

Ruling the Greek World

Approaches to the Roman Empire in the East

Edited by Juan Manuel Cortés Copete,
Elena Muñiz Grijalvo
and Fernando Lozano Gómez



CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Editors' Preface | 7 |
| 1. <i>Cristina Rosillo-López</i> Greek Self-Presentation to the Roman Republican Power..... | 13 |
| 2. <i>Elena Muñiz Grijalvo</i> Greek Religion as a Feature of Greek Identity..... | 27 |
| 3. <i>Juan Manuel Cortés Copete</i> Hellas, Roman Province..... | 43 |
| 4. <i>Arminda Lozano</i> Imperium Romanum and the Religious Centres of Asia Minor. The Intervention of Roman Political Power on the Temples of Asia Minor | 67 |
| 5. <i>Ted Kaizer</i> Dura-Europos under Roman Rule | 91 |
| 6. <i>Elena Calandra</i> Official Images in Athens in the Middle-Imperial Period | 103 |
| 7. <i>Fernando Lozano, Rocío Gordillo</i> A Dialogue on Power: Emperor Worship in the Delphic Amphictyony | 127 |
| 8. <i>Greg Woolf</i> Greek Archaeologists at Rome | 147 |
| 9. <i>Maurice Sartre</i> Strabon et Plutarque: regards croisés sur l' <i>Hégemonia tôn Rhomaiôn</i> | 161 |
| 10. <i>Francesca Fontanella</i> The Roman Empire in the Works of Aelius Aristides | 171 |
| General Index | 187 |

GREEK ARCHAEOLOGISTS AT ROME¹

Greg Woolf

1. ARCHAEOLOGY COMES TO ROME

This paper concerns a cultural moment, the point at which the City of Rome moved, as it were, from being the subject of ethnographic and antiquarian investigation, to one of the main centres of such research. The movements of scholars to Rome in the last half-century of the Republic is an old story, well told on a number of occasions. But the links between this enterprise and Roman imperialism in the west remain to be explored. What this paper offers are some suggestions about the respective roles of Greek intellectuals, Roman aristocrats and western provincials in this process, and some observations on the context of this activity.

I begin with Diodoros of Sicily, explaining what it was that had brought him to Rome.

After he had decided to write a history of the entire world, from the earliest times to the present day, and had realised what an immense project this would be, he travelled widely in Asia and Europe visiting the locations of key historical events, and spent in total thirty years in research.

As for the resources on which I depended in this labour, they were first of all that enthusiasm which enables anyone to bring to completion a task which seems impossible, and secondly the great supply of materials relevant to this study which is provided by the city of Rome. For the supremacy of this city, a supremacy so powerful that it extends to the bounds of the inhabited world, has provided me in the course of my long residence there with many resources in the most accessible form. For I am a native of the city of Argyrium in Sicily and since through mixing with the Romans in that island, I had acquired a special familiarity with their language, I was able to acquire an accurate knowledge of all the events of the empire from the records (*hypomnemeta*) which have been carefully preserved by them over a long period of time. I have set the start of my history with the myths of Greeks and Barbarians, after examining to the best of my ability the records each people keeps of ancient times (*archaios chronos*)².

There is much one might say about Diodoros' self-representation on the basis of this passage. The affairs of Greeks and Barbarians point back to Herodotos and Thucydides, and his insistence on the importance of autopsy to correct the errors of his predecessors recalls Polybios. The preceding passage on the strengths and limitations of earlier historians (coupled with the claim that his work was on a greater

- 1 I am grateful to the comments of all those at the Seville colloquium and to a seminar audience at Oxford. This paper also owes a good deal to discussions with Dan Hogg. Some of the ideas first presented here were subsequently developed in G. Woolf *Tales of the Barbarians. Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West*. (Malden and Oxford 2011).
- 2 Diodoros 1.4.2–5 (adapted from Loeb translation).

scale that any of theirs, and more useful too) marks him as thoroughly Hellenistic. As for the genre, Pliny confirms that the work was entitled a *Bibliothēke* – a library – perhaps relating to Diodoros’ claim that part of its utility was to save the reader the trouble of hunting in a number of other separate works. But he also uses the term *historie* and its cognates, and presented his work as a Common (*Koine*) History, a term which we today translate as Universal History³. Less conventionally, Diodoros makes explicit the link between a Common History and mankind’s common humanity, expressed in a world of peoples bound together by kinship (*suggeneia*).

For the opening books of the *Bibliothēke*, he depends on the *mythologoumena* of Greeks and Barbarians. This is a greater part of his design than it was for Herodotos, since the first six books were dedicated to Egyptian, Assyrian, Indian, Ethiopian *logoi*, to the Greek myths and to the origins of the peoples of the west. After book six the narrative is more conventionally hellenocentric from the Trojan War to Alexander and then tracks the history of the Hellenistic world and its absorption by Rome up to the eve of Caesar’s Gallic War. The conventional term for the kind of investigations pursued in the first six books (alluded to in Diodoros’ reference to *archaios chronos* here and in the preface to book 2) was *archaeologia*, archaeology, hence the title of this paper⁴.

