

THE RULING CLASS OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC AND GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

By H. D. JOCELYN, M.A., Ph.D.

HULME PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

INTRODUCTION

WHAT I am concerned with in this essay¹ is a kind of activity imported into Rome from those communities of Greek culture which fell under Roman domination during the last three centuries of the Republic and the degree to which this activity affected the character of Roman society and the behaviour of individual Romans. The formal study of logic, physics and ethics, the three areas into which Greek *φιλόσοφοι* divided the content of their teaching,² could be pursued seriously in an ancient Mediterranean society only by men of considerable wealth³ and the modern student must bear in mind constantly how few of the families which possessed the Roman citizenship also possessed sufficient material resources to permit an individual member to devote part of his life to an activity like philosophical study. It is also important to remember that not all wealthy families shared directly in the governance of the Republican state. The senator is not to be confused with the average Roman or even with the average wealthy Roman.

The further temporal boundary of my study may be marked by the erection at Rome of the statues of two Greeks in the "horns" of the *comitium* sometime during the obscure years of war with the Samnite peoples of southern Italy (343–290).⁴ One statue represented Alcibiades, the most famous of the fifth-century Athenian men of state taught by the philosopher Socrates.⁵ The military skill of Alcibiades was perhaps more

¹ An expanded version of a lecture given in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester on Wednesday, the 8th of December 1976.

² For the triple division see Cic. *De orat.* 1.68, *Ac.* 1.19, 2.116, *Fin.* 4.4, *Diog. Laert.* 1.18, 7.39, 10.30.

³ For the expensiveness of higher education see, for example, *Plat. Prot.* 326 c, [*Lysias*] 20.11, *Lucian, Somn.* 1.

⁴ *Plin. Nat.* 34. 26, *Plut. Num.* 8.20. For statues of Pythagoras see G. Becatti, *Boll. d'Arte*, xxxiv (1949), 97–110.

⁵ *Plut. Alc.* 1.2.

famous in Italy than his unpopularity with some of his fellow citizens. The Athenian expedition of 415–413 might, some thought, have destroyed the menace of Syracuse for ever had not Alcibiades been removed from its command.¹ The other statue represented Pythagoras, the man who reputedly first claimed the title of *φιλόσοφος*, “lover of wisdom”.² Pythagoras taught philosophy for many years during the late sixth century in Croton and a tightly knit corporation of philosophers claiming descent from him and his pupils maintained itself in various Italian centres until the early years of the fourth century.³ Individuals continued to call themselves *Πυθαγόρειοι* and sometimes to teach philosophy for long after this.⁴ At the time the statues were erected⁵ Pythagoras was believed to have had Romans and citizens of other non-Greek Italian communities as well as Greeks from outside Croton among his pupils,⁶ to have been critical of monarchic forms of government,⁷ and to have played an active role in the government of Croton although not himself a native of the city.⁸ The pupils of Pythagoras and their pupils maintained a similar kind of internationalism⁹ and a similar practical interest in what they considered to be good government.¹⁰

¹ Plut. *Alc.* 32.5. Cf. Liv. 28.41.17.

² Heraclides Pont. ap. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.8, Diog. Laert. 8.8.

³ For the end of the Pythagorean corporation see Polyb. 2.39, Cic. *Tim.* 1, Diodor. 15.76.4, Diog. Laert. 8.45–46 (citing Aristoxenus), Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 57–8, Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 248–51.

⁴ See Plut. *Cat. mai.* 2.3 for a “Pythagorean” in Tarentum in 209.

⁵ Accounts of Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans were written by Aristoxenus of Tarentum, who was born about 370 and lived a very long life, and by this man’s contemporary, Dicaearchus of Messene.

⁶ Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 22, Diog. Laert. 8.14, Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 34 (= Aristoxenus, fr. 17 Wehrli). For the legend that Numa was one of these Roman pupils see Cic. *De orat.* 2.154, *Rep.* 2.28, *Tusc.* 4.3, Diod. Sic. 8.14, Dionys. Hal. 2.59, Liv. 1.18.2 etc. Those who wrote the law-codes for Locroi, Catane and Rhegium were with similar anachronism made pupils of Pythagoras (Diog. Laert. 8.16).

⁷ Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 9, 21.

⁸ Diog. Laert. 8.3.

⁹ For men from Chalcis and Phleius pupils of Philolaus and Eurytus at Tarentum see Diog. Laert. 8.46. For Pontius, the father of the Samnite hero of 321, conversing with Archytas see Cic. *Cat. mai.* 41.

¹⁰ For Parmenides drawing up laws for his native Elea see Speusippus ap. Diog. Laert. 9.23; for the pupils of Parmenides taking part in government see Strab. 6.252.

A speech delivered by Imperator Caesar diui f. to the citizens of Alexandria after he entered the fallen city in 30 B.C. may fix the nearer boundary of my study. The kingdom of the Ptolemies was the last of the Greek and Graeco-barbarian states¹ to be swallowed into the Roman empire. The great-nephew and heir of the dictator C. Iulius Caesar paraded himself as a consul with extraordinary powers soon to be relinquished² but his victory established him in the eyes of history³ as the final destroyer of the Republic and the first of a second line of Roman monarchs. Alexandria could have suffered as Syracuse,⁴ Tarentum,⁵ Corinth,⁶ Athens⁷ and other Greek cities had suffered at the hands of victorious Roman generals but the young Caesar, speaking in Greek,⁸ announced that he had decided to be merciful. One of the reasons he gave was his friendship with Areius (ὁ δίδυμος), a citizen of Alexandria and a teacher of philosophy in the Athenian Stoic tradition.⁹ The elder Caesar had probably taken this man back to Rome with him in 47¹⁰ and encouraged his nephew to regard him as a kind of moral tutor. Areius accompanied his charge to Apollonia in 45¹¹ and was to remain closely associated with the household for many years.¹² At

¹ For the make-up of the actual population of Alexandria see Polybius 34.14. Macedonian royalty always asserted its Greekness (cf. Liv. 31.29.14–15). Cleopatra VII was the only member of the Ptolemaic dynasty who spoke barbarian languages; some of her predecessors even abandoned Macedonian in favour of the Attic-Ionic koine (cf. Plut. *Ant.* 27.3–4).

² *Res gestae* 34.

³ See, for example, Dio Cass. 52.1.

⁴ Liv. 25.31.8–11, Diodor. Sic. 26.20.2, Plut. *Marcell.* 19.

⁵ Liv. 27.16.7, Strab. 6.278, Plut. *Fab.* 22.

⁶ Polyb. 39.2, Pausan. 7.16.7.

⁷ Plut. *Sull.* 14, Appian, *B. Mithr.* 39.

⁸ Dio Cass. 51.16.4. The story is recounted by Plutarch, *Ant.* 80.1, *Mor.* 814 d, and alluded to by Themistius, 8.129. 14 ff., and Julian, *Epist.* 51.433d, *Caes.* 27.326b. It probably came from the monarch's autobiography.

⁹ He was treated among the Stoics in the lost part of Diogenes Laertius' seventh book (Ind. Laur. 69.35).

¹⁰ I am guessing on the analogy of the elder Cato's acquisition of Ennius (Nep. *Cat.* 1.4, Hieron. *Chron.* Ol. 135.1) and the younger Cato's of Antipater of Tyre and Athenodorus of Tarsus (ὁ κορδυλίων see below, p. 336, n. 6).

¹¹ Sueton. *Aug.* 8.2, 89.1.

¹² In general see Dio Cass. 52.36.4. For his association with Maecenas see M. *Ant.* 8.31, Aelian, *VH* 12.25; for the consolatory letter addressed to Livia over the death of Drusus Sen. *Dial.* 6.4–5.

least two other philosophers were similarly associated, the Stoic Athenodorus of Tarsus¹ and Xenarchus of Seleuceia, a teacher in another of the Athenian traditions, the Peripatetic.²

Writing in the time of Trajan about the elder Cato's hostility to the higher Greek learning, Plutarch of Chaeroneia made a statement which could be interpreted to mean that around the year 30, when Rome's material power was at its height, all forms of Greek learning were likewise in her possession.³ Many scholars of modern times, with Plutarch's statement at the back of their minds, have supposed that those who governed the Roman Republic were for a very long time almost totally ignorant of things Greek but that during the last three centuries of the Republic's existence they became increasingly indistinguishable in outlook from the educated Greek gentlemen with whom they had intercourse. Some have even been tempted to consider the teaching of philosophers relevant to the explanation of the personal idiosyncrasies of certain Romans and their behaviour in times of political crisis; to the explanation of their attitudes to the religious apparatus of the state and the opportunities which this apparatus offered to those seeking personal or factional advantage; to the explanation of the policies advocated or accepted by them in regard to such issues as the control of public and private expenditure, the expansion of empire, the treatment of subject peoples, poor citizens, slaves and ex-slaves.

The suicide of M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54) after the battle of Thapsus in 46 has always symbolized for romantics the end of the Republican constitution. Cato called himself a Stoic, as did some of those senators who under the early Emperors dreamed of restoring the Republic. In modern times it has

¹ Strab. 14.674, Plut. *Publ.* 17.5, Lucian, *Macrob.* 21, Dio Chrys. 33.48, Aelian, *VH* 12.25, Dio Cass. 52.36.4, 56.43.2. Strabo distinguishes this man from ὁ κορδυλίωv by referring to him as the son of Sandon. He seems to have been already in Rome by 50 (see Cic. *Fam.* 3.7.5). Writing to Atticus in 44 (*Att.* 16.11.4, 16.14.4) Cicero refers to an "Athenodorus caluus" owning books by Posidonius and in some way dependent upon Atticus. This must be the son of Sandon.

² Strab. 14.670. Strabo distinguishes him from Athenaeus, another man of Seleuceia who studied with the Peripatetics and later spent time in Rome, as having chosen τὸν παιδευτικὸν βίον.

³ *Cat. mai.* 23.3.

been asserted time and again that philosophers of the Stoic tradition were supremely influential upon the attitudes and ways of behaviour of the men of the Republic.

The purpose of my essay is to raise doubts about these neatly schematic views on the intellectual history of the Republic and to suggest another scheme. I shall argue that in the years when Republican Rome's embassies and armies were dealing with Greek states which enjoyed a genuine independence, Roman minds were not as closed to Greek ideas as they sometimes tended to be later; that philosophy was already by the late fourth century an object of interest to men of material well-being; that a number of factors, in particular anxiety about maintaining a moral authority over Greek-speaking subjects, led in the early years of the second century to an increasing suspicion of activities like philosophy among those men of wealth who belonged to the Senate; that among wealthy families outside the senatorial class who were less directly concerned with government, attitudes remained positive or at least neutral; that in the late second century a few senatorial families began to permit their sons to study with philosophers while most continued to regard such study as inconsonant with the senatorial way of life; that the amount of study permitted was rarely very considerable; that teachers of the Stoic tradition were at no time more generally acceptable than those of the other three major living philosophical traditions, the Academic, the Peripatetic and the Epicurean; that the circumstances in which most young aristocrats received philosophical instruction were akin to those which prevailed in the royal courts of the Greek and Graeco-barbarian world rather than to those of the more prestigious centres of study; that these circumstances and the linguistic medium through which instruction was imparted and the continuing climate of social antipathy towards philosophers were such as to prevent any instruction from having a profound or long-lasting effect upon those who received it.

I

No Romans are said in our record to have had relations with a particular Greek philosopher before the second century except

King Numa and M. Porcius Cato (cos. 195). The story of Numa's studies under Pythagoras¹ is chronologically impossible and that of Cato's visit to the Pythagorean Nearchus in Tarentum in 209² has suspicious features about it. M. Tullius Cicero (cos. 63) had access to information now lost on many individual Roman men of state of the fourth and third centuries and strong personal motives for extending Roman acquaintance with philosophy far back in time. When writing a historical introduction to the fourth book of his *Tusculanae disputationes*, however, he could find no Roman except Numa associated with Pythagoras or with the corporation of philosophers who maintained in Italy for at least a century and a half the common life of study which Pythagoras had set up and he knew that the chronographers had taken away all grounds for calling Numa a Pythagorean.³ He nevertheless declared that there must have been Roman Pythagoreans.

Modern students usually dismiss Cicero's gut feeling as lacking all evidence and indeed all plausibility. Three considerations, however, need to be kept in mind: first, that ambassadors and soldiers were not the only Romans during these early centuries to penetrate into Greek-speaking areas;⁴ second, that Romans not involved in public activities rarely left much record of themselves; and third, that the ban which from 218 lay upon direct senatorial involvement in commerce⁵ and the suspicion which came to fall on un-Roman activities like the study of philosophy would have encouraged senators of the second and first centuries to wash the records of their ancestors clean of embarrassing associations. There also survive from the fourth-century record a number of statements, two in

¹ See above, p. 324, n. 6.

² Cic. *Cat. mai.* 39-41, Plut. *Cat. mai.* 2.3.

³ *Rep.* 2.28-9, *Tucs.* 4.2-3.

⁴ The evidence is scanty but sufficient. Between 262 and 236 a 'Ρωμαῖος was appointed a πρόξενος of the Aetolians on the nomination of a man of Naupactus (*IG IX*² 1.17.51-52). In 261 a 'Ρωμαῖος performed stage tricks at a festival in Delos (inscr. 8.25 in *BCH* 7 [1883], 114). In 252 a 'Ρωμαϊκὴ ναῦς travelled to Syria via Caria (Plut. *Arat.* 12.5-6). In 228 one Plautus was victorious at the Isthmian games (Zonaras 8.19.7).

