepts from too much competition. Perhaps even Varro could not cast a horoscope and had to call on Tarutius.

The 'Chaldaeans' made strikingly unfulfilled prophecies of death in bed to Crassus, Pompey and Caesar. But this was no deterrent. In 44 young Octavius and his friend Agrippa consulted the astrologer Theogenes at Apollonia. In 42 a *mathematicus* called Scribonius is said to have prophesied the greatness of her new-born son Tiberius to the future Empress Livia.<sup>55</sup>

As for real Egyptian religion, it is clear that the Romans received it, as one might expect, mostly filtered through Graeco-Egyptian sources. The cult of Serapis, for example, seems to have been an artificial construction of the first Ptolemies, designed to unite Greeks and natives in a devotion associated with loyalty to the dynasty. Isis was much worshipped, but her cult and image much adapted, by the Greeks in Egypt, and from them her rites spread over the Mediterranean. But neither Greeks or Romans could be other than shocked by the animal worship, as they saw it, of the native religion.<sup>56</sup>

The somewhat incoherent account of Egyptian religion offered at

<sup>53</sup> Strabo 16.C739; DS 2.29-31.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Catullus 90.2: *Persicum aruspicium*.

<sup>55</sup> *De Div.* 2.99; Suet. *Aug.* 94.12, *Ti.* 14.2.

<sup>56</sup> *De Nat. Deor.* 1.43, 3.47. A source of Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 432b) makes Moses the founder of Egyptian animal worship; and see p. 311 for Nigidius.

considerable length by Diodorus Siculus is undoubtedly of Greek origin, probably mainly from the early Hellenistic author Hecataeus of Abdera, combined with more recent sources.<sup>57</sup> It insists that Egypt is where the gods were born (and the heavens first observed) and that Greek religion is derived from Egypt. The natural aspects of Osiris and Isis are first stressed; they are Sun and Moon, whence all the other elements, identified with the main Greek gods (Athena is the Air), are created; perhaps from a different source Osiris is also equated with Dionysus. Other Egyptian gods are Euhemerized, and indeed the name Osiris also belonged, we are told, to a great king who built cities and temples and crossed the world on a civilising mission, while his wife Isis ruled at home. Thoth, the Greek Hermes, was this Osiris' scribe, who invented letters, music and so on; Heracles, Prometheus, Perseus and others were distinguished Egyptians, nine girl musicians were remembered as the Muses. Much of Greece was colonised from Egypt (Diodorus finally becomes openly sceptical). The story is then told of Osiris' murder by his brother Tryphon, and the revenge of Isis and her son Horus, with the founding of cults to Osiris throughout Egypt. There is also a variant account of Isis, notably as a healer through dreams whom 'almost the whole world' honours (this must be of recent origin), with a quotation from an inscription supposed to mark her tomb in Arabia; inscriptions in her praise in fact survive. But the recent and artificial Serapis is hardly mentioned.

Most of the elements we have considered are to be found in the work of Nigidius Figulus. Though we are told that Varro was better in theology and Nigidius in 'general studies', it is clear that the latter's main interests were in fact in the occult.<sup>58</sup> Jerome, as we saw, calls him *Pythagoricus et magus*. *Magus*, by now, meant not a member of the Persian order of priests, but a magician of oriental cast. *Magi* were not always distinguished from *Chaldaei*, but books attributed to Zoroaster did circulate in the Hellenistic world, like those supposed to be by his disciple Ostanēs, who was thought to be in particular an alchemist. Magic, again, was considered an *ars*, which may be one reason magicians are better regarded than witches, humble and ignorant females. When eastern magic first entered Rome is uncertain, but we saw that Pliny held that Asclepiades' success as a doctor was partly due to a reaction against the claims of the *magi* for their charms.<sup>59</sup> The Egyptians were also known for magic, and Greek-writing sources used by Alexander Polyhistor regarded the Jews as famous for it: Abraham invents astrology and teaches it to the Egyptians, Moses' wonder-working is played up and he is even identified with Thoth.<sup>60</sup> But though there were Jews in Rome, we do not hear of Romans going to them for magical aid. There was some feeling that magic was wrong; Catullus speaks of *Persarum impia religio* and envisages a *magus* springing from the incestuous embraces of an enemy of his.<sup>61</sup> But it was chiefly necromancy,

<sup>57</sup> DS 1.6-27.

<sup>58</sup> Serv. *Aen.* 10.175. B. Cardauns, *ANRW* 2.16.1 (1978) 80 thinks Varro may be a gloss for *ille*, i.e. Nigidius.

<sup>59</sup> p. 171.

<sup>60</sup> Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 418d, 420b, c; 432b, 434c, 435.

<sup>61</sup> Catullus 90. Damaging person or property by magic (*veneficium*) was an indictable offence.

which as some averred demanded the sacrifice of an innocent boy, which aroused horror. Cicero, accusing Vatinius of Pythagoreanism, which for Nigidius and his friends meant primarily an interest in magic, pretends this involves summoning the dead and sacrificing boys to the *Di Manes* of the underworld. But in one of his treatises, where he has no motive to libel Ap. Claudius, now dead, and indeed calls him 'my friend', he states with surprising calm that Appius practised necromancy. And Cicero writes to Nigidius as *uni omnium doctissimo et sanctissimo*.<sup>62</sup>

The fame that he left was partly that of an astrologer. We are told of his casting the horoscope of the future Emperor Augustus on the day of his birth in 63, and prophesying his coming greatness. Lucan represents him as foretelling from the stars, which he knew better than any Egyptian, the result of the battle of Pharsalus. Augustine says he gained his *cognomen* Figulus, the Potter, from his use of the argument from the spinning potter's wheel, on which two marks made almost simultaneously yet turn out to be far apart, to dispose of the argument against astrology derived from the different fates of twins. But we also hear, apparently *via* Varro, of his using boys inspired by incantations to trace a sum of money lost by one Fabius, which was found to be partly buried and partly scattered, with one coin in the hands of Cato.<sup>63</sup>

Two of Nigidius' works were concerned with Italian divination: *De Augurio Privato* with a subject that Cicero said had become almost entirely neglected, and *De Extis* presumably with haruspicy, probably from Etruscan sources. The scanty remains explain old words and technical terms.<sup>64</sup> The longest passage attributed to Nigidius is the so-called *Brontosopia*, a calendar noting what thunder presages on each day of the year (October 7: if it thunders there will be a glut of pulse and a scarcity of wine). Like the similar works we have met it claims to be translated from Etruscan, indeed from Tages himself. But it seems to be too sweeping to be really Etruscan, and it declares that it applies only to Rome (it uses the Roman calendar). At best, it has been translated into Greek – all Nigidius' works seem to have been in Latin – and perhaps adapted to imperial conditions: there is a good deal about 'the king' as well as plagues, servile revolts, famines and outbreaks of indiscipline among women.<sup>65</sup> At worst, it is a document to which the famous name of Nigidius has been arbitrarily attached in the course of transmission to the late author in whom we find it.

<sup>62</sup> *In Vat.* 14 (cf. ps-Cic. *Invect.* in *Sall.* 5.14: *sodalitium sacrilegi Nigidiani*); *De Div.* 1.132, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.37; *Ad F.* 4.13.3. But Varro in the *Curio de Cultu Deorum* surely only said, *pace* Augustine's special pleading in *Civ. Dei.* 7.35, that Numa practised the more innocent hydromancy (water, not blood is used). Laberius' mime *Necyomantia*, Ribbeck *SRF* II 289. Dio 45.1.4 is probably anachronistic.

<sup>63</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 94.5, cf. Dio 45.1; Lucan 1. 639ff.; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 5.3 (but the scholiast of Lucan says he got the name because returning from Greece he said he had learnt that the sphere turns as rapidly as a potter's wheel; or was his wealth from – Arretine? – potteries?); Apul. *Apol.* 42.

<sup>64</sup> Frags 80, 81 Swob.

<sup>65</sup> Lydus *De Ost.* 27-38. All the months have 30 days and are deemed to begin with the new moon; the year starts in June, when the moon is in the House of the Crab. This modern astronomy at least does not support T. Cornell, *JRS* (1978) 172 in his claim that the document reflects Etruscan conditions in the archaic period.

It is possible that Nigidius wrote a separate account of the interpretation of dreams, if so the only known treatment in Latin of a subject popular with the Greeks but again chiefly derived from the East. But our fragment deals with dreams about thunderbolts and might come from a work on the latter – though Greek dream-literature did discuss dreams of this kind. While to be struck by a thunderbolt in reality is ill-omened, to dream of it portends good fortune. Nigidius may have used interpretation by contraries elsewhere.<sup>66</sup>

We know more of the astrological work called *Sphaera*, the Sphere (a work of this title is also attributed to the near-contemporary Asclepiades of Myrleia).<sup>67</sup> It gave legends of the figures commemorated in the signs of the Zodiac, and referred to the rising and setting of stars and constellations with respect to these signs.

The Zodiacal legends Nigidius tells are mostly Greek or heavily Hellenized – Taurus is Europa's Bull, the Twins are Castor and Pollux, Leo the Nemean Lion slain by Hercules; but the story of Capricorn, identified with Pan, is set in the East and serves as an aetiology of Egyptian animal-worship and other religious customs.<sup>68</sup> A digression described the enthronement, initiation and coronation of the King of Egypt at Memphis, and a recent Egyptological study is prepared to accept it as largely correct.<sup>69</sup> The present tense cannot, alas, prove a contemporary source, let alone autopsy. Pisces, the Fish, are at home in the Euphrates, and involved in a peculiar story about the birth of the Dea Syria, Atargatis, from eggs found in the river. To the *Sphaera Barbarica* on Eastern constellations (later driven out by Greek ones), which perhaps combined with the *Sphaera Graecanica* to form a single work, is attributed an identification of the Ploughman, with, probably, the Greek Triptolemus, and with Horus or Horon, the son of Osiris.<sup>70</sup> Nigidius' mixed Egyptian and Mesopotamian material has of course been filtered through Greek sources.

The lengthy work *On the Gods* (at least nineteen books) seems also to combine the most disparate elements, in order, this time, to throw light on Graeco-Roman deities. Dealing with cosmogonies and divine histories, Nigidius gave a version he described as Orphic: first Saturn ruled, then Jupiter, then (here we perhaps pass into the future) Neptune and finally Pluto. Another was attributed to the Magi (perhaps from an oracle attributed to Hystaspes, Zoroaster's protector, dealing with eschatology and the world's destruction by fire, known in Judaising or Christian versions).<sup>71</sup> This said that the reign of Apollo was about to come, and Nigidius wonders if the (Stoic) *ardor* or *ekpyrōsis*, the recurring conflagration of the world, is the same. Philosophic influence may be seen in a fragment about life in accordance with nature, but soon Nigidius is back with 'Etruscan disciplines', telling us that there are four kinds of Penates, each corresponding to one of the four realms, of Jupiter, Neptune, the gods below, and mankind – 'talking I don't

<sup>66</sup> Frag. 82 Swob.

<sup>67</sup> F. Boll, *Sphaera* (1903) 543.

<sup>68</sup> Frag. 98 Swob.

<sup>69</sup> J. Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (1968) 95.

<sup>70</sup> Frags 102-3 Swob. For the *De Terra*, probably not the same as the *Sphaera*, see p. 266.

<sup>71</sup> Frag. 67 Swob.

know what incomprehensible stuff' complains our source.<sup>72</sup> Nigidius further asks if the Penates might be Neptune and Apollo themselves, who built the 'immortal' walls of Troy and were brought to Italy by Aeneas. On the Lares, though apparently in different works, he retailed diverse theories – guardians of the house, Curetes from Crete, the Samothracian Dactyloi or Fingers (scholars still disagree on the origin and function of the Lares).<sup>73</sup> There was inevitably etymology and explanation of Greek words. There were regulations about cult, or quotation from these: 'let him rise and make four cakes.'<sup>74</sup> And, probably ultimately from this work, there is a long narrative of a wedding among the gods which explains in which of the sixteen regions of the sky each dwells, and makes another shot at the Penates – the 'Penates of Jupiter' are the 'Senators of the Gods' and the *Di Consentes*. The sixteen regions are Etruscan; the Senators of the Gods may be Egyptian; some of the gods have old Italic names, while the connection of Juno Caelestis with Saturn is Punic (though there is little Punic influence on Roman religion, in spite of the possible *evocatio* of Punic Juno from Carthage by Scipio Aemilianus; Carthage had been a hated foe and the Romans deplored child sacrifice).<sup>75</sup> About the only influence missing is that of the Druids, of whom Cicero, otherwise totally uninterested in western barbarians, has like Caesar something to say.<sup>76</sup> But some of the Nigidian mish-mash may possibly already have been in an Etruscan source.

Nigidius' work was eclipsed by Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, which would seem to have been both more nationalistic in approach and more philosophic. It was used by the poets of the Augustan period and by Christian writers such as Tertullian and Augustine, whose bias must be kept in mind as we try to reconstruct it. The sixteen books were dedicated to the *pontifex maximus*, Caesar, probably with the hope that he might restore some of the usages fallen into desuetude – as he to some extent did, though perhaps partly to provide posts of honour for his followers. The work followed on the (rather longer) *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum*, and Varro excused himself by pointing out that he was not dealing with the gods as such, but with institutions set up by men; it is they who have given the gods names and cults. But he is not, he says, dealing only with names and titles; what is the use of knowing the name of Liber if you do not know that he is not the god to pray to for water?<sup>77</sup>

From Augustine, who used the work extensively in the *City of God*, we know its typically Varronian structure: after a general introduction, five groups of three books, the first triad on men (the different priesthoods at Rome, *pontifices*, augers and *XVviri*) the second on places (three sorts of holy place) the third on times (three sorts of festival – the Christians were shocked that a

<sup>72</sup> Frag. 68 Swob. (from Arnobius).

<sup>73</sup> Frag. 70 Swob.

<sup>74</sup> Frags 71-7 Swob. For the importance of the etymological approach, observe the *De Etyymi Deorum* of Cornificius, p. 114.

<sup>75</sup> Frag. 78 Swob.

<sup>76</sup> *De Div.* 1.90. Alexander Polyhistor (*FGH* no. 273 frag. 94) made Pythagoras study with 'Gauls', i.e. Druids.

<sup>77</sup> Varro *Ant. RD* frags 3, 5, Card.

book on dramatic festivals should be found in a work on religion). The fourth triad dealt with rites and the fifth finally with the gods, divided into *dei certi*, *incerti* and *praecipui et selecti* – an awkward *divisio*, especially as some or all in the third category had already been treated in the first. The *dei certi* were further divided into gods relating to man, from his conception to his death – from Janus who presides over beginnings to Nenia invoked in funeral laments – to aspects of man like food and dress, and to other things needful for life. About the *dei incerti*, who included divinised human beings, Varro did not think he could say anything certain; let those who could, do so, but he was likelier to be brought to doubt what he had said about the *dei certi* than to accept anything further.<sup>78</sup> What he thought he knew for certain often came from etymologies and was fantastic.

Augustine attacks Varro's arrangement as contradictory, objecting that he divides the *dei praecipui et selecti* into heavenly, active and masculine on the one hand and terrestrial, passive and feminine on the other, after saying in the previous book that the iconography of the statues at Samothrace shows that the mysteries there depend on this distinction, made manifest in Jupiter and Juno, while Minerva represents Platonic ideas, the model or pattern of things. But then Varro introduces Minerva among the female deities, while surely Neptune and Pluto, who are masculine, are related to the earth rather than the sky.<sup>79</sup>

The first book, or part of it, was philosophic. It was perhaps here that Varro introduced the three Stoic philosophies, *mythicon*, *physicon* and *civile* as he called them. His subject is the civil theology of Rome. Civil religion is composed of elements from the other two, neither of which is by itself suited for society, the poetic by deficiency and the natural or philosophic by excess. Elements of the latter are especially valuable, however, as philosophy aims at usefulness and poetry only at pleasure. Were Varro founding a city, he would introduce a religion more closely based on 'natural' theology than Rome's – though he probably said that Numa forbade cult statues, only introduced by Etruscan and Greek artists. Their less pure worship reduced fear of the gods and introduced error. (Something similar may have been in the *Republic* of the Stoic Zeno.) It seems Varro would also have liked to do without sacrifices, holding as he does to the Stoic view perhaps shared by Antiochus that the true God is the living fire, the rational soul of the world, and to kill anything is to kill a part of God; Varro may also have drawn on Pythagorean traditions. Gods, he says, do not want sacrifice; their statues want it even less. This is not to say that they do not respond to prayer; Varro will at least have held that this was a good thing, like other forms of worship.<sup>80</sup>

But the Romans are an ancient people and their traditional institutions ought not to be forgotten. Varro feared that many gods would perish not by hostile action but by neglect. It is his desire to save these and restore them to the memory of the *boni* (a word with conservative political overtones), a

<sup>78</sup> Id. ib. frag. 204 Card.

<sup>79</sup> Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 7.28.

<sup>80</sup> Varro *Ant. RD* frags 6-22 Card.

project more useful than Aeneas' rescue of the Penates from Troy.<sup>81</sup> Besides, many tenets of civil theology are politically valuable, such as that great men should believe they are the sons of gods.<sup>82</sup> In general, Varro seems to have believed that the *antiqui* thought in symbols, 'so that a man might gain insight into the world and its parts, that is the true gods'; even anthropomorphic images symbolise the rational soul of the gods. Augustine felt that Varro was led into contradiction between his desire to attribute 'natural' explanations to the *antiqui* and that to describe old Roman religion as it was.<sup>83</sup> But it may be pointed out in his defence that many modern thinkers see religion as a way to explain the world.

The world which religion explains for Varro is made of mind and body, it is divided into heaven and earth, and each of these into two. Janus is the world. Augustine points out that this creates problems with Jupiter; but Jupiter is among other things the fiery aether, his 'wife' and 'sister' Juno is the lower air, as Neptune's wife Salacia is the lower depth of the sea and Pluto's wife Proserpina the lower depth of the earth. Tarquinius Priscus, the Etruscan King of Rome, is thought to have received these ideas from Samothrace, though they really evoke the contemporary Academy or Stoa, which used allegory to reconcile the philosophers with the poets and artists. All four sections of the cosmos are full of spirits, the aether of the stars, the sublunary air of 'heroes, *lares* and *genii*' (the Greek *daimones*), and earth and water of mortal souls. The lesser gods, and even Mercury and Mars, only represent human functions.<sup>84</sup>

But most of the work was antiquarian and scholarly in nature. Book 2, as we saw, concerned the origin and function of the Roman priests. Romulus himself instituted sixty priests with their assistants, proof that no other people is as religious as the Romans. There was a full account of the garb, taboos and duties of various ancient offices; a fragment concerns the white *galerus* worn by the Flamen Dialis (there had been no holder of the position for two generations when Varro wrote). The book on the augurs certainly discussed the augural law on thunderbolts, simpler than the Etruscan, and perhaps divided divination into four kinds, corresponding to the four elements, aeromancy, pyromancy, geomancy and hydromancy. That on the *XVviri*, who had charge of the Sibylline books, included discussion of the various Sibyls of the Greek world, perhaps deciding that the Sibyl of Erythrae in Asia was responsible for the books kept in Rome (possibly the collection reconstituted after the fire of 83 by diligent search for 'Sibylline' oracles throughout the Greek world, presumably by the *XVviri*). It is likely that Varro himself accepted some sorts of divination, as so many Stoics did.<sup>85</sup>

From Book 5 is preserved a note that the altars of the celestial, terrestrial and infernal gods have different names, and a discussion of the old spelling of *ara*, altar, as *asa*, with an excursion into the history of spelling, and also

<sup>81</sup> Id. ib. frag. 2a Card.

<sup>82</sup> Id. ib. frag. 20 Card.

<sup>83</sup> Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 7.17, 23.

<sup>84</sup> Varro *Ant. RD* frags 230, 28, 205, 256, 259, 226 Card.; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 7.14.