I use the term “archaeologist” deliberately and despite its modern usage, because the connotations of “antiquarian” are even more misleading. The term “historian” is both too broad and too narrow. Too broad because we use it for those who wrote accounts of very recent, even contemporary events – Thucydides and Caesar for example – while those who practiced *archaeologia* always had a strong interest in *ta archaia*, in the ancient times of the deep past, accessible only through myth supplemented by learned conjecture. And “historian” is too narrow, because their work included subjects we regard today as the province of ethnography, religious studies, even comparative philology.

Archaeological investigations, in this sense, appear in all sorts of works. The attempt to define genre has been largely fruitless. Attempts to create a taxonomy of historical writing have turned out to be at best a limited convenience, at worst quite misleading⁵. What united this research was a set of shared preoccupations coupled with some broad agreement (and narrow disagreements) on how to answer them. Behind the interests of the small number of individuals who researched and composed archaeological texts lay a much wider interest in the “*origines gentium*”, the origins of peoples. By wider I mean that in important respects, what seem to us to be slightly implausible stories found gathered in recondite compilatory texts, like

3 K. Clarke, “Universal Perspectives in Historiography”, in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and narrative in ancient historical texts* (Leiden, Boston & Köln 1999).

4 E. Bickermann, “Origines Gentium”, *Classical Philology* 47 (1952), 65–81.

5 F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 15 vols (Berlin and Leiden, 1923–1958) provides a guide through the maze but the organizing principles he and his continuators employ correspond only in part with native categories, about which there may have been little consensus. Arguably the absence of specific performative contexts for most scientific writing and its uncertain location in educational syllabuses allowed a great deal of flexibility to ancient authors. For some recent comment see K. Clarke, *Making time for the past. Local history and the polis* (Oxford 2008), 174–5.

that of Diodoros, were of genuine significance to the citizens as well as the elites, of ancient cities⁶. Foundation stories, legends of migration and accounts of kinship between peoples now widely separated in space were key planks of ancient identities long before the Hellenistic period⁷. That interest depended on the special values placed on both descent and antiquity in the traditional societies of the ancient world, and on a familiar tactic through which the movements and acts of key individuals – heroes, kings, founders, ancestors – were made to stand proxy for the history of entire peoples who claimed them. This wide lay-belief in the importance of origins, directed and supported research into them and helps explain the presence of archaeological material in a wide range of literary works.

Most of the writing that emerged from this activity was in prose rather than verse. It naturally had much in common with other kinds of historical writing. But it also touched on medical, geographical and ethical sciences, and might appear in miscellanistic writing, in sympotica and more rarely in any form of verse from lyric odes to epic and satire. It was, in origin, a quintessentially Greek science. We usually trace it back to Herodotos and behind him Hekataios of Miletos. But a good case has been made for this kind of genealogical thinking in the Hesiodic corpus⁸, while Diodoros and Strabo themselves represented their archaeological investigations as unproblematically standing in a tradition that began with Homer. By their day, however, it had in practice become a more circumscribed intellectual field, one in which explanatory paradigms as well as particular versions competed and some conventions had begun to emerge about what should or not be included in ethnographic accounts, and how they should be organised. Never a self-standing discipline like medicine or mathematics, archaeology had a place alongside geographical, sociological, political, ethical and historical researches into more recent epochs⁹.

Diodoros provided my starting point because in his work we can see not only the lines of these ancient traditions but also a new departure, the notion of Rome as a good place to conduct research. Rome had featured as an *object* of archaeological speculation since perhaps Aristotle, and certainly since Timaios writing in Athens in the early third century¹⁰. But the idea that Rome was a superior place to study, let alone that a good knowledge of Latin made accessible a mass of previously unexplored source material, is without precedent in extant texts. As ethnographers might

6 P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks believe in their myths? An essay in the constitutive imagination*. Translated by P. Wissing (Chicago 1988).

7 E. Dench, *Romulus' Asylum. Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the age of Hadrian* (Oxford 2005); Ch. P. Jones, *Kinship diplomacy in the Ancient world* (Cambridge 1999).

8 R.L. Fowler, "Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and the creation of the Hellenes", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44 (1998), 1–19; J.M. Hall, *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity* (Cambridge 1997).

9 K. Clarke, *Between Geography and History. Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman world* (Oxford 1999).

10 A. Momigliano, "Athens in the third century BC and the discovery of Rome in the Histories of Timaeus of Tauromenium", in A. Momigliano (ed.), *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford 1959), 529–56.

put it today, Rome was no longer simply a place to do fieldwork, but had become part of the academy¹¹.