⁵ Liv. 21.63.3-4 (*plebiscitum* of 218), Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.45, Scaeuola, *Dig.* 50.5.3 (*lex Iulia*).

writing and one in plastic art, which give a certain colour to Cicero's expression of feeling.

Heracleides of Heracleia (ὁ Ποντικός) travelled in Italy before the mid-fourth century and heard the lectures of Pythagoreans there.¹ When he wrote his treatise on the soul he had no clear idea of the geographical position of Rome except that it lay to the north of where he had travelled and he believed it to be a Greek city.² It has to be asked how he came to such a belief. I would suggest that he had met Greek-speaking Romans in the lecture rooms of his Pythagorean hosts.

Aristoxenus of Tarentum studied under the Pythagorean Xenophilus of Chalcis³ and made the acquaintance of other Pythagoreans during the middle years of the fourth century. He could have had no hard evidence to back his statement that Pythagoras himself had had Roman pupils⁴ but would hardly have made such a statement if there had not been Romans in Pythagorean lecture rooms in more recent times.

Those who had the statue of Pythagoras erected in the *comitium* are not to be thought of as simply obeying an unexpected command of the priests at Delphi. By their action they were asserting to foreign visitors of official status a social and political affinity between the Roman state and those Greek states of aristocratic constitution where the teachings of Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans had been held in honour. Not only the priests of Delphic Apollo among contemporary Greeks were prepared to accept claims of this character. Eratosthenes of Cyrene set the Romans, along with the Carthaginians, apart from the rest of the βάρβαροι.⁵ Some even believed in a racial affinity between Romans and Greeks. I have already mentioned Heracleides. It is also worth mentioning the terms in which Demetrius I of Macedonia (ὁ πολιορκητής) protested to the Senate about the pirates of Antium⁶ and Aristotle's belief that Rome was founded by Achaeans unable to return to their

¹ Diog. Laert. 5.86.

² Plut. *Cam.* 22.3.

³ Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 251, Suda, s.v. 'Αριστόξευος.

⁴ See above, p. 324, n. 6.

⁵ Strab. 1.66. Contrast the attitude of Pyrrhus (Plut. *Flam.* 5.4).

⁶ Strab. 5.232.

ancient abodes after the sack of Troy.¹ The erection of the statue of Pythagoras was not an isolated or eccentric act. The cult of Ceres was conducted in Greek² and oracles written in Greek were kept for official consultation.³ Overtly Greek deities like Hercules⁴ and Aesculapius⁵ were still being received among the gods of the city. Men of state could speak Greek⁶ and even write verses in the language.⁷ *Cognomina* like Philo,⁸ Sophus⁹ and Philippus¹⁰ could be affected. The man who called himself Philo got away with allowing Naples terms of accommodation in 326¹¹ remarkably generous compared with the treatment received by Greek communities which later stood in the way of Roman imperialism. The erection of a statue of Pythagoras in the political heart of the city does not prove that down to that time Roman men of state had been given to frequenting philosophers but it would at least indicate that there were then no positive hindrances to philosophical study of the kind which existed later, and that in the view of native Romans of that time their own ancestors were not the only repositories of moral and political wisdom.

II

The first Roman aristocrats whom Cicero could find associated by name with particular philosophers in the records available to him were C. Laelius (cos. 140), P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147, 134) and L. Furius Philus (cos. 136).¹² These men were probably listed by Cleitomachus of Carthage among the young men who listened to the lectures delivered in Rome in 155 by the Academic Carneades of Cyrene, the Stoic Diogenes

¹ Dionys. Hal. 1.72.3.

² Cic. *Balb.* 55.

³ Dionys. Hal. 4.62.

⁴ In 312. Previously the cult at the *forum boarium* had been in the hands of private families (see Fest. p. 237, s.v. *Potitium*, Liv. 1.7.12-14, 9.29.9-10).

⁵ In 293. See Liv. 10.47.7.

⁶ See Dionys. Hal. 19.5.1, Appian, *B. Samn.* 7 for the bad Greek spoken by L. Postumius Megellus (cos. 305, 294, 291) in Tarentum in 282.

⁷ See Cic. *Tusc.* 4.4 for the *carmen Pythagoreum* of Ap. Claudius Caecus (cos. 307, 296). For Panaetius to have appreciated it it must have been in Greek.

⁸ Q. Publilius Philo (cos. 339, 327, 320, 315).

⁹ P. Sempronius Sophus (cos. 304).

¹⁰ Q. Marcius Phillipus (cos. 281).

¹¹ Liv. 8.26.6.

¹² *De Orat.* 2.154-5, *Tusc.* 4.5. Cf. *Tusc.* 1.3.

of Seleuceia and the Peripatetic Critolaus of Phaselis.¹ The three philosophers had come to Rome to plead for Athens over a fine which had been imposed upon the city² and while waiting to be received by the Senate gave public demonstrations of their less purely philosophical skills.

Cicero's belief that the Athenians sent these philosophers as ambassadors because they knew some leading men of the Senate to be interested in philosophy was naïve. The Athenians frequently sent philosophers on diplomatic missions abroad, even when they were not native Athenians.³ So did other Greek states.⁴ Philosophy with its internationalist traditions⁵ was thought a study which fitted men to handle strangers. In any case, by 155 the four corporations of philosophers which had maintained themselves in Athens since the fourth century were one of the city's most famous and valued possessions, as famous and as valued as, say, the temple which Pericles had built for the goddess Athena or the site of the mysteries of Demeter. To send the leaders of three of them to Rome as ambassadors was to some extent an act of self-abasement. The Athenians had strong material motives. The sum of money which they wanted to avoid paying out was a considerable one.

I should point out in passing that the absence from the embassy of the Epicurean Basileides of Tyre, a man certainly less

¹ At *Ac.* 2.137 Cicero quotes Cleitomachus as the source of a story about Carneades and A. Postumius Albinus (cos. 151). Polybius would have not mentioned any names in his account of the Athenian embassy (*Gell.* 6.14.8-10, *Plut. Cat. mai.* 22). For older auditors see *Cic. Rep.* 3.9.

² See *Pausan.* 7.11.5 for the fullest account of the background.

³ Aristotle was sent to Philip II (*Hermipp.* ap. *Diog. Laert.* 5.2), Xenocrates to Philip and to Antipater (*Ind. Herc. Ac.* 7-8, *Plut. Phoc.* 27, *Diog. Laert.* 4.8-9), Crates to Demetrius (*Plut. Demetr.* 46.2), Prytanis to Antigonos III (*inscr. Hesperia* 4 [1935], 525, n. 39, *Polyb.* 5.93.8, *Suda*, s.v. *Εὐφορίων*).

⁴ Eretria sent Menedemus to Ptolemy I and Lysimachus (*Diog. Laert.* 2.140); Ptolemy I sent Theodoros to Lysimachus (*Diog. Laert.* 2.102); Pitane sent Arcesilaus to Antigonos II (*Diog. Laert.* 4.39).

⁵ For the non-Crotonians in the lecture room of Pythagoras see *Porph. Vit. Pyth.* 19. For the pupils whom Protagoras of Abdera brought with him to Athens see *Plat. Prot.* 315a. The founders of the Peripatos and the Stoa were not themselves Athenian, the founder of the Stoa not even Greek. For the Lampsacene pupils of Epicurus see *Diog. Laert.* 10.22 ff. For the Megalopolitan nobles who studied in the Academy see *Polyb.* 10.22, *Plut. Arat.* 5.1, *Philop.* 1.2, 4.3.

distinguished than Carneades but not any less distinguished than Diogenes and Critolaus, need not have been caused by any feeling that Epicurean doctrine was peculiarly offensive to Roman senators. On at least one occasion the Pergamenes were not afraid to send an Epicurean to represent them in Rome.¹ Basileides was perhaps just not much of an orator.

Nothing is known about the upbringing of Furius² and there is no reason to think that Laelius had listened to Diogenes before 155³ or that Scipio had had the company of professional philosophers either in the house of his natural father, L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182, 168),⁴ or in that of the man who adopted him, P. Cornelius Scipio.⁵ The Metrodorus whom Paullus brought from Athens in 167⁶ was to be a companion for the fourteen-year old son and the twelve-year old he had had of his second wife.⁷ In any case philosophy was just one of a number of intellectual and semi-intellectual pursuits in which Metrodorus dabbled. General curiosity would have been enough to take Laelius, Scipio and Furius to hear the visitors of 155.

If any leading senators were already interested in philosophy in 155 they studied it in books and succeeded in concealing their interest from their fellows. Cato found no difficulty in having the visit of the Athenian teachers curtailed. There were, however, men outside the senatorial class certainly pursuing philosophical study. The burning of the books of king Numa in 181,⁸ the expulsion of the Epicurean teachers Alcaeus and Philiscus in 173 (or 154)⁹ and the expulsion of a number of

¹ See the inscription published in *Mitt. Arch. Inst. Athen. Abt.*, xxxiii (1908), 408, n. 38.

² Cic. *Mur.* 66 merely tantalizes. C. Sulpicius Gallus (cos. 166), also mentioned here, was famous for his knowledge of astronomy (Cic. *Rep.* 1.21, *et al.*).

³ Cic. *Fin.* 2.24 is to be understood in conjunction with *Tusc.* 4.5 and *De orat.* 2.154-5.

⁴ See Plut. *Aem.* 6.5. It is significant that here Plutarch talks of σοφισταί rather than φιλόσοφοι; for Plutarch's rigid distinction of the two terms see *Ant. 80, Mor.* 48d, 80a, 99e-f.

⁵ See Polyb. 31.24.

⁶ Plin. *Nat.* 35.135; cf. Plut. *Aem.* 28.10.

⁷ These did not live to be taught anything by Metrodorus; see Liv. 45.40, Vell. Pat. 1.10.5, Val. Max. 5.10.2.

⁸ Liv. 40.29.3-14, Plin. *Nat.* 13.84-87, Plut. *Num.* 22.6-8.

⁹ Athen. 12.547a, Aelian, *VH* 9.12.

unspecified philosophers in 161¹ were meant to discourage such men directly and any senators who might be tempted to ape them indirectly. The word *philosophus* had entered the language² and even spawned a verb *philosophari*.³ Comedies staged from 239 on at the public festivals usually centred their actions in the households of comparatively well-off Athenian private citizens and could easily have ignored philosophy without departing very far from the Greek scripts upon which they were based. Nevertheless they presented philosophical study as a normal pursuit of the young men of these households⁴ and even had slaves holding forth on the themes of the philosophers' lecture rooms.⁵ Tragedies staged at the same festivals had actions set at a time centuries before the appearance of philosophers in Greek society but, although the Greek scripts upon which these were based studiously avoided mention of philosophers,⁶ the Latin scripts did not.⁷ Clearly a Greek community could not be imagined in second century Rome without philosophers. It is not impossible that already by 155 Romans from outside the senatorial order had been given to visiting Athenian lecture rooms, or that in the forgotten past even young men from senatorial families had been there. One wonders how A. Manlius Torquatus Atticus (cos. 244, 241) acquired his second cognomen and what the *Ῥωμαῖοι* Lucius and Spurius did at Athens in 148/7 besides share the administration of the Ptolemaic festival with Panaetius of Rhodes and others, Athenians and foreigners, who are known to have had philosophical interests.⁸

Panaetius of Rhodes, who had been a pupil of Diogenes of Seleuceia and of Antipater of Tarsus, Diogenes' successor as

¹ Sueton. *Gramm.* 25.1, Gell. 15.11.1.

² It seems to be recorded first at Plaut. *Rud.* 986 (significantly in metaphorical abuse).

³ Plaut. *Capt.* 284, *Merc.* 147, *Pseud.* 687, 974, *Enn. Trag.* 340.

⁴ Ter. *Andr.* 51–57, *Eun.* 261–4.

⁵ Plaut. *Pseud.* 677–87. The Latin adaptations also had slaves drinking in the style of Athenian gentlemen (Plaut. *Stich.* 446–8).

⁶ Euripides was rebuked by critics for making the heroes talk at times like philosophers (Schol. *Hipp.* 953) but never admitted the word *φιλόσοφος* to a script.

⁷ Pacuv. *Trag.* 348, 366, 372.

⁸ *IG II/III*² 2.1938.

leader of the Stoics, began visiting Rome and other barbarian cities some time in the third quarter of the second century. His motive was perhaps no more than learned curiosity.¹ Laelius and Scipio, who were now mature men, gave him hospitality.² He was of their age and of similar social status in his own community. It is wrong to represent the relationship which developed as one of master and pupils. When Scipio travelled to the East in 140 with L. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 142) and Sp. Mummius³ on an official mission of enquiry, he took Panaetius in his notably small personal entourage.⁴ This may not have been the only occasion on which Panaetius accompanied Scipio on tours of foreign duty.⁵ Whether Scipio's motive was to enjoy theoretical conversations or to take advantage of Panaetius' practical experience of men and affairs is nowhere stated in our record. The one is as likely as the other. It is noteworthy that the other members of the eastern entourage were all slaves. Laelius' sons-in-law, C. Fannius (cos. 122?)⁶ and Q. Mucius Scaeuola ("augur", cos. 117),⁷ and Scipio's nephew, Q. Aelius Tubero,⁸ heard Panaetius conversing during his visits to Rome. One could not, however, even here talk of master and pupils except in a highly metaphorical way.