<sup>85</sup> Id. ib. frags 51-61 Card.; Tac. *Ann.* 6.12; *De Div.* 1.68, Varro alarmed by a prophecy.

etymology. The next book distinguished various types of temples and the words proper to them and explained that they were partly instituted for social reasons. It gave much history and legend about different temples in Rome and the objects in them. Augustine cites it as a recognised part of Varro's learning that he could mention numbers of forgotten shrines often in his day occupied by private persons.<sup>86</sup> Little remains from the three books on festivals and the three on rites, at least for certain.

In the last triad the gods dealt with under the rubric of *certi* included the numerous and to later ages often comic old Latin gods whom Varro had recovered from old documents, perhaps especially the *Indigitamenta*, and from now neglected rites; perhaps in origin hardly real gods, but aspects of the divine invoked only in groups or in the train of a greater deity. Here no doubt were Rubigo, the god of blight in the fields, Fessona, invoked by tired people, and many more. As ever there were varied *obiter dicta*: on Greek influence on Latin vocabulary, Aristotle's views on generation.<sup>87</sup> The book on the *dei incerti* had much legend of the humans divinised after death – Aeneas, Romulus, Faunus and so on, and also dealt with the uncertain 'great gods' of the Samothracian mysteries.<sup>88</sup> The *dei praecipui* were the twenty gods particularly honoured in Rome and assimilated to Greek divinities. Here too Varro, quoting Xenophanes, disclaims certain knowledge; man has opinion, only God has knowledge, of these things.<sup>89</sup> He drew however on poetry, iconography, pontifical literature and Roman and foreign cult practice. Tertullian suggests that Saturn provided problems; his name was derived from *satio*, seeding, but he was identified with Kronos – and Chronos, time; Varro considered the attributes of his statues, and the Punic and Gallic cults of gods identified with him.<sup>90</sup> Indeed, in this book and elsewhere there was discussion of foreign cults, for purposes of comparison and to register Rome's importations: the 'municipal gods' peculiar to Italian towns, for example Delventinus of Casinum, and of course especially Sabine, but also Etruscan deities. There was mention of the Jewish god, easily identified with Jupiter (the first surviving reference in Latin) and of the Egyptian gods whose worship the Senate had recently tried to suppress, in the city of Rome at least.<sup>91</sup> But Augustine said that he found nothing on Attis and his eunuch priests: 'interpretation failed, reason blushed, eloquence fell silent'.<sup>92</sup>

Varro even thought he could throw light on Greek religion: he claims that his 'natural' interpretation of the mysteries of Samothrace is unknown even to the priests there, and he intends to send it to them.<sup>93</sup> At all events, though there had been many Greek works on the cults of a particular city or

<sup>86</sup> Varro op. cit. frags 62-75 Card.; Aug. *Civ. Dei* 3.17.

<sup>87</sup> Id. ib. frags 87-203 Card.; 89, 98.

<sup>88</sup> Id. ib. frags 204-24 Card.

<sup>89</sup> Id. ib. frag. 228 Card.

<sup>90</sup> Id. ib. frags 239-47 Card.

<sup>91</sup> Id. ib. frags 33, 34; 16, 17; 46 Card.

<sup>92</sup> Aug. *Civ. Dei* 7.25-6. Roman scholars also neglected the alarming rites of the Cappadocian Ma. These were emotional religions, without intellectual pretensions.

<sup>93</sup> Varro op. cit. frag. 206 Card.

sanctuary, there had probably been none with the sweep and on the scale of the *Antiquitates*, one of the crowning achievements of the Roman urge to systematisation. Boyancé notes how strange it was to try to integrate traditional Roman religion with that of the philosophers' cosmic god, but suggests that it was essential if Roman religion was to be associated with a world empire.<sup>94</sup> One may compare Cicero's attempt in the *De Legibus* to prove that all Rome's religious and political institutions were in accord with Natural Law and so ideal for any nation; but Cicero is less learned, and more critical. Not that Varro was not opposed to 'superstition'; the superstitious man fears the gods, the religious man reveres them as he would his parents; for they are good, more apt to spare than to punish.<sup>95</sup>

Whatever one thinks of the results, in their approach to religion and the occult the Romans were, in the first century, reaching a sort of intellectual maturity, as in so many fields. They were beginning to practise new *artes*, requiring much learning, and extending their horizon to take in Druids in the West and Iranians and Chaldaeans in the East; in other words they were adopting up-to-date international ideas. This is one of the fields in which the contrast with the second century is most marked. It is also the one field in which it makes some sense to talk of orientalised, though eastern influence was almost entirely mediated by Greek sources which had largely transmuted the original material. (The flood was to sweep on under the Empire, and the Emperors' trust in astrology was to make that at least almost a part of the State religion). But the Romans felt that they had something to contribute to the study of the divine, above all in their knowledge of the Etruscan discipline. Nigidius' amalgam was no doubt largely his own. So, certainly, was Varro's combination of Greek philosophy and Roman antiquarianism.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>94</sup> P. Boyancé, *REA* (1955) 57.

<sup>95</sup> Varro op. cit. frag. 47 Card.

<sup>96</sup> Gavius Bassus, a *grammaticus*, also wrote *De Diis* (for date see A. Gellius 3.9, possibly after Antony's death) with symbolic and 'physical' explanations of the iconography of Janus.

## Conclusion

If the Mithridatic Wars mark a period of transition, how far did the years of chaos after Cicero's death form another? To some extent of course they did. The Civil Wars of Pompey and Caesar had already swept away many distinguished orators and writers of the upper class and ushered in a period more austere in its tastes and under the shadow of Caesar and his great plans. The proscriptions and the new civil wars thinned the aristocracy yet further, eliminating among others Brutus, with his philosophic and historical interests, and Cicero's two clever Caesarian friends, Cornificius and Trebonius. We know that some young men with rhetorical ambitions from the provinces, notably the elder Seneca and Porcius Latro, delayed going to Rome; and when they did arrive, after Actium, they found the quarrel between Atticists and Asianists dead, and few speakers active, apart from Asinius Pollio, who had started their careers under the Republic.<sup>1</sup> Livy, too, seems to have stayed in Patavium in northern Italy, and gone neither to Rome nor to Greece for his education. But Varro and Atticus escaped the proscriptions and wrote on under the protection of old age, Varro at least as busily as ever and into the twenties, in spite of the loss of one of his libraries.

There was less disruption among intellectuals of lower social status. Freedmen and adherents of great men may often have had to follow their patrons abroad, though freedmen were not usually liable to military service, and were normally spared when their patrons came to grief. The *grammatici* Caecilius Epirota, Tyrannio (under whom Strabo was now studying), Valerius Cato too, seem to have continued teaching in the thirties. Those poets who proclaimed an Epicurean quietism appear to have lived undisturbed, though Virgil may not have been the only man of letters to lose land in the distributions to veterans. The Greek philosophers busy on the manuscripts of Aristotle or on other tasks probably continued them without interruption. Diodorus, clearly elderly by now, finished his history some time in the triumviral period. Vitruvius, after an interval of poverty, found a job with Octavian. A consciousness of the supreme importance of recent events and nostalgia for the past stimulated historians, the best-known being Sallust, to try to analyse what had gone wrong, or to record the drama and the roles of the main actors in it. Antiquarians, perhaps inspired by Varro's example, attempted to set down many features of the remoter past. As for the lawyers, if Servius Sulpicius had succumbed in 43, his pupils seem mostly to have prospered, and possibly avoided the wars.

Even the first few years after Octavian became Augustus, though they saw the influx into Rome of a new generation not only of Latin-speaking

<sup>1</sup> Sen. Rhet. *Controv.* 1 *praef.* 11-13.

intellectuals from Italy or the western provinces, but of Greeks such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, are in many ways a hang-over from the Republic, with Rome still unaware that she was to be ruled by a dynasty of Caesars and the foundations of monarchy not fully established. Indeed, it was a period of intellectual confidence and renewal. But gradually changes were to come.

The acquisition of real poetic classics in Virgil and Horace, as well as the new assurance in the standards reached by Roman oratory in the generation of Cicero, with the growing number and increasing status of Roman teachers, especially in rhetoric, meant that education was less concerned with Greek models, and less in the hands of Greeks, than it had been in Cicero's day. The elder Seneca had a limited knowledge of Greek rhetoric,<sup>2</sup> though quarrels between schools, such as that between the Apollodoreans and Theodorean, still took their rise from Greek theorists. Augustus encouraged Roman and Italian traditions, though he was not hostile to those of classical Greece. It is often observed that, somewhat later, Pliny and Quintilian are less steeped in Greek literature and ideas than Cicero or Varro, though it should be said that that is partly because neither was much interested in philosophy; for certainly many Romans still chose to write in Greek, and Nero and Domitian introduced to Rome Greek-style festivals with literary competitions. And in the second century the upper classes of the western and eastern halves of the Empire were to meet in the Senate and the civil service.<sup>3</sup>

In spite of the 'Roman philosophy' taught by Sextius (who in fact wrote in Greek, and whose school petered out in the second generation) philosophy remained a Greek subject, like medicine, and many Greek philosophers were to be found in Rome. But it was less fashionable now for young Romans to study in Greece. There was some vogue for the still largely Greek-speaking Massilia as a centre of education ('instead of Athens', says Strabo);<sup>4</sup> not too far from Italy, it had a reputation for moral severity. It seems to have lacked teachers or scholars of any distinction; we know philosophy was taught there, but not the name of a single philosopher, and the elder Seneca implies that its schools of rhetoric were derivative from those in Rome.<sup>5</sup> (It is true that we do not know the names of any philosophers in Athens either between the feeble Theomnestus and Plutarch's teacher Ammonius). Alexandria was now truly within the Empire, and Alexandrian teachers and scholars came to Rome (perhaps not the most able, or not for long); but members of the upper class had to have imperial permission to visit Egypt, and thus the city where most of the real intellectual achievements of the period took place – in grammar, medicine and mechanics – could not attract Roman pupils. This was the more grave in that Rhodes, reduced to poverty by Cassius in 43, was not to recover its intellectual and cultural prestige, though it remained a pleasant place for

<sup>2</sup> J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (1981) 77-83 (though perhaps owing to his birth and education in Spain).

<sup>3</sup> By the early first century A.D. Greek was heard in the Senate without an interpreter, Val. Max. 2.2.3.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo 4.C181; cf. M. Clerc, *Massilia II* (1929) 315. Several doctors from the city made a name in Rome.

<sup>5</sup> Sen. Rhet. *Controv.* 2.6.12.

Tiberius to spend his virtual exile in; Pergamum retained to some extent its position as a cultural centre. Paradoxically, the Roman upper class was a little cut off from Greek intellectual life – more cut off than Cicero or Varro had been.

A more direct result of political change was that the most important decisions were now made behind closed doors on the Palatine, with results for historiography and oratory well appreciated by Tacitus. Lawyers soon needed imperial patronage to give authorised *responsa*; they concentrated on refining the civil law. The Emperor's choice of doctor, and that doctor's success or lack of it in treating the imperial family, became relevant to medical history. In general, intellectuals were in or out of favour; Timagenes quarrelled with Augustus, though in this early period he could still turn elsewhere. The Emperor's tastes and beliefs – in the first instance, Augustus' preference for a simple prose style, acceptance of various forms of divination, and probable disapproval of Epicureanism – were influential, and his patronage, at first indirect, crucial, especially with the increase of more or less official jobs for intellectuals. There was some inefficient censorship in the public libraries and by means of the occasional treason trials of writers and the public book-burnings, and also by the banishment or execution of Greek philosophers and their Roman pupils, who were obliged (especially the Stoics, who might not admit to being swayed by fear or other emotions) to denounce turpitude or tyranny. On the whole the philosophers in Rome came to see it as their most urgent task to help the upper classes to live virtuously and contentedly in a society where they had on the one hand the opportunity of enormous and corrupting wealth, and occasionally power, and on the other were often faced with the threat of political oppression. The intellectual aspect of philosophy often took second place to the moral, though we must not exaggerate this tendency.

The spreading fashion for giving public readings of one's works meant that authors were exceptionally exposed. It has also been seen as encouraging episodic structure and a striving for immediate effect, emotional or merely clever,<sup>6</sup> while the importance now in oratory of the artificial declamation will have had a similar result. Certainly close argument and detailed documentation are best appreciated by the eye, or at least by listening to a reader alone or in a small group; but work introduced by a recitation was designed primarily to be read thereafter. Sophisticated taste and a wide knowledge of earlier writers led to a love of allusion on one hand and variation on the other, which is not the same as a love of truth. Indeed, it has been urged, there was a certain indifference to what was said, compared with the skill with which it was said, and in scientific matters for example a wish to show off a variety of explanations or theories, without caring which was correct.

However, one should not put too much stress on the well-known complaints of intellectual and artistic decline which begin in the later first century A.D. They are to a large extent only an admittedly new form of the permanent

<sup>6</sup> G. Williams, *Change and Decline* (1978).

Roman preoccupation with moral (and so political) decline due to increasing luxury. Thus Seneca and the Elder Pliny deplore the state of science, and the remark by one of Petronius' characters that the devotion to science shown by Democritus, Eudoxus and Chrysippus could not be found today is as revealing if it is a parody as if it is sincerely meant.<sup>7</sup> The decline of interest in painting is lamented by the Elder Pliny as owing to luxury (clearly, here, the vulgar preference for precious materials also noted by Vitruvius). Peace and prosperity, it is true, are not always beneficial to the arts and sciences; Pliny also points out the value of small political units and the competition between Hellenistic kings, which naturally makes us think of the courts of Renaissance Italy.<sup>8</sup> But artistic and intellectual renaissances were also proclaimed at intervals, and complaints of a desire for novelty may reveal attempts at originality. The tendency to turn to the supernatural may disturb us, but apart from the fact that it was not necessarily damaging of itself to the creative arts, it did not discourage certain forms of intellectual subtlety; and rationalism was slow to die. The tendency to turn inward might lead to greater psychological awareness.

At all events, many of the advances of the previous period were retained. Rome could not fall back into the undeveloped and primitive state of the second century B.C. Indeed, the early Empire was in some ways more mature than the late Republic; in particular, the mania for organisation had relaxed, and many of the methods taught by scholars and philosophers had been digested. It was, too, a period of definite if not dramatic technological development, in civil and military engineering, in agriculture and glass-making, and in other fields, though whether those most responsible were strictly Roman rather than Greek is uncertain.

The intellectual horizon of the late Republic was dominated by three subjects of Greek origin, *grammatica*, rhetoric and philosophy. They were not only interwoven with each other, but with all others. In almost all subjects, Greek traditions dominated, but to a different extent and in different ways. The Romans' need to acquire these traditions was real. The Latin language was still clumsy, and was changing rapidly; it needed to be fixed and refined, and, if the legacy of the Roman past, so important to the Romans, was to be made use of, archaic Latin must be explained. Rhetoric helped to organise a speech or a narrative as well as to ornament it, and was of importance even beyond lawcourts and political assemblies. The assimilation of Greek rules of thought, of dialectic, whether directly or indirectly, was a step of primary importance for the history of the West; dialectic was thought of as partly of Stoic origin, and Stoic doctrines influenced fields as different as *grammatica* and divination – though not, curiously, medicine; but there was room for the other schools as well, and indeed where ethics are concerned there seem to have been few whole-hearted Stoics; it is for this reason that Cicero can more than once describe Stoicism as unpopular.

<sup>7</sup> Sen. *NQ* 7.31-2; Pliny *NH* 14.2-6; Petron., *Sat.* 88; cf. Sen. *Rhet. Controv.* 1 *præf.* 6-8.

<sup>8</sup> Pliny *NH* 14.4.

It may seem strange to us to be invited to regard the Romans as deeply concerned not only with verbal niceties but with what we might regard as logic-chopping. Are they not always presented to us as strictly practical persons?<sup>9</sup> The pockets of mystical arithmology and some of the rash theological speculation might make us doubt the universal truth of this over-familiar generalisation, as perhaps might the interest in the history and criticism of poetry, while Varro for one, in spite of claiming that all *artes* arise for use,<sup>10</sup> clearly had a strong impulse to pure erudition. And the unhappy political situation drove some into preferring the 'theoretic' or contemplative life to the active one. But on the whole no doubt the Romans were practical enough in their ends; they wanted to communicate and persuade, to learn law more easily, to discover the future or restore the past. But to do all this they needed to develop their language and their powers of thought.

There was also a strongly-felt need to make available the mass of factual information, mostly collected by the Greeks, that was now available at Rome. In this context the range of Latin writers of the time is striking; Cicero was aware that almost the only prose works of the second century were histories, speeches and legal treatises.<sup>11</sup> There were now attempts to synchronise Greek and Roman chronology, to make the classic Greek works on astronomy, zoology and botany available by translations or adaptations which would also establish the Latin equivalents for the essential Greek terminology; also to rescue the lore, believed to be so valuable, that was locked up in the dying Etruscan language, and to learn something of the more outlandish areas of or beyond the Empire, even if at a fairly superficial level. Diodorus' provision of a digest of the main Greek historians may also be noted. Without all this it would not have been possible for Rome, when her internal crisis was over, to have taken up the task of ruling her Empire in alliance with the educated classes in the Greek world – an alliance that was indeed to end in fusion. That was the greatest practical achievement of her intellectual revolution – as Strabo was to be aware.<sup>12</sup>

There was no doubt a strongly Philistine streak in the old-fashioned Roman outlook, though contempt for lyric poetry, which Cicero once voices, or for the visual arts, which he professes in public at least,<sup>13</sup> could be united with a high regard for what were thought more serious subjects. But it is impossible to say that little value was put on things of the mind in a society in which all four of the most significant politicians of the time paid dramatic honour to learning: where Cato gave the philosopher with whom he walked the place of honour, and where Pompey lowered the *fascēs* of a Roman proconsul before the great Posidonius; where Caesar, implicitly putting another's achievement at least as high as his own in extending the frontiers of the Roman Empire, said that Cicero had extended those of the Roman spirit,

<sup>9</sup> They saw themselves thus: *nostrī omnium utilitatium ... rapacissimi*, Pliny *NH* 25.4.

<sup>10</sup> Cassiod. *Inst.* 2 *praef.*

<sup>11</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 4.5. The Elder Cato's works did cover a rather wider field, though it is unlikely that they formed an encyclopaedia.

<sup>12</sup> Strabo 9.C401.

<sup>13</sup> *Hort. frag.* 12 Gr.; *In Verr.* 2.2.87, 4.4-5.

and himself tried to harness Greek and Roman intellectuals to the reform of the state; and where, finally, Cicero felt that the only cure for Rome's problems was a better education, in philosophy but also in history and other subjects, for those in political life. No doubt these were all exceptional men. But Strabo, looking back, said that the Romans had been able to rule the world because they had devoted themselves to *paideia*.

The Ciceronian age was also one in which considerable intellectual liberty prevailed, as it had done in the Greek world – fundamentally because neither was dominated by a powerful monarchy with a fixed ideology, nor by a priestly caste, learned perhaps, but committed to a revealed or traditional orthodoxy; we have noticed how open even the discussion of religion was, and how wildly various the speculations put forward. There were limits no doubt to freedom; the Greeks, though frequently left as we have argued to go their own way, could not write what would be abhorrent to their Roman patrons, those patrons could not so rebel against Roman traditions as to espouse radical democracy, rank atheism, or genuine Cynicism, with its contempt for all institutions and its mendicant and wandering way of life. But where there were many schools of thought to choose from and no sanctions to ensure that a man stick strictly to any, where indeed eclecticism was rampant, almost no one need deny his temperament or convictions. The cut-throat competition between professional teachers in particular encouraged variety and the vitality that Cicero noted as resulting,<sup>14</sup> though originality was usually restricted to a limited area (often simply that of the terminology and organisation of a subject). Indeed Diodorus copies from some Graeco-oriental source a remarkable passage contrasting Greek intellectual anarchy with the stability and thoroughness of the learning of eastern priesthoods. In these, he says, men are brought up from childhood in full-time study of certain fixed subjects, whereas in Greece only a few turn to serious intellectual work, and that late, and for profit. 'Since they are taught conflicting views, Greek students live in intellectual chaos and cannot put faith in anything.'<sup>15</sup> In spite of the influx of oriental religious influence into Italy, it was only very slowly that a freedom of spirit only slightly less than that of the Greeks was to disappear from Italy, even if Cicero's Academic open-mindedness (with all its faults) had never been quite typical.