When did this change take place? Inevitably, there is mild controversy over which thirty year period Diodoros means and the dates of his residence in Rome, but the broad outline is clear enough. The *Bibliothēke* covered world history from the beginnings to 59 BC. Diodoros was in Egypt in the 180th Olympiad (60–56 BC). Jerome says that Diodoros became famous in 49 BC. The latest event certainly mentioned is the foundation of the Roman colony at Tauromenium, conventionally 36 BC. Caesar is frequently referred to as deified in recognition of his achievements, but there is no mention of Actium in a number of places where it might be expected. For present purposes it is enough for us to conclude that Diodoros wrote in a world dominated by the conquests of Pompey and then Caesar, but one in which autocracy was not yet seen as inevitable¹². The whole of that period would have been treated in the last of the *Bibliothēke*'s 40 books, a book which began in 70 BC. The world described by Diodoros certainly *feels* pre-Augustan. There is none of the consciousness of monarchy that recurs throughout Strabo's *Geography*, also largely written in Rome but completed half a century later¹³.

Between the period of Diodoros' researches and those of Strabo, Rome was the key centre for numerous archaeological investigations conducted by Greeks. Alexander Polyhistor was brought back as a slave from the Mithridatic Wars. Timagenes of Alexandria came to Rome as a captive in 55 BC and stayed on to become a household retainer of first Augustus, and then Asinius Pollio. Dionysios of Halikarnassos too came to Rome, voluntarily in his case, learned the language and spent a quarter century writing his Roman Archaeology.

I arrived in Italy at the very time that Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war, in the middle of the one hundred and eighty-seventh Olympiad and having from that time to this present day, a period of twenty-two years, lived at Rome, learned the language of the Romans and acquainted myself with their writings, I have devoted myself during all that time to matters bearing upon my subject. Some information I received orally from men of the greatest learning, with whom I associated; and the rest I gathered from histories written by the approved Roman authors – Porcius Cato, Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, the Aelii, Gellii and Calpurnii and many others of note; with these works, which are like the Greek annalistic accounts, as a basis, I set about the writing of my history¹⁴.

Dionysios will have arrived in 30 or 29 BC and completed his work in 7 BC. Other, lesser, figures spent long periods there.

- 11 For the distinction between “the field” and “the academy” as complementary but opposed loci in the production of ethnographic knowledge cf. Clarke 2008, op. cit. (n. 5); J. Clifford-G. Marcus (eds.), *Writing culture. The poetics and politics of ethnography* (Berkeley 1986).
- 12 A. Wallace-Hadrill, “*Mutatio morum*: the idea of a cultural revolution”, in T. Habinek-A. Schiesaro (eds.), *The Roman cultural revolution* (Cambridge 1997), for this period as one of cultural innovation.
- 13 For the Augustan context of Strabo see now Veyne 1988, op. cit. (n. 6); D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek man of letters in Augustan Rome* (London – New York 2000); D. Dueck-H. Lindsay-S. Pothecary (eds.), *Strabo's cultural geography. The making of a Kolossourgia* (Cambridge 2005).
- 14 Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.3.2–3 (translation Loeb).

This material is under copyright. Any use outside of the narrow boundaries of copyright law is illegal and may be prosecuted.

This applies in particular to copies, translations, microfilming as well as storage and processing in electronic systems.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2016

There had naturally been shorter visits from Greek intellectuals much earlier. The visit of Crates of Mallos in 159 BC and the philosophers' embassy of 155 BC are often cited. Polybios, for reasons outside of his control, spent a long period in Rome, and Panaitios was also a guest of the Scipiones towards the end of this period. Artemidoros of Ephesus visited, also as an ambassador, and Posidonios was in Rome between 87–6 BC. The prominence of philosophers on diplomatic missions suggests that some Greek cities had already identified this as a special interest of the Republican aristocracy¹⁵. It has been argued that Roman leaders made deliberate use of some of these visitors to help them understand the new worlds into which Roman armies were expanding¹⁶. But although Roman wars certainly facilitated the explorations of Polybios and Posidonios and perhaps others, the evidence for deliberate promotion of these ventures, except in the case of Polybios, or use of their results by Rome is slight¹⁷. Not is there any sign that intellectuals came to Rome in the second or early first century BC in order to study. Those that were not brought by diplomatic business seem mostly to have been visiting as teachers and performers: after the return of the Achaean exiles there were no significant Greek scholars living and working in Rome for around two generations.

From the middle of the last century BC all this changed. Rome was not the sole location of scholarly research. Apart from Athens and Alexandria there were important groups of scholars working in the courts of those monarchs often called client kings and they can offer interesting views of Rome from the margins¹⁸. But the centre of scholarly gravity had shifted to the Mediterranean's new capital.