Another pupil of Antipater of Tarsus, Blossius of Cumae, was in Rome about the same time as Panaetius. He associated with P. Mucius Scaeuola (cos. 133)⁹ and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (trib. pl. 133).¹⁰ What interests took him to Rome, apart from curiosity, are unclear. There is no reason, however, to think

¹ See *Ind. Herc. Stoic.*, 56 ff. Philosophers were given to tourism; e.g. Pythagoras (Diog. Laert. 8.2), and Plato (Diog. Laert. 3.6).

² Cic. *Mur.* 66, *Att.* 9.12.2, *Rep.* 1.15, 1.34, 3.5, *Fin.* 4.23, *Tusc.* 1.81, *Off.* 1.90, *Vell. Pat.* 1.13.3, *Plut. Mor.* 814c, *Gell.* 17.21.1, *Porph. Hor. Carm.* 1.29.13, *Symm. Or.* 3.7, *Ep.* 1.20.2, *Themist. Orat.* 34.8, *Suda*, svv. Παναίτιος, Πολύβιος.

³ Cic. *Rep.* 3.47-8, *Iustin.* 38.8.8.

⁴ Cic. *Ac.* 2.5, *Plut. Mor.* 200 f., 777a, *Athen.* 12.549d.

⁵ See *Vell. Pat.* 1.13.3.

⁶ Cic. *Brut.* 101. Cicero here has Fannius someone other than the consul of 122.

⁷ Cic. *De orat.* 1.75.

⁸ Cic. *De orat.* 3.87; for works addressed by Panaetius to Tubero see Cic. *Ac.* 2.135, *Fin.* 4.23, *Tusc.* 4.4.

⁹ Cic. *Lael.* 37.

¹⁰ *Plut. Ti. Gracch.* 8.5, 17.4, 20.3.

that he taught philosophy in any professional way either there or anywhere else.¹

During the troubled years 88–86 a number of philosophers from the Athenian corporations sought refuge in Rome. We do not know who in particular welcomed Phaedrus, a man of an eminent Athenian family who was to succeed his teacher Zeno of Sidon as the leader of the Epicureans. The father of M. Tullius Cicero (cos. 63) allowed him to talk to his son and establish a life-long friendship.² Philo of Larisa, the leader of the Academics, seems to have been given hospitality by Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102).³ The young Cicero and many others enjoyed his conversation.⁴ With Philo there probably came associates and pupils,⁵ including Antiochus of Ascalon who was to succeed him as the Academic leader.⁶ L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74) found Antiochus a sympathetic person and took him in his retinue on two long tours of official duty in the East in 86–80 and 73–68.⁷ The association of M. Licinius Crassus (cos. 70, 55) with the Peripatetic Alexander⁸ and that of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cos. 58) with the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara, another of the pupils of Zeno of Sidon,⁹ were of a broadly similar character and probably arose in the same way. None of these visitors could be said to have made a normal profession of philosophy in Rome.

¹ The language which Plutarch uses of Blossius and Gracchus should be contrasted with that which he uses of the Stoic teacher Sphaerus of Borysthenes and King Cleomenes in the parallel Life (*Cleom.* 2.2–3).

² Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.2.

³ Cic. *Ac.* 2.12 (for Catulus as an Academic see Cic. *Ac.* 2.148, *Brut.* 132). C. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 75) seems to have had some association with Philo in Athens before this (Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.59).

⁴ Cic. *Ac.* 1.13, *Brut.* 306, *Nat. deor.* 1.6, 1.17, *Tusc.* 2.9.

⁵ See *Ind. Herc. Stoic.*, 73 for associates of Panaetius accompanying him to Rome.

⁶ *Ind. Herc. Ac.*, 34.36–8 seems to refer to a visit to Rome. From Cic. *Ac.* 2.11 it can be argued that, while Heraclitus went to Alexandria in 88, Antiochus must have accompanied Philo to Rome.

⁷ Cic. *Ac.* 2.4, 11, 61, *Ind. Herc. Ac.*, 34.39–43, Aelian, *VH* 12.25.

⁸ Plut. *Crass.* 3.3.

⁹ Cic. *Pis.* 67–71 and Ascon. on 68. The “Socraton” of Catull. 47 has often been identified with Philodemus. Philodemus dedicated at least one of his writings (*περὶ τοῦ καθ’ Ὁμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλείως*) to Piso.

A pupil of Panaetius, Poseidonius of Apameia, came to Rome on official business for the city of Rhodes in the winter of 87–86.¹ It was doubtless on this visit that he first established relations with Cn. Pompeius (cos. 70, 55) and the young Cicero.² The Peripatetic Dio came on an embassy from Alexandria in 57.³ Poseidonius perhaps made a second official visit in 51.⁴ The date of the visit of the Epicurean Apollophanes from Pergamum⁵ is not known. These visits had as much or as little long-term effect as that of the Athenian trio in 155.

The coming to Rome of the Stoics Antipater of Tyre and Athenodorus of Tarsus (ὁ κορδυλίων), one of them in 66, the other in 56, is of more significance for my general theme.

Both were pursuing philosophy seriously in Greek communities and came to Rome at the persuasion of M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54).⁶ Cato had an obsessive and unconcealable interest in the subject⁷ and could not do without the presence of teachers even on holidays⁸ or on military service. In his entourage at Thapsus he is said to have had a Stoic Apollonides and a Peripatetic Demetrius.⁹ It is not known whether he set any of these philosophers over the children of his household. Some households, however, of the first century did have philosophers teaching their children. The Stoic Diodotus lived between about 89 and 59 in the house of the Ciceros,¹⁰ exercising some authority over Marcus. M. Pupius Piso Frugi Calpurnianus (cos. 61) when a young man had the Peripatetic Staseas of

¹ Plut. *Mar.* 45.4.

² Cic. *Fin.* 1.6, *Tusc.* 2.61, *Nat. deor.* 1.6, 1.123, *Diu.* 1.6, 2.47, *Fat.* 5, Plut. *Cic.* 4.4, *Pomp.* 42.5, Strab. 11.491.

³ Cic. *Cael.* 23–24, 51–55, Strab. 17.796, Dio Cass. 39.13–14.

⁴ Suda, s.v. Ποσειδώνιος. For the renewal of the treaty between Rhodes and Rome in this year see Lentulus ap. Cic. *Fam.* 12.15.2.

⁵ See above, p. 332, n. 1.

⁶ Cic. *Mur.* 66 (delivered in 63), Plin. *Nat.* 7.113. Antipater is named at Plut. *Cat. min.* 4.1, Athenodorus at 10.1–2, 16.1.

⁷ See Cic. *Fin.* 3.7 for Cato surrounded by Stoic literature in the library of the villa of Lucullus' heir at Tusculum in 52.

⁸ Plut. *Cat. min.* 20.1.

⁹ Plut. *Cat. min.* 65–70. The philosophers are not mentioned by Dio (43.11.2–5) or Appian (*B.C.* 2.98–99).

¹⁰ Cic. *Att.* 2.20.6, *Fam.* 9.4, 13.16.4, *Ac.* 2.115, *Nat. deor.* 1.6, *Tusc.* 5.113, *Brut.* 309.

Naples living with him and imparting instruction.¹ In the house of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio (cos. 52) women are said to have listened to philosophers.² Areius' position as the teacher of the heir of Julius Caesar³ and that of the Academic Nestor of Tarsus as the teacher of the heirs of C. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 50) and Ti. Claudius Nero (praet. 42)⁴ thus had some Republican precedent but not so very much.

The smallness of the number of professional philosophers recorded as having visited Rome during the time of the Republic is no accident of the record, for the same record contains a very considerable number of teachers of grammar and of rhetoric not only visiting Rome but establishing their professional activities there.⁵

More is recorded—significantly, I think—of contacts between Romans and philosophers outside Rome.

A number of men in public office attended philosophers' lecture rooms or summoned philosophers to their presence when passing through Greek cities. L. Licinius Crassus (cos. 95) listened to the Academics Charmadas, Cleitomachus, and Aeschines, the Stoic Mnesarchus and the Peripatetic Diodorus in Athens in 110–109⁶; M. Antonius (cos. 99) the same men a few years later.⁷ In 93 L. Gellius Publicola (cos. 72) called all the philosophers of Athens together, including, it would seem, the Epicurean Zeno of Sidon, and offered to arbitrate their disputes.⁸ In 67–66 M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54) paid many visits to the Stoic Athenodorus in Pergamum.⁹ In 66 Cn. Pompeius (cos. 70, 55) visited Poseidonius in Rhodes¹⁰ and perhaps the Peripatetic Cratippus of Pergamum in Mytilene.¹¹ He visited Poseidonius again in 62¹² and is said to have treated the

¹ Cic. *De orat.* 1.104, *Fin.* 5.8, 5.75.

² Plut. *Pomp.* 55.1. Scipio was the natural son of P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica.

³ See above, p. 325.

⁴ Strab. 14.674–5, Lucian, *Macrob.* 21.

⁵ See A. Hillscher, "Hominum litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum historia critica", *NJbb* suppl. xviii (1892), 355 ff.

⁶ Cic. *De orat.* 1.45–7, 2.365, 3.75.

⁷ Cic. *De orat.* 1.82–94.

⁸ Cic. *Leg.* 1.53.

⁹ Plut. *Cat. min.* 10.1–2.

¹⁰ Strab. 11.492.

¹¹ Aelian, *VH* 7.21.

¹² Cic. *Tusc.* 2.61, Plin. *Nat.* 7.112, Plut. *Pomp.* 42.5.

philosophers of Athens with munificence¹ when passing through this city in the same year. In 51 M. Tullius Cicero (cos. 63) visited the Academic Aristus and the Epicurean Patro in Athens² and made the acquaintance of Cratippus, a teacher of Mytilene, in Ephesus.³ In 47–48 M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54) took a philosophical walk with a certain Philostratus somewhere in Sicily.⁴ In 46–47 C. Iulius Caesar (cos. 59, 48, 46–4) called upon the Peripatetic Aristo in Alexandria.⁵ In 44 M. Iunius Brutus (praet. 44) attended the lectures of Cratippus, now moved to Athens, and the Academic Theomnestus, the successor, doubtless, of Aristus.⁶

In some of the cases aforementioned reasons of state or touristic curiosity rather than genuine interest in philosophy motivated Roman actions. Greek communities by the first century normally held their philosophers in high honour and were pleased to see respect shown them by foreign visitors. Many Romans abroad on official business liked to see famous sites and famous people.⁷ Those statesmen, however, who frequented philosophers during periods of exile must have had reasonably serious motives. Athens had T. Albucius (praet. 109 or 105) a resident student for some years after 103,⁸ and C. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 75) between 91 and 82.⁹ Rhodes received Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus (cos. 109) as a student in 100–99.¹⁰ M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 51)¹¹ and Cn. Pompeius¹² himself spent time with Cratippus in Mytilene after the battle of Pharsalus in 48.

T. Albucius had acquired his interest many years before when a very young man in Athens itself, probably from the lectures of the Epicurean Zeno.¹³ Albucius is the first of a number of young Romans for whom a period of philosophical

¹ Plut. *Pomp.* 42.5.

² Cic. *Att.* 5.10.5, 5.11.6, 5.19.3, *Farr.* 13.1.3, *Brut.* 332, *Tusc.* 5.22.

³ Cic. *Tim.* 2.

⁴ Plut. *Cat. min.* 57.2.

⁵ Aelian, *VH* 7.21.

⁶ Plut. *Brut.* 24.1.

⁷ Polyb. 30.10.3–6, Liv. 45.27–28, Cic. *Manil.* 40.

⁸ Cic. *Tusc.* 5.108.

⁹ Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.59, 1.93.

¹⁰ Plut. *Mar.* 29.12, Liv. *per.* 69.

¹¹ Cic. *Brut.* 250.

¹² Plut. *Pomp.* 75.2.

¹³ Lucil. ap. Cic. *Fin.* 1.9 (88–94 Marx), Varr. *Men.* 127, Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.93, *Brut.* 131.

study in Greek cities is clearly and certainly recorded. A M. Vigellius lived with Panaetius sometime during the period when Panaetius headed the Athenian Stoics (129/128–110/110).¹ It was probably under Panaetius that M. Claudius Marcellus (praet. by 74) studied in 110.² Between 84 and 82 M. Terentius Varro (praet. 69) heard the lectures of Antiochus, Philo's successor as leader of the Academics.³ L. Aelius Tubero listened either to Antiochus or to Antiochus' successor Aristus.⁴ M. Tullius Cicero visited a number of Greek cities in the years 79–77. At Athens he listened during a six months' stay not only to Antiochus⁵ but also to the Epicureans Zeno and Phaedrus.⁶ M. Pupius Piso Frugi Calpurnianus (cos. 61), Q. Tullius Cicero (praet. 62), L. Tullius Cicero and T. Pomponius accompanied him to Antiochus' lectures⁷; possibly also P. Nigidius Figulus (praet. 58).⁸ T. Pomponius had already been living in Athens for about three years and, like a number of resident Romans, found Phaedrus both intellectually and personally attractive.⁹ In Rhodes Cicero listened to Poseidonius,¹⁰ who headed a corporation of philosophers there probably founded by Panaetius. He seems to have been accompanied by Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51).¹¹ M. Iunius Brutus (praet. 44) lived for a period with Aristus and the Academics at Athens around the year 60.¹² The children of some aristocrats of Cicero's generation turned up at Athens in the years 45–43, among them Cicero's own son, Marcus, L.