The age, too, looked both to past and present. On the one hand the Romans, literally ancestor-worshippers, were almost bound to overvalue the achievements of the *maiores*. The historical and antiquarian investigations undertaken by so many writers probably took up more papyrus than those concerned with any Greek city, unless conceivably Athens (but the Athenians had been on the job much longer). Varro and others also looked back to a flowering of poetry in the second century, which was less really distinguished than they thought; but they cannot have done the same with prose, though one or two orators of the period were still appreciated, if somewhat deprecatingly. The Romans also looked back, to some extent despising

<sup>14</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.4.

<sup>15</sup> DS 2.29.

contemporary Greece, to the great figures of the Hellenic past, in war and politics (Nepos' surviving biographies are almost entirely of fifth- and fourth-century figures), in literature and art; so did the now politically powerless Greeks themselves, who at the end of our period even abandoned the recent developments of their language for an artificial revival of Attic. *Vetus Graecia* for the Romans was usually that of the classical period, but could be more recent; Cicero thought that in his boyhood, with distinguished pupils of Carneades still active in Athens, the state of philosophy was more flourishing than it was in his old age.<sup>16</sup> New movements in philosophy were or claimed to be revivals – those of Antiochus, of the study of Aristotle, of Pythagoreanism – while the Epicureans were conservative and often far from up-to-date. In *grammatica* and rhetoric in particular the Romans were dependent on achievements of the Hellenistic period, though often of its earlier part; they would have been surprised to learn how recent some of the arts of magic and divination which they thought age-old really were. But in some subjects, such as geography and ethnography, they will have been aware that knowledge was still accruing.

There was still a reasonably healthy balance between authority and experience; Varro for example appeals to both in his agricultural work. And many Romans had considerable faith in themselves and their present. They no longer accepted that they were barbarians,<sup>17</sup> and if Cicero's freedman Tiro and later authors can use the contemptuous Greek term *Opici* to mean 'us uneducated Italians', it seems now to have a humorous touch to it. It was the vulgar, now, who were called barbarians.<sup>18</sup> The Greeks too probably realised that the Romans were catching up, even if we cannot vouch for the literal truth of the story that Apollonius Molon, hearing the young Cicero declaim, lamented that Greece's only remaining primacy, that in education and eloquence, was passing from her.<sup>19</sup> But Diodorus praised Caesar's eloquence, and soon Caecilius of Caleacte (though not of pure Greek stock, perhaps, and from Sicily, not the East) was to accept Cicero's heavy hints that he was the Roman Demosthenes, while the Greeks of the Augustan age were (we are told) to allow Roman taste to influence their style, though not it seems to let Roman literature itself do so to any significant extent.

The Romans felt that in many subjects the gap between themselves and the Greeks was closing. In some (mathematics, medicine, and in the fine arts painting and sculpture) they did not choose to compete, and in a few (jurisprudence, military science, later at least some forms of engineering) it was accepted that the advantage was on their side. By the middle of the first century they had all the tools available for competition: plenty of books, the best teachers. Cicero of course felt that he had given Rome oratory equal to that of the Greeks, and a philosophical literature that at least made his countrymen independent of Greece; he hoped to equal the Greek historians as

<sup>16</sup> *Acad.* 2.16, cf. *De Nat. Deor.* 1.11.

<sup>17</sup> *De Rep.* 1.58 (but, a n isolated case, *Orat.* 160).

<sup>18</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 5.104.

<sup>19</sup> *Plut. Cic.* 4.5.

well. He urged all who could to 'seize and bring to Rome a kind of glory in which Greece was now failing'.<sup>20</sup> Several remarks (two of them compliments to Cicero, one regretfully measured praise of Terence) reveal in Caesar a burning cultural competitiveness, such as we suspected also in Atticus, and can to some extent document in both Varro (especially over poetry) and Nepos (over history and biography). Vitruvius held that it was only because they had left no writings that Cossutius and Mucius were not accepted as architects equal to the greatest of the Greeks. Cicero was aware that most people thought Latin a poorer language than Greek,<sup>21</sup> but he denied this was true in all fields, and held that it was potentially at least as rich; like Varro and others he attempted to expand its vocabulary. Vitruvius is readier to use Greek terms, but when Greek words are employed by Latin speakers in a sense other than their original one, he has no desire to impose correctness; Roman usage, it is implied, is as worthy of respect as Greek, just as Roman forms of building are as valid as Greek ones. The notorious desire of the Augustan poets to rival the Greeks in new forms of verse by no means stands alone; what perhaps does is Virgil's statement, in *Aeneid* 6, that while Rome's *artes* are war and government, she is inferior not only in sculpture and astronomy, but oratory too.

It did not, in Cicero's day, seem impossible even to go beyond the Greeks, occasionally, in terms of content. After all, the Romans were fond of the commonplace that they improved all that they borrowed. Cicero thought that after a late start they had advanced with immense rapidity in the arts and sciences. In spite of modesty about his abilities as an original philosopher, he thought his *Academica* clearer than anything in Greek. Varro believed he was making a contribution to the debate on analogy and anomaly, and that his work on agriculture was more precisely defined and more complete than that of any Greek author; he proposed to explain the mysteries of Samothrace to their own priests. It seems more than likely that many of his contemporaries, like Lactantius much later, thought him more learned than any Greek; in his mastery of the two cultures he probably was. Finally Vitruvius was convinced that he was writing the first really comprehensive work on architecture. An urge to the encyclopaedic is indeed typical of Rome at this date, and it is not strange that there was a wish to sum up the knowledge now available, and now also properly organisable, either at a fairly elementary level, as in Varro's *Disciplinae*, or on a more specialised one, as in his *Antiquitates*; one thinks also of Scaevola treating the Civil Law *generatim*, and Cicero planning to introduce the Romans to all the main branches of philosophy.

But Roman writers did not envisage any dramatic break with or advance over the Greeks. Perhaps it would have been hard to conceive of really outdoing that remarkable race, or parting company with it completely. There was faith in the present, but not, perhaps, faith in the future, at least the more distant future. The ancient belief in progress was indeed always incomplete,

<sup>20</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.5.

<sup>21</sup> *Pro Caec.* 51. In the next generation Cestius could say Cicero had brought it to excel Greek, *Sen. Rhet. Suas.* 7.10 (though Cestius is known to have disliked Cicero).

by the standards of the doctrine in its more modern heyday. It was accepted – as, in well-known passages, by Lucretius, Varro and Vitruvius – that man had progressed from initial primitivism. But will he go on progressing? More likely, as the biological schema has it, every art will have its period of greatness and then decay. During the Civil Wars Cicero thought that Latin oratory was declining, but Latin philosophy coming to birth, owing partly to circumstances, partly to an inner law of nature.<sup>22</sup> Whole civilisations would decay too, as Etruria and Greece were visibly decaying, though in different ways, and as, in the struggles of the dying republic, it seemed that Rome might be doing. Many in seventeenth-century England thought, even more dramatically, that the end of the world was near, but they had a text to prove that this would be preceded by a period not only of unrest but of advancing knowledge, which in fact proved a stimulus to scientific work.<sup>23</sup> The prophecies at Rome promising a new age said nothing of that. But this sort of futurology was not an ancient *ars* (divination told one nothing about intellectual matters, as Cicero pointed out); the Romans at the end of the Ciceronian period did not attempt to look far ahead or to map out areas of possible advance: the lack of permanent institutions for intellectual study would have made this difficult in any event. Had they been able to see the future, they would have learnt that Rome was not to recover under the Empire the sense of intellectual excitement and achievement that she knew in the period of the collapse of the Republic.

<sup>22</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* 2.5.

<sup>23</sup> Daniel 12.4.

# Bibliography

## I. Editions

Editions of standard works by standard authors are not included; nor are well-known collections of fragments, such as *GRF*, *HRR*, *FGH* or *FPL*, or new or partial editions of the Herculaneum papyri mainly in the periodical literature (especially *Cronache Ercolanesi*) or in *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanesi*, ed. F. Sbordone, for which see *Syzêtêseis, Studi sull' Epicureismo Greco e Romano, offerti a M. Gigante*, vol. 2, *Rassegne bibliografiche*, Naples 1983. The fragments of the jurists are to be found in O. Lenel, *Palingenesia Iuris Civilis* 1889.

Asclepiades: *Asclepiadis Bithyni Fragmenta*, ed. C.G. Gumpert, 1794, repr. in R.M. Green, *Asclepiades: His Life and Writings*, 1955 (very incomplete).

Dionysius Thrax: *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysius Thrax*, ed. K. Linke (with frags. of Tyrannio and Diocles, ed. W. Haas), 1977.

Geminus: *Géminos: Introduction aux Phénomènes*, ed. G. Aujac, 1975.

Hermagoras of Temnos: *Hermagorae Temnitae testimonia et fragmenta, adiunctis et Hermagorae cuiusdam discipuli Theodori Gadarei et Hermagorae minoris fragmenta*, ed. D. Matthes 1962.

Nigidius Figulus: *P. Nigidius Figulus. Opera*, ed. A. Swoboda, 1899, repr. 1964.

Philo of Larissa: *Philon von Larissa, Testimonia und Kommentar*, B. Wiśniewski, 1982.

Philodemus: *On Rhetoric. Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*, 2 vols, ed. S. Sudhaus, 1892, 1896 (Suppl. to vol I, 1895; repr. 1964)

*On the Good King According to Homer. Peri tou kath' Homêron Agathou Basileôs*, ed. A. Oliveri, 1909.

*Il buon re secondo Omero*, ed. T. Dorandi, 1982.

*On Vices. Peri kakiôn X*, ed. C. Jensen, 1911.

*On Freedom of Speech. Peri parrêsias*, ed. A. Olivieri, 1914.

*On Anger. De Ira*, ed. C. Wilke, 1914.

*On Poetry. Über die Gedichte V*, ed. C. Jensen, 1923.

*On Music. Philodemus de musica librorum quae extant*, ed. I. Kernke, 1889.

*De Muziek*, ed. D.A. van Krevelen, 1939.

*Against the [Sophists]. Philodemi Adversus [Sophistas]*, ed. F. Sbordone, 1947.

*On Household Management. Philodemus Peri oikonomias quae dicitur libellus*, ed. C. Jensen, 1907.

*On the Gods. Philodemus über die Götter: erstes Buch*, ed. H. Diels, *Abh. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1915; *drittes Buch, id. ib.*, 1916.

*On Piety. Philodem über Frommigkeit*, ed. T. Gomperz, *Herkulanische Studien II*, 1866.

*On Death. Philodemus over den Dood*, ed. T. Kuiper, 1925.

*On Methods of Inference<sup>2</sup>*, ed. P.H. and E.A. De Lacy, 1978.

*Index Stoicorum. Index Stoicorum Herculensis*, ed. A. Traversa, 1952.

*Index Academicorum. Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculensis*, ed. S. Mekler, 1902, repr. 1958.

Philoxenus: *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*, ed. C. Theodoridis, 1976.

Posidonius: *Posidonius. Vol. I The Fragments*, ed. L. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd, 1972.

- Posidonios. Die Fragmente*, 2 vols., ed. W. Theiler, 1982.  
*Rhetorica ad Herennium. Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, ed. G. Calboli 1969.  
 M. Terentius Varro. *De Gente Populi Romani*, ed. P. Fraccaro, *Studi Varroniani*, 1907.  
*De Vita Populi Romani*, ed. B. Riposati, 1939.  
*De Philosophia. Liber De Philosophia*, ed. G. Langenberg, 1959.  
*Curio de cultu deorum. Varros Logistoricus über die Götterverehrung: Curio de cultu deorum*, ed. B. Cardauns, 1960.  
*Menippean Satires. Varron, Satires Menippées*, ed. J.-P. Cèbe, vols. 1- , 1972 (since this large undertaking is not yet far advanced, I have cited the edition by F. Bücheler, 1862).  
*Antiquitates. Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, 2 vols., ed. B. Cardauns, 1976.  
 Tyrannio: see Dionysius Thrax.

## II. Other works

The following list contains full details of all books and articles referred to in the footnotes, and of a few other directly relevant works only. Articles in Pauly-Wissowa are not included.

- Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J. & Nisbet, R.G.M., 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm', *JRS*, 1979, 125.  
 Anderson, W.S., *Pompey, his friends, and the Literature of the First Century B.C.*, Berkeley ed. 1963.  
 Astin, A.E., *Cato the Censor*, Oxford 1978.  
 Badian, E., 'The early historians', in *Latin Historians*, ed. T.A. Dorey, London 1966.  
 'The attempt to try Caesar', in *Polis and Imperium*, ed. J.A.S. Evans, Toronto 1974, 145.  
 Bailey, D.R. Shackleton, 'A merging of Licinii Crassi', *AJAH*, 1976, 162.  
*Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature*, Univ. Park, Pa., 1976.  
 Balme, D.R., 'Genos and Eidos in Aristotle's biology', *CQ*, 1962, 81.  
 Barwick, K., *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica* Leipzig 1922.  
*Probleme der Stoische Sprachlehre und Rhetorik*, Berlin 1957.  
 Behrens, O., *Die Wissenschaftslehre im Zivilrecht des Q. Mucius Scaevola Pontifex*, Göttingen 1976.  
 Bengtson, H., 'Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer (cos. 60) und die Inder', *Hist.*, 1954/5, 229 (= id., *Kl. Schr. zur Alten Gesch.*, Munich 1974, 470).  
 Bergman, J., *Ich bin Isis*, Uppsala 1968.  
 Blomqvist, J., *The Date and Origin of the Greek Version of Hanno's Periplous*, Lund 1979.  
 Böll, F., *Sphaera: neue griechische Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sternbilder*, Leipzig 1903.  
 Bonner, S.F., 'Anecdoton Parisinum', *Hermes*, 1960, 354.  
 Boscherini, S., *Lingua e Scienza greca nel 'De Agricultura' di Catone*, Rome 1970.  
 'Città e campagna nella dottrina linguistica di Varrone', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, 2 vols, Rieti 1976, 317..  
 Bowersock, G., *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965.  
 Boyancé, P., 'Sur la théologie de Varron', *REA*, 1955, 57.  
 'La connaissance du grec à Rome', *REL*, 1956, 111.  
 'Les implications philosophiques des recherches de Varron sur la religion romaine', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 137.  
 Bretone, M., *Tecniche e Ideologie dei Giuristi Romani*, Naples 1971.  
 Brink, C.O., 'Varro and Horace', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX,

- Geneva 1962, 175.
- Bruck, E.F., 'Cicero versus the Scaevolae: law of inheritance and decay of Roman religion', *Seminar III*, 1945, 1.
- Brunt, P.A., 'Cn. Tremellius Scrofa the agronomist', *CR*, 1972, 304.
- 'Free labour and public works at Rome', *JRS*, 1980, 81.
- Burkert, W., 'Zur geistesgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica', in *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. XVIII, Geneva 1971, 23.
- Calboli, G., *Studi Grammaticali*, Bologna 1962.
- 'Cornificiana: L'autore e la tendenza politica della Rhetorica ad Herennium', *Atti Acc. Sci. Bologna, Classe di Sci. Mor.*, 1963-4.
- Callebat, L., 'La prose du "De Architectura" de Vitruve', *ANFW II* 30.1, 1982, 696.
- Capitani, U., 'Celso, Scribonio Largo, Plinio il Vecchio e il loro atteggiamento nei confronti della medicina popolare', *Maia*, 1972, 120.
- Cardauns, B., 'Varro und die Religion. Zur Theologie, Wirkungsgeschichte und Leistung der "Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum"', *ANRW II* 16.1, 1978, 80.
- Cassola, P., 'Romani e Italici in Oriente', *Dial. Arch.*, 1970/71, 305.
- 'Diodoro e la Storia Romana', *ANRW II* 30.1, 1982, 724.
- Cavallo, G., 'Dal segno incompiuto al segno negato. Linee per una ricerca su alfabetismo, produzione e circolazione di cultura scritta in Italia nei primi secoli dell'impero', in *Alfabetismo e cultura scritta nella storia della società italiana, Atti del seminario tenutosi a Perugia il 29-30 marzo 1977*, Perugia 1978.
- Cavuoto, P., 'Iscrizioni inedite di Benevento', *Epigraphica*, 1968, 126.
- Christes, J., *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden 1979.
- Cichorius, C., *Römische Studien*, Leipzig 1922, repr. Darmstadt 1961.
- Rom und Mytilene*, Leipzig 1888.
- Clausen, W.V., 'Callimachus and Latin poetry', *GBRS*, 1964, 181.
- Clerc, M., *Massilia*, 2 vols., Marseilles 1927-9.
- Coarelli, F., 'Il complesso Pompeiano del Campo Marzio e la sua decorazione scultorea', *Rend. Acc. Pont.*, 1971-2, 99.
- Collart, J., *Varron grammairien latin*, Paris 1954.
- 'Analogie et anomalie', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX, Geneva, 1962, 117.
- Conway, R.S., *The Italic Dialects*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1897.
- Cornell, T., 'Principes of Tarquinia', *JRS*, 1978, 167.
- Crawford, M.H., *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974.
- 'Greek intellectuals and the Roman aristocracy in the first century B.C.', in *Imperialism in the Ancient world*, ed. P.D.A. Garnsey & C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge 1978.
- Cronert, W., 'Der Epikureer Philonides', *Sitzb. Berl. Ak.*, 1900, 942.
- 'Die Logika *Zêtēmata* des Chrysispos und die übrigen Papyri logischen Inhalts aus der herculanensischen Bibliothek', *Hermes*, 1901, 548.
- Colotes und Menedemos*, Leipzig 1906.
- Crowther, N.B., 'Parthenius and Roman Poetry', *Mnem.*, 1976, 65.
- Dack, E. van 't, *Reizen, expedities en emigratie uit Italie naar Ptolemaisch Egypte*, Brussels 1980.
- Dahlmann, H., 'Der römische Gelehrte', *Gymn.* 1931, 185.
- 'Caesars Schrift über die Analogie', *RhM*, 1935, 258./
- Varros Schrift de Poematis und der hellenistisch-römische Poetik*, Wiesbaden 1953.
- 'Catus oder Cato? Noch einmal der Titel von Varros Logistoricus', *Navicula Chilonensis*, Leiden 1956.

- 'Zu Varros Literaturforschung, besonders in 'De Poetis''', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX, Geneva 1962, 1.
- 'Varroniana', *ANRW* I 3, 197x, 3.
- 'Zu Varros antiquarisch-historischen Werken, besonders den Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 163.
- Dahlmann, H. & Heisterhagen, R., *Varronische Studien* I, Mainz 1957.
- Dahlmann, H. & Speyer, W., *Varronische Studien* II, Mainz 1959.
- Daly, L.W., 'Roman study abroad', *AJP*, 1950, 40.
- Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Brussels 1967
- D'Arms, J.H., *Romans on the Bay of Naples: a social and cultural study of the villas and their owners, 150 B.C. to A.D. 400*, Cambridge Mass. 1970.
- Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge Mass. 1981.
- Deichgräber, K., *Die griechische Empirikerschule*<sup>2</sup> Berlin/Zurich 1965.
- Della Casa, A., *Nigidio Figulo*, Rome 1962.
- Della Corte, F., 'Varrone Metricista', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX, Geneva 1962, 141.
- Varrone: il terzo gran lume Romano*,<sup>2</sup> Florence 1970.
- La filologia latina dalle origini a Varrone*,<sup>2</sup> Florence 1981.
- Della Corte, M., *Iuventus: un nuovo aspetto della vita pubblica di Pompei*, Arpino 1924.
- Di Benedetto, V., 'Dionisio di Trace e la Techne a lui attributa', *Ann. Scuol. Norm. Sup. Pisa*, 1958, 169; 1959, 87.
- Dicks, D.R., 'The *klimata* in Greek geography', *CQ*, 1955, 248.
- Dihle, A., 'Analogie und Attizismus', *Hermes*, 1957, 170.
- 'Zur Hellenistischen Ethnographie', in *Grecs et Barbares. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. VIII, Geneva 1961.
- Dilke, O.A.W., *The Roman Landsurveyors*, Newton Abbot 1971.
- 'Varro and the origins of centuriation', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 353.
- Dillon, J., *The Middle Platonists*, London 1977.
- D'Ippolito, F., 'Il tempo di Ofilio', in id., *I Giuristi e la Città: Ricerche sulla Giurisprudenza Romana della Repubblica Romana*, Naples 1978.
- Douglas, A.E., 'Clausulae in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as evidence of its date', *CQ*, 1960, 65.
- Düring, I., *Aristotle in the Biographical Tradition*, Göteborg 1957.
- Earl, D.W., 'Prologue-form in ancient historiography', *ANRW* I 2, 1972, 842.
- Edelstein, E.J. & L., *Asclepius: a collection and interpretation of the testimonies*, Baltimore 1945.
- Edelstein L., *Ancient Medicine: Selected Papers*, ed. O. Temkin & C.L. Temkin, Baltimore 1969.
- Fairweather, J., *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge 1981.
- Fehling, D., 'Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion', *Glotta*, 1956, 214; 1957, 48.
- Ferrero, L., *Storia del Pitagorismo nel mondo romano dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, Cuneo 1953.
- Forni, G., 'Cesare ingegnere, scienziato e la riforma del calendario', in *Cesare nel bimillenario della morte*, Turin 1956.
- Fraenkel, E., 'Lucili quam sis mendosus', *Hermes*, 1933, 392.
- Horace*, Oxford 1957.
- Francis, E.D. & Vickers, M.J., 'Signa Priscae Artis: Eretria and Siphnos', *JHS*, 1983.
- Fraser, P.M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols, Oxford 1972.