2. THE RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

The Greek archaeologists at Rome – Diodoros, Timagenes, Dionysios, Strabo and the rest – may be thought of as belonging to at least two wider communities. The first and most obvious community is that group of educated Greeks who came to Rome soon after the Mithridatic Wars¹⁹. Some came as prisoners or hostages and some apparently came to make their fortune, mostly as teachers like Dionysios, or

15 M. Griffin, "Philosophy, politics and politicians at Rome", in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata I. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford 1989).

16 One of the many inspirational suggestions in A. Momigliano, *Alien wisdom. The limits of hellenisation* (Cambridge 1975).

17 Pace Momigliano, it is not easy to show exactly how Posidonios "helped Caesar through his historical work to conquer Gaul" (p.72) despite the likely influence of his account over Caesar's own ethnographic excursus.

18 L. M. Yarrow, *Historiography at the end of the republic. Provincial perspectives on Roman rule* (Oxford 2006); D. W. Roller, *The world of Juba II and Kleopatra Selene. Royal scholarship on Rome's African frontier* (London-New York 2003).

19 E. Rawson, *Intellectual life in the late Roman Republic* (London 1985), who picks out Tyrannion the Elder, Alexander Polyhistor and Parthenius as the stars of a large crowd. See also M. H. Crawford, "Intellectuals and the Roman aristocracy in the first century BC", in P. Garnsey-C. R. Whittaker (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient world* (Cambridge 1978) and A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Review article: Greek knowledge, Roman power", *Classical Philology* 83 (1988), 224–33.

to become the star protégé of a Roman noble, as in the case of Philodemos of Gadera. Many presumably came in one capacity, and were able to establish new positions for themselves. Many were polymaths, a large group had philosophical interests, some taught. Archaeologists engaged in researching the origins and character of western peoples, were in a minority.

The wealth and friendship of Roman patrons seems to have been essential for most intellectuals. The anecdote about Timagenes being expelled from Augustus' house and being taken in by Asinius Pollio suggest that without a patron a Greek scholar could not function. Patrons provided accommodation and sustenance and probably usually some income. Some of that might be acquired by other means. Teaching was clearly an important income for some long term residents, if perhaps one they did not always choose to advertise in their works. A private income was presumably available to some, since few scholars can have been genuinely poor and some modern writers consider most of them as members of provincial elites²⁰. But only scholars with patrons could gain access to the two more fundamental resources mentioned by Dionysios, books and personal connections within the Roman aristocracy.

Diodoros' praise for the facilities available in Rome recalls the travellers' tales told by modern European scholars on their return from sabbatical visits to lavishly provided Schools of Advanced Study and Research Institutes in the US. Access to world-class research libraries was essential. Until Asinius Pollio and Augustus created Rome's first public libraries, this meant access to the private collections of Roman aristocrats.²¹ Polybios had depended during his stay on the books brought back by Aemilius Paullus from the Macedonian royal library of Pella. Since that time more libraries had been transplanted to Rome. Those of Carthage had been given to African petty kings, and presumably provided the basis for the researches of Juba of Mauretania, but that was an exception. The Mithridatic Wars had brought more libraries to Rome. Lucullus' library at Tusculum is described by Plutarch.

He got together many books, and they were well written, and his use of them was more honourable to him than his acquisition of them. His libraries were thrown open to all, and the cloisters surrounding them, and the study-rooms, were accessible without restriction to the Greeks, who constantly repaired thither as to an hostelry of the Muses, and spent the day with one another, in glad escape from their other occupations. Lucullus himself also often spent his leisure hours there with them, walking about in the cloisters with their scholars, and he would assist their statesmen in whatever they desired. And in general his house was a home and *prytaneium* for the Greeks who came to Rome. He was fond of all philosophy, and well-disposed and friendly towards every school, but from the first he cherished a particular and zealous love for the Academy, not the New Academy, so-called, although that school at the time had a vigorous representative of the doctrines of Carneades in Philo, but the Old Academy, which at that time was headed by a persuasive man and powerful speaker in the person of Antiochus of Ascalon.

20 G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek world* (Oxford 1965); Yarrow 2006, op. cit. (n.18).

21 On the nature of libraries in Republican Rome see now J.König, K.Oikonomopolou and G.Woolf (eds.) *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge 2013) and G. W. Houston, *Inside Ancient Libraries. Book collections and their management in antiquity* (Chapel Hill NC, 2014).

This material is under copyright. Any use outside of the narrow boundaries of copyright law is illegal and may be prosecuted.