¹ Cic. *De orat.* 3.78.

² Cic. *De orat.* 1.57. Friendly references in Posidonius' historical writing to the Marcelli have led some to think that this Marcellus and he were fellow pupils of Panaetius at Athens. *Ind. Herc. Stoic.* 74.6 lists a Piso among the serious pupils of Panaetius.

³ Cic. *Att.* 13.25.3, *Ac.* 1.12.

⁴ Photius, cod. 212, p. 169b, 31 ff.

⁵ Cic. *Fin.* 5.1, *Brut.* 315, *Ac.* 2.113, Plut. *Cic.* 4.1, Anon. *Vir. ill.* 81.2.

⁶ Cic. *Fin.* 1.16, *Tusc.* 3.38.

⁷ Cic. *Fin.* 5.1.

⁸ Plut. *Cic.* 20.3.

⁹ For Pomponius see Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.5, *Leg.* 1.21, 1.53, *Fin.* 1.16, 5.3; for L. Saufeius Nep. *Att.* 12.3. For the way in which Pomponius and Saufeius marked their feeling for Phaedrus see the inscriptions discussed by A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia*, xviii (1949), 96–103.

¹⁰ Plut. *Cic.* 4.4–6.

¹¹ Cic. *Brut.* 151–3.

¹² Cic. *Brut.* 332, *Ac.* 1.12, *Fin.* 5.8, Plut. *Brut.* 2.3, Anon. *Vir. ill.* 82.1.

Calpurnius Bibulus, Manlius Torquatus Acidinus and M. Valerius Messala Corvinus.¹ But not only the children of aristocrats. There was also at Athens in these years Q. Horatius Flaccus, the son of a wealthy freed slave.² Nearer Rome at about the same time Naples had attractions for Romans interested in philosophy. To the Epicureans Philodemus and Siro resident in that city there came from an aristocratic family T. Manlius Torquatus (praet. 49)³ and from the Italian bourgeoisie P. Vergilius Maro and a number of others difficult to identify precisely.⁴ It is interesting that *Ῥωμαῖοι* are recorded among the *ἑφηβοὶ* of Athens in 119/118, 117/116, 107/106, 101/100, 39/38 and that from 123/122 the *ἑφηβοὶ* had regularly attended some lectures by philosophers.⁵

Many periods of independent study by young Romans in Greek cities must lie unrecorded. It is unlikely that Massilia saw its first Roman students in the time of Nero.⁶ Athens would, as I have several times suggested, have seen many before T. Albucius. Clear evidence, however, is lacking. It may have been in the company of his father in 140⁷ that Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus (cos. 109) heard Carneades lecture.⁸ It may have been in Rome that P. Rutilius Rufus (cos. 105) heard Panaetius.⁹ The relationships with L. Marcius Censorinus (cos. 149) and C. Lucilius which caused Cleitomachus to dedicate works to them¹⁰ may have been established in Rome rather than in Athens. Nevertheless when all allowances are made for the gaps in our record of what particular Romans did in their youth,

¹ Cic. *Att.* 12.32.2, *Off.* 1.1, 3.6, M. Cic. fil. ap. Cic. *Fam.* 16.21.3-5, Trebonius ap. Cic. *Fam.* 12.16, Plut. *Cic.* 24.6, 45.3, *Brut.* 24.3.

² Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.16, 2.2.43-45, 81-83.

³ Cic. *Fin.* 2.119. Cf. *Fam.* 6.11.2.

⁴ Foca, *Vit. Verg.* 63, Serv. *Verg. Buc.* 6.13, *Aen.* 6.264. For Pap. Herc. 312 and others see W. Crönert, *Stud. z. Pal. u. Pap.*, vi (1906), 125.

⁵ See below, p. 347, n. 8.

⁶ Tac. *Agr.* 4.3-4. Cf. Strab. 4.181.

⁷ For sons accompanying their fathers on official missions see Cic. *Flacc.* 5, *Att.* 6.7.2, *Fam.* 2.17.1.

⁸ Cic. *De orat.* 3.68-69.

⁹ Cic. *Brut.* 114. Cf. Poseid. ap. Cic. *Off.* 3.10. The notion that Rutilius was one of the young friends of Scipio and Laelius is not, however, without its difficulties.

¹⁰ Cic. *Ac.* 2.102.

the number of those who are reported to have received instruction from philosophers even during the last years of the Republic is significantly tiny. Again the record is overwhelmingly concerned with Romans of the senatorial class and yet a remarkable proportion of those associated with named philosophers come from outside this class. It should be noted that, although T. Albucius, M. Terentius Varro and M. Tullius Cicero became senators, they were not themselves born of senators. Consideration of the record gives no support to the idea that fathers willing to encourage or tolerate philosophical interests in their sons as a rule greatly preferred Stoic teachers to Academics, Peripatetics or Epicureans.

The names of many Roman citizens whose lives fell in the period between the erection of the statue of Pythagoras in the *comitium* and the fall of Alexandria are known. If some scholar were energetic enough to draw up lists of those linked in any way with a particular kind of philosophy or with philosophy in general, he would perform a useful service, but I do not think that the conclusions to be drawn from such lists would be different from those which consideration of the known pupils of particular teachers compels.

III

The dialogues which Cicero wrote during periods of retirement from active political life portray Roman senators from the time of M. Porcius Cato (cos. 195) to that of Cicero himself presenting learned and complex philosophical arguments to each other. One might deduce that if few aristocrats knew any philosophy those who did knew a great deal. That would be a false deduction. It may be presumed, and I have done so in this essay, that Cicero never consciously falsified the facts about the careers of his personages or attributed to them attitudes wildly inconsistent with what he believed to be theirs, but the situations in which he placed them and the quantity of philosophical knowledge which he caused to issue from their mouths are hardly to be taken as historical.

The conventions of the dialogue as Plato, Aristotle and Heracleides had established them permitted a certain amount of

liberty with the facts of history¹ and Cicero did not try to conceal from his contemporaries either that he invented situations² or that he took the substance of disquisitions for his dialogues from Greek technical treatises.³ Many found his inventions implausible, particularly where men of generations previous to his own were concerned, and Cicero felt embarrassed by their criticism.⁴ Nevertheless, the imaginative power of the picture of aristocratic culture in the Rome of 129 B.C. painted in the *De republica*, the most commonly read of his dialogues, has affected modern scholars to a strange degree, often leading them to exaggerate grossly the effect of the brief visit to Rome by the three Athenian philosophers twenty-six years previously and that of the lengthier visits of Panaetius during the interval. The dialogue could not have been intended to represent truly the ordinary intellectual interests and social behaviour of any section of the Roman senatorial class in 129. It did not even reflect the reality of private conversation among eminent *consulares* during the late fifties as much as a dream of what things might be if such persons did seriously take up philosophical study.

A dialogue in which Cicero makes himself, with some help from T. Pomponius Atticus and M. Iunius Brutus, describe those who had distinguished themselves as orators in Rome through the time of the Republic down to early in 46 provides a better general view of the spread and depth of Roman philosophical interests than do the dialogues specifically concerned with philosophy. Since Cicero was himself convinced of the value of the doctrines of some philosophers in the fostering of oratorical effectiveness and the lack of value of others,⁵ it is significant how few Romans he links in the *Brutus* with a particular philo-

¹ See Cic. *Fam.* 9.8 on the *mos dialogorum*; Diog. Laert. 3.35 for Socrates' alleged view of Plato's dialogues.

² *Att.* 4.16.2, 13.19.3-6, *Cat. mai.* 3, *Lael.* 4.

³ *Att.* 12.52.3. There are less modest statements at *Ac.* 1.10-11 and *Fin.* 1.4-8.

⁴ *Q. fr.* 3.5.1-2, *Ac.* 2.7.

⁵ See *Orat.* 11-19, 113-19, *Parad.* 2, *Tusc.* 2.9, apart from *Brut.* 119-20, 306, 309, 315, 322. Such passages as these lie behind Tac. *Orat.* 30.3-31.8, Quintil. *Inst.* 10.1.81. For the general issue of philosophy and oratory see also *De orat.* 1.83 ff. (M. Antonius [cos. 99] speaking), 3.63 ff. (L. Licinius Crassus [cos. 95] speaking).

sophical tradition: eight with the Stoic—Sp. Mummius, C. Fannius (? cos. 122), P. Rutilius Rufus (cos. 105), Q. Aelius Tubero (? praet. 132), M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54), Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51), Sex. Pompeius, L. Aelius Stilo¹—one with the Peripatetic—M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 51),² one with the Epicurean—T. Albucius³—three with the Academic—Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102), himself (cos. 63) and Brutus (praet. 44).⁴ Elegant vagueness covers the education of most of those who are given roles in the other dialogues: M. Porcius Cato (cos. 195), P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147, 134), C. Laelius (cos. 140), M' Manilius (cos. 149), L. Furius Philus (cos. 136), Q. Mucius Scaeuola (cos. 117), M. Antonius (cos. 99), L. Licinius Crassus (cos. 95), C. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 75), Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 78), L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74), M. Pupius Piso (cos. 61), L. Manlius Torquatus (praet. 49).⁵ The preponderance of Stoics among the orators to whom the *Brutus* gives a philosophical label has no significance; it is due simply to the fact that the modes of argument recommended and employed by Stoic teachers in the lecture room diverged more from those commonly used in the Senate, the law courts and the assemblies than did other philosophical modes⁶ and were thus more easily detectable or imaginable in orators known to have associated with philosophers of the Stoic tradition.

The so-called *saturae* published by C. Lucilius in the last quarter of the second century, by M. Terentius Varro in the first quarter of the first, and by Q. Horatius Flaccus in the third quarter of the first, were concerned for the most part with the social life of men ranking below senators in common esteem.⁷ The readership sought lay for the most part also in the same

¹ 94; 101; 114-16; 117-18; 118-19; 151-3; 175; 206.

² 250. ³ 131.

⁴ 132; *passim*; 119-20, 149, 332.

⁵ 61-69, 293-4; 83-94; 108; 102; 139-42; 143-9; 202-4; 222; 236; 265.

⁶ See Cic. *Parad.* 2.

⁷ Some of Lucilius' pieces referred to his friendship with P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147, 134) and C. Laelius (cos. 140) and to the alleged vices of political rivals of these aristocrats (Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.65-74 and [Acro] ad loc.). Such themes, however, would have no more predominated in the thirty books of Lucilian writing available to Horace than does Horace's relationship with Maecenas in the two books of the *Sermones*.

social class.¹ Conversations about philosophical questions were a frequent theme.² One could not deduce that such conversations occurred with the same frequency in any sector of actual Roman society. The Latin writers consciously imitated, at least where the generality of their themes, their mood and their tone were concerned, famous works by Bion of Borysthenes³ and Menippus of Gadara,⁴ two third-century teachers and writers who tried to free philosophy from the grip of the great Athenian corporations. The kinds of conversations which the latter set in Greek towns Lucilius, Varro and Horace set mainly in Rome. It would be legitimate, however, to deduce from the many names of famous philosophers the Latin writers dropped,⁵ the amount of philosophical jargon they deployed,⁶ and the sophisticated character of the jokes they made at the expense of philosophers and their pupils that the readers they had in mind to entertain knew at least the broad outlines of the history of philosophical speculation.⁷ There was probably more know-

¹ See Cic. *Fin.* 1.7 for Lucilius on his readers. Horace, when listing at *Serm.* 1.10.81–92 those men whose literary approval he desired, named more from outside than from inside the aristocracy.

² The 28th book of Lucilius seems to have contained a parody of a philosophers' symposium (frs. 751 ff.); for his ridicule of Stoics see Porph. *Hor. Serm.* 1.3.124. Fr. 583 of Varro's *saturae Menippeae* laughs at the theology of the Stoics and the Epicureans (cf. also fr. 122). Horace refers at *Serm.* 2.6.70 ff. to conversations on ethical problems over wine in his own house. His address to Maecenas in *Serm.* 1.1 has a philosophical tone laughingly excused with a shot at the end at the Stoic Plotius Crispinus (vv. 120–21). Another address to Maecenas (*Serm.* 1.3) takes on a philosophical tone as it progresses and ends with ridicule of the Greek Stoics and such Roman adepts as Crispinus. He has the bankrupt Damasippus lecture him philosophically at *Serm.* 2.3.31 ff. with appeals to the authority of the Stoic Stertinius and he has the slave Dauus do the same thing on the authority of Crispinus at *Serm.* 2.7.6 ff. ³ [Acro], *Hor. Epist.* 2.2.60.

⁴ Cic. *Ac.* 1.8, *Gell.* 2.18.7, [Probus], *Virg. Buc.* 6.31.

⁵ Lucilius names Aristippus (742), Carneades (31), Polemo (755), Socrates (832); Varro Antipater (291), Aristotle (128, 543), Aristoxenus (360), Carneades (483, 484), Cleanthes (245), Democritus (81), Diogenes (281, 444, 469, 517), Empedocles (163), Epicurus (315, 402), Heracleides Ponticus (81, 445), Socrates (6, 99, 490), Zeno (164, 483); Horace Aristippus (*Serm.* 2.3.100), Chrysippus (1.3.127, 2.3.44, 2.3.287), Pythagoras (2.4.3, 2.6.63).

⁶ Lucilius 753, Varro 142, 144, 164, 177, 231, 291, 323, 362, 402, 583. Horace avoided all words of obvious Greek origin on general stylistic grounds.