- Frede, M., 'Principles of Stoic grammar', in *The Stoics*, ed. J.M. Rist, Berkeley etc. 1978.
- 'The method of the so-called Methodical school of Medicine', in *Science and Speculation*, ed. J. Barnes etc., Cambridge 1982.
- Frederiksen, M., 'Republican Capua: a social and economic study', *PBSR*, 1959, 80. *Campainia*, ed. N. Purcell, London 1984.
- Fuhrmann, M., *Das Systematische Lehrbuch: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Antike*, Göttingen 1960.
- Furley, D.J., 'Lucretius the Epicurean', *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* vol. XXIV (1978) 1.
- Gabba, E., 'Il latino come dialetto greco', *Misc. A. Rostagni* 1963.
- 'Tecnologia Militare Antica', *Tecnologia, economia e società, Atti del Convegno di Como 1979*, Como 1980, 219.
- 'True history and false history in Classical Antiquity', *JRS*, 1981, 50.
- Geiger, J., 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', *Athenaeum*, 1979, 48.
- Gelsomino, R., *Varrone e i sette colli di Roma*, Rome 1975.
- Gigante, M., *Ricerche Filodemee*, Naples 1969.
- Civiltà delle forme letterarie in antica Pompei*, Naples 1979.
- Giomini, R., 'Il grammatico Filosseno e la derivazione del latino dall' eolico', *PdLP*, 1953, 365.
- Gigon, O. 'Die Erneuerung der Philosophie in der Zeit Ciceros', *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IV, Geneva 1955, 28.
- Glucker, J., *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Göttingen 1978.
- Goold, G.P., 'A Greek professional circle at Rome', *TAPA*, 1961, 168.
- Gottschalk, H.B., 'Notes on the wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs', *Hermes*, 1972, 314. *Heraclides of Pontus*, Oxford 1980.
- Gros, P., 'Le dossier vitruvien d'Hermogenes', *MEFRA*, 1978, 687.
- 'Structures et limites de la compilation vitruvienne dans les livres III et IV du De Architectura', *Latomus* 1975.
- Hagendahl, H., *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, Göteborg 1967.
- Hampe, R. & Gropengiesser, H., *Aus der Sammlung des Archäologischen Institutes der Universität Heidelberg*, Berlin etc. 1967.
- Hardie, A., *Statius and the Silvae: poets, patrons and epideixis in the Greco-Roman world*, Liverpool 1983.
- Hardy, E.G., *Three Spanish Charters*, Oxford 1912.
- Harig, G., 'Die antike Auffassung vom Gift und der Tod des Mithridates', *NTM*, 1977, 104.
- 'Die philosophische Grundlagen des medizinischen Systems des Asklepiades von Bithynien', *Philol.*, 1983, 43.
- Hatzfeld, J., *Les Trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris 1919.
- Hendrickson, G.L., 'The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar, its occasion, nature and date, with additional fragments', *CP*, 1906, 97.
- 'The Memoirs of Rutilius Rufus', *CP*, 1933, 153.
- 'Brutus *De Virtute*', *AJP*, 1939, 401.
- Heurgon, J., 'L. Cincius et la loi du clavus annalis', *Athenaeum*, 1964, 432. *Daily Life of the Etruscans*, tr. J. Kirkup, London 1964.
- 'L'agronome carthaginois Magon et ses traducteurs en latin et en grec', *CRAI*, 1976, 441.
- 'Varron et l'haruspice Etrusque Tarquinius Priscus', in J. Collart (al.) *Varron. Grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Paris 1978.
- Hillscher, A., 'Hominum litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma

- comemoratorum historia critica', *Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. XVIII*, 1892, 353.
- Hine, H.M., *An Edition with Commentary of Seneca, Natural Questions Book Two*, New York 1981.
- Hodge, A.T., 'Siphons in Roman aqueducts', *PBSR*, 1983, 174.
- Hornblower, J., *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1981.
- Horsfall, N.M., 'Varro and Caesar; three chronological problems', *BICS*, 1976, 79.
- 'Dido in the light of history', *Proc. Virgil Soc.*, 1973/4, 1.
- 'The Collegium Poetarum', *BICS*, 1976, 79.
- 'Some problems in the Aeneas legend', *CQ*, 1979, 372.
- 'Doctus sermones utriusque linguae', *Echos du Monde Antique/Classical News and Views*, 1979, 372.
- 'Virgil and the Conquest of Chaos', *Antichthon*, 1981, 141.
- 'From history to legend: M. Manlius and the geese', *CJ*, 1981, 298.
- Humbert, M., *Municipium et Civitas sine suffragio*, Rome 1978.
- Jex-Blake, K., & Sellers, E., *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, repr. with pref. and bibl. by R.V. Schoder SJ, Chicago 1976.
- Jocelyn, H.D., 'Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* and religious affairs in the late Roman Republic', *Bull. Rylands Libr.*, 1982, 148.
- Jory, E.J., 'P. Cornelius P.1. Surus: an epigraphical note', *BICS*, 1968, 125.
- Kaimio, J., *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki 1979.
- Kennedy, G., *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 BC – AD 300*, Princeton 1972.
- Kenney, E.J., 'Books and readers in the Roman World', *CHCL* II 32.
- Kleberg, T., *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike*, Darmstadt 1967.
- Klotz, A., 'Die geographische commentarii des Agrippa und ihre Überreste', *Klio*, 1931, 36, 386.
- 'Geographie und Ethnographie in Caesars Bellum Gallicum', *RhM*, 1934, 66.
- Knoche, U., *Roman Satire*, tr. E.S. Ramage, Bloomington Ind. etc. 1975.
- Kolendo, J., 'Le traité d'agronomie des Saserna', *Archivum Filol. XX*, 1973.
- Kudlien, F., *Der griechischer Arzt im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Seine Stellung in Staat und Gesellschaft*, Wiesbaden 1979.
- Kuhnert, F., *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike*, Berlin 1961.
- Kunkel, W., *Herkunft und Soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen?*, Graz etc. 1967.
- Laffranque, M., *Poseidonios d'Apamée: essai de mise au point*, Paris 1964.
- Lana, I., 'Sextiorum nova et Romani roboris secta', *RIFC*, 1953, 1, 209.
- Landels, J.G., *Engineering in the Ancient World*, London 1978.
- La Penna, A., 'Alcuni concetti base di Varrone sulla storia Romana', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 397.
- Leeman, A.D., *Orationis Ratio: the stylistic theories and practice of the Roman orators, historians and philosophers*, 2 vols, Amsterdam 1963.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London 1981.
- Leo, F. *Die Plautinische Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik*, Berlin 1897.
- Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie*, Leipzig 1901.
- Lewis, D.M., 'Two days', *CR*, 1969, 272.
- Lintott, A.W., 'A historian in Cicero: *Ad familiares* – P. Licinius (?) Apollonius', *RhM*, 1976, 368.
- Lloyd, G.E.R., *Science, Folklore and Ideology*, Cambridge 1983.
- Long, A.A., *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London 1974.
- 'Astrology: arguments pro and contra', in *Science and Speculation*, ed. J. Barnes etc., Cambridge 1982.
- Luck, J., *Der Akademiker Antiochos*, Stuttgart 1953.
- Lynch, J.P., *Aristotle's School: a study of a Greek educational institution*, Berkeley etc. 1972.
- Malitz, J., *Die Historien des Posidonius*, Munich 1983.

- Manzo, A. 'Spunti di storia dell'arte e di critica d'arte in Varrone', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 415.
- Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, tr. G. Lamb, London 1956.
- Marsden, E.W., *Greek and Roman Artillery: I. Historical Development, II, Technical Treatises*, Oxford 1969, 1971.
- Marshall, A. J., 'The Structure of Cicero's Edict', *AJP*, 1964, 185.  
'Library resources and creative writing at Rome', *Phoenix*, 1976, 252.
- Martin, R., *Recherches sur les agronomes latins*, Paris 1971.
- Mayer, R., 'Neronian Classicism', *AJP*, 1982, 305.
- Meer, L. Bouke van der, *Etruscan Urns from Volterra*, Groningen 1978.
- Mejer, J., 'Demetrius of Magnesia: on poets and authors of the same name', *Hermes*, 1981, 447.
- Merlin, A. & Poinsot, L., 'Bronzes de Mahdia', *CRAI*, 1911, 208.
- Meritt, W.S. & Traill, J.S., *The Athenian Agora XV: Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton 1974.
- Messerschmidt, F., 'Das Grabmal des Porsenna', in *Das Neue Bild der Antike, II Rom*, ed. H. Berve, Leipzig 1942.
- Milne, H. J. M., *Greek Shorthand Manuals: syllabary and commentary*, London 1934.
- Miquel, J., 'Stoische Logik und römische Jurisprudenz', *ZSS*, 1970, 85.
- Moles, J., 'Some "last words" of M. Iunius Brutus', *Latomus*, 1983, 763.
- Molisani, G., 'Lucius Cornelius Quinti Catuli architectus', *RAL*, 1971, 41.
- Momigliano, A. 'Ancient history and the antiquarian', in id., *Contributi alla Storia degli Studi Classici*, Rome 1955 67.  
*The Development of Greek Biography*, Cambridge Mass. 1971.  
*Second Thoughts on Greek Biography*, Amsterdam 1971.  
*Alien Wisdom: the limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge 1975.
- 'The historians of the Classical world and their audiences: some suggestions', in id. *Sesto Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*, I, Rome 1980, 361.
- Mras, K., 'Varros Menippeische Satiren und die Philosophie', *NJA*, 1914, 390.
- Münzer, F. *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin 1897.  
'Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber', *Hermes*, 1905, 50.
- Murray, O., 'Philodemus on the Good King according to Homer', *JRS*, 1965, 161.  
'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic kingship', *JEA*, 1970, 141.
- Nash, D., 'Reconstructing Poseidonios' Celtic ethnography: some considerations', *Britannia*, 1976, 111.
- Neugebauer, O., *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, New York 1957.  
*A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy*, 3 vols, Berlin etc. 1975.
- Noble, J.V. & Price, D.J. de S., 'The water clock in the tower of the winds', *AJA*, 1968, 345.
- Nörr, D., *Divisio and Partitio*, 1972.  
'Pomponius oder Zum Geschichtsverständnis der römischen Juristen', *ANRW II* 15, 1976, 497.
- Nutton, V., 'The Medical School of Velia', *PdclP*, 1970, 211.  
'The seeds of disease: an explanation of contagion and infection from the Greeks to the Renaissance', *Medical History*, 1983, 1.
- Ogilvie, R.M., 'Livy, Licinius Macer and the Libri Lintei', *JRS*, 1958, 40.
- Otha Wingo, E., *Latin Punctuation in the Classical Age*, The Hague etc. 1972.
- Pallottino, M., *The Etruscans*, tr. J. Cremona, ed. D. Ridgeway, London 1975.
- Palm, J., *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund 1955.
- Palmer, R., 'On the track of the Ignoble', *Athen.*, 1983, 343.
- Pape, M., *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentlichen Ausstellung in Rom*, Diss. Hamburg 1975.

- Parlangeli, D., 'Ancora sulla grecità dell' Italia meridionale', *ZRPh*, 1960, 118.
- Pédech, P., *La Géographie des Grecs*, Paris 1976.
- 'Géographes grecs et géographes romains', in *Colloque Histoire et Historiographie Clio*, ed. R. Chevallier, Paris 1980, 23.
- Petrochilis, N., *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*, Athens 1974.
- Pfaffel, W., *Quartus Gradus Etymologiae: Untersuchungen zur Etymologie Varros in 'De Lingua Latina'*, Königstein 1981.
- Philippson, R., 'Philodems Buch über den Zorn', *RhM*, 1916, 425.
- 'Papyrus Herculanensis 831', *AJP*, 1943, 148.
- Pfeiffer, R., *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Pigeaud, J.-M., 'La physiologie de Lucrèce', *REL*, 1980, 176.
- La Maladie de l'âme*, Paris 1981.
- Pisani, V., "'Non solum ad Aristophanis lucernam sed etiam Cleanthis': la teoria grammaticale e quella filosofica nell' etimologia di Varrone", *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 197.
- Pollitt, J.J., *The Ancient View of Greek Art: criticism, history and terminology*, New Haven 1974.
- Price, D. de S., *Gears from the Greeks: the Antikythera Mechanism, a calendar computer from ca. 80 B.C.*, New York 1975.
- Purcell, N., 'The Apparitores: a study in social mobility', *PBSR*, 1983, 125.
- Questa, C., 'L'antichissima edizione dei cantica di Plauto: origine, caratteristiche, vicende', *RFIC*, 1974, 58, 174.
- Radke, G., *Archaisches Latein: historische und sprachgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Darmstadt 1981.
- Raubitschek, A.E., 'Phaedros and his Roman Pupils', *Hesperia*, 1949, 96.
- Rawson, E., 'Prodigy lists and the use of the Annales Maximi', *CQ*, 1971, 158.
- 'The literary sources for the pre-Marian army', *PBSR*, 1971, 13.
- 'The interpretation of Cicero's "De Legibus"', *ANRW I 4*, 1973, 334.
- 'The first Latin annalists', *Latomus*, 1976, 689.
- 'The Roman aristocracy and its properties', in *Studies in Roman Property*, ed. M.I. Finley, Cambridge 1976, 85.
- 'Caesar, Etruria and the Disciplina Etrusca', *JRS*, 1978, 132.
- 'The identity problems of Q. Cornificius', *CQ*, 1978, 188.
- 'The introduction of logical organization into Roman prose literature', *PBSR*, 1978, 12.
- 'L. Cornelius Sisenna and the early first century B.C.', *CQ*, 1979, 327.
- 'M. Aeficius Calvinus and his grammaticus', *LCM*, 1979, 53.
- 'The life and death of Asclepiades of Bithynia', *CQ*, 1982, 358.
- 'History, historiography and Cicero's Expositio consiliorum suorum', *LCM*, 1982.
- 'Rome and the Areopagus', *Athenaeum*, 1985, forthcoming.
- Rehm, A., 'Der römische Bauernkalender und der kalendar Caesars', *Epitymbion H. Swoboda*, Reichenberg 1927.
- Paraegmastudien*, Munich 1941.
- Rehm, B., *Das geographische Bild des alten Italiens in Vergils Aeneis*, Leipzig 1932.
- Reinhardt, K., *Posidonius von Apameia, der Rhodier genannt*, Stuttgart 1954.
- Richardson, J.S., 'The "Commentariolum Petitionis"', *Hist.* 1971, 436.
- Rickard, T.A., 'The mining of the Romans in Spain', *JRS*, 1928, 129.
- Ritschl, F., 'De M. Terenti Varronis Disciplinarum libris commentarius', in id., *Opuscula Philologica III*, 1877, 351.
- Robbins, F.E., 'Posidonius and the sources of Pythagorean arithmology', *CP*, 1920, 309.

- 'The tradition of Greek arithmology', *CP*, 1921, 97.
- Robert, L., 'Études épigraphiques et philologiques', *BEHE* 272, 1938, 15.
- 'La Bibliothèque de Nysa de Carie', *Hellenica* I, Limoges, 1940, 145.
- Robins, R.H., *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, London 1951.
- Ross, D., 'Two rustic notes', *CP*, 1979, 52.
- Ruffel, P., 'Mots grecs dans Vitruve', *Hommages J. Bayet*, Brussels 19xx, 627.
- Ruffel, P. & Soubiran, J., 'Vitruve ou Mamurra?', *Pallas*, 1962, 123.
- Russell, D.A., *Criticism in Antiquity*, London 1981.
- Rusten, J.S., *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, Opladen 1982.
- Saller, R.P., *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge 1982.
- Sallmann, K.G., *Die Geographie des Alteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältniss zu Varro*, Berlin 1971.
- 'M. Varro quid ad medicinam contulerit', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 507.
- Saulnier, C., *L'Armée et la guerre dans le monde étrusco-romain, VIIIe-IVe siècle*, Paris 1980.
- Sbordone, F., 'Sul de poematis di Varrone', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 515.
- ed., *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanesi*, Naples 1969, I 169.
- Schanz, M., revised Hosius, C., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I, Munich 1927.
- Schiavone, A., *Nascita della Giurisprudenza: Cultura aristocratica e pensiero giuridico nella Roma tardo-repubblicana*, Rome 1976.
- Schlunk, R.R., *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid*, Ann Arbor 1974.
- Schramm, E., 'Erläuterung der Geschützbeschreibung bei Vitruvius X 10-12', *Sitz. Berl. Ak.*, 1917, 718.
- Schröter, R., 'Die Varronische Etymologie', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX, Geneva 1962.
- Schultz, F., *History of Roman Legal Science*, Oxford 1946.
- Scobie, A., 'Story-tellers, storytelling and the novel in Greco-Roman Antiquity', *RhM*, 1979, 229.
- Sedley, D., 'The end of the Academy', *Phronesis*, 1981, 67.
- 'On signs', in *Science and Speculation*, ed. J. Barnes etc., Cambridge 1982.
- Sherwin-White, A.N., *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge 1967.
- Skydsgaard, J.E., *Varro the Scholar: studies in the first book of Varro's De Re Rustica*, Copenhagen 1968.
- Sommer, R., 'T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken', *Hermes*, 1926, 389.
- Somville, P., 'Un témoignage de Varron sur la cosmologie pythagoricienne', *RHR*, 1964, 39.
- Speranza, F., 'Saserna e Sasernae', *Helikon*, 1971/2, 466.
- Spoerri, W., *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*, Basle 1959.
- Stahl, W.H., *Roman Science: origins, development and influence to the later Middle Ages*, Madison Wis. 1962.
- Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*, vol. I, New York 1971.
- di Stefano Manzella, I., 'Un'iscrizione sepolcrale romana datata con la seconda dittatura di Cesare', *Epigraphica*, 1973, 105.
- Stein, A., *Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur*, Prague 1931.
- Stein, P., *Regulae Iuris: from Juristic Rules to Legal Maxims*, Edinburgh 1966.
- Strong, D.E., 'Roman museums', in id. (ed.), *Archaeological Theory and Practice*, London 1973, 247.
- Stuart, D.R., *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley 1926.
- Syme, R., 'Who was Decidius Saxa?' *JRS*, 1937, 127 (= *Roman Papers* I, 30).