This applies in particular to copies, translations, microfilming as well as storage and processing in electronic systems.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2016

This man Lucullus hastened to make his friend and companion, and arrayed him against the disciples of Philo, of whom Cicero also was one.²²

Plutarch offers an image of a kind of Roman Museum, not simply a collection of texts but also a sort of *ersatz* philosophical school, equipped for peripatetic debate and with a clear philosophical allegiance²³. Plutarch's Lucullus patronised on a grand scale, civic or regal rather than aristocratic. It was Kings that assembled great libraries and Greek *cities* that entertained honoured individuals with meals and hospitality in *prytaneia*. The Muses recall the great foundations of Fulvius Nobilior and of course Ptolemy II. The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum was less grand, but is most plausibly understood as having originated in the same period. It too possessed a library, spaces for debate embellished like Cicero's philosophical retreat – his "Lyceum" at Tusculum – with Greek statuary, and a clear if different philosophical allegiance. Its discovery is a reminder that not all the collections and establishments of this kind are necessarily attested in our surviving literary sources. Perhaps we should imagine a number of great homes in and around Rome containing collections of various sizes, mostly comprising Greek texts, alluding in their design and ethos to the philosophical schools of Hellenistic Athens.

Greek archaeologists in Republican Rome needed aristocratic patrons in order to gain access to all these collections. This was not only hard work, but work which only a few could ever undertake. Their reading expeditions were presented as undertaken for the benefit of the many. Diodoros hints at this in his justification for writing the *Bibliothēke*. Advertising the great benefit it would bring to his readers he writes

If a man should begin with the most ancient times and record to the best of his ability the affairs of the entire world down to his own day, so far as they have been handed down to memory, as though they were the affairs of just one *polis*, he would obviously have to undertake an immense labour, yet he would have composed a treatise of the utmost value to those who are studiously inclined. For from such a treatise every man will be able readily to take what is of use for his special purpose, drawing as it were from a great fountain. The reason for this is that, in the first place, it is not easy for those who propose to go through the writings of so many historians to obtain the books which come to be needed, and in the second place, that because the works vary so widely and are so numerous, the recovery of past events becomes extremely difficult to understand and achieve.²⁴

Here in a nutshell is the dilemma of the Hellenistic archaeologist, one very familiar to modern scholars in the humanities. So much has already been written that it is difficult to find copies of everything relevant and once one has done so, there lies ahead an enormous work in reconciling differences and combining different ac-

- 22 Plutarch, *Life of Lucullus* 42. 1–2 (trans. Loeb). A philosophical and literary lens naturally shaped many of the extant representations of these libraries and how they were used. On the library of Lucullus see T.K. Dix "The library of Lucullus." *Athenaeum* 88.2 (2000), 441–464 and especially S.A. Frampton "What to Do with Books in the *De finibus*." forthcoming in *TAPA* 146.1 (Spring 2016).
- 23 D. Sedley, "Philosophical allegiance in the Greco-Roman world" in M. Griffin-J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata I. Essays on philosophy and Roman society* (Oxford 1989); id., *Lucretius and the transformation of Greek wisdom* (Cambridge 1998).
- 24 Diodoros 1.3.6–8 (trans. Loeb, my italics)

counts²⁵. Conducting research of this kind meant moving between the residences of the very wealthy in search of potentially rare and costly copies of Greek books. No outsider, however well provided for financially, could gain access to this material without the help of Roman patrons.

Diodoros also mentions the importance of Latin records for historical research. What he meant by this is unclear: only fragments survive of the second half of the *Bibliothēke* in which the rise of Rome was treated. More generally there is increasing scepticism about the extent to which there existed in Rome either public archives, or publicly accessible records like those held by priestly colleges. Both Greek archaeologists like Dionysios and the Roman scholars of the Ciceronian and Augustan ages – men like Varro, Nepos, Atticus and Verrius Flaccus – seem to have had to invest a great deal of effort into establishing even such basic data as consular *fasti*. On the other hand, the notion of using original documents and public records as authorities was well known. Numerous examples could be cited from Polybios to Livy of this practice, and not all were epigraphic²⁶. But when Cicero and his contemporaries did seek documentary evidence they often looked not in the *aerarium* nor the *tabularium* but in the privately held records of those aristocratic families with consular and censorial ancestors²⁷. The same category of records is cited by Dionysios in his exhaustive investigation of the chronology of early Roman history²⁸. Once again the importance of access to the homes of Rome's aristocracy is underlined.

Did access bring other kinds of knowledge? Dionysios claims in the passage quoted above (as Polybios had before him) to have learned from conversations with great Romans. But he is also frank about how little they know about their own past.

The Romans, to be sure, have not so much as one single historian or chronicler who is ancient; however, each of their historians has taken something out of ancient accounts that are preserved on sacred tablets.²⁹

What follows is a virtuoso demonstration of the incoherence of Roman traditions, and even a lack of consensus over which of Rome's three foundations is the real one. Dionysios returns immediately to Greek historians, beginning with Timaios. Besides it looks as if those Romans he spoke to were mostly local archaeologists

25 The difference from the age of Herodotos is, naturally, largely a matter of degree perhaps accentuated by a greater tendency in later writers to foreground these difficulties as a way of building their authority. For Herodotos' book-world see R. L. Fowler, "Herodotos and his contemporaries", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996), 62–87.