⁷ The remarks of Lucilius reported at Cic. *De orat.* 2.25 and Plin. *Nat. praef.* 7 are not to be taken over-seriously.

ledge of philosophy outside than inside the Senate. It could, however, as likely have been acquired from books as from professional teachers.

IV

Not only were those Romans who came into contact with professional philosophers during the years of the Republic few in number and the knowledge which they acquired small, but the conditions in which they made contact differed greatly from those which normally obtained in the most prestigious Greek centres of study. Whatever was the degree of influence exercised by philosophers upon native Greeks, Romans as a rule could not have undergone nearly so much. Where the sons of senators were concerned the conditions of contact were particularly inhibiting.

The corporations of philosophers which were to be found from the late sixth century in the Greek-speaking states of South Italy and Sicily and from the late fifth century in Athens and states which admired Athenian cultural institutions had a number of common features: the ownership of a place of cult¹; a way of life distinct from that of the family and the inter-family groups of the state in which the corporation pursued its activity²; an emphasis on moral and intellectual criteria in selecting new members³ and a readiness to ignore the boundaries of class, city and race⁴; a submissiveness to the authority of a leader⁵; a

¹ In general see Aeschin. *Timarch.* 10 and for the *Μουσεια* of the Academics and Peripatetics Athen. 12.547 f., Diog. Laert. 4.1, 5.51.

² Whatever may be thought of the truthfulness of the way Aristophanes portrayed Socrates at the Dionysia of 423, the *φροντιστήριον* could not have been an entirely imaginary institution. Other institutions were less ascetic but equally concerned about the precise way in which their members lived; see Athen. 12.547d-548b on the dining practices of the Peripatetics and the Academics, Diog. Laert. 4.19 on the housing of the Academics.

³ See Gell. 1.9.1-3 on Pythagoras, Diog. Laert. 4.10 on Xenocrates.

⁴ For the pupils of Pythagoras, himself not a native of Croton, see above, p. 331, n. 5. Two of the Athenian corporations were founded by non-Athenians and all had non-Athenian leaders as well as non-Athenian ordinary members at some point of their history. The Epicureans were doubtless odd in permitting slaves to study philosophy (Diog. Laert. 10.3, 10).

⁵ *αὐτὸς ἔφα* sufficed for the pupils of Pythagoras (Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.10, Val. Max. 8.15. ext. 1). The behaviour of Colotes to his teacher (Plut. *Mor.* 1100a,

secrecy in relation to at least some of its objects of study¹; and a faith that study within it affected an individual's patterns of behaviour.² From the early third century, when the practice of shaving the face clean became customary among upper-class Greeks,³ the leader and the more senior members of a corporation could signalize their special way of life to outsiders by letting their beards grow.⁴ Some corporations succeeded in continuing their existence past the lifetimes of their first constituent members: real property,⁵ a way of living patterned by social and quasi-religious rituals,⁶ and a structure of authority⁷ were transmitted along with either the particular doctrines of the original leader or at least the general framework of his teaching.

By the first century B.C. Athens had long been the universally

1117b) was extreme but indicative of the general attitude of the Epicureans. The Academics, Peripatetics and Stoics were renowned for their quarrelsomeness (Numenius ap. Euseb. *PE* 14.5.3) but nearly always found it desirable to have a leader. Menedemus was criticized for his laxity in regard to matters of discipline (Diog. Laert. 2.130).

¹ See Aristoph. *Nub.* 140 ff., 824 ff. For Pythagoras and secrecy see Aristot. ap. Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 41, Aristoxenus ap. Diog. Laert. 8.15; for Plato see Plat. *Epist.* 2.314c; for Aristotle see Plut. *Alex.* 7.3-5. See further below, p. 365, n. 1. for talk of philosophy as initiation into *μυστήρια*.

² Even Aristotle thought that ethics was a normative study (*EN* 1103b 27). The story of Polemo's moral conversion (Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.254, Porphy. ad. loc., Diog. Laert. 4.16) illustrates the kind of hope which comforted many a professional teacher of philosophy.

³ Chrysipp. ap. Athen. 13.565a-d.

⁴ Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.133, 2.3.35, Plut. *Mor.* 352c, Arrian, *Diss. Epict.* 1.2.29, 3.1.24, Dio Chrys. 72.2, Gell. 9.2.1-6, Lucian, *Eun.* 9, *Piscat.* 11, *Icarom.* 5, *Demon.* 13, Athen. 5.211e, Alciphron 3.55.

⁵ This comes out most plainly in the wills of the Peripatetic leaders Theophrastus (Diog. Laert 5.52), Strato (Diog. Laert 5.62) and Lyco (Diog. Laert. 5.70).

⁶ For the *Πυθαγόρειος τρόπος . . . τοῦ βίου* and its preservation see Plat. *Rep.* 10.600b. Diogenes, Porphyry and Iamblichus provide plenty of detail, not all of it very credible. For the commemoration of the deceased among the Peripatetics see Harpocration, s.v. *ὀργεῶνας* (citing the will of Theophrastus). For Epicurus' commands about the monthly symposium and the annual celebration of his birthday see Diog. Laert. 10.18; for their long-lasting effect see Philodem. *A.P.* 11.44, Cic. *Fin.* 2.101, Plin. *Nat.* 35.5, Athen. 7.298d.

⁷ A committee seems to have governed the Academics for a period (*Ind. Herc. Ac.* col. M) but these, like others, usually thought a leader necessary. For hierarchy below the leader among the Peripatetics see Athen. 12.547d ff., Diog. Laert. 5.53, 71.

acknowledged home of philosophy in the Greek-speaking world. There were established in the city four corporations with leaders who could each name a chain of predecessors going back unbroken to the fourth century¹ and point to the places where the founders first taught.² The Epicureans kept the name which they had probably used of themselves since the lifetime of Epicurus. The Academics, the Peripatetics and the Stoics, corporations less concerned with maintaining the doctrines of their founders pure,³ accepted the nicknames long applied to them by outsiders.⁴ All four corporations almost certainly possessed considerable wealth in addition to what their members at any one time owned as individuals.⁵ The Athenian community held them in high honour. There had been no persecution since 306.⁶ In times of trouble individual philosophers were even entrusted with missions to foreign states.⁷ By 123/122, if not before, youths of high family were officially encouraged to take some instruction from them.⁸ In 89/88 an orator felt able to stir a crowd by mentioning the city's students of philosophy in the same breath as the priests of Demeter and the twin sons of Zeus.⁹ The quality of the studies pursued by the corporations even became a matter of official concern.¹⁰

¹ The Epicurean succession certainly survived Sulla's sack of the city (Suda, s.v. 'Επίκουρος). There is no reason to think that the Academic Theomnestus, the Peripatetic Cratippus (Plut. *Brut.* 24.1) and the Stoic Dionysius (Cic. *Tusc.* 2.26) did not head intact organizations.

² Cic. *Fin.* 5.2-3, *Fam.* 13.1.3, *Att.* 5.11, 5.19.

³ Numenius ap. Euseb. *PE.* 14.5.3.

⁴ For 'Ακαδημαϊκός see first Timon ap. Diog. Laert 4.67; for Περιπατητικός Hermippus ap. Diog. Laert 5.2; for Στωϊκός Epicurus ap. Diog. Laert. 7.5.

⁵ For the way in which property was transmitted within the corporations see above, p. 346, n. 5. Monarchs (Diog. Laert. 4.8, 4.38, 5.66-7, 7.169) and Roman magistrates (Plut. *Pomp.* 42.11) made large gifts to corporation heads.

⁶ For the law of Sophocles see Athen. 13.610 f., Pollux 9.42, Diog. Laert. 5.38.

⁷ See above, p. 331.

⁸ *IG* II/III² 1006.19 ff., 62 ff. Cf. the decrees of council and people for 100/99 (1028.34 f.), 95/94 (1029.21), 83-73 (1039.47), 41/40 (1042 C. 7 f.), 38/37 (1043.42 f.), 21/20 (1040.26 ff.).

⁹ See the speech put in the mouth of Athenion by Poseidonius (ap. Athen. 5.213d).

¹⁰ Plut. *Cic.* 24.7. There is some confusion in Cicero's account. The decree of the Areopagus must have been motivated by fear of losing Cratippus rather than by a desire to please Cicero.

Other Greek communities politically constituted like Athens usually tolerated¹ and occasionally honoured² resident philosophical corporations. Some carried the same names as the Athenian corporations and even succeeded in perpetuating themselves over a number of generations.³ What it was that enabled professional teachers or groups of teachers operating outside Athens to call themselves Academics, Peripatetics, Epicureans or Stoics is not revealed in the extant literature. It could not have been a matter simply of self-baptism, so to speak. The titles and credentials of teachers were from time to time challenged.⁴ To be recognized as an Epicurean required, one suspects, something more than a knowledge of the doctrines of Epicurus and the way of life he prescribed for philosophers. Even more would this have been the case with the Academic, Peripatetic and Stoic titles, for the corporations founded in Athens by Plato, Aristotle and Zeno had not attempted to preserve unchanged their founders' teachings.

Many individual *βάρβαροι* from states of aristocratic constitution visited or became members of the South Italian and the Athenian corporations. Such corporations, however, rarely formed in the states from which they came. The kind of naked athletic exercises which the ordinary well-born Greek practised during youth and which most philosophers approved of even to the extent of conducting classes in their vicinity⁵ were looked

¹ The Messenians are said to have expelled Epicureans (Athen. 12.547a, Suda, s.v. *'Επίκουρος*) but most expulsions of intellectuals are laid at the doors of monarchs.

² See Diog. Laert. 9.64 for Elis granting *ἀτέλεια* to Pyrrho and his companions. For inscriptional evidence on honours granted to philosophers see M. N. Tod, *JHS*, lxxvii (1957), 132–41, J. and L. Robert, *REG*, lxxi (1958), 199–200.

³ For a Stoic corporation in Rhodes passing through at least three generations see Suda, s.v. *Ποσειδώνιος*. For a *Στωϊκὴ διαδοχὴ* in Babylon see Plut. *Mor.* 605b. For an inscription relating to an *Ἀϋρ. Βήλιος Φίλιππος διάδοχος ἐν Ἀπαμείᾳ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων* see *Ann. Archéol. Arab. Syriennes*, xxiii (1973), 66 ff.

⁴ Plut. *Ant.* 80.2 (on a false Academic), Diog. Laert. 10.26 (on genuine Epicureans).

⁵ Lyco went so far as to make provision in his will for the oil needed by the young members of the Peripatetic corporation (Diog. Laert. 5.71; cf. Athen. 12.547d, Diog. Laert. 5.67).

at askance by most βάρβαροι, and by the Romans in particular.¹ The γυμνάσιον was about the one architectural feature of the typical Greek city absent from Republican Rome. The atmosphere in which the Greek corporations flourished, the atmosphere which contributed a good deal to the long-term effect of their activities, thus could not be fully reproduced outside a Greek community.

Cleitomachus is supposed to have "done philosophy" in Carthage before he went to Athens to study.² In Rome an Aurelius Opillus taught a group of pupils philosophy among other subjects during the early years of the first century.³ A Q. Sextius had a "following" in the middle of this century.⁴ Neither Aurelius nor Sextius claimed to belong to any of the famous Greek traditions. The only professional philosophers of our record who could conceivably have attempted to establish corporations of the Athenian type were the Epicureans expelled in 173 (or 154)⁵ and the unnamed teachers expelled in 161.⁶ The conversations which the *scriba* L. Petillius held with his friends in 181 and those which more than a century later Cicero, Nigidius Figulus and the younger Cato held with theirs may have seemed like philosophical activity to some observers⁷ but Cicero had no desire to be confused with a professional teacher,⁸ and we may suppose that none of the others did. Certainly no group of philosophically interested persons established a permanent corporate existence for itself even during the Empire.

¹ Cf. Cic. *Rep.* 4.4, *Tusc.* 4.70. To watch Greek professional athletes competing at the *ludi* (Liv. 39.22.2, *et al.*), however, was a different matter from actually competing with one's Roman peers.

² Diog. Laert. 4.67. But see *Ind. Herc. Ac.* col. 24-25.

³ Sueton. *Gramm.* 6.1-2.

⁴ Sen. *Contr.* 2. praef. 4, Sen. *Nat.* 7.32.2, *Epist.* 59.7, 73.12, 98.13, 108.17, Plin. *Nat.* 18.274.

⁵ Athen. 12.547a, Aelian, *VH.* 9.12. ⁶ Sueton. *Gramm.* 25.1, Gell. 15.11.1.

⁷ For L. Petillius and the events of 181 see Liv. 40.29.3-14. For one impression given by Nigidius' activity see Schol. Bob. Cic. *Vatin.* 14. Plutarch's statement at Cic. 40.1 about Cicero derives from a naïve reading of the *Disputationes Tusculanae* (32.5 derives similarly from Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.6). Plutarch makes one of Cato's philosophical admirers, M. Fauonius, his ἐπαστής (*Brut.* 12.3, 34.2; for ἔργω and philosophy see below, p. 365).

⁸ Cic. *Fam.* 9.20.3 *ueniunt etiam qui me audiunt quasi doctum hominem.* Cf. Cicero's embarrassment at even writing on the subject (*Fin.* 1.12).