- 'The origin of Cornelius Gallus', *CQ*, 1938, 39 (= *Roman Papers* I, 470).  
 'Who was Vedius Pollio?', *JRS*, 1961, 23 (= *Roman Papers* II, 518).  
*Sallust*, Berkeley etc. 1964.  
 'A great orator mislaid', *CQ*, 1981, 421 (= *Roman Papers* III, 1415).
- Talamanca, M., 'Lo schema 'genus-species' nelle sistematiche dei juristi romani', in *Colloquio italo-francese: La filosofia greca e il diritto romano, Roma 14-17 1973, II; Acc. Naz. dei Lincei*, 1977, 103.
- Taylor, D.J., *Declinatio: a study of the linguistic theory of M. Terentius Varro*, 1974.
- Taylor, L.R., 'Horace's Equestrian Cursus', *AJP*, 1925, 161.  
 'Republican and Augustan writers enrolled in the Equestrian Centuries', *TAPA*, 1968, 469.
- Thesleff, H., 'On the problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica. An alternative theory of date and purpose', in *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. XVIII, 1971, 57.
- Thompson, H.A., 'The Odeion in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia*, 1950, 31.
- Thulin, C., *Die Etruskische Disziplin*, 3 vols, Göteborg 1906-9.
- Torelli, M., *Elogia Tarquinensia*, Florence 1975.  
 'Glosse Etrusche: qualche problema di trasmissione', in *Mélanges Heurgon*, Rome 1976, 1001.  
 'Una nuova epigrafe di Bantia e la cronologia dello statuto municipale Bantino', *Athenaeum*, 1983, 252.
- Traglia, A., 'Dottrine etimologiche ed etimologie varroniane con particolare riguardo al linguaggio poetico', in *Varron. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, vol. IX, Geneva 1962, 33.  
 'L'ars grammatica di Varrone in rapporto con le altre arti', *Atti Congr. Internaz. Stud. Varr.*, Rieti 1976, 177.  
 'Etimologia e sinonimia in Nigidio Figulo', in J. Collart (al.), *Varron. Grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Paris 1978.
- Trail, J.S., 'Greek inscriptions from the Athenian Agora. Addenda to *The Athenian Agora*, vol. XV, *Inscriptions. The Athenian Councillors*', *Hesperia*, 1978, 269.
- Treggiari, S., *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, Oxford 1969.  
 'C. Pompeius' freedman biographer again', *CR*, 1969, 264.
- Trüdinger, K., *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*, Diss. Basle 1918.
- Walser, G., *Caesar und die Germanen*, Wiesbaden 1956.
- Wardman, A., *Rome's Debt to Greece*, London 1976.
- Watson, A., 'Roman private law and the Leges Regiae', *JRS*, 1972, 100.  
*Lawmaking in the Later Roman Republic*, Oxford 1974.
- Weinstock, S., 'C. Fonteius Capito and the Libri Tagetici', *PBSR*, 1950, 44.  
 'Libri Fulgurales', *PBSR*, 1951, 122.
- Wells, C.M., *The German Policy of Augustus: an examination of the archaeological evidence*, Oxford 1972.
- White, K.D., 'Roman agricultural writers, I: Varro and his predecessors', *ANRW* I 4, 1973, 439.
- Wieacker, F., 'Griechische Wurzeln des Institutionsystems', *ZSS*, 1953, 93.
- White, P., 'Amicitia and the profession of poetry in Early Imperial Rome', *JRS*, 1978, 74.  
 'Positions for poets in Early Imperial Rome', in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, ed. B.K. Gold, Austin 1982, 50.
- Wiedemann, T.E.J., review of Christes, J., (see above) *CR*, 1982, 75.
- Williams, G., *Change and Decline*, Berkeley etc. 1978.  
 'Phases of political patronage of literature in Rome', in *Literary and Artistic Patronage*

- at Rome, ed. B.K. Gold, Austin 1982, 3.
- Wilson, A.J.N., *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*, Manchester 1966.
- Wiseman, T.P., *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Oxford 1971.
- Cinna the Poet*, Leicester 1974.
- Clio's Cosmetics: three studies in Greco-Roman literature*, Leicester 1979.
- 'Topography and rhetoric: the trial of Manlius', *Historia*, 1979, 32.
- 'Looking for Camerius: the topography of Catullus 55', *PBSR*, 1980, 6.
- 'Pete nobiles amicos: poets and patrons in Late Republican Rome', in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, ed. B.K. Gold, Austin 1982, 28.
- 'Domi nobiles and the Roman cultural élite', in *Les 'Bourgeoisies' municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ie siècles av. J.-C.*, Naples 1983.
- Zetzel, J.E.G., 'Emendavi ad Tironem: some notes on scholarship in the second century A.D.', *HSCP*, 1973, 225.
- 'A Homeric reminiscence in Catullus', *AJP*, 1978, 332.
- Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*, New York 1981.
- Zevi, F., 'Tre iscrizioni con firme di artisti greci. Saggi nel tempio dell'ara rotonda a Ostia', *Rend. Pont. Acc. Arch.* 1969/70, 95.
- 'Il santuario della Fortuna Primigenia a Palestrina: nuovi dati per la storia degli studi', *Prospettiva*, 1979, 2.

# Index

Post-Triumviral authors quoted simply for their information do not appear in this index. Romans are listed under *nomen* where known, except for a few freedmen most familiar under their Greek names. *Praenomina* are given where known.

- Abraham, 309  
Academics, Academy, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15,  
17, 22, 31, 36, 40, 54, 55, 57, 58, 80,  
81, 82, 96, 97, 111, 120, 126, 132, 133,  
139, 146, 178, 207, 282, 283, 285, 286,  
289, 290, 294, 306, 314, 322  
Accius L., 39, 119, 121, 130, 268, 271,  
272, 273, 275, 277, 278  
Accius T. of Pisaurum, 34  
Achaemenids, 106  
Acheron, 300, 303  
Acragas, 36, 226  
Actium, 18  
Adria, 191  
Adriatic Sea, 264  
Aedes Felicitatis, 194, 197  
Aeficius Calvinus M., 13  
Aegean, 11, 12, 13, 30, 163, 255, 265  
Aelii Tiberones, 97  
Aelius, 107  
Aelius Catus Sex., 4, 202, 204  
Aelius Gallus C. (legal writer), 205  
Aelius Stilo L., 76, 118, 120, 127, 202,  
234, 235, 238, 269, 270, 273, 277, 281,  
298; *De Proloquiis*, 132, 138  
Aelius Tubero L., 17, 97, 220  
Aelius Tubero Q. (the elder), 4, 57, 80,  
89, 97, 143, 162, 206, 207  
Aelius Tubero Q. (the younger), 89, 97,  
213, 220  
Aemilii, 231, 292  
Aemilius Paullus L., 31, 40, 193  
Aemilius Scaurus M. (the elder), 92, 227  
Aemilius Scaurus M. (the younger), 181,  
257  
Aeneas, 198, 218, 245, 269, 312, 314, 315  
Aenesidemus of Cnossus, 17, 97  
Aeolism, 55, 69, 120, 124, 125, 127  
Aeschines, 145  
Aeschines of Neapolis, 22  
Aeschylus, 271  
Aesculapius, 31, 85, 178, 241, 304  
Aesopus (actor), 152  
Africa, African, 17, 50, 63, 71, 87, 135,  
136, 211, 250, 251, 253, 257, 258, 262,  
263, 264, 265, 269  
Agatharchides of Cnidus, 251, 253, 254,  
262  
Agathocles, 224, 226  
Agathocles of Neapolis, 33  
Agesilaus, 230  
Agesistratus (military engineer), 192,  
193  
Agrippa, *see* Vipsanius  
Alabanda, 6  
Alba Longa, 198, 244  
Alban hills, 248  
Albani, 108  
Albucius T., 6, 7  
Albucius Silus C., 35, 79  
Alcman, 55, 267  
Alesia, 263  
Alexander of Ephesus, 44, 167, 249, 257,  
265  
Alexander (Peripatetic), 81  
Alexander Polyhistor, 8, 44, 55, 61, 62,  
69, 161, 162, 249, 252, 255, 256, 267,  
293, 294, 299, 308, 309, 312; *Hypomn.*  
*Pyth.*, 32; *Italika*, 26; *Peri Rhomes*, 26  
Alexander the Great, 18, 63, 100, 104,  
105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 180, 192, 222,  
224, 226, 250, 251, 253, 256, 291, 299  
Alexandria, Alexandrian, 13, 14, 15, 16,  
17, 30, 36, 38, 39, 43, 68, 69, 74, 80,  
109, 111, 113, 117, 118, 119, 121, 124,  
126, 141, 165, 170, 171, 174, 178, 190,

- 191, 251, 253, 258, 268, 269, 271, 272,  
273, 278, 281, 292, 318
- Alexio (doctor), 86
- Alfenus Varus P., 35, 44, 90, 211, 212,  
213
- Alps, 264
- Amafinius C., 49, 139, 284
- Amazons, 108, 253, 254
- Ameria, 180
- Amisus, 42, 69, 111
- Ammonius, 318
- Ampius Balbus T., 92, 108, 222
- Anaxagoras, 294
- Anaxilaus of Larissa, 293
- Andromeda, 257
- Andronicus of Cirrhus, 163
- Andronicus of Rhodes, 142, 290, 291
- Anna, 269
- Annaeus Seneca L. (the elder), 317, 318
- Annaeus Seneca L. (the younger), 320
- Annales Maximi, 219, 239
- Annus Cimber T., 79
- Antalcidas, Peace of, 246
- Antenor, 264
- Anticythera mechanism, 163, 166
- Antigonus of Carystus, 194
- Antioch, 15, 194
- Antiochus of Ascalon, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15,  
31, 36, 57, 58, 61, 80, 81, 82, 96, 126,  
139, 171, 283, 285, 286, 289, 290, 313,  
323
- Antipater of Tyre, 82, 83, 295
- Antipater (Stoic), 22, 126, 284
- Antisthenes, 101, 196
- Antistius Labeo M., 90, 203, 211, 213
- Antium, 41, 42, 70, 219
- Antonius Gniphio M., 16, 35, 52, 67, 73,  
74, 76, 110, 118, 121, 122, 131, 269
- Antonius M. (orator), 3, 4, 42, 43, 46, 89,  
139, 146, 147, 148, 155, 215, 234
- Antonius M. (Antony), 10, 17, 35, 37, 40,  
41, 47, 48, 72, 79, 80, 81, 93, 97, 114,  
153, 154, 169, 227, 295, 316
- Apamea, 5
- Apelles, 186, 193, 195, 197
- Apellicon of Teos, 11, 40, 41, 43, 142,  
289, 290
- Aphrodite, 197, 248, 308
- Apollo, 30, 39, 188, 190, 303, 306, 311,  
312
- Apollodorus (grammarian), 126
- Apollodorus of Artemita, 63
- Apollodorus of Athens, 264, 301
- Apollodorus of Pergamum, 15, 56, 77, 79,  
153, 154, 155, 318
- Apollonia, 77, 308
- Apollonius (freedman of P. Crassus), 79,  
110, 111, 229
- Apollonius 'Malakos', 144, 151, 153
- Apollonius (military engineer), 193
- Apollonius Molon, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 57, 76,  
77, 110, 144, 151, 153, 255, 256, 282,  
323
- Apollonius of Rhodes, 264, 267
- Apollonius (sculptor), 199
- Apollonius (Stoic), 82
- Apollophanes, 23
- Appuleius L., 67
- Aquilius (dramatic poet), 277
- Aquilius Gallus C., 90, 206, 210, 211
- Arabia, 64, 181, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255,  
256, 265, 287, 309
- Arabian Gulf, 263
- Aratus, 44, 157, 167, 267
- Arcadia, 272
- Arcesilaus (sculptor), 194, 197, 198
- Archelaus (epigrammatist), 183
- Archelaus (of Rhodes?), 10
- Archias (poet), 5, 32, 61, 109, 221
- Archimedes, 36, 156, 157, 159, 163, 191,  
287, 288
- Archytas of Tarentum, 31, 32, 160
- Arcturus, 165
- Ardea, 220, 239
- Areius of Alexandria, 17, 81, 82, 112, 293
- Areopagus, 12, 80, 82
- Ares, 308
- Argei, 237
- Argo, 258, 264
- Argonauts, 254
- Argos, 237, 244
- Ariovistus, 260, 261, 262
- Aristarchus (unknown), 23
- Aristarchus, 71, 102, 119, 122, 127, 269,  
278
- Aristarchus of Samos, 158, 164, 165
- Aristides the Just, 244
- Aristippus (philosopher), 186
- Aristo of Alexandria, 15, 109, 111
- Aristo of Ceos, 296
- Aristo of Chios, 280
- Aristodemus of Nysa, 55, 68, 70, 76, 104,

- 106, 125  
 Aristodemus of Nysa II, 68  
 Aristophanes, 273  
 Aristophanes of Byzantium, 126, 275  
 Aristotle, 5, 11, 30, 31, 40, 41, 43, 77, 95, 101, 106, 107, 127, 133, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 179, 181, 182, 183, 197, 206, 233, 234, 235, 237, 250, 251, 268, 271, 275, 276, 280, 284, 288, 289, 290, 291, 296, 315, 317, 323  
 Aristoxenus of Tarentum, 30, 33, 168, 169, 186, 291, 292, 293  
 Aristus (Academic), 11, 12, 15, 80, 81, 82, 285  
 Armenia, 17, 109  
 Arpinum, 25, 34, 41, 50, 185  
 Arretium, 310  
 Arrius Q., 123  
 Artemidorus of Cnidus, 23, 96, 111  
 Artemidorus of Ephesus, 5, 62, 251, 253, 258  
 Artemidorus of Perge, 86  
 Artemo of Cassandreia, 51  
 Asclepiades of Bithynia, xi, 4, 5, 18, 31, 36, 52, 60, 61, 77, 84, 85, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 184, 289, 309; *Definitions*, 175; *On Wine*, 175; *Preparations*, 175  
 Asclepiades of Myrleia, 37, 69, 107, 119, 121, 251, 311  
 Asclepiodorus of Nicaea, 6  
 Asclepiodotus, 217  
 Asclepius, *see* Aesculapius  
 Asculum, 20, 104  
 Asellio, *see* Sempronius  
 Asia, 10, 11, 17, 29, 64, 85, 107, 109, 168, 171, 188, 196, 217, 224, 228, 255, 265, 272, 285, 302, 314  
 Asianic, Asianism, 121, 144, 151, 153, 222, 278, 317  
 Asilius Dimas, 60  
 Asinius Pollio C., 10, 35, 39, 42, 52, 73, 109, 111, 114, 131, 228, 317  
 Assyria, Assyrian, 225, 252, 255, 293  
 Astura, 71  
 Atargatis, 311  
 Ateius Capito C., 73  
 Ateius M. or L. (centurion), 73  
 Ateius Philologus L., 8, 73, 74, 76, 131, 269, 273; *Gloss. lib.*, 124  
 Atellane, 275, 276, 277  
 Athena, 186, 309; *see also* Minerva  
 Athenaeus (military engineer), 192  
 Athenaeus of Attaleia, 170, 171, 178  
 Athenaeus (rhetor), 151, 153  
 Athenagoras (unknown), 23  
 Athenodorus Cordylion, 15, 82  
 Athenodorus son of Sandon, 81, 82, 295  
 Athens, Athenian, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 24, 38, 40, 41, 47, 48, 53, 55, 56, 58, 61, 73, 77, 79, 80, 82, 94, 102, 107, 145, 150, 153, 163, 186, 190, 191, 193, 222, 224, 226, 231, 235, 237, 238, 239, 243, 244, 271, 272, 276, 283, 284, 289, 290, 318, 322  
 Atilius ?L. (dramatic poet), 272, 276  
 Atlantic, 63, 157, 256  
 Atlantis, 254  
 Atratinus, *see* Sempronius  
 Atria, *see* Adria  
 Atrium Libertatis, 42, 238  
 Atta, *see* Quinctius  
 Attalus (philosopher), 305  
 Attica, Attic, 12, 14, 273, 274  
 Attica (Caecilia Attica), 47  
 Atticism, 114, 125, 144, 153, 317, 323  
 Atticus, *see* Pomponius  
 Attis, 315  
 Attius Dionysius, 71  
*Auct. Rhet. ad Her.*, 57, 78, 120, 139, 148, 150, 151, 197, 206, 216  
 Aufidius Cn., 92, 222  
 Aufidius Sikelos or Siculus T., 36, 85  
 Augustus, ix, 27, 31, 42, 47, 63, 64, 67, 69, 81, 87, 109, 110, 112, 124, 130, 153, 190, 191, 192, 241, 242, 251, 252, 264, 306, 310, 317, 319; *see also* Octavius C. and Octavian  
 Aurelius (Catullus' friend), 260  
 Aurelius Cotta C., 7, 8, 300  
 Aurelius Cotta M., 121, 194  
 Aurelius Opillus Q., 4, 7, 23, 67, 273; *Musae*, 124  
 Aurunculeius Cotta L., 101, 111, 216, 279  
 Ausonian, 33  
 Aventine, 39, 237  
 Axis M., 195  
 Babylon, Babylonia, 106, 165, 166, 299, 306, 308  
 Baccheius of Tanagra, 60

- Bacchiads, 200  
 Bacchus, 303, 306  
 Bactria, 225  
 Baiae, 25, 31  
 Balbus, *see* Cornelius and Lucilius  
 Balkans, 264  
 Bantia, 20  
 Battaces of Pessinus, 5  
 Belgae, 261  
 Beneventum, 21, 34, 48, 74  
 Berossus, 165, 166, 225, 256  
 Bibulus, *see* Calpurnius  
 Bithynia, 15, 58, 69, 70  
 Black Sea, 264, 265.  
 Blaisos (Blaesus) of Capreae, 22  
 Blandus, *see* Rubellius  
 Blossius of Cumae, 22  
 Boeotia, 33, 230  
 Boethus of Sidon, 290, 291  
 Bolus of Mende, 182  
 Bona Dea, 306  
 Brahmins, 256, 293  
 Britannus, 263  
 Britain, Britons, 62, 101, 112, 176, 252,  
 254, 255, 259, 260, 261, 262  
 Brixia, 35  
 Bromius (Epicurean), 144, 295  
 Brundisium, 23, 34  
 Bruttium, 35  
 Brutus, *see* Junius  
 Busiris, 144  
 Butas, 233, 249  
  
 Cabeira, 192  
 Caecilius Epirota Q., 46, 69, 75, 102, 103,  
 317  
 Caecilius (friend of Catullus), 35  
 Caecilius Jucundus, 50  
 Caecilius Metellus Celer Q., 263  
 Caecilius Metellus Creticus, 258  
 Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus Q., 7  
 Caecilius Metellus Nepos, 77  
 Caecilius Metellus Numidicus Q., 6, 120  
 Caecilius Metellus Scipio Nasica Q., 47,  
 97, 229  
 Caecilius of Caleacte, 37, 323  
 Caecilius Statius, 271, 276, 277, 278  
 Caecina A., 13, 28, 29, 93, 139, 304, 305,  
 306  
 Caelian, 237  
 Caelius Rufus M., 45, 78, 154, 223  
 Caerellia, 43, 47  
 [Caesar] *Bell. Afr.*, 49  
 [Caesar] *Bell. Hisp.*, 49  
 Caesar, *see* Julius  
 'Caesius', 93, 306  
 Caesius T., 93  
 Cafatius L., 28  
 Cales, 196  
 Calidius M., 56, 76, 153, 154  
 Callicles (painter), 197  
 Callimachus, 70, 233, 237, 273  
 Callisthenes, 223  
 Callistratus, *see* Domitius  
 Calpurnii Pisones, 42, 97, 198  
 Calpurnius Bibulus L., 12, 229  
 Calpurnius Bibulus M., 16, 194  
 Calpurnius Piso (gov. Spain), 93  
 Calpurnius Piso C., (Cicero's son-in-  
 law), 97  
 Calpurnius Piso Cn. (cos. 23), 59  
 Calpurnius Piso Frugi L. (historian), 97,  
 234, 298  
 Calpurnius Piso L. (cos. 58), 23, 24, 59,  
 60, 81, 85, 97, 269  
 Calvus, *see* Licinius  
 Campania, Campanian, 19, 20, 21, 22,  
 23, 24, 25, 29, 33, 34, 40, 42, 44, 53,  
 59, 71, 72, 79, 88, 101, 195, 276, 290  
 Canidia, 33  
 Canusium, 33  
 Capito, *see* Fonteius  
 Capitol, 107, 185, 189, 191, 238, 243, 247  
 Cappadocia, 17, 62, 302  
 Capua, 21, 22, 23, 34, 48, 75, 91, 196  
 Caput Ferentinae, 248  
 Carmen Saliare, 239, 248, 269  
 Carneades, 6, 9, 11, 31, 55, 57, 58, 94,  
 139, 143, 151, 183, 283, 286, 294, 302,  
 306, 323  
 Carrhae, 62, 229  
 Carthage, Carthaginians, 17, 36, 37, 211,  
 225, 226, 231, 240, 243, 264, 265, 312  
 Carvilius Ruga Sp., 210  
 Carystius, 268  
 Casca, *see* Servilius  
 Cascellius A., 90, 213  
 Casinum, 41, 163, 183, 315  
 Caspian Sea, 56, 263, 264, 265  
 Cassius Dionysius, 135  
 Cassius Longinus L., 135