26 S. Demougin (ed.), *La mémoire perdue: à la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique*. Série Histoire ancienne et médiévale (Paris 1994) beginning a project on Roman archives continued in C. Moatti, "La mémoire perdue III. Recherches sur l'administration romaine: le cas des archives judiciaires pénales", *Mélanges de l'École française à Rome* 113 (2000) 647–779; id., "Les archives du census: le contrôle des hommes", *Mélanges de l'École française à Rome* 113 (2001) 559–764; id. (ed.), *La mémoire perdue: recherches sur l'administration romaine* (Rome 1998).

27 P. Culham, "Archives and alternatives in Republican Rome", *Classical Philology* 84 (1989), 100–115.

28 Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.74.4

29 Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.73.1

rather than generals who had been involved in the conquest of the west. Cato is in a rare cross-over category. Polybios' connections were at quite a different level. Lucullus and Asinius Pollio would have been in that league, but we cannot be sure all Greek scholars were among their intimates.

Perhaps it is sensible to envisage Greek archaeologists at Rome as enjoying a range of different financial circumstances and very variable access to both Roman scholars and Roman statesmen. Some were on close terms with Roman grandees, some of whom shared their interests. Cicero and his contemporaries write of their learned house-guests with apparent respect. But many Greek scholars will have been of lower status or less close to the aristocracy, even if given access to their libraries. From the Republic we do not have anything like Juvenal's and Lucian's satirical portraits of Greek scholars as just part of a crowd of *domestici* exploiting and suffering from the patronage of boorish Roman nobles.

3. THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE WEST

I said earlier that those scholars whom I have called Greek archaeologists at Rome belonged to two communities. So far I have discussed only one of these communities, that group of Greek intellectuals that came to Rome after the Mithridatic Wars and during Pompey's ascendancy and then stayed there to work in and around the houses of the Roman aristocracy. Only a few of these were primarily engaged in researching the deep past, but the general value placed on polymathy perhaps suggests many were interested.

The second community comprised all those involved in the investigation of *ta archaia*, wherever based and whatever their origins. For it is a striking feature of this period that archaeological investigation began to be conducted on a wider and wider scale, within the rapidly expanding western provinces. Where earlier generations of archaeologists had primarily collected origin stories for Italian peoples³⁰, now the field of enquiry was extended to Spain, Africa and Gaul. So too was the range of those involved in this project. Over the last generation of the Republic through the Augustan period, Greek archaeologists were joined by new kinds of writers, some Roman, some provincial, and some Greeks living in the provinces. Archaeology was no longer a uniquely Greek science, and archaeologists like Diodoros found themselves for the first time part of an ethnically diverse and polyglot intellectual community. Another reason why Rome had become the centre of archaeological investigations is that it was one of the few places where all these strands intersected.

Consider for a moment Diodoros' investigations into the origins of the Gauls, contained in chapters 24–32 of book 5 of the *Bibliothēke*. His description of the customs, appearance and institutions of the Gauls are generally held to be based on

30 T.P. Wiseman, "Domi nobiles and the Roman cultural élite", *Les Bourgeoisies municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C.* (Naples 1981); E. Dench, *From barbarians to new men. Greek, Roman and Modern perceptions of peoples from Central Apennines* (Oxford 1995) offer overviews.

the researches of Posidonios, conducted at the beginning of the last century BC, and perhaps inserted into his account of the Cimbric Wars. (Posidonios is usually considered a common source for similar passages in Diodoros and Strabo, and some fragments – most inevitably concerned with feasting – have been preserved by Athenaios³¹.) But Diodoros also shows a knowledge of Caesar's campaigns of the 50s, formally later than the end point of the *Bibliothēke*. There is also some additional matter that cannot be ascribed to either Posidonios or Caesar. One such passage occurs in book 4 in the course of his account of the wanderings of Herakles. On his return from defeating Geryon in Spain, Herakles had pacified the entirety of Gaul and then founded the city of Alesia, the name of which recalls his wanderings. It was to begin with a great centre of civilization but the gradual mingling of its inhabitants with the locals barbarised it. All the same the Celts up to this day regard it as the hearth and capital (*hestia* and *metropolis*) of all Celtica and it remained free up until the day it was besieged and captured by Caesar who has become a god on account of his great deeds³².