The magistrates of the Republic as such never offered professional philosophers any honour or even encouragement. It was significantly the innovating dictator Julius Caesar who tried to compliment Q. Sextius by putting him in the Senate¹ and to entice the leader of the Athenian Peripatetics.² The Emperors on the other hand, while subsidizing the collection and care of books³ and the teaching of rhetoric⁴ at Rome, did nothing to aid the public position of philosophy. Later emperors involved themselves in the affairs of the Athenian corporations⁵ but did nothing where the capital of the Empire was concerned.

Most of the professional philosophers who are recorded as having been in Rome before 30 B.C. either were there on non-philosophical business or were the invited guests of particular families. The former might give a few occasional lectures monitored by the magistrates. The latter might teach over an extended period but their teaching had to endure the control of the head of the family which gave them hospitality. Their position was one of extreme social dependence, a position similar to that held by those who accepted the hospitality of the tyrant of a Greek state or the Greek-speaking king of a barbarian or semi-barbarian state.

Many philosophers did accept such hospitality. Syracuse saw Plato⁶ and Aristippus of Cyrene⁷ in the time of the two Dionysii. Pella saw Aristotle in the time of Philip II,⁸ Callisthenes of Olynthus and Anaxarchus of Abdera in that of Alexander III,⁹ the Stoic Persaeus of Citium¹⁰ and Bion of Borysthenes¹¹ in the

¹ Sen. *Epist.* 98.13. Cf. Sueton. *Iul.* 42.1. ² Plut. *Cic.* 24.7.

³ Sueton. *Gramm.* 20.2 (C. Iulius Hyginus), 21.3 (C. Melissus), *Iul.* 56.7 (Pompeius Macer).

⁴ Sueton. *Vesp.* 18, Hieron. *Chron.* Ol. 216.4, Zonaras 11.17.

⁵ See for Hadrian, *IG II/III*² 1099, 1097, *SEG* 3.226, J. H. Oliver, *TAPhA*, lxi (1938), 494 ff.; for Marcus Aurelius, Galen 19.50, Lucian, *Eun.* 3, 8, Dio Cass. 72.31.3, Tatian 19, Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 566; for Septimius Severus and Caracalla, Alexander Aphrodis. *Fat.* 1. For Antoninus Pius and the privileges of philosophers see *Dig.* 27.1.6.2 ff.

⁶ Plut. *Dio* 5, 11–16, 18–20, *Timol.* 15.2, Diog. Laert. 3.18–24.

⁷ Diog. Laert. 2.66–67.

⁸ Plut. *Alex.* 7–8, Diog. Laert. 5.4, 5.10.

⁹ Plut. *Alex.* 52.3–5, Diog. Laert. 5.4.

¹⁰ Hermipp. ap. Athen. 4.562d, Plut. *Arat.* 18.1, Diog. Laert. 7.6, 7.36.

¹¹ Diog. Laert. 4.46.

time of Antigonus Gonatas, Euphantus of Olynthus in that of Demetrius II,¹ and the Peripatetic Prytanis of Carystus in that of Antigonus Doson.² Alexandria saw Hecataeus of Abdera,³ Theodorus of Cyrene,⁴ Diodorus of Iasus,⁵ Stilpo of Megara,⁶ and the Peripatetics Demetrius of Athens (Phalerum)⁷ and Strato of Lampsacus⁸ in the time of the first Ptolemy, the Stoic Sphaerus of Borysthenes in the time of the second,⁹ the Academic Panaretus in the time of the third,¹⁰ and the Academic Philostratus in the time of Cleopatra VII,¹¹ the last of the dynasty. Antioch saw Euphorion of Chalcis, a pupil of the Academic Lacydes and the Peripatetic Prytanis in the time of Antiochus III,¹² the Epicurean Philonides of Laodiceia on and off from the time of Seleucus IV to that of Demetrius I,¹³ the Epicurean Diogenes of Seleuceia in the time of Alexander Balas.¹⁴ Micipsa surrounded himself in Numidian Cirta with philosophers¹⁵ at about the same time as Scipio Aemilianus was giving hospitality to Panaetius in Rome. The guests of a monarch entertained him with conversation at table, supervised the education of his children, particularly the one marked out for the succession, accompanied him on foreign journeys, even performed administrative and diplomatic tasks for him. The one monarchical state where a corporation similar in organization to the Athenian ones formed was Alexandria, but philosophy as such never had a very high place in the famous precinct of the Muses.¹⁶ In Alexandria and

¹ Diog. Laert. 2.110.

² Probably. See Polyb. 5.93.8 for his acting on behalf of Antigonus.

³ Joseph. *Ap.* 1.183.

⁴ Diog. Laert. 2.97-103.

⁵ Diog. Laert. 2.111, Sext. Emp. *Pyrrh.* 2.245.

⁶ Diog. Laert. 2.111 (but see also 2.115).

⁷ Diog. Laert. 5.77-79, Suda, s.v. Δημήτριος . . . Φαληρέυς.

⁸ Diog. Laert. 5.58, 60, Suda, s.v. Στράτων Λαμψακηνός.

⁹ Athen 8.354e, Diog. Laert. 7.177, 185. The record is confused: his host is more likely to have been Philadelphus or Euergetes than Eupator.

¹⁰ Polemo ap. Athen. 12.552c.

¹¹ Plut. *Ant.* 80.2, Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* 486.

¹² Suda, s.v. Εὐφορίων . . . Χαλκιδεύς.

¹³ Pap. Herc. 1044, W. Crönert, *SB Ak. Berlin*, 1900, 942-5.

¹⁴ Athen. 5.211a-d.

¹⁵ Diodor. 34/35.35.

¹⁶ The precinct gave the corporation its name (Plut. *Mor.* 1095d). In Athens the Academics, the Peripatetics and perhaps all groups of students had their *Μουσεῖα* (see above, p. 345, n. 1). Athenaeus 1.22d and a number of imperial inscriptions and papyri (see M. N. Tod, *JHS*, lxxvii (1957), 138) refer to

other such states the teacher was always at the mercy of the monarch's whims and many were those who suffered expulsion or worse.¹ Some philosophers refused persistent royal invitations² and there was a widespread feeling that the true philosophical life was impossible in the vicinity of a monarch.³

The heads of the great families of the Roman republic often reminded foreign observers of monarchs⁴ and within certain areas indeed had the power of monarchs. It is interesting that Philodemus went against all Epicurean tradition and dedicated a treatise on *ὁ ἀγαθὸς βασιλεύς* to his Roman patron Piso. The philosopher who received the hospitality of a senatorial family might find refuge with another if he gave offence but his freedom was almost as circumscribed as it would have been in a monarchical state. The position he occupied in Roman society inevitably turned him into something of a *σοφιστής*, a kind of teacher from whom he was obliged theoretically to distinguish himself, particularly if he claimed a connection with any of the famous Athenian corporations.⁵ From such a position he could exercise little real influence on those he might try to teach, whether they were his patron and his patron's friends or his patron's children.

The Romans who studied with a group of philosophers in Athens or Rhodes or Mytilene or Naples were more susceptible to the influence of philosophy. It is to be noted, however, that most of those who appear in the record were either men of

φιλόσοφοι as members of the Alexandrian Museum but it was grammar and science which made this corporation famous.

¹ *φιλόσοφοι* were among those expelled in 145 by Ptolemy VII ; see Meneclæ of Barca ap. Athen. 4.184c.

² See Diog. Laert. 2.115 (Stilpo ; but see also 2.111), 2.127 (Menedemus hostile even to pupils going to Antigonos), 4.60 (Lacydes), 5.37 (Theophrastus), 5.67 (Lyco), 7.185 (Cleanthes and Chrysippus).

³ See Epicurus ap. Plut. Mor. 1127a ; the sneer in *Ind. Herc. Stoic.* col. 13 at Persæus *τὸν αὐλικόν, οὐ τὸν φιλόσοφον ἡρημένον βίον*; the story of the Indian and Anaxarchus (Diog. Laert. 9.63).

⁴ Plut. *Pyrrh.* 19.5 (for Cineas reporting to Pyrrhus on his impression of the Senate).

⁵ Ordinary Athenians were not always prepared to make the distinction ; see the original wording of the law of 306 as reported by Pollux, 9.42 (contrast Athen. 13.610 f., Diog. Laert. 5.38).

advanced years and doubtlessly calloused souls or else young men seeking to acquire within a short time a veneer from all types of higher culture. Cicero's son did not live with Cratippus and the permanent members of the Peripatetic corporation and he took as much interest in grammar and rhetoric as he did in philosophy.¹

V

The medium through which Romans received oral instruction from philosophers even in Rome itself was the Greek language. The story of Cleitomachus philosophizing at Carthage in Punic² may be an invention but where Rome is concerned there are, significantly, no such stories. Carneades, Diogenes, Critolaus, Diodotus, Staseas, Phaedrus, Philodemus, Philo, Poseidonius, Antipater, the two Athenodoruses³ and Nestor would have lectured in Greek as Plutarch was to do in the time of the Flavian emperors.⁴ Those native Latin speakers of the late Republic and early Empire whom we know to have approached becoming professional teachers, the Sextii,⁵ L. Annaeus Cornutus⁶ and C. Musonius Rufus,⁷ all wrote about their subject in Greek, just as King Numa was reputed to have done,⁸ and we may suppose that they lectured in Greek. It was the *littérateur*, seeking a novel theme for poetry⁹ or for oratorical prose¹⁰ who liked to dress the

¹ M. Cic. fil. ap. Cic. *Fam.* 16.21.3-6.

² Diog. Laert. 4.67.

³ Note the words of Pliny at *Nat.* 7.113.

⁴ *Mor.* 522d-e. Cf. *Mor.* 973a ff., *Publ.* 15.3-5. At *Dem.* 2.1 Plutarch excuses his failure to learn Latin properly as the result of having been occupied with talking about philosophy.

⁵ Sen. *Epist.* 59.7 *Graecis uerbis, Romanis moribus.*

⁶ There survives Cornutus' *ἐπιδρομή τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν παραδιδόμενων*. His works on grammar and rhetoric seem to have been in Latin.

⁷ Rendel Harris Papyri I. 32-50 has a piece of his work *εἰ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα τέκνα θρεπτέον*. Stobaeus cites this at length and a large number of others, some pretty clearly from the actual pen of Musonius.

⁸ Valerius Antias ap. Plin. *Nat.* 13.88, Plut. *Num.* 22.4.

⁹ Lucret. 1.922-34. For the attitude of genuine Epicureans to the sort of medium used by Lucretius see Sext. *Emp. Adv. math.* 1.296-9.

¹⁰ Cic. *Att.* 15.13a.2, *Tusc.* 1.7, 2.26, *Fin.* 1.6, *Parad.* 5, *Off.* 1.3. Cf. Sen. *Dial.* 10.10.1 (on Papirianus Fabianus).

doctrines of the classical and post-classical philosophers in Latin. Such activity always had to be defended against the scorn of the person more interested in philosophy than in literature.¹ Cicero's dialogues belonged even in his own eyes to literature. He made practically all his personages men of state, doubtlessly having decided that to introduce real philosophers as his exemplars, Plato, Aristotle and Heracleides, had done,² and to make them speak Latin, particularly Latin of the oratorical kind, would make his situations totally implausible. The word *philosophia* was for the native speaker of Latin (much more than *comoedia* or *tragoedia* or *poema*) an obvious borrowing from Greek denoting an essentially Greek activity. Those who took an interest in this activity were often labelled *Graeci* by their fellows.³

If all serious philosophical instruction was in Greek two questions raise themselves : the first is how well in an intellectual way could students whose first language was not Greek understand the doctrines presented to them ; the second and more important question is what effect doctrines so presented could have had on the emotional springs of religious belief and moral action in Roman senators and their sons.

The evidence for the extent of the knowledge of the Greek language among upper-class Romans during the Republic is mainly anecdotal and one might suppose that it was because of the relative rarity of such knowledge at any one period that individuals were singled out for mention. Some knowledge, however, there was from a very early date and everything points towards a spreading and deepening of this knowledge as time passed. Men involved in foreign commerce could not do without Greek. Where senators were concerned, the *decemviri* did not need to understand the litanies chanted in the temple of Ceres or the oracles kept in the temple of Jupiter but those who had to do political business on Rome's behalf with

¹ See what is put into Varro's mouth at Cic. *Ac.* 1.8. For Cicero's defence see *Ac.* 1.10, *Fin.* 1.4-8, *Nat. deor.* 1.8.

² Diog. Laert. 5.89.

³ For Albucius "Graecus" see Lucilius ap. Cic. *Fin.* 1.9; for Cicero "Graecus" and "scholasticus" see Plut. *Cic.* 5.2. For *Graecus* as a mildly opprobrious synonym for *philosophus* see Persius 5.189-91, 6.37-40.

Massiliotes, Delphians, Macedonians and Rhodians in the course of the fourth century and with many other Greek communities in the course of the third would hardly have put their whole trust in interpreters. L. Postumius Megellus (cos. 305, 294, 291),¹ Q. Fabius Pictor,² T. Quinctius Flaminius (cos. 198),³ M. Porcius Cato (cos. 195),⁴ L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182, 162),⁵ and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (cos. 177, 163)⁶ were surely not the only men reared in propertied families during the fourth and third centuries who acquired some knowledge of Greek.⁷ Those senators who wrote of their city's history in Greek during the second century would have been not only seeking to persuade Greek speakers in other communities of the purity of Roman motives and the sanity of Roman actions but also comforting themselves and men of their class. Polybius of Megalopolis certainly addressed his histories to Romans as well as to Greeks.⁸ By the early first century, to judge by the story of Q. Sertorius' attempt to raise up a Spanish *élite* on the Roman model,⁹ it was regular for senators to have made some study of Greek literature during childhood. The effects of this kind of education can be seen. The Roman officers who fell at Carrhae in 53 carried the pornographical writings of Aristeides in their baggage.¹⁰ C. Cassius Longinus (praet. 44) always spoke Greek when he wanted to show affection.¹¹ Lack of fluency in Greek even became a cause for comment.¹² Cicero might have felt that not all who laid claim to a knowledge of Greek in the

¹ Dionys. Hal. 19.5.1, Appian, *B. Samn.* 7.