- Cassius Longinus C., 10, 24, 49, 72, 101, 111, 229, 284, 318  
 Cassius Parmensis C., 35  
 Cassius Sp., 199  
 Castor of Rhodes, 17, 224, 244, 293  
 Castor and Pollux, 311  
 Catius T. (Epicurean), 35, 49, 284, 295  
 Cato, *see* Porcius  
 Catullus, *see* Valerius  
 Catulus, *see* Lutatius  
 Caucasus, 109, 255  
 Celteine, 263  
 Celts, Celtic, 20, 62, 259, 262, 265  
 Celtus, 263  
 Censorinus, *see* Marcius  
 Ceos, 265  
 Cercina, 90, 211, 269  
 Ceres, 189, 199, 306  
 Cerne, 264  
 Cestius, 325  
 Cethegus, *see* Cornelius  
 Chaldeans, 61, 130, 225, 252, 256, 299, 307, 308, 309, 316  
 Channel, 110  
 Chares (sculptor), 197  
 Charite (priestess of Delphi), 196  
 Charmadas (Academic), 6, 11, 31, 134  
 Chersiphron of Cnossus, 190  
 Chiron, 304  
 Choinoboschia, 256  
 Chronos, 315  
 Chrysippus, 123, 126, 127, 128, 133, 320  
 Chrysippus (freedman of Cicero), 42, 43  
 Cicereius, 13  
 Cicero, *see* Tullius  
 Cilicia, 45, 51, 62, 81, 82, 209  
 Cimbri, 259, 261  
 Cimmerian Bosphorus, 225  
 Cimon, 49  
 Cincinnatus, *see* Quinctius  
 Cincius L., 200, 217, 247, 248, 298  
 Cincius Alimentus L., 247  
 Cineas, 216  
 Cinna, perhaps a Helvius Cinna, 70  
 Cinna, *see* Helvius  
 Circus Flaminius, 200  
 Circus Maximus, 189, 236, 299  
 Civil Wars, 35, 41, 49, 68, 71, 96, 104, 110, 221, 242, 260, 317, 325  
 Claudii, 37, 78, 219  
 Claudii Marcelli, 231  
 Claudii Pulchri, 74  
 Claudius Caecus Ap., 292  
 Claudius (Emperor), 27  
 Claudius Didymus, 69  
 Claudius Marcellus M. (Augustus' nephew), 192  
 Claudius Marcellus C. (augur), 93, 302  
 Claudius Marcellus M. (aed. 91), 6, 8  
 Claudius Marcellus M. (cos. 51), 96, 285, 286, 287  
 Claudius Nero ?, 60, 80  
 Claudius Pulcher Ap., 82, 93, 194, 302, 310  
 Claudius Pulcher C., 194, 275  
 Claudius Quadrigarius Q., 91, 218, 219, 220  
 Cleanthes, 124, 126  
 Cleanthes (Cato's doctor), 85  
 Cleitarchus, 144, 222, 223, 226  
 Cleopatra VII of Egypt, 15, 16, 36, 40, 100  
 Clephantus, 174  
 Clephantus (doctor at Larinum), 30  
 Clio, 217  
 Clitomachus, 57  
 Cloatius Verus, 141, 180  
 Clodia Metelli, 47  
 Clodius (Clodius Paulus?), 219, 231  
 Clodius P., 46, 78, 88  
 Clodius Ser., 76, 269, 273, 278  
 Clodius Sex., 37, 79  
 Clodius Tuscus, 305  
 Cluatius (architect), 22  
 Cluentius Habitus A., 203  
 Clusium, 191  
 Cocceius Auctus L., 21, 22, 88  
 Coelius Antipater L., 96, 205, 218, 222, 227  
 Cominius P. of Spoletium, 34  
 Commagene, 17, 302  
 Consus, 240  
 Coponius C., 16  
 Coponius T., 16  
 Corcyra, 178  
 Corduba, 37  
 Corinna, 55, 267  
 Corinth, 195, 196, 200, 227  
 Corinthian bronze, 88, 196  
 Corinthian Order, 187, 188, 189  
 Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, 47, 230  
 Corneli, 90

- Cornelius (*grammaticus*), 269  
 Cornelius Alexander, *see* Alexander Polyhistor  
 Cornelius Balbus C. (the elder), 43, 98, 111  
 Cornelius Balbus C. (the younger), 111  
 Cornelius Cethegus C., 196  
 Cornelius Dolabella P., 71, 72  
 Cornelius Dolabella Cn., 110  
 Cornelius Epicadus L., 48, 72, 130, 269  
 Cornelius Gallus C., 35, 37, 48, 55, 70, 75, 269, 270  
 Cornelius L. (*praef. fabrum*), 87  
 Cornelius Lentulus, 69  
 Cornelius Maximus Q., 90  
 Cornelius Nepos, 35, 44, 49, 92, 95, 96, 102, 103, 104, 152, 198, 199, 200, 217, 223, 227, 230, 231, 246, 263, 264, 265, 279, 284, 285, 323, 324; *Chronica*, 103; *De vir.ill.*, 230; *Exempla*, 227; *Vitae*, 103  
 Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus P., 4, 57, 63, 71, 81, 89, 162, 206, 226, 256, 272, 279, 292, 312  
 Cornelius Scipio Africanus P., 97, 108, 111, 229, 274  
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio P., 57  
 Cornelius Sisenna L., 4, 26, 48, 92, 121, 122, 192, 215, 217, 221, 222, 228  
 Cornelius Sulla Faustus, 17, 41, 72  
 Cornelius Sulla L., 7, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 24, 27, 33, 40, 41, 42, 70, 72, 73, 75, 76, 85, 89, 92, 109, 124, 152, 181, 218, 219, 221, 228, 289, 307  
 Cornificia, 47, 71  
 Cornificius (?Longus), 114, 124, 298, 312  
 Cornificius Q., 43, 47, 103, 113, 114, 124, 317  
 Cornificius (writer on rhetoric), 151  
 Cornish, 254  
 Coruncanian Ti., 204  
 Cos, 58, 71, 72, 81, 178, 197  
 Cosconii, 272  
 Cosconius Q., 126, 272  
 Cosentia, 35  
 Cossutius D., 22, 88, 190, 324  
 Cotta, *see* Aurelius and Aurunculeius  
 Cotta L., 279  
 Crantor, 57  
 Crassus, *see* Licinius  
 Craterus, 86, 239  
 Crates of Mallus, 51, 70, 75, 118, 121, 127, 268, 281  
 Crateuas, 14, 180  
 Cratippus, 10, 11, 12, 15, 80, 82, 94, 96, 98, 105, 109, 290  
 Cremona, 35, 90  
 Crete, Cretans, 49, 258, 312  
 Crispinus, 49, 53  
 Critognatus, 228  
 Critolaus (Peripatetic), 143, 144, 145, 151  
 Croton, 292  
 Ctesias, 224, 252, 253  
 Ctesibius, 166, 191, 192, 287  
 Cumae, 20, 23, 24, 41  
 Curetes, 312  
 Curio, *see* Scribonius  
 Curius M', 13  
 Curtius M', 236  
 Curtius Nicias, 9, 24, 71, 72, 102, 104, 270  
 Cynics, Cynicism, 33, 53, 95, 139, 162, 178, 280, 282, 283, 286, 296, 301, 322  
 Cyprus, 81, 82, 179, 194  
 Cyrene, 81  
 Cyrus (architect), 88, 160  
 Cyrus (Persian King), 108  
 Cytheris, *see* Volumnia  
 Cyzicus, 73  
 Dalmatia, 265  
 Damasippus (Junius?), 53, 88, 194  
 Damon, 294  
 Damophilus (artist), 199  
 Daphnis (learned slave), 5  
 Daphnis of Miletus, 190  
 Darius, King of Media, 106  
 Dead Sea, 255  
 Deiotarus, King of Galatia, 17  
 Delos, 12, 13, 16, 21, 53, 72, 265  
 Delphi, 77, 179, 299, 302  
 Delventinus, 315  
 Demades, 145  
 Demaratus (Bacchiad), 200  
 Demetrius of Cyme, 9  
 Demetrius of Ephesus, 190  
 Demetrius of Laconia, 60, 80, 156, 177, 280, 295  
 Demetrius of Magnesia, 102  
 Demetrius of Phaleron, 244  
 Demetrius (Peripatetic), 82

- Democritus, 53, 145, 177, 182, 284, 289, 320  
 Demosthenes, 64, 145, 323  
 Dertona, 34  
 Di Consentes, 312  
 Di Manes, 310  
 Di Novensiles (Novensides), 298, 303, 307  
 Diades, 192  
 Diana, 190  
 Dicaearchus, 70, 101, 102, 103, 235, 236, 242, 271  
 Dido, 269  
 Didymus Chalcenterus, 69  
 Didymus (metrologist), 112  
 Dinon, 230  
 Dio (?), Epicurean, 24  
 Dio of Alexandria, 15, 16, 21  
 Diocles, *see* Tyrannio (the younger)  
 Diodorus of Sardis, 8  
 Diodorus Siculus, ix, 15, 16, 36, 37, 43, 61, 92, 181, 192, 216, 217, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 263, 293, 308, 309, 317, 321, 322, 323  
 Diodotus, 79, 82, 156, 168, 207, 293  
 Diogenes, 283  
 Diogenes of Babylon, 143, 144, 145, 151  
 Dion, 224  
 Dionysius (Atticus' freedman), 47, 70, 71, 102  
 Dionysius (declaimer), 71  
 Dionysius of Athens, 195  
 Dionysius of Charax, 64  
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 44, 61, 64, 97, 107, 213, 290, 318  
 Dionysius of Sidon, 128  
 Dionysius of Syracuse (tyrant), 246  
 Dionysius (portrait-painter), 198  
 Dionysius Scytobrachion, 16, 254  
 Dionysius (slave of Cicero), 41  
 Dionysius (Stoic), 10  
 Dionysius Thrax, 16, 17, 69, 118, 119, 120, 134  
 Dionysus, 253, 263, 309  
 Diophanes of Bithynia, 17, 136  
 Diophanes of Mytilene, 76  
 Diopus, 200  
 Dioscurides Phacas, 16  
 Diphilus (reader to L. Crassus), 45  
 Dodona, 4  
 Dogmatists, 174  
 Dolabella, *see* Cornelius  
 Domitian (Emperor), 39, 318  
 Domitius Ahenobarbus L. (the elder), 97  
 Domitius Ahenobarbus L. (the younger), 97  
 Domitius Callistratus, 8  
 Doric Order, 187, 188, 189, 190  
 Druids, 254, 261, 293, 299, 312, 316  
 Duillius C., 240  
 Duris of Samos, 193  
 Ecphantus, 200  
 Egnatius, 37, 285  
 Egypt, 14, 15, 16, 17, 50, 56, 69, 71, 81, 107, 111, 112, 128, 141, 163, 183, 191, 223, 224, 225, 226, 245, 252, 253, 255, 256, 258, 291, 299, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 315  
 Elea, *see* Velia  
 Eleusis, 190, 299, 302  
 Empedocles, 284, 285  
 Empedotimus, 283  
 Empirics, 30, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 295  
 Empylus of Rhodes, 10, 77, 229  
 Eneti, 264  
 Ennius Q., 51, 52, 72, 75, 127, 130, 146, 221, 235, 243, 269, 270, 272, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 292  
 Ennius ?Sex. (grammarian), 130, 269, 279, 281, 302  
 Ephesus, 5, 87, 190  
 Ephorus, 223, 224, 225, 226, 254  
 Epicadus, *see* Cornelius  
 Epicrates, 141  
 Epicurus, Epicureans, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 23, 24, 25, 49, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 72, 80, 81, 83, 86, 94, 95, 101, 109, 118, 121, 124, 139, 143, 144, 145, 148, 156, 172, 173, 177, 211, 213, 222, 223, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 289, 294, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 301, 302, 317, 319, 323  
 Epidius M., 25, 79  
 Epirus, 75, 100  
 Erasistratus, 172, 173, 174  
 Eratosthenes, 63, 73, 112, 157, 158, 159, 160, 244, 250, 251, 255, 257, 262, 280  
 Eros, 194  
 Erythrae, 314  
 Erythraean sea, 108

- Ethiopia, Ethiopians, 176, 252, 253  
 Etruria, Etruscan, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25,  
 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 90, 93, 94, 128, 139,  
 158, 178, 189, 191, 199, 200, 219, 221,  
 225, 236, 240, 247, 248, 254, 255, 298,  
 299, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 310,  
 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 321, 325  
 Eucheir, 200  
 Euclid, 157, 159  
 Eudorus, 292, 293  
 Eudoxus (traveller), 257, 263, 266  
 Eudoxus of Cnidus, 167, 320  
 Eugrammus, 200  
 Euhemerus, 4, 225, 245, 255, 298, 304,  
 309  
 Euphranor (sculptor), 197  
 Euphrates, 224, 311  
 Euripides, 53, 110, 271, 274, 280  
 Europe, 258, 265  
 Evander, 196  
 Exodus, 255, 256  
 Ezechiel, 256  
  
 Faberius, 87  
 Fabii, 37, 40, 231  
 Fabius Gallus M., 24, 229  
 Fabius M., 103  
 Fabius Pictor Q., 36, 225  
 Fabius Maximus (Stoic), 37, 49, 53  
 Fabius (unknown), 310  
 Fadius Sex., 31  
 Fannius C., 96, 227  
 Fanum, 87  
 Faunus, 255, 315  
 Favonius M., 10, 95  
 Fessona, 315  
 Firmum, 34, 94, 307  
 Flaccus, *see* Valerius  
 Flavius M., 112  
 Flora (courtesan), 48  
 Flora (goddess), 187  
 Florentia, 306  
 Fonteius, 93, 200, 305  
 Fonteius Capito C., 93  
 Formiae, 41, 87  
 Fortuna, 306  
 Forum, 42, 52, 194  
 Forum Boarium, 199  
 Forum Julii, 37  
 Fregellae, 278  
 Frontinus, 157  
  
 Fufcius, 88, 188  
 Fulvia, 46  
 Fulvius Nobilior M., 39  
 Fundania, 47  
 Furius (friend of Catullus), 260  
 Furius Antias A., 5, 221, 228  
 Furius Bibaculus M., 35, 75, 111  
 Furius Philocalus, 48, 75, 91  
 Furius Philus L., 272  
  
 Gabinius A., 16, 17  
 Gades, 98, 111, 157, 263, 264  
 Galatea, 263  
 Galates, 263  
 Galatia, 17  
 Galba, *see* Sulpicius  
 Gallic, *see* Gauls  
 Gallus, *see* Cornelius  
 Ganges, 266  
 Gaul, 5, 37, 42, 49, 62, 63, 74, 75, 81, 110,  
 111, 113, 227, 228, 250, 251, 254, 258,  
 260, 263, 265; Cisalpine, 20, 34, 35,  
 37, 46, 122, 136, 263; Transpadane,  
 14  
 Gauls, Gallic, 128, 202, 219, 243, 246,  
 255, 259, 261, 262, 263, 284, 312, 315  
 Gavius Bassus, 316  
 Gellius Cn., 220  
 Gellius L., 7  
 Geminus, 60  
 Geminus, 60, 107, 112, 157, 165, 167; *see*  
*also* Pompeius  
 Genius Iovialis, 306  
 Germany, Germans, 63, 259, 260, 261,  
 262, 263  
 Glycon (doctor), 85  
 Gnaeus, 59  
 Gorgasus (artist), 199  
 Gorgias (rhetor), 77, 153  
 Gorgias (sophist), 144  
 Gracchi, 76, 231, 243  
 Gracchus, *see* Sempronius  
 Granius Flaccus, 93, 113, 213, 298, 303,  
 305  
 Grapus (Granius Flaccus?), 305  
  
 Halicarnassus, 188, 193  
 Hamilcar (agronomist), 136  
 Hannibal, 217, 246  
 Hannibalic War, 21, 32, 33, 170  
 Hanno, 264

- Hecataeus of Abdera, 252, 253, 255, 309  
 Hecaton, 97  
 Hegesias, 144  
 Heius C., 195, 196  
 Helvetians, 260  
 Helvius Cinna C., 10, 35, 44, 58  
 Heraclea (S. Italy), 32  
 Heraclea Pontica, 8, 194, 225  
 Heracles, *see* Hercules  
 Heraclides of Pontus, 164, 165, 172, 178, 284, 292  
 Heraclides of Tarentum, 30, 173, 178  
 Heraclides of Temnus, 77  
 Heraclitus, 174, 299  
 Heraclitus of Tyre, 15  
 Herculaneum, 23, 24, 42, 55, 60, 80, 83, 156, 198, 294, 301  
 Hercules, 34, 39, 189, 193, 237, 253, 263, 264, 309, 311  
 Hercynian Forest, 262  
 Hermagoras of Temnus, 54, 56, 106, 145, 147, 148, 150, 153, 155, 205, 207  
 Hermarchus (Epicurean), 296  
 Hermes, 255, 308; *see also* Mercury  
 Hermes Trismegistus, 304, 305, 307, 309  
 Hermodorus of Salamis, 188, 200  
 Hermogenes of Alabanda, 188  
 Herod the Great, 36  
 Herodes (Athenian), 102  
 Herodotus, 217, 223, 225, 250, 253, 281, 291  
 Herophilus, 171, 174, 178  
 Hesiod, 268  
 Hesperides, 266  
 Hiberi, 265  
 Hiempsal ?II of Numidia, 17, 63  
 Hiero, King of Syracuse, 160  
 Hiero (painter), 88  
 Hierocles of Alabanda, 6  
 Hieronymus of Cardia, 226, 230, 255  
 Himera, 36  
 Hipparchus, 63, 163, 257  
 Hippocrates, 30, 135, 171, 172, 174, 177, 178, 186  
 Hippocratic corpus, 135  
 Hirtius A., 24, 58, 104, 110, 228, 229  
 Homer, 14, 46, 55, 59, 105, 106, 110, 145, 198, 235, 245, 249, 250, 252, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 280, 281  
 Horace, 12, 23, 31, 33, 34, 39, 42, 49, 50, 52, 53, 75, 86, 88, 89, 152, 156, 267, 268, 270, 278, 280, 281, 284, 318; *Satires*, ix; *Epodes* 47  
 Hortensius Hortalus Q., 7, 8, 47, 57, 150, 151, 152, 155, 195, 221, 243  
 Horus, 309, 311  
 Hostilii Sasernae, 35  
 Hostius Pamphilus C., 85  
 Hyginus (Julius Hyginus C.), 17, 230, 231  
 Hyperboreans, 253  
 Hyperlydian, 168  
 Hypodorian, 168  
 Hypsicrates, 8, 55, 68, 111, 125  
 Hyria, 295  
 Hystaspes, 311  
 Iacchus, *see* Sescennius  
 Iaia of Cyzicus, 48, 198  
 Iambulus, 253  
 Iberians, 108  
 Ictinus, 190  
 Iguvine Tables, 28  
 Illyria, 256  
 India, 62, 106, 252, 253, 256, 263, 265  
 Insubrian Gauls, 35, 49, 284  
 Ionic, 55  
 Ionic Order, 188, 189  
 Iranian, Iranians, 293, 316  
 Isidorus of Charax, 64  
 Isidorus of Pergamum, 15  
 Isis, 299, 308, 309  
 Isocrates, 143, 144, 145, 156  
 Ister, 264  
 Istria, 264  
 Jaffa, 257  
 Janus, 302, 313, 314, 316  
 Jason (Stoic), 10  
 Jews, 37, 61, 62, 63, 107, 255, 256, 309, 311, 315  
 Juba, King of Mauretania, 64, 249, 293  
 Judaea, 256, 257  
 Julii, 110  
 Julius Caesar C., ix, 3, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 28, 35, 39, 42, 48, 63, 69, 71, 74, 76, 77, 79, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 105, 109, 112, 113, 114, 121, 122, 125, 131, 164, 170, 181, 190, 192, 195, 196, 202, 212, 213, 214, 216, 221, 226, 227, 229, 245, 251, 255, 258, 263, 267, 268, 276, 277,