Even if we allow for this part of the *Bibliothēke* to be published as late as the middle of the thirties BC then it is striking how rapidly Alesia has become mythologised, effectively within at most twenty years of the Caesarian siege. What had been a relatively minor hill-fort until its choice by Vercingetorix as the place for his last stand against Caesar, has become an ancient foundation and a central place in a new barbarian history. How the investigation proceeded is obscure. Should we see this as claims made by locals (but if so they have learned quickly about the Herakles myth, and have enough Greek to create this bogus etymology of Alesia from *alei*)? Caesar used other means to make this siege seem central, so he is not the source for this. Are we dealing with a recent elaboration on that theme, perhaps by Timagenes whom we know to have devoted long passages to a Celtic Ethnography? This method of equipping barbarians with a past is familiar from many parallel cases³³. It seems unlikely Diodoros has himself invented this legend.

Somewhere between Gaul and Rome some archaeologists have been at work. Diodoros *could* have encountered the story in the provinces, but it is much more likely he encountered it in Rome. He has certainly been at work reconciling divergent accounts, since although he writes after Caesar whose careful distinction between Gauls and Germans must have been known to him, Diodoros scrupulously follows Posidonios' earlier account in which the Germans did not feature and the classical Greek division of Europe between Celts and Scythians was preserved, and later offers a distinction between Keltai in the south and Galatai in the north with the comment that the Romans call all of them Galatai regardless.

31 D. Nash, "Reconstructing Poseidonius' Celtic ethnography: some considerations", *Britannia* 7 (1976), 141–171.

32 Diodoros, *Bibliothēke* 4.19.1–2.

33 H-J. Gehrke, "Heroen als Grenzgänger zwischen Griechen und Barbaren", in F. Gruen (ed.), *Cultural borrowings and ethnic appropriations in antiquity* (Stuttgart 2005); V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland (eds.), *Origines Gentium, Ausonius Publications* (Paris 2001).

This material is under copyright. Any use outside of the narrow boundaries of copyright law is illegal and may be prosecuted.

This applies in particular to copies, translations, microfilming as well as storage and processing in electronic systems.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2016

We have a little more knowledge about another example of archaeological investigation very local to where we are today, among the Turdetanoi of Andalusia. Strabo in his account of the region writes as follows³⁴:

Beyond the regions in question, in the mountain country, Odysseia is to be seen, and in it the temple of Athene, as has been stated by Poseidonios, Artemidoros, and Asclepiades the Myrlean, a man who taught grammar in Turdetania and has published an account of the tribes of that region. According to Asclepiades, shields and ships' beaks have been nailed up in the temple of Athene as memorials of the wanderings of Odysseus; and some of those who made the expedition with Teucer lived in Callaicia, and there were once two cities there, of which one was called Hellenes, and the other, Amphiloichi; for not only did Amphiloichus die at the place, but his companions wandered as far as the interior of the country. And, he further says, history tells us that some of the companions of Heracles and of the emigrants from Messene colonised Iberia. As for Cantabria, a part of it was seized and held by the Laconians, according to both Asclepiades and others. Here, too, they mention a city Opsicella, founded by Ocelas, who in company with Antenor and his children crossed over to Italy.

This passage has long been used to exemplify the working methods of those who investigated the *origines gentium*³⁵. It is indeed a perfect example of how local traditions were related to grand mythological schemas, here again Herakles but also the *nostoi* narratives that recounted the travels of heroes and refugees after the Trojan War. It also illustrates how toponyms and ethnonyms and also monuments were deployed as evidence to suggest or support particular conjectures. But perhaps most fascinating is the figure of Asclepiades as the key cultural broker, teaching Greek *grammatika* to the barbarians in a Roman province, and in his spare time conducting investigations into their archaeology which fed into the mainstream. Strabo and Diodoros are full of anecdotes of this sort. Diodoros has a wonderful account of how Egyptian priests have records documenting the visits to Egypt of Orpheus, Musaeus, Melampus, Daedalus, Homer, Lycurgus, Solon, Plato, Pythagoras, Eudoxus, Democritus and Oenopides³⁶. These tall tales he may have heard in Egypt, but the western ones must mostly have come to Rome first of all.

From the 50s BC we begin to see the first versions of archaeological investigations written in Latin. Caesar's ethnographic passages and those in Sallust's *Jugurtha* are the best known today, both drawing on a mixture of written sources in Greek supplemented (apparently) by local tradition³⁷. But Cicero too planned a Geography and by the middle of the first century AD Pliny the Elder was able to draw on a large number of archaeologicalia produced by *nostri* as well as those of the Greeks.

34 Strabo 3.4.3

35 Bickermann 1952, op. cit. (n. 4).

36 Diodoros 1.96.2 with O. Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship", *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970), 141–171.

37 Caesar and Cicero both claim knowledge of the Gauls from oral testimony cf. G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman. The origins of provincial civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge 1998), ch. 3. See recently on Sallust R. Morstein-Marx, "The myth of Numidian origins in Sallust's African excursus (*Jugurtha* 17.7–18.12)", *American Journal of Philology* 122 (2001), 171–200; on Juba Roller 2003, op. cit. (n. 18), on Mela R. Batty, "Mela's Phoenician Geography", *Journal of Roman Studies* 90 (2000), 70–95.

