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HADRIAN AND GREEK SENATORS

Two small conjoining pieces of bronze were found in 1986 at Bad Wimpfen in Baden-Württemberg, a former military vicus, later chief town of the Upper German civitas Alisinensium. They belonged to a military diploma for a veteran of cohors II Hispanorum; and the consular date is preserved, P. Sufenate [ ] / Ti. Claudio Attico [ ]. This pair had already occurred, it turned out, on another diploma fragment, from Norican Faviana (Mautern in Austria; CIL XVI 174), issued under Hadrian no earlier than 128 (he is p(ater) p(atriae): [ ] Vero Ti. Claudio [ ]). A conflated text produces P. Sufenate Vero Ti. Claudio Attico [Herode cos.]; [Herode] can be restored because the spacing on the Wimpfen diploma shows that a further cognomen for the second consul must have been engraved below [Vero]. This Ti. Claudius Atticus, there can be no doubt, was the father of the sophist Herodes Atticus. His colleague, P. Sufenas Verus, was one of the legates of Lycia-Pamphylia named in the Opramoas dossier; this, newly combined with other documents, establishes that Sufenas’ governorship began in 129 and ended in 132. He was probably consul at the end of his term. This is confirmed by M. M. Roxan’s analysis: she puts the diploma ‘c. a. 131–133’.4

Not much more needs saying here about Sufenas Verus5. The minor sensation is the date for the elder Atticus’ consulship, which had been universally assigned to the reign of Trajan. Other considerations aside, he was identified with the governor (ὑπαρχαίος, sc. of Judaea) Atticus, who, according to Eusebius (HE 3.32.3–6, citing Hesegippus), in the reign of Trajan tortured and crucified the 120-year-old Symeon or Simon son of Clopas, a kinsman of Jesus.6 To be sure, Philostratus (V.

---

1 This article is a suitably adjusted version of the Ronald Syme lecture delivered at Wolfson College, Oxford on 7 November 1996. References to his many publications are, not surprisingly, numerous. His note of caution here cited applies to the case here offered – it is ‘subject to hazard’. The present paper is closely related to a biography of Hadrian, completed in autumn 1996, to appear in September 1997. Géza Alföldy and Werner Eck were good enough to read an early draft and offer comments. The latter also read a first version of the biography; and he drew to my attention the new inscription from Larinum (which resulted in a great expansion of App. 1, below). Antony Spawforth and Malcolm Errington kindly gave advice on particular points, in answer to my questions. Responsibility for what follows remains with the author.

2 M. Pietsch, ‘Ein neues Militärdiplomfragment aus Bad Wimpfen’, Fundberichte aus Baden-Württemberg 15 (1990) 247–263, acknowledging ample advice from G. Alföldy; the text is reproduced as AE 1990. 763 (cf. 1991.1286); and by Roxan, RMD III no. 159, with discussion, pp. 278ff. Syme (apprised by G. Alföldy) registered the new date, RP VI 352 n. 29, but did not discuss the implications.


5 For the rare name, W. Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen (Berlin 1904) esp. 239, 530, presumably an ethnic (cf. Trebula Sufenas); also found as a cognomen (of the senatorial Nonii), but not listed in Kajanto 1965. Note M. Sufenas M.f. Proculus, an Augustan equestrian officer, AE 1960.266; P. Sufenas P.f. Pal. Myro, eq.R., ILS 6188a–c; P. Sufenas T.f, Ivir of Hispellum, AE 1978.829; Rémy 1989, 301.

6 In the Chronicle (vers. Arm.) Eusebius places the martyrdom between the tenth and eleventh years of Trajan, i.e. 106/7 or 107/8; the Chronicon Paschale, p. 471 Bonn, summarising Eusebius-Hesegippus, gives the year 105. Cf., for the identification of the persecutor with the sophist’s father, E. Klebs, PIR1 C 654; E. Groag, RE 3.2 (1899) 2677 and PIR2 A 1338 (not, however, A. Stein, PIR2 C 801); E.M. Smallwood, JRS 52 (1962) 131–3, who proposed 104 for the consulship;
soph. 2.1.1) implies that the sophist’s father was twice consul. But that his tenure of the *fasces* with Sufenas Verus was his second can be ruled out. Not necessarily because of the standard doctrine that there were no *consules suffecti iterum* after the year 103. This remains an *argumentum ex silentio*.7 There is another consideration: a *cos.* II could hardly take second place in a consular pair to a *cos.* I. Both diplomas have Sufenas as *consul prior*.8 Thus it must be concluded that the elder Atticus was consul suffect only a dozen years, or less, before his son became *ordinarius* (143). Atticus had been granted *ornamenta praetoria*; he was later presumably *adlectus inter praetorios*.9 These *ornamenta* – ex *s.c.* – may have come under Trajan; but the notion that his adlection was also conferred by Trajan – let alone by Nerva – now becomes doubtful.