- 279, 286, 303, 305, 308, 312, 317, 321, 323, 324; *Comm.*, 109, 110, 217, 228, 235, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263; *De analog.*, 122, 123, 153; *De astris*, 112, 165
- Julius Caesar C. (Augustus' grandson), 64
- Julius Caesar L. (writer on augury), 93, 302,
- Julius Caesar L. (writer on myth, perhaps the same), 110
- Julius Caesar Strabo C., 39, 110, 121
- Julius Calidus L., 101
- Junii, 96, 102, 231
- Junius Brutus D., 46
- Junius Brutus M., 8, 10, 12, 43, 58, 65, 71, 72, 77, 81, 85, 96, 102, 103, 122, 207, 209, 210, 211, 227, 229, 231, 285, 286, 317
- Junius Brutus M. (legal writer), 203, 204, 205, 208, 210
- Junius Congus (Gracchanus?) M., 234, 235
- Junius D. (rhetor), 77
- Junius Damasippus L., 89
- Junius Silanus D., 135
- Juno, 189, 248, 312, 313, 314
- Jupiter, 87, 189, 191, 199, 300, 304, 305, 307, 308, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315
- Kent, 260
- Kronos, 315
- La Tère, 262
- Laberius D., 53, 111, 289, 310
- Laconian, 55
- Lacus Cutiliae, 26
- Laelius Archelaus, 73, 270, 279
- Laelius C., 156, 272, 279
- Laelius Hermas, 73
- Laenii of Brundisium, 34
- Lament for Bion*, 33
- Lares, 312
- Larinum, 30, 87
- Latium, Latins, 19, 34, 42, 86, 210, 235, 244, 248, 273, 276
- Laurentum, 244
- Laurium, 193
- Leonidas of Tarentum, 100
- Lesbia, 47
- Lesbos, 96, 105
- Lex Aternia Tarpeia*, 242
- Lex Papia*, 14
- Liber, 303, 312
- Libra, 245
- Libya, 254, 265
- Licinii, 219
- Licinius Calvus C., 51, 114, 153, 184
- Licinius Crassus L., 3, 4, 6, 45, 76, 78, 84, 133, 147, 148, 151, 201, 205, 206
- Licinius Crassus M., 45, 81, 229, 308
- Licinius Crassus P., 79, 111, 229
- Licinius Crassus P. (governor of Spain), 256, 259
- Licinius Damasippus, 89
- Licinius (*litteratus homo*), 4
- Licinius Lucullus L., 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 40, 69, 81, 92, 95, 109, 150, 163, 180, 194, 195, 197, 216, 221, 222, 228, 243, 264, 289, 290
- Licinius Macer C., 78, 92, 219, 220, 245, 246
- Licinius Murena (aedile), 194
- Licinius Murena L., 69
- Liguria, Ligurians, 254, 255
- Livia, 47, 308
- Livius Andronicus L., 74, 268, 271, 274, 277, 278
- Livius Drusus C., 202
- Livy, 18, 35, 48, 97, 219, 234, 240, 247, 264, 273, 317
- Lixus, 264
- Longinus, 281
- Loreius Tiburtinus, 21
- Lucanian, Lucanians, 31, 33, 181
- Lucceius L., 16, 92, 105, 108, 221, 222, 229
- Lucian, 83
- Lucillii, 73
- Lucillii Balbi, 104
- Lucilius Balbus L., 5, 90, 206, 211
- Lucilius Balbus Q., 5, 58
- Lucilius C. (poet), 6, 21, 35, 57, 72, 73, 104, 114, 119, 127, 129, 178, 242, 268, 270, 272, 273, 278, 279, 283
- Lucretius Carus T., ix, 3, 52, 58, 59, 61, 86, 117, 126, 167, 177, 189, 278, 280, 281, 285, 289, 295, 325
- Lucrine Lake, 21
- Lucullus, *see* Licinius
- Lupercalia, 28
- Lutatius Catulus Q. (the elder), 4, 5, 58,

- 92, 194, 228  
 Lutatius Catulus Q. (the younger), 57, 87  
 Lyceum, 11, 12, 40, 172, 290, 291  
 Lycus of Neapolis, 30  
 Lydia, 225, 256  
 Lysiades, 80  
 Lysippus, 195, 197  
  
 Maccius, Maccus, 271, 277  
 Macedonia, Macedonians, 5, 10, 40, 81, 85, 256  
 Macer, *see* Licinius  
 Maecenas, 29  
 Maecius Tarpa Sp., 39, 105, 278  
 Maeotis, Lake, 109  
 Magi, 171, 182, 299, 309, 311  
 Magna Graecia, 20, 30, 31, 32, 271, 276, 291  
 Mago, 50, 135, 136, 179  
 Mahdia wreck, 238  
 Maia, 248  
 Mamurra (Vitruvius Mamurra?), 86, 109  
 Manetho, 225  
 Manilius Antiochus (astrologer), 72, 94, 307  
 Manilius M. (astronomical poet), 307  
 Manilius M', 4, 203, 204, 205  
 Manilius (Mamilius, Manlius? – senator), 4, 273, 298, 307  
 Manlii Torquati, 24, 25  
 Manlius Sosis L., 25  
 Manlius T. (*negotiator*), 13  
 Manlius Torquatus Acidinus, 12  
 Manlius Torquatus L., 24  
 Manlius Torquatus T., 10  
 Manlius Torquatus T. (duellist with Gaul), 218  
 Mantua, 35, 304  
 Marcellus, *see* Claudius  
 Marcus Censorinus L., 57  
 Marcus (Samnite philosopher), 33  
 Marius C., 4, 5, 78, 120, 151, 216, 222, 228, 259  
 Marius M., 25, 45  
 Mars, 200, 308, 314  
 Marsi, Marsian, 20, 33, 225, 249  
 Marsyas, 168  
 Martha, Syrian divineress, 5  
 Massilia, 113, 192, 225, 265, 318  
  
 Matius ?C., 153  
 Mediolanum, 35, 176, 177  
 Mediterranean, 14  
 Megasthenes, 253  
 Melissus, 74  
 Memmius C. (pr. 58), 58, 71, 72  
 Memphis, 16, 311  
 Menander, 53, 109, 113, 271, 272, 274, 277  
 Meneclis of Alabanda, 6, 7, 8  
 Menecrates of Lesbos, 36  
 Menecrates of Tralles, 85  
 Menedemus (Athenian), 6  
 Menippus, 283  
 Mentor (artist), 194, 196  
 Mercury 164, 165, 308, 314; *see also* Hermes  
 Mermadilis, 108  
 Meroe, 253  
 Mesopotamia, 245, 307, 311  
 Messala, *see* Valerius  
 Messana, 195  
 Messapian, 20, 33  
 Messana, 195  
 Messapian, 20, 33  
 Messenia, 304  
 Metagenes of Cnossus, 190  
 Metapontum, 32, 292  
 Metelli, 76, 274  
 Metellus, *see* Caecilius  
 Methodism, Methodists, 85, 176, 177  
 Metrodorus (Epicurean), 296  
 Metrodorus of Scepsis, 14, 150  
 Micipsa of Numidia, 17  
 Miletus, 60, 69, 190  
 Miltiades, 231  
 Minerva, 39, 84, 104, 189, 303, 313; *see also* Athena  
 Misenum, 42, 88  
 Mithridates VI of Pontus, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 61, 63, 73, 84, 107, 108, 141, 150, 171, 172, 179, 180, 181, 192, 251, 258  
 Mithridatic Wars, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 69, 70, 76, 106, 181, 192, 307, 317  
 Mitylene, *see* Mytilene  
 Moloch, 264  
 Molon, *see* Apollonius  
 Monima, 109  
 Morocco, 264  
 Moschus, 79

- Moses, 255, 256, 308, 309  
 Moso, 256  
 Mucius C. (architect), 88, 324  
 Mucius Scaevola P. (pont. max.), 203, 210  
 Mucius Scaevola Q. (augur), 6, 89, 90, 100, 203, 204  
 Mucius Scaevola Q. (pont. max.), 4, 80, 89, 90, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 213, 239, 300, 324  
 Mummius L., 195, 198, 231  
 Munatius Rufus, 229  
 Murena, *see* Licinius  
 Muses, 277, 303, 309  
 Mussius Aper A., 13  
 Mutina, 85  
 Myron, 186, 193, 197  
 Mytilene, 12, 15, 109, 285, 286
- Nabataeans, 253, 255, 256  
 Naevius Cn., 141, 268, 269, 271, 274, 275, 277, 278  
 Naples, 6, 9, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 32, 33  
 Narbo Martius, 37, 49  
 Narona, 265  
 Nausiphanes, 145  
 Neapolis, *see* Naples  
 Nechepso, 307  
 Neleus, 40  
 Nemesis, 198  
 Nemrudh Dag, 302  
 Nenia, 313  
 Neoptolemus of Parium, 280  
 Nepos, *see* Cornelius  
 Neptune, 311, 312, 313, 314  
 Nero (Emperor), 39, 318  
 Nestor of Tarsus, 81  
 Nicaea, 13, 70  
 Nicasicrates, 296  
 Nicias of Cos, *see* Curtius Nicias  
 Nicolaus of Damascus, 157, 291  
 Nicomachus, 290  
 Nicomedes ?III of Bithynia, 15  
 Nicon of Acragas, 36  
 Nicon (perhaps Nicon of Acragas), 31, 60  
 Nigidii, 94  
 Nigidius Figulus P., 9, 30, 94, 95, 122, 124, 128, 131, 162, 164, 166, 171, 203, 205, 290, 291, 292, 293, 308, 309, 310, 311, 316; *Comm. Gramm.*, 123; *De anim.*, 181, 182, 183; *De aug. priv.*, 310; *De diis*, 139, 311, 312; *De gestu*, 151; *De hom. nat.*, 181; *De terra*, 266, 311; *De vent.*, 288; *Sphaera*, 266, 311
- Nile, 16, 111, 252, 265  
 Nineveh, 224  
 Ninus, 255  
 Nola, 23, 33  
 Nortia, 247  
 Novara, 79  
 Novius (comic poet), 22  
 Novum Comum, 35  
 Nuceria, 25  
 Numa Pompilius, 245, 292, 298, 303, 310, 313  
 Numidia, 17, 63  
 Numisius P. (architect), 22  
 Numitorius Nicanor C., 85  
 Nysius? (Samnite philosopher), 33
- Ocean, 106, 251, 258, 265  
 Octavia, 47  
 Octavian, 48, 56, 72, 79, 82, 86, 87, 93, 101, 112, 154, 192, 245, 293, 295, 317; *see also* Octavius C. and Augustus  
 Octavius C., 17, 308; *see also* Octavian and Augustus  
 Octavius Hersenius or Herrenus, 34  
 Octavius L. of Reate, 34  
 Octavius Teucer, 35  
 Octavius Cn. (cos. 88), 307  
 Odysseus, 224, 250, 252  
 Ofilius A., 90, 113, 212, 213  
 Ogygus, 244  
 Okkelos the Lucanian, 31, 32, 33  
 Olympia, 279  
 Olympic Games, 244  
 Olympieum, 190  
 Opici, 323  
 Oppius C., 93, 97, 105, 111, 213, 229  
 Oppius Chares, 35, 180, 242  
 Oppius, *De silv. arb.*, 180  
 Orbilius Pupillus L., 34, 48, 74, 75, 124  
 Orcynian Forest, 262  
 Orgetorix, 260  
 Orion, 165  
 Orpheus, Orphism, 139, 311  
 Oscan, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 33, 34, 90, 129, 240, 276  
 Osiris, 309, 311  
 Ostanes, 309  
 Ostia, 21, 180, 196

- Oulis, Ouliadae, 30  
 Ovid, 42, 114, 163, 233, 294  
  
 Pacuvius M., 51, 275, 278  
 Pacuvius Labeo, 90  
 Paelignian, 22, 33  
 Paeonius of Ephesus, 190  
 Paeonius (rhetor), 77  
 Paestum (Posidonia), 20  
 Palatine, 42, 306, 319  
 Pales, 306  
 Paestrina, *see* Praeneste  
 Pammenes (rhetor), 10  
 Pan, 311  
 Panaetius, 4, 5, 6, 33, 54, 57, 68, 71, 81, 83, 97, 162, 197, 207, 244, 290, 295, 302, 306  
 Panchaea, 4, 255  
 Paphlagonia, 264  
 Papirii, 213, 303  
 Papirius Sex. or P. (supposed pont. max.), 213, 303  
 Papirius Paetus L., 23, 24, 83  
 Parilia, 245, 307  
 Parmenides, 31, 285  
 Parthenius, 8, 44, 55, 70, 263  
 Parthenon, 190  
 Parthia, 17, 56, 62, 63, 227, 251, 256  
 Pasiteles, 32, 88, 193, 194, 197, 258  
 Patara, 295  
 Patavium, 35, 317  
 Patrae, 13  
 Patro, 80, 101  
 Pausias, 195, 197  
 Pauson, 197  
 Pax, temple of, 42  
 Peiraeus, 96  
 Pelopidas, 230  
 Peloponnese, 13  
 Peloponnesian War, 224  
 Penates, 139, 298, 306, 311, 312, 314  
 Percennius Minius, 33  
 Pergamum, 15, 39, 40, 51, 70, 77, 82, 118, 194, 196, 234, 268, 271, 272, 319  
 Pericles, 294  
 Peripatetics, 6, 11, 12, 15, 22, 31, 40, 58, 59, 70, 81, 82, 94, 96, 105, 111, 132, 133, 168, 202, 207, 250, 251, 277, 280, 290, 291, 296  
 Perseus, 309  
 Persia, Persians, 180, 225, 230, 231, 252, 265, 293, 299, 308, 309  
 Persian Wars, 189, 226  
 Perusia, 94  
 Pessinus, 5  
 Petosiris, 307  
 Petra, 255  
 Petrarch, ix  
 Petronius, 320  
 Peucetian, 33  
 Phaedrus (Epicurean), 6, 7, 9, 11, 80, 101  
 Phalaris, 226  
 Pharsalus, 96, 105, 285, 310  
 Pherecydes of Samos, 294  
 Phidias, 195, 198  
 Philagrus (rhetor), 77  
 Philemon, 274  
 Philinus of Acragas, 225  
 Philip II of Macedon, 198, 223, 224, 231  
 Philippi, 81, 229  
 Philistus, 223  
 Philo of Larissa, 5, 7, 11, 44, 54, 57, 58, 82, 143, 146, 148, 282, 286, 289  
 Philochorus, 239  
 Philodemus, 15, 22, 23, 24, 30, 36, 48, 52, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 80, 81, 83, 85, 97, 111, 118, 119, 152, 193, 197, 207, 281, 294, 295, 296; *Mus.*, 169; *On Anger*, 296; *On Death*, 297; *On Economy*, 296; *On Freedom of Speech*, 296; *On Signs*, 295; *On the Gods*, 301; *On the Good King*, 269; *On the Stoics*, 22; *On Vices*, 296; *Poet.*, 280, 281; *Rhet.*, 134, 143, 144, 145, 146, 281; *Syntaxis*, 294  
 Philodemus? *On Piety*, 300, 301  
 Philodemus? *On Providence*, 301  
 Philolaus, 294  
 Philologus, *see* Ateius  
 Philonides, 294  
 Philostratus (Academic), 36, 82  
 Philoxenus, possibly Claudius Philoxenus (doctor), 30  
 Philoxenus of Alexandria, 17, 55, 68, 69, 102, 118, 119, 125, 141  
 Phocion, 145  
 Phoenicia, Phoenicians, 17, 128, 130, 265  
 Phradmon of Argos, 196  
 Phrygia, Phrygians, 168, 256  
 Picenum, Picene, 20, 307  
 Picus, 255  
 Pietrabbondante, 33

- Pinnius T. and/or Q., 13, 41, 46  
 Pisaurum, 34  
 Pisidia, 302  
 Piso, *see* Calpurnius  
 Pitholeon of Rhodes, 79  
 Pittacus, 294  
 Plato, 31, 47, 57, 81, 82, 96, 132, 140,  
 141, 143, 156, 160, 169, 172, 198, 209,  
 284, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 295, 303  
 Plato (comic poet), 196  
 Plautus, 50, 53, 122, 141, 193, 223, 240,  
 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276,  
 277, 278  
 Pleiades, 164  
 Pliny the Elder, 318, 320  
 Plotius Gallus L., 50, 78, 151  
 Plotius Tucca P., 23  
 Pluto, 311, 313, 314  
 Pneumatics, 170, 178  
 Po, 91, 264, 287, 304  
 Polemo of Ilium, 234, 238, 243, 244  
 Pollio of Tralles, 136  
 Polybius, 5, 15, 61, 62, 63, 92, 96, 151,  
 216, 217, 218, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225,  
 226, 227, 230, 240, 241, 246, 249, 250,  
 251, 255, 260  
 Polycles (artist), 194  
 Polyclitus, 186, 193, 198  
 Pompeii, 20, 21, 25, 34, 50, 94  
 Pompeius Geminus Cn., 107  
 Pompeius Lenaeus, 73, 104, 107, 131,  
 141, 179, 180, 270  
 Pompeius Magnus Cn. (Pompey), 5, 7, 8,  
 17, 21, 39, 41, 46, 47, 48, 49, 60, 61,  
 62, 68, 71, 72, 73, 79, 91, 92, 93, 97,  
 98, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 113,  
 136, 139, 145, 156, 160, 164, 176, 180,  
 181, 185, 189, 196, 202, 212, 216, 221,  
 222, 226, 229, 235, 255, 257, 258, 265,  
 278, 288, 308, 317, 321  
 Pompeius Sex., 4, 90, 104, 206  
 Pompeius Sex. (the younger), 23  
 Pompeius Strabo Cn., 108, 228  
 Pompeius Trogus, 227  
 Pompilius Andronicus M., 23, 72, 75,  
 269  
 Pomponius (later Caecilius) Atticus T.,  
 9, 11, 13, 25, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46,  
 48, 51, 52, 55, 61, 64, 68, 69, 71, 75,  
 76, 81, 86, 92, 95, 96, 100, 101, 102,  
 103, 104, 105, 110, 125, 156, 185, 195,  
 196, 198, 220, 223, 226, 230, 231, 234,  
 235, 242, 245, 246, 267, 271, 285, 290,  
 317, 324; *Annales*, 103  
 Pomponius L. (author of *Atellanes*), 53  
 Pontus, 14, 40, 180, 192, 258  
 Poplios (Publius), 13  
 Porcia, 229  
 Porcii, 232  
 Porcius Cato M. (the elder), 4, 26, 73,  
 85, 91, 95, 103, 134, 135, 141, 143,  
 146, 170, 179, 203, 204, 216, 230, 231,  
 234, 241, 263, 292, 307, 321; *De Agr.*  
 134, 136, 137  
 Porcius Cato M. (the younger), 10, 15,  
 33, 36, 40, 81, 82, 83, 95, 96, 110, 194,  
 229, 233, 286, 310, 321  
 Porcius Latro M., 317  
 Porcius Licinus, 5, 268, 272, 274  
 Porsenna Lars, 191  
 Porticus Metelli, 193  
 Posidonius, x, 5, 7, 8, 10, 30, 36, 37, 40,  
 54, 61, 62, 63, 68, 80, 82, 83, 97, 98,  
 106, 107, 108, 109, 118, 124, 132, 145,  
 157, 158, 162, 163, 166, 171, 178, 179,  
 185, 191, 217, 223, 226, 228, 249, 251,  
 252, 253, 254, 255, 259, 260, 261, 262,  
 263, 265, 280, 287, 288, 290, 293, 295,  
 301, 305, 307, 321  
 Possis, 197  
 Praeneste, 28, 34, 239, 258, 306  
 Praxiphanes, 215  
 Praxiteles, 193, 194, 197  
 Priene, 186  
 Procilius, ?L., 236  
 Prometheus, 309  
 Propertius Sex., 233  
 Proserpina, 314  
 Protogenes (painter), 197  
 Protogenes (reader to M. Marius), 45  
 Ptolemaeum (Athens), 11, 12  
 Ptolemies, 113, 232, 308  
 Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt, 40,  
 253, 258  
 Ptolemy VIII of Egypt, 14, 15  
 Ptolemy XII Auletes of Egypt, 15, 16  
 Ptolemy XIII of Egypt, 105  
 Publilius Syrus, 22, 51, 72, 307  
 Publius (Roman *eques*), 37  
 Pulena Laris, 27  
 Punic, 17, 22, 63, 135, 137, 240, 266, 312,  
 315