But for my final example I want to consider the work of Pompeius Trogus. His *Historiae Philippicae* were in some ways very similar to Diodoros' *Bibliothēke*, being a 44 book account of world history from the beginning to his own day. The end date is in the middle of Augustus' reign and so the whole was composed about mid-way in time between Diodoros' work and Strabo's. The big difference is that it was composed in Latin, not Greek. Yet it should not be classified as a purely Roman version of their works, since the title and much of the subject matter claims Hellenistic Greek models, and Trogus himself was a Vocontian from southern Gaul whose grandfather had been enfranchised by Pompey and whose father had served with Caesar as some sort of secretary. One wonders if some of his duties included translation? At any rate he was as polyglot as Diodoros claimed to be.

Modern historians sometimes seem fascinated by figures of this kind who combine in their persons the ethnic complexities of the age. But it is less often pointed out that Trogus goes out of his way to signal all this himself. Trogus' self portrait occurs in his 43rd book which is in fact the most archaeological of all the work, in the sense in which I have been using the term. That book, which we know only in epitome, begins with Trogus declaring he will now return home as he would be an ungrateful citizen not to do so. There follows an account of the origins of Italy, of Saturn's reign, of the stories of Faunus, Evander, Hercules, Latinus, Aeneas and the foundation of Alba Longa. So far his narrative coheres with the version in the *Aeneid*. But his earlier books on Carthage tell the story of Dido without Aeneas: like Diodoros, then, he is selecting carefully from rival versions. The next section told the Romulus and Remus story, evidently at great length, followed by the restoration of Numitor, the foundation of Rome and the rape of the Sabine women. But at this point the story takes an unfamiliar tangent. During the reign of Tarquin, the Phocaeans arrive fleeing Asia, and then go on to found Marseilles. Trogus now recounts the archaeology of the Phocaeans, their arrival in Gaul, their meeting with King Nannus, the marriage of Protis and Gyptis, war with the Ligurians and the foundation of Marseilles. An exact parallel is established here to the story of Aeneas and Lavinia. There then follows the civilizing of Gaul, the plot of Comanus the Segobrigian and the Ligurian conspiracy at the Floralia, then Massiliot victories over Gauls, Ligures and Carthaginians. At this point the ancient friendship of Rome and Marseilles becomes the theme emphasising the loyalty of Marseilles to Rome. So the Massiliots collect gold and silver to compensate Rome for the sack by the Gauls (described as a rather more devastating destruction than in most Roman accounts), and their consequent privileges and rewards are related. No mention is made of Marseilles' part in Caesar's civil war or its consequent loss of privileges and territory. It is at the end of *this* book that Pompeius Trogus discloses his Vocontian origin, his grand father enfranchised by Pompey in the Sertorian war, his uncle serving with Pompey, and his father trusted by Julius Caesar. The entirety of book 43 has interwoven the archaeologies of Rome, Marseilles and the Gauls. Trogus' self identification forms the conclusion of it.

The new barbarian archaeologies of Alesia, of the Turdetanoi and of the Gauls, were the products of investigations conducted in the middle of the last century BC. Rome was, inevitably, a central point of reference. The city of Rome where Di-

odoros, Dionysios, Trogus and Strabo worked at gathering and systematizing this new information was also crucial. The traditional picture of Greek scholars in Rome is not wrong. They were indeed kidnapped and enticed to come to the centre of power by the force and wealth of Roman aristocrats, some of whom had stolen and purchased vital library resources at the same time. Rome was the one place where they might establish close links with Roman aristocrats who still held some much material in private hands. It was also the best place to pick up the emerging new knowledge of the west produced in the provinces by educated individuals drawn from many backgrounds. Roman conquerors provided the circumstances within this new research took place. But it is less obvious that Greek intellectuals were commissioned to document the new world for the benefit of their Roman patrons. When we ask who did the work of creating new archaeologies of the west the two most obvious groups are western provincials and Greek intellectuals based in Rome: there is no reason to think their intended audiences were Romans rather than other Greek intellectuals. In practice of course, all educated persons read Greek scholarship.

This was apparently a very specific historical moment. Trogus and Strabo stand at the end of a tradition. When Ammianus wanted to appropriate this sort of knowledge he went to Timagenes. Other kinds of historical writing predominated in the Greek and Latin tradition of the early empire. This does not mean local archaeology did not continue, and it surfaces occasionally in later texts. I have mentioned Mela, and the fruits of local traditions recur too in Lucan and Statius. But the really intense period of scientific progress was very short, less than a century in total. Greek archaeologists in Rome were at the heart of it.