The excavator of the Wimpfen diploma – relying on the advice of G. Alföldy – properly remarks that the elder Atticus was hitherto regarded as ‘der erste Konsul nicht nur aus Athen, sondern aus Griechenland überhaupt’. He seems to imply that this is no longer the case.10 This remains to be seen. One must at any rate eliminate other candidates as the earliest Athenian or ‘Achaian’ consul: C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus (*suff.* 109), from the former royal house of Commagene, and L. Statius Aquila (*suff.* 116), Athenians only by adoption; or, for that matter, P. Aelius Hadrianus (*suff.* 108), and, later, L. Flavius Arrianus (*suff.* c. 129), not to mention earlier archons – and thus honorary Athenians – from the highest levels at Rome, the emperor Domitian and Q. Vibius Crispus.11 The sophist’s father may still have been the first consul from Athens, and from old Greece, even if it was, after all, not Trajan who adlected him into the senate, but Hadrian. He may very well also have been the first senator from Greece. But for this distinction there is, at first sight, another candidate, the Spartan C. Julius Euryycles Herc(u)lanus L. Vibullius Pius.

The entry into the senate of Euryycles Herculanus, as quaestor, not by adlection, was for a long time generally dated to the reign of Hadrian. In the Realencyclopädie E. Groag introduces him as ‘hochadeliger Spartaner und römischer Senator der traianisch-hadrianischen Zeit’, concluding that Hadrian rather than Trajan made him a senator. Not merely because of Hadrian’s philhellenism: Herculanus was still alive in late 130 (he survived Antinous, who perished in October of that year), apparently without having become consul. Hence, Groag argued, his senatorial rank could hardly go back much earlier (although he admitted that the *cursus*-inscription – not dated – did not necessarily reproduce his entire career as a Roman senator). Groag also noted that Herculanus was legate to a proconsul in a western province, an appointment more likely under Hadrian than before. He stuck to this dating in his monograph of 1939. Likewise L. Petersen, in the second edition of PIR (1966) commented: ‘Primus Graecorum ut videtur ab Hadriano in senatum acceptus est.’ Yet she put his probable date of birth c. 70 – which would have made him a very elderly quaestor, aged at least 48, if he served under Hadrian, twice the normal age of entry. This seems hard to swallow. More recently, H. Halfmann pronounced that ‘die Laufbahn ist sicher in die trajanische Zeit zu datieren, da [Herculanus] auf keinen Fall viel jünger gewesen sein kann als Q. Pompeius Falco (*cos. suff.* 108), der auch den Namen von [Herculanus] in seiner Nomenklatur führte’. Meanwhile, A. J. S. Spawforth, offering new readings of


7 See further App. 1, below.
8 Pietsch, op.cit. (n. 2) 258. This problem is evidently overlooked by A.J.S.Spawforth, Oxford Classical Dictionary (1996) 338: ‘[Atticus] held a first (suffect) consulship under Trajan and governed Judaea in AD 107. A military diploma . . . dates his second (suffect) consulship (cf. Philostr. VS 546 [= 2.1.1]) to 128–38; this honour – rare for a *novus homo* – he must have owed to the favour of Hadrian, a great lover of Athens.’ See further App. 1, below.
9 AE 1919,8 = Smallwood no. 198 = Ameling 1983, II no. 34, Corinth; cf. AE 1977,774 = Ameling II no. 35, ibid. (heavily restored); cf. id. I 22f. See further App. 1, below.
10 Pietsch, op.cit. (n. 2) 258.
posthumous inscriptions in honour of Herculanus, showed that the Spartan magnate’s female ‘cousin’, ἀνευστά, was none other than Julia Balbilla, sister of Philopappus, best known for her poems on the Colossus of Memnon. Spawforth did not comment directly on the date when Herculanus became a senator. He put his date of birth c. 73, and took ἀνευστά to mean ‘first cousin’.12

Halfmann’s argument is not decisive. Even if Falco, consul suffect 10813, was quite old (although probably not yet 70) at the time of Herculanus’ death, viz. c. 136 or 137, as Spawforth usefully established, he was still alive in 140. He was visited on his country estate in that year by Antoninus Pius and Aurelius Caesar; the latter was impressed by an unusual tree there.14 In other words, Falco was simply still around to inherit something from this wealthy Spartan — including Herculanus’ names (omitting praenomina), which were duly passed on, to be swapped, however, by over thirty more, in the nomenclature of Falco’s grandson.15 One can only guess why Herculanus made Falco one of his heirs, with the condicio nominis ferendi: gratitude for some remembered service from Falco’s late father-in-law Sosius Senecio is plausible enough. In any case, the Euryclid line seems to have ended with Herculanus: he presumably wanted the names to be perpetuated at the highest level, which in his person the Euryclids had finally attained.16

As for Herculanus’ ἀνευστά Balbilla, she can easily have been much older than him. There is no need to suppose that the word has to mean first cousin. To quote a contemporary example, ἀνευστός in the inscription of C. Julius Severus (suff. c. 138) covers a remoter degree of kinship: no one could argue that this Galatian magnate was first cousin to all four distinguished consulars there listed (perhaps not to any of them: he may well only have been e.g. second cousin, first cousin once or twice removed, or some other sort of relative).17 That Balbilla was related to Herculanus is not sufficient ground to put his birth back to the early 70s.