² For Fabius' mission to Delphi in 216 see Liv. 22.57.5; for his senatorial status Polyb. 3.9.4; for his writing in Greek Dionys. Hal. 1.6.2 and the inscription published by G. Manganaro, *PP*, xxix (1974), 389 ff.

³ Plut. *Flam.* 5.7.

⁴ Plut. *Cat. mai.* 12.4. A distinction always has to be made between the language and 'Ελληνική παιδεία (2.4, 22.3, 23.3). Cic. *De orat.* 3.135 refers to the latter.

⁵ Liv. 45.8.8.

⁶ Cic. *Brut.* 79.

⁷ Livy (9.36.3) leaves it unclear when Greek literature replaced Etruscan literature in Roman education.

⁸ 6.11.3-8, 31.22.8.

⁹ Plut. *Sert.* 14.2.

¹⁰ Plut. *Crass.* 32.3-4.

¹¹ Plut. *Brut.* 40.2. For Greek as the language of lovers see also Lucret. 4.1160-69, Martial 10.68.5, Juven. 6.185-96.

¹² Plut. *Pomp.* 79.2 (on Pompey), Suet. *Aug.* 89.1 (on Octavian).

mid-forties did genuinely possess such knowledge¹ but there can be no doubt that there were many by that time both inside and outside the Senate who could catch the sense of a philosophical lecture.

It was one thing, however, to catch the sense of a lecture or discussion in the Greek language, quite another to relate the substance of what had been said to the situations of Roman private and public life and the moral dilemmas persons in those situations had to face. The latter, I suggest, would have been more difficult, especially for senators, in 30 B.C. than it had been in the late fourth century.

The language used by the philosopher was that of a now subject race. Indeed many members or apparent members of this race were owned by individual Romans as slaves. The leaders of those Greek communities which had been allowed a formal independence carried in the eyes of senators the burden of the political failures of their ancestors.² To the Roman of religious temper it seemed that the Gods of the Greeks had abandoned them.³ Whatever might happen in private, Latin was proudly maintained as the sole language of public administration in Rome and as the principal language of the state cult. The presiding magistrate compelled the philosophers who addressed the Senate on behalf of Athens in 155 to endure simultaneous translation of their words,⁴ not so much in order to allow all senators present to understand them as to impress upon the visitors the inferiority of the state they represented. Throughout the Republic foreigners normally addressed the Senate through interpreters.⁵ Apollonius of Alabanda (*ὁ Μόλων*) received a signal compliment when in 81, during Sulla's dictatorship,⁶ he was allowed to dispense with an interpreter. This incident should not be used as evidence either for the extent of knowledge of Greek among senators in the early first century or

¹ *Fin.* 1.10.

² Cf. *Cic. Flacc.* 16.

³ Cf. *Liv.* 27.16.8 (on Fabius and the Tarentines).

⁴ *Gell.* 6.14.9.

⁵ *Cic. Diu.* 2.131, *Fin.* 5.89. *Val. Max.* 2.2.3 suggests that things relaxed under the Empire. The traditionalist Tiberius, however, disapproved even of Greek words being used at Senate meetings (*Sueton. Tib.* 71).

⁶ *Cic. Brut.* 312, *Strab.* 14.652, *Val. Max.* 2.2.3.

for their normal attitude towards the use of Greek on formal state occasions. Roman magistrates abroad were expected to show a similarly jealous concern for Latin. When Cato used an interpreter at Athens in 191¹ and Paullus one at Amphipolis in 167² it was not because of their inability to speak Greek but in order to put those who heard them in what the Roman considered to be their place.³ Cicero ran into criticism for addressing the *βουλή* of Syracuse in Greek in 75⁴ and there would have been special reasons to cause Octavian to use Greek before an Alexandrian assembly in 30.⁵

The date of the origin of the myth linking Rome's origin with the Trojans who fled from Priam's city is a matter of great controversy but there can be no question but that in the course of the last three centuries of Republican history this myth progressively replaced those which linked the founders of Rome rather with the Greeks who sacked Troy.⁶ A consciousness of Roman uniqueness and ultimate superiority went with the myth. The Greek cities which had sent men to Troy and the cities founded by men barred from Greece after the fall of Troy were in the fullness of time to be subdued by Rome. T. Quinctius Flamininus was not abasing himself or paying any compliment to the Greeks formerly subject to Macedon when he had set up in the shrine of Delphic Apollo an inscription which claimed descent for himself from Aeneas and implied that he had liberated the descendants of Aeneas' enemies.⁷ Interestingly, the myth came to be related so as to make Aeneas' descendants give up the Trojan language and adopt the language of the area in which they settled, namely Latin.⁸

Latin speech, like the traditional Roman dress, the *toga* and the *calcei*, came to be a symbol of power and authority. For a Roman to speak in Greek corresponded with putting on the square-cut *ιμάτιον* and the soft white *φαικάσια*, with lowering

¹ Plut. *Cat. mai.* 12.5.

² Liv. 45.29.3-4.

³ See Val. Max. 2.2.2.

⁴ Cic. *Verr* 2.4.147.

⁵ See above, p. 325.

⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus had special reasons for resurrecting them (1.11).

⁷ Plut. *Flam.* 12.6.

⁸ Virg. *Aen.* 12.819 ff.

oneself to the social level of Greeks.¹ One can, of course, only guess at the feelings of the senators and sons of senators who listened to philosophers lecturing. Those who speak of a single Graeco-Roman or Classical culture shared by members of two linguistic groups cannot be proved wrong but I should repeat my point that cultivated Latin speakers in the time of the Republic were not a socially homogeneous group and urge that even in a Greek physical and social environment men so conscious of their success and power and so proud of their ancestral language, as we know senators were, could not have taken with full seriousness discourse on the nature of the gods, the state and international society which was cast in a language associated with failure and defeat. So much less could they have done so in Rome itself. Again, what might have been taken seriously for a moment could not retain its force for long among the rulers of such a society. It was as easy to shake off the words of a philosopher as it was to divest oneself of an *ιμάτιον*.²

VI

The young Roman of senatorial family who pursued philosophical studies had more than unsuitable scholastic environments with which to contend. Whatever may have been the attitude of those who erected the statue of Pythagoras at the end of the fourth century, from at least the early years of the second, if not before, persons with any say in the education of potential members of the senatorial order felt obliged to display in public a degree of positive hostility to philosophers.

In 181 the urban praetor Q. Petillius with the support of the Senate burnt in the vicinity of the statue of Pythagoras the alleged writings of Pythagoras' most distinguished Roman pupil.³ In 173 (or 154)⁴ and 161⁵ teachers of philosophy were

¹ For the Roman obsession with correct dress see the criticisms thrown at P. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 205) over his behaviour in Syracuse in 204 (Liv. 29.19.12); at C. Rabirius Postumus over his behaviour in Alexandria in 55 (Cic. *Rab. Post.* 26-27).

² See Appian's striking account of the behaviour of Mark Antony at Athens in the winter of 39-38 and the spring of 38: *B. Ciu.* 5.76 (cf. also Plut. *Ant.* 33.4, Dio Cass. 48.39).

³ Liv. 40.29.13-14.

⁴ Athen. 12.547a, Aelian, *VH* 9.12.

⁵ Sueton. *Gramm.* 25.1, Gell. 15.11.1.

expelled from the city. In 155 the heads of three of the Athenian corporations come to Rome as ambassadors had to return to Athens as soon as they had completed their official business.¹ Similar incidents occurred during the reigns of Augustus,² Nero,³ Vespasian⁴ and Domitian.⁵

The absence of such incidents from the record of the years 155 B.C.–28 B.C. could indicate only that teachers of philosophy during that period took care to make themselves inconspicuous. The feelings which M. Porcius Cato (cos. 195) exploited in 155, when he denounced to the Senate the lectures being given by the philosopher-ambassadors from Athens and the deleterious effect these lectures were likely to have on the city's youth,⁶ remained powerful for a long time afterwards. The public infatuation with philosophy of Cato's great-grandson M. Porcius Cato (praet. 54) was an embarrassment to this man's political allies and a source of joy to his enemies.⁷ In the speeches which he made between entering public life in 81 and attaining the consulship in 63 M. Tullius Cicero was careful to show no sign of the philosophical learning which he had acquired in youth and which he continued to cultivate.⁸ Nevertheless political enemies often ridiculed him for it.⁹ In later speeches he praised no one for an interest in philosophy but damned many.¹⁰ He explained points of doctrine with ostentatious modesty as if he himself knew only the outlines and as if his hearers would despise anyone who knew more.¹¹ He even went so far as to simplify and distort such points when it suited his purposes of

¹ Plin. *Nat.* 7.112, Plut. *Cat. mai.* 22.4–5. ² Hieron. *Chron.* Ol. 188.1

³ Tacit. *Ann.* 15.71, Dio Cass. 62.27.4, Hieron. *Cron.* Ol. 211.3.

⁴ Dio Cass. 65.13.2.

⁵ Plin. *Epist.* 3.11.2, Sueton. *Dom.* 10.3, Gell. 15.11.4–5, Dio Cass. 67.13.3, Philostratus, *VA* 8.1 ff., Hieron. *Cron.* Ol. 217.1, Ol. 218.3.

⁶ Plut. *Cat. mai.* 22.6–7.

⁷ Cic. *Mur.* 60–66, Plut. *Cat. min.* 57.2.

⁸ Cicero's talk at *Nat. deor.* 1.6 of *orationes . . . refertae philosophorum sententiis* is exaggerated to fit his general argument. He is more circumspect at *Off.* 1.155.

⁹ Plut. *Cic.* 5.2.

¹⁰ *Mur.* 60–66 (attacking the Stoic Cato in 63; cf. Plut. *Cat. min.* 21.5, Cic. 50.4–5), *Dom.* 47 (attacking Sex. Cloelius "dialecticus" in 57), *Vatin.* 14 (attacking the Pythagorean Vatinius in 56), *Pis.* 37, 68–71 (attacking the Epicurean Calpurnius Piso in 55; cf. *Sest.* 23, 47, *P. red. in sen.* 14).

¹¹ *Cael.* 40–41, *Pis.* 68–71, *Deiot.* 37. For pretended ignorance on other matters cf. *Verr.* 4.4, *Sest.* 48, *Dom.* 39, 121.

the moment.¹ Octavian would never have expressed pride in the friendship of a professional philosopher before an assembly in Rome as he did in Alexandria in 30.²

What survives of Republican imaginative literature is redolent of the same antipathy towards philosophy. *Satura* may be left to one side since it addressed a very confined sector of Latin speakers and was set in a Greek tradition which itself mocked the more abstruse elements of philosophy.³ The comic and tragic scripts written between 239 and the early years of the first century were performed at festivals open to all, even non-citizens. They were directly commissioned by the magistrates in charge of the festivals and may be held to reflect not only the mixture of enthusiasm for Attic poetry of the classical period and pride in local traditions of stage performance which motivated these magistrates but also their attitudes to such activities as the study of philosophy. Certainly the attitudes informing them differed from those to be found in the Attic works upon which their plots were based. Overtly philosophical statements tended to occur in the speeches of personages being held up to ridicule or condemnation. The professional teacher was usually referred to slightly in both comedy and tragedy, as a verbal trickster, a dealer in paradoxes, a dispenser of advice quite useless in real situations.⁴ The word *philosophus* always had had an opprobrious tone absent from its near synonym *sapiens*.⁵ Sex. Aelius Paetus (cos. 198) is said to have frequently quoted with approval from a tragedy by Ennius which contained among its personages a Greek military commander who deplored excessive devotion to philosophical study.⁶

The versification of Epicurus' work *περὶ φύσεως* by T. Lucretius Carus and the prose dialogues of Cicero belong, as I have said, to literature rather than to serious philosophy. What

¹ For an actual admission see *Fin.* 4.74.

² See above, p. 325.

³ See above, p. 344.

⁴ See H. D. Jocelyn, *Antichthon*, vii (1973), 25 ff. I shall deal with this at greater length elsewhere.

⁵ Contrast Plaut. *Stich.* 123-4 and *Pseud.* 971-4; in both cases it is a question of the semi-philosophical tag *γνώθι σεαυτόν*.