- Punic Wars, 37, 225, 242, 243, 271, 274  
 Pupius Piso M., 6, 9, 81, 97  
 Puteoli, 21, 24, 25, 41, 93  
 Pyrenees, 106  
 Pyrrhus King of Epirus, 216, 243  
 Pythagoras (sculptor), 32  
 Pythagoras, Pythagoreans, 22, 30, 31,  
 32, 33, 53, 64, 94, 123, 126, 138, 156,  
 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 168, 169, 174,  
 179, 181, 225, 245, 249, 283, 285, 291,  
 292, 293, 294, 299, 310, 312, 313, 323  
 Pytheas of Massilia, 251, 257  
 Pytheos, 186, 188  
  
 Quinctius Atta T., 276  
 Quinctius Cincinnatus T., 247  
 Quinquatrus, 84  
 Quintilian, 318  
 Quintus Trogus T., 238  
 Quintus, 60  
  
 Rabirius (Epicurean), 23, 49, 139  
 Rabirius Postumus C., 16, 71  
 Rabirius C. (senator), 110  
 Reate, 26, 34, 195, 266  
 Red Sea, 251, 253, 263  
 Rhamnus, 198  
 Rhegium, 20, 32, 36  
*Rhet ad Her.*, *see Auct. Rhet. ad Her.*  
 Rhine, 87, 260, 261, 262, 287  
 Rhinthon, 22, 276  
 Rhodes, Rhodian, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13,  
 17, 55, 58, 69, 77, 79, 87, 106, 107,  
 109, 110, 118, 120, 143, 144, 150, 151,  
 153, 163, 193, 197, 226, 296, 318  
 Rhosian Ware, 100  
 Riace, 194  
 Romulus, 128, 244, 307, 314, 315  
 Roscius Gallus Q., 76, 152  
 Rubellius Blandus, 79  
 Rubigo, 315  
 Rufus (dedicatee of work by Varro), 159  
 Rutilius Lupus P., 151  
 Rutilius Rufus P., 4, 7, 64, 67, 80, 92,  
 109, 143, 151, 197, 206, 228  
  
 Sabine, Sabines, 25, 26, 129, 306, 315  
 Safinius Pollio T., 22  
 Salacia, 314  
 Sallust, ix, 46, 63, 73, 92, 94, 109, 111,  
 131, 216, 221, 222, 264, 317  
 Sallustius, Cn. 285  
 Samnite, Samnites, 25, 26, 33, 240  
 Samos, 210  
 Samothrace, 8, 237, 299, 312, 313, 314,  
 315, 324  
 Santra, 72, 92, 103, 230, 231, 270, 279  
 Sardinia, 22, 258  
 Sarnus, 25  
 Sasernae, 35, 91, 136, 137; *see also*  
 Hostilii  
 Saturn, 218, 242, 308, 311, 312, 315  
 Saturnalia, 241  
 Saturnia, 238  
 Saturnians, 268, 269  
 Saufeius L., 9, 13, 285  
 Scaevola, *see* Mucius  
 Scaurus, *see* Aemilius  
 Sceptics, Scepticism, 11, 17, 31, 54, 178,  
 282, 286, 295, 302  
 Scipio, *see* Cornelius  
 Scipiones, 40, 97  
 Scribonius Aphrodisius, 75  
 Scribonius (astrologer), 308  
 Scribonius Curio C. (the younger), 46,  
 104  
 Scribonius Libo L., 92, 105, 108, 216,  
 246  
 Scythia, 253  
 Sea of Azov, 265  
 Sedigitus, *see* Volcacius  
 Seius M., 180  
 Seleucids, 15, 255  
 Selius (?) P. and C., 7, 57  
 Semiramis, 252  
 Sempronia, 46  
 Sempronii Tuditani, 46  
 Sempronius Asellio L., 37, 218, 222, 227  
 Sempronius Atratinus L., 78  
 Sempronius Gracchus C., 4, 46, 76, 78,  
 226, 234, 243  
 Septimius P., 88, 188  
 Septimontium, 237  
 Septuagint, 256  
 Serapio (geographer), 44, 156, 257  
 Serapion (name), 30  
 Serapis, 85, 299, 308, 309  
 Sergius M', 238  
 Sergius Orata L., 21  
 Sertorius Q., 266  
 Servian Walls, 237  
 Servilii, 232

- Servilius Casca Longus P., 216  
 Sescennius Iacchus, 35, 184  
 Sevius Nicanor, 72, 180  
 Sextilius P., 135  
 Sextius Q., 3, 94, 318  
 Sibylline Books, 303, 306, 314  
 Sibyls, 314  
 Sicily, Sicilian, 25, 35, 36, 37, 77, 81, 88,  
 163, 193, 197, 200, 221, 223, 225, 226,  
 227, 271, 276, 285, 323  
 Sicyon, 194, 244  
 Silanus, *see* Junius  
 Simonides, 150  
 Simylus, 233  
 Siro, 23, 24, 59  
 Sisenna, *see* Cornelius  
 Sisiphus, 89  
 Skiras, 22  
 Social War, 26, 33, 68, 92, 104, 108, 148,  
 221, 222, 225, 249  
 Socrates, 46, 53, 284, 294  
 Solomon, 256  
 Sophocles, 102, 105, 272, 280  
 Sopolis (painter), 198  
 Sora, 34  
 Sosigenes, 17, 112, 165  
 Sosii (booksellers), 42  
 Sosus of Ascalon, 22, 23, 58  
 Spain, Spanish, 37, 50, 62, 63, 74, 93, 135,  
 157, 191, 214, 225, 226, 235, 250, 251,  
 254, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 265, 285,  
 318  
 Sparta, Spartans, 49, 145, 194, 222, 226,  
 255  
 Spartocids, 225  
 Spoletium, 34  
 Spurinna, 28  
 Spurrinae, 29  
 Staberius Eros, 72, 122  
 Stallius C. and M., 22  
 Staseas of Naples, 6, 9, 22, 81  
 Statilius, 81  
 Statius Sebosus, 266  
 Stertinius, 53  
 Stertinius, 49, 53, 151, 284  
 Stilo, *see* Aelius  
 Stoics, Stoicism, 10, 11, 15, 22, 30, 37,  
 40, 47, 49, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 70, 80,  
 82, 88, 94, 95, 96, 97, 104, 106, 114,  
 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126,  
 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 139, 143,  
 148, 150, 151, 156, 157, 158, 165, 167,  
 168, 169, 172, 178, 182, 206, 207, 211,  
 213, 223, 228, 252, 270, 280, 282, 283,  
 284, 285, 286, 289, 290, 293, 294, 295,  
 300, 301, 302, 305, 307, 311, 313, 314,  
 319, 320  
 Strabo, 8, 18, 289, 290, 317, 321, 322  
 Strato of ?Epirus, 77  
 Suebi, 261, 262, 263  
 Sueius M., 180, 278  
 Suessa Aurunca, 73  
 Suffenas, 45  
 Suffustius Num., 28  
 Sulla (*litterator*), 51  
 Sulla, *see* Cornelius  
 Sulpicia, 47  
 Sulpicius Blitho, 230, 246  
 Sulpicius Galba Ser., 151  
 Sulpicius Galus C., 162, 292  
 Sulpicius Rufus Ser. (the elder), 9, 89, 90,  
 93, 96, 113, 196, 202, 206, 207, 209,  
 210, 211, 212, 213, 317  
 Sulpicius Rufus Ser. (the younger), 210  
 Summanus, 305  
 Syracuse, Syracusan, 36, 37, 55, 163,  
 224, 226  
 Syria, 10, 15, 16, 23, 32, 36, 72, 81, 126,  
 256, 294, 295  
 Tacitus, 319  
 Tages, 27, 304, 310  
 Tanais, River, 109  
 Tanaquil, 199  
 Tanusius Geminus, 221, 264  
 Tarentum, 4, 20, 31, 32, 35  
 Tarquenna, 28  
 Tarquinii, 27, 28, 29  
 Tarquinius (?Priscus), 306  
 Tarquinius Priscus (King of Rome), 200,  
 248, 314  
 Tarquinius Priscus, 7, 28, 93, 242, 304  
 Tarsus, 15, 17, 81, 82  
 Tarutius L., 34, 65, 94, 244, 245, 307,  
 308  
 Tauromenium, 36, 223  
 Teanum Apulum, 22  
 Teanum Sidicinum, 22, 58  
 Tellus, 258  
 Temnus, 77  
 Tenedos, 194  
 Terence, 7, 39, 113, 267, 268, 271, 272,

- 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 324  
 Terentius Libo, 278  
 Terentius M., 241, 242  
 Terentius Varro Atacinus P., 37, 111, 167, 260, 265, 267  
 Terentius Varro M., ix, 7, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50, 52, 58, 62, 76, 85, 86, 88, 91, 94, 96, 97, 102, 103, 105, 113, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 131, 132, 135, 157, 158, 163, 166, 167, 178, 179, 180, 183, 190, 196, 197, 198, 199, 205, 210, 220, 223, 231, 234, 235, 236, 238, 239, 240, 242, 244, 247, 248, 255; 257, 258, 264, 265, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 277, 281, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 298, 300, 306, 308, 309, 310, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325; *Ad Cn. Pomp.*, 139, 216, 235; *Aetia*, 233; *Annales*, 221, 246; *Ant.*, 218, 237, 243, 286, 324; *Ant. div.* 26, 113, 139, 179, 236, 273, 299, 303, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316; *Ant. hum.*, 236, 241, 242, 265, 312; *Atticus*, 102; *Aug. libri*, 302; *Catus*, 97, 193; *Curio*, 310; *De action. scaen.*, 273; *De actis scaen.*, 273; *De Aest.*, 265; *De ant. lit.*, 130, 235, 240; *De bibl.*, 51; *De com. Plaut.*, 273; *De compos. sat.*, 270; *De descript.*, 152; *De fam. Troi.*, 245; *De forma philos.*, 287; *De gente pR*, 244; *De grad.*, 212; *De iure civ.*, 207, 212; *De lect.*, 51; *De litoral.*, 265; *de LL.*, 3, 43, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 139, 141, 161, 237, 239, 241, 247, 248, 270, 279; *De ora marit.*, 265, 288; *De orig. LL*, 105; *De person.*, 273, 275; *De philos.*, 139, 282, 286; *De poem.*, 273, 279; *De poet.*, 230, 273, 275; *De Pompeio*, 108; *De princ. num.*, 162; *De propr. script.*, 277; *De quaest. scaen.*, 275; *De RR*, 13, 28, 46, 136, 137, 138, 164, 203; *De scaen. orig.*, 273; *De val. tuend.*, 179; *de vent.*, 164; *De vita pR*, 102, 241, 242, 243; *De vita sua*, 229; *Disc.*, 88, 117, 132, 140, 152, 158, 170, 201, 324; *Disc. (arch.)*, 186, 188, 191; *Disc. (arithm.)*, 160, 161; *Disc. (astron.)*, 163; *Disc. (dial.)* 132; *Disc. (geom.)*, 158, 159, 265; *Disc. (med.)*, 178, 180; *Disc. (music.)*, 167, 168; *Ephem. Nav.*, 105, 164, 183, 265, 288; *Epist.*, 231; *Epist. Quaest.*, 231; *Gallus Fundanius*, 265; *Hebd. (Imagines)*, 44, 161, 164, 179, 198, 230, 273, 287; *Legat.*, 235; *Libr. nav.*, 183; *Marcellus*, 287; *Messalla*, 179; *Orestes*, 287; *Peri char.*, 152; *Quaest. Plaut.*, 273; *Rhet. libri*, 152; *Sat. Mem.p.* 30, 48, 50, 78, 84, 96, 140, 162, 178, 194, 235, 268, 273, 278, 283, 284; *Scaurus*, 273; *Sisenna*, 215, 221; *Tricaranus*, 216; *Tubero*, 97, 161, 179  
 Tetrilius (?) Rogus, 7, 57  
 Teutones, 259, 261  
 Thallimetus (?Halimetus), 101  
 Thebes, Thebans, 85  
 Themison of Laodicea, 18, 35, 60, 85, 176, 177, 178, 180  
 Themistocles, 226, 230  
 Theodorus of Gadara, 57, 76, 153, 154, 318  
 Theogenes (astrologer), 308  
 Theomnestus of Naucratis (Academic), 10, 318  
 Theophanes of Mytilene, 9, 61, 62, 92, 98, 105, 108, 109, 255  
 Theophrastus, 40, 43, 101, 137, 141, 151, 179, 180, 181, 183, 215, 281, 287, 289, 290, 291, 296  
 Theophrastus (original name of Tyrannio), 69  
 Theopompus, 223, 224  
 Theopompus of Cnidus, 23, 96, 98, 111  
 Thespieae, 13, 194  
 Thessalus (doctor), 176  
 Thoth, *see* Hermes Trismegistus  
 Thucydides, 79, 97, 144, 177, 223, 226, 230, 281  
 Thule, 264  
 Thurii, 285  
 Thyillus, 32, 221  
 Tiber, 53, 243  
 Tiberius (Emperor), 308, 319  
 Tibur, 21, 34  
 Tigris, 64, 224  
 Timaeus, 36, 223, 224, 225, 226, 230, 234, 242, 250, 254, 269, 292, 293  
 Timagenes, 17, 18, 319  
 Timasagoras, 296  
 Tin Islands, 256, 259  
 Tingi, 264  
 Tiro, *see* Tullius  
 Titinius, 276

- Tlepolemus (sculptor), 88  
 Tower of Babel, 256  
 Trabea Q., 276  
 Transpadanes, 35  
 Trebatius Testa, C., 41, 45, 76, 77, 90,  
 113, 206, 209, 211, 212, 213, 317  
 Trebia, 24  
 Trebianus, 24  
 Trebius, 24  
 Trebonius C., 11, 12, 114  
 Tremellius Scrofa Cn., 91, 136, 137  
 Triptolemus, 311  
 Tritonis, Lake, 254  
 Troad, 40  
 Troglodytes, 253  
 Trojan War, 237, 255  
 Troy, Trojans, 31, 218, 264, 312, 314  
 Trypho (grammarian), 36  
 Tryphon, 309  
 Tubero, *see* Aelius  
 Tullia, 46, 71, 211  
 Tullius Cicero L., 9, 11  
 Tullius Cicero M., *passim*  
 Tullius Cicero M. (the younger), 11, 12,  
 43, 45, 69, 82  
 Tullius Cicero Q., 41, 66, 68, 139, 167,  
 216, 221, 299  
 Tullius Cicero Q. (the younger), 11, 77  
 Tullius Cratippus M., *see* Cratippus  
 Tullius Servius (King of Rome), 199, 242  
 Tullius Tiro M., 25, 40, 45, 66, 75, 86,  
 93, 104, 178, 229, 323  
 Turdetani, 251  
 Turia, 47  
 Turpilius Sex. (comic poet), 53  
 Turranius, D., 46  
 Turranius Niger, 46  
 Tuscanic, 189, 191, 199  
 Tusculum, 6, 40, 41, 42, 71, 75, 194, 195,  
 239  
 Twelve Tables, 202, 206, 211, 235, 239  
 Tyche, 223  
 Tyrannio (the elder), 8, 40, 41, 42, 43,  
 52, 55, 67, 69, 70, 102, 111, 118, 119,  
 125, 130, 257, 267, 290, 317  
 Tyrannio (the younger – Diocles son of  
 Artemidorus), 17, 69  
 Tyre, 256  
 Umbrian, 28  
 Urso, 214  
 Utica, 85, 274  
 Valerii, 219  
 Valerius Antias, 91, 217, 219, 220  
 Valerius Cato P., 35, 74, 75, 104, 270,  
 317  
 Valerius Catullus C., ix, 10, 35, 42, 45,  
 47, 58, 93, 103, 109, 113, 114, 123,  
 221, 246, 258, 260, 281, 285, 309  
 Valerius Flaccus L. (flam. mart.) 239  
 Valerius Maximus, 153  
 Valerius Messalla Rufus M., 93, 232, 302  
 Valerius Messalla (?Corvinus, M.), 12  
 Valerius Soranus Q., 34, 51, 105, 300  
 Vargunteius Q., 52  
 Varius Rufus L., 23  
 Vatinius P., 94, 310  
 Vegoia, 27, 306  
 Veii, 306  
 Velia, 30, 31, 60, 90  
 Velleius C., 5  
 Veneti (Gaul), 260  
 Veneti (Italy), Venetic, 20, 35, 264  
 Venus, 164, 165, 187, 244, 248, 308  
 Venusia, 34, 67  
 Veranius, 93, 258, 302, 303  
 Veranius Flaccus, 93  
 Vercingetorix, 263  
 Vergilius, 269  
 Verginia, 48  
 Verginius A., 206  
 Verres C., 36, 37, 86, 88, 194, 196  
 Verrius Flaccus M., 28, 67  
 Vestorius C., 25, 48, 87  
 Vettius (augur), 33  
 Vettius Philocomus, 270  
 Vettius, *see* Cyrus (architect)  
 Vibius Pansa C., 24, 85  
 Vibii Visci, 35  
 Vigellius M., 5  
 Vipsanius Agrippa M., 21, 87, 88, 112,  
 114, 308  
 Virgil, 23, 35, 70, 79, 156, 167, 177, 180,  
 245, 267, 269, 317, 318, 324; *Eclogues*,  
 48  
 Visellius Aculeo C. (the elder), 206  
 Visellius Varro C., 194  
 Vitruvius Mamurra, 87  
 Vitruvius Pollio, ix, 3, 21, 29, 32, 42, 44,  
 46, 47, 48, 52, 86, 87, 88, 117, 130,  
 134, 140, 141, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160,

- 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 177, 181, 185,  
186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195,  
199, 201, 203, 236, 282, 287, 289, 299,  
306, 317, 320, 324, 325
- Volaterrae, 19, 29, 304
- Volcacius Sedigitus, 268, 271, 272, 273,  
276
- Volcae Tectosages, 262
- Volcatius (lawyer), 90
- Volnius, 29
- Volscian, 20, 25
- Volsinii, 247, 248
- Voltacilius Pilutus L., 78, 91, 92, 104,  
108
- Voltacilius Pitholaus M. (perhaps the  
same), 79
- Volumnia Cytheris, 48
- Volumnius P., 81, 229
- Volusius, 35, 221
- Vulca of Veii, 199
- Vulcan, 248
- Xenocles of Adramyttium, 8, 9
- Xenophanes, 315
- Xenophon, 46, 62, 108, 223, 227, 228,  
230, 296
- Zaratus, Zarathustra, 293; *see also*  
Zoroaster
- Zeno of Citium, 82, 283, 313
- Zeno of Rhodes, 226
- Zeno of Sidon, 7, 9, 11, 23, 58, 59, 60,  
144, 280, 295, 296, 301
- Zenodotus, 12, 75
- Zeus, 198, 304, 308
- Zeuxis, 193
- Zoroaster, 309, 311; *see also* Zaratus