⁶ For the actual passage see Cic. *Tusc.* 2.1, Gell. 5.15.9, 5.16.5. For Aelius see Cic. *Rep.* 1.30 and cf. *De orat.* 2.156 (M. Antonius the speaker).

these works let slip of their authors' hopes and fears about reception is highly significant. Lucretius wrote with the apparent encouragement of Cicero¹ and addressed his poem formally to C. Memmius (praet. 58), a sophisticated senator, well read in Greek literature,² who had written Latin erotic verses in his youth³ and had taken the poet C. Valerius Catullus with him in his entourage when he went to govern a province.⁴ He represented Memmius as one who needed to be made interested in Epicurus' doctrines⁵ and was likely to think propagation of such doctrines damaging to the religious interests of the state.⁶ It so happens that we know Memmius to have been so contemptuous of the Epicurean corporation as to want to redevelop the site of its founder's house in the district of Melite.⁷ Cicero dedicated most of his dialogues to the rising young man of state, M. Iunius Brutus (praet. 44),⁸ employed men of state as his personages, and put in their mouths the kind of oratorical Latin which they affected on state occasions.⁹ The prefaces to the dialogues openly state what the texts of the public speeches tacitly assume. Some of Cicero's peers were ignorant of or uninterested in philosophy.¹⁰ Many, however, were positively hostile¹¹ or convinced that the degree of interest which writing a dialogue displayed was excessive and beneath the dignity of a senator.¹² Cicero himself could not maintain a consistent attitude of private interest and public hostility. The number of apologies he made for spending his time in the composition of dialogues¹³ and the distancing comments he felt obliged to make about the learning of Q. Aelius Tubero¹⁴ and the deceased younger Cato¹⁵ show the effects which the social atmosphere had on his inner spirit.

The hostility to philosophy which affected so many Republican

¹ Cic. *Q. fr.* 2.9.3, Hieron. *Ol.* 171.3.

² Cic. *Brut.* 247.

³ Ov. *Trist.* 2.433, Plin. *Epist.* 5.3.5.

⁴ Catull. 10, 28.

⁵ *l.* 50-53, 935-50.

⁶ *l.* 80-82.

⁷ Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.

⁸ The *Academica* were dedicated to M. Terentius Varro (praet. 69), the *Cato maior* and the *Laelius* to his publisher T. Pomponius (Atticus). The *De officiis* took the form of an address to his son, whom he expected to endeavour to maintain the nobility he had won for the family.

⁹ See above, pp. 353-4.

¹⁰ *Nat. deor.* 1.8.

¹¹ *Fin.* 1.1, *Off.* 2.2.

¹² *Fin.* 1.1. Cf. *Ac.* 2.5.

¹³ *Ac.* 1.11, *Fin.* 1.10-12, *Tusc.* 2.1, *Diu.* 2.4-8.

¹⁴ *Ap. Gell.* 1.22.7.

¹⁵ *Parad.* 1.

senators did not die with the Republic. The expulsions of teachers operated by Augustus and his successors were not eccentric displays of administrative archaism. The seriousness with which L. Annaeus Seneca (cos. A.D. 55 or 56) took the Stoic Sotio of Alexandria's vegetarian precepts bothered his father greatly.¹ Mothers discouraged the philosophical interests of Nero² and Cn. Iulius Agricola (cos. 77).³ The extreme and long-lasting enthusiasm of Marcus Aurelius was a worry to his mother,⁴ to M. Cornelius Fronto (cos. 143),⁵ and doubtless to most of the imperial court. The family of Alexander Severus succeeded in heading off the interest this future emperor showed.⁶ Chroniclers of Imperial affairs like Cornelius Tacitus (cos. 97) and the Romanized Greek Cassius Dio Cocceianus (cos. before 211 and again in 229) lost no opportunity of damning the philosophers they found associated in the record with men of state.⁷ Petronius would have expected his readers to find in the epitaph his imaginary municipal freedman, C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus, wrote for himself— . . . *nec umquam philosophum audiuit*⁸—an inept affectation rather than a conscious defiance of the attitudes of high Imperial society.

The causes of the antipathy to teachers of philosophy which can be detected in senatorial circles are not hard to seek.

The failure of the son of a senator to enter the Senate disgraced his family and if it seemed in anywise conscious or deliberate worried other families concerned for the solidarity of the senatorial class. Between the ages of 16 and 25 such a man was expected to prepare himself for and to show himself suited to the life of a senator. He was likely to receive even fewer opportunities than later of opting out of traditional activities. To take up the study of philosophy was an opting out, however momentary. The memory remained green of a time when no distractions of an intellectual kind existed,⁹ when a man's

¹ Sen. *Epist.* 108.22.

² Sueton. *Ner.* 52.

³ Tacit. *Agr.* 4.4.

⁴ Capitol. SHA *Aur.* 2.6.

⁵ P. 138. 13 ff. (ed. Van den Hout).

⁶ Lampr. SHA *Alex.* 14.5.

⁷ Tacit. *Ann.* 13.42.4, *Hist.* 3.81.1, 4.5; Dio Cass. 52.36.4.

⁸ Petron. 71.12.

⁹ Plut. *Marcell.* 1.2-3, *Flam.* 1.3. In the time of Polybius a man had to fight ten campaigns before he could stand for election to a magistracy (6.19.4).

father, perhaps his paternal grandfather, certainly his father's elder male relatives and friends,¹ and the city's elected magistrates supervised his religious, military, legal and political training.

A group of philosophers operating independently in the Athenian way was likely to look to senatorial *patresfamiliae* and particularly to the magistrates like the groups which foreign immigrants formed to practise the cults they brought with them to Rome. The quasi-religious rituals with which some philosophical groups sought to pattern their social life² increased the possibility of their incurring the deep suspicions that attached to all non-Roman cults.³

Hospitality offered to an individual philosopher or a man reputed to have philosophical interests was likely to make a senatorial family suspect to its neighbours. A senator might take, indeed he was expected to take, advice from his peers but if he took such advice from a foreigner he would seem a potential imitator of those products of the Athenian corporations who refused to share power and prestige with their peers and became tyrants.⁴ It made no difference that in fact most products of the corporations were staunch upholders of aristocratic constitutions. For a senator to go further and to put his children in the care of a philosopher was to remind his peers of the kings of the East and perhaps to incur even worse odium.⁵

The fact that philosophers gave their instruction in the Greek language not only made this instruction hard for pupils of senatorial family to accept emotionally.⁶ It brought upon their heads all the suspicions which were felt concerning the morals of Greek-speakers generally. By the middle of the second century Greek-speakers were not just a subject race but,

¹ See Cic. *Cael.* 9, 39, *Lael.* 1, *Leg.* 1.13, *Phil.* 2.3.

² See above, p. 346.

³ The burning of the books of Numa took place only five years after the suppression of the Bacchanal groups (*Liv.* 39.8 ff.). For the direct linking of philosophical groups with *superstitio peregrina* see Cic. *Vatin.* 14, *Sen. Epist.* 108.22, *Dio Cass.* 52.36.

⁴ Demochares made capital out of such considerations in his speech opposing the repeal of the Sophoclean law in 306 (*Athen.* 11.508f-9b).

⁵ For the Roman attitude to kings see *Polyb.* 30.19.12-13.

⁶ See above, p. 356.

in the common view, a well of vice and corruption.¹ The comedians applied the verb *pergraecari* to excessive eating and drinking among the well-off young Athenians who figured in their plots² and thereby exploited if not the common language then at least a common attitude. If Polybius thought most Greeks were dishonest,³ his Roman readers were even more convinced they were. Cicero's grandfather believed he could estimate a man's wickedness from the level of his skill at speaking Greek.⁴ A measure of the power of the common stereotype is the way in which Cicero himself, despite an upbringing unorthodox in its openness to the higher Greek culture, seems genuinely to have believed in the immoralities the stereotype attributed to contemporary Greek-speakers.⁵ The philosopher only had to open his mouth to conjure up prejudice. Indeed the two words which he used most often of the activity of himself and his pupils, *σχολή* and *διατριβή*, could only be translated directly into Latin by words and phrases indicative of idleness and time-wasting.

The authority which the head of a group of philosophers or even an individual teacher claimed⁶ could not but seem menacing to *patresfamiliae* of conventional stamp. Many of the metaphors and images which a philosopher might use in talking of himself, his pupils and their activity were such as to increase the alarm his person caused. If he assimilated his standing *vis-à-vis* his pupils to that of an actual *paterfamilias*⁷ he perhaps merely gave offence. If he assimilated it to that of the priestly manager of a

¹ See Liv. 39.6.7-9 on the vice allegedly brought back from the Greek-speaking areas of Asia by Cn. Manlius Vulso in 187; Polyb. 31.25.4 on what was brought back from Greece itself by L. Aemilius Paullus in 168.

² Plaut. *Bacch.* 813, *et al.* Cf. Paul. Fest. p. 235 *pergraecari est epulis et potationibus inseruire.*

³ 6.56.13; cf. 18.34.7.

⁴ Cic. *De orat.* 2.265.

⁵ *Q. fr.* 1.1.18-20, *Att.* 6.1.15. Such remarks meant for private ears are more significant than the appeals to public prejudice made in the speech for L. Flaccus (16-19, 24, 90).

⁶ See above, p. 346.

⁷ I cannot find an exact parallel in Greek writing for Lucret. 3.9-10 *tu* (sc. "Epicure") *pater es . . . tu patria nobis suppeditas*, Cic. *Brut.* 306 *totum ei* (sc. "Philoni") *me tradidi*, M. Cic. fil. ap. Cic. *Fam.* 16.21.3 *Cratippo me scito non ut discipulum sed ut filium esse coniunctissimum*, Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.126-7 *pater . . . Chrysippus*, Persius 5.36 *me tibi* (sc. "Cornuto") *supposui* but doubtless there are some.

mystery cult¹ he surely excited religious unease. The likening of philosophical curiosity to a kind of ἔρως² was a frequent cause of scandalous story-telling even in Greek communities.³ It was bound to rouse very deep and very potent sexual fears in literal-minded Romans.⁴

The antipathy to philosophers which prevailed in senatorial circles, an antipathy caused not so much by any particular doctrine as by the role which they seemed to demand in guiding their pupils' lives, was not easy for individuals to combat. A Roman retained in law total power over his children as long as he lived.⁵ The higher he stood socially the more firmly he was expected to maintain this power. He could not abdicate it at 60 as the head of an Athenian household could a much less all-embracing power.⁶ What anyone within his power did and spent he was responsible for in the eyes of his peers and philosophy was an activity which required economic backing both generous and unconcealable. When a legitimate son took a wife, which he was expected to do around the age of 25,⁷ he brought into the family group a father-in-law and other males more likely than not to hold conventional attitudes. Quinquennially appointed *censores* regarded the maintenance of conventional morality as one of their duties⁸ and could enquire into the way a senator occupied his time or permitted his sons to occupy theirs. To study philosophy thus required a struggle with a society well equipped to suppress non-conformity.

¹ Aristoph. *Nub.* 140, 250 ff., 824, Plat. *Symp.* 209e, *Euth.* 277d, Timocrates ap. Diog. Laert. 10.6, Plut. *Alex.* 7.3, *Mor.* 382d. ² Plat. *Symp.* 211b.

³ See Diog. Laert. 2.23, 2.49, 3.29 ff., 4.19, 4.21, 4.29, 4.40, 5.3, 5.39 for the stories retailed by a certain Aristippus; Lucil. frs. 755-6 for Roman knowledge of these stories.

⁴ For the attitude of the *paterfamilias* to sodomy where his legitimate children were concerned see Val. Max. 6.1.5 (on Q. Fabius Maximus Seruilianus [cos. 142]); for the attitude of the military commander where his troops were concerned Polyb. 6.37.9.

⁵ Gaius, *Inst.* 1.55. See Dionys. Hal. 2.26.1 ff. for the impression made on a Greek by this feature of Roman society.

⁶ Plat. *Lys.* 209c.

⁷ For the evidence see P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.-A.D. 14* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 136-40.

⁸ See Plut. *Cat. mai.* 19.3 for the inscription on the statue of M. Porcius Cato, *ensor* in 184.

CONCLUSION

Consideration of the actual record makes one thing quite clear. Plutarch's assertion¹ that at the height of her material power Rome had possession of all forms of Greek learning could not apply to the last years of the Republic. Plutarch was perhaps unconsciously flattering senatorial friends of the time of Trajan, men like L. Mestrius Florus and Q. Sosius Senecio, the dedicatee of the *Parallel Lives*, and providing reasons why his Greek readers should, like himself, collaborate with the Roman rulers of Greece.² An earlier and more intelligent but no less philo-Roman observer, the Stoic philosopher Poseidonius of Apameia, was struck by the readiness with which the Romans adopted novelties from neighbouring peoples. He did not include the study of philosophy among these novelties.³

The answer to the question of what effect the teachings of philosophers had on those few senators and their sons who heard them is not so clear. It is, however, hardly to be believed that an activity carried on by a tiny minority of the ruling class in restricting physical and social conditions, in a foreign language and in an atmosphere of general antipathy could have had much effect on the behaviour of this minority when it participated in the governing of the state. Poseidonius praised the simple unluxurious life led by the eccentrics Q. Mucius Scaeuola ("augur" cos. 117), Q. Aelius Tubero and P. Rutilius Rufus (cos. 105), all pupils in one sense or another of his own teacher Panaetius, but he attributed their frugality to the lingering influence of older Roman customs as much as to the power of Stoic doctrine.⁴ Rome never became a Greek city. Some Greek immigrants helped to change its ways and to soften the temper of its governors but to this process—compared, for example, with the architect, the sculptor, the painter, the pastry-cook or the gentleman's companion—the philosopher contributed little.

¹ See above, p. 326.

² Cf. *Mor.* 776a-9b, 814c-d.

³ See *Athen.* 6.273d-f.

⁴ See *Athen.* 6.274a-e. What Diodorus says of P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio (cos. 111) at 34/35.33.8 may come from Poseidonius.