There are, to be sure, some awkward problems in the stemma of the Euryclids: how many generations between the Augustan dynast of Sparta and the senator Eurycles Herculanus? One further consideration may be registered here: Herculanus was apparently not patronomos, eponymous magistrate, of Sparta, until about the end of the second decade of the second century, shortly before 120. There is no information about a minimum age for this post. But it is hard to believe that a Euryclid would have avoided holding the patronomate until he was nearer fifty than forty. The post had a

12 IG V 1, 1172 = Smallwood 210, Gytheum, gives his senatorial career (text below, App. 2). Cf. Groag, RE 10.1 (1917), Iulius no. 221, 580–5; id. 1939, 117f.; PIR² I 302; also Alföldy 1969, 176f. (not discussing date of birth), all for Hadrianic entry to senate; for Trajanic date, Crimes 1949, 189 n. 3; Halfmann 1979, 125ff.; A.J.S. Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 249–60; cf. id., in Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 110ff. – entry to senate ‘probably through the sponsorship of Trajan’. See further App. 2, below.

13 FO2 47, heavily restored, but generally accepted. On his career, A.R. Birley 1981, 95ff.

14 Fronto, Ad M. Caes. 2.9, p. 29 v.d.Hout, the letter, addressed amplissimo consuli magistro suo, can now be dated to July or August 142; for Fronto, it turns out, consul in those months in 142, not 143, W. Eck & M.M. Roxan, in Festschr. Lieb 1995, 79ff.; thus the visit anno abhinc tertio can be assigned to 140. (Syme, RP II 495, is worth quoting: ‘[Falco’s] later years were given over to experiments in arboriculture: he went in for grafting, an operation that should not have proved arduous or uncongenial to a Roman senator of consular standing.’)

15 The grandson (ord. 169) – who included the praenomina: ILS 1104. Falco’s own full names are known only from ILS 1035 = Smallwood 231, Tarracina: Q. Roscio Sex. f. Quir. Coelio Murenae Silio Deciano Vibull(i)io Pio Iulio Eurycli Herciano, set up after his proconsulship of Asia (123–4) but not otherwise dated. The Euryclid items, from Vibullius to Herculanus, do not appear earlier (as sometimes mistakenly assumed, e.g. Syme 1980, 49 n. 30: ‘The additional items emerge in 116’), even in an inscription from his proconsulship, IEph 713. Salomies 1992, 121ff., discusses his nomenclature and origin (cf. below, n. 35). Herculanus’ death: Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 251f.

16 On ‘testamentary adoption’ or the condicio nominis ferendi, very different from a real adoption, Syme, RP IV 159ff.; Salomies 1992, esp. 15ff. Failure to observe the difference misled Chrimes 1949, 189 n. 3 and, evidently, Halfmann 1979, 126. For Falco’s wife Sosia Polla, ILS 1037, 8820; IGR IV 780; Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, no. 723. On Senecio, below, and n. 35.

liturgical character, lavish expenditure was unquestionably expected and the Euryclids were extremely rich.\(^\text{18}\)

All in all, the new evidence about the elder Atticus suggests, \textit{a fortiori}, that he and Herculanus acquired senatorial status at about the same time – viz. early in the reign of Hadrian – although just when and with what rank Atticus became a senator requires further thought. At any rate, if Herculanus did acquire senatorial rank from Hadrian, he must be assumed to have been from the next generation to Atticus: not many years older than the future sophist Herodes – and not a first cousin, but a first cousin once removed, of Julia Balbilla (or even more remotely related).

If the two grandees from old Greece did not become senators until the reign of Hadrian, one would like to know why. At least the elder Atticus was old enough and rich enough to have gained this status under Trajan who, it does not need to be emphasised, greatly boosted Greeks of various sorts.\(^\text{19}\) The entry into the senate of men from the east went back a long way, the trail-blazer being Q. Pompeius Macer, praetor in 15, grandson of Pompey’s friend and historian Theophras of Mytilene. Descendants of colonists followed. L. Sergius Paulus from Antioch-towards-Pisidia may even have become suffect consul as early as 70, if so the first from the east. Otherwise one is left with T. Junius Montanus from Alexandria Troas, in 81. Under Domitian the great leap forward began. The earliest ‘genuine Greek’ – i.e. not of Italian ancestry – to become consul, Ti. Julius Candidus Marius Celsus, from somewhere in western Asia, was suffect in 86 – and, as \textit{cos.} II in 105, the first, or equal first, Greek \textit{ordinarius}. Candidus was, though, so many think, half-Narbonensian (inferred from the names Marius Celsus). He was soon followed by Ti. Julius Celsus Polemaeanus from Sardes (\textit{suff.} 92) and C. Antius A. Julius Quadratus from Pergamum (\textit{suff.} 94), the latter, colleague of Candidus as \textit{II ord.} 105, being from a nexus also linked to various royal houses of Asia Minor and beyond.\(^\text{20}\)

Perhaps Claudius Atticus had been too proud to solicit senatorial rank; he might even have been offered it by Trajan and declined. \(^\text{21}\) It might be, also, that he was not good enough at Latin, and was not prepared to be laughed at in the \textit{curia}. One will note that he sent his son, the future sophist, to be brought up in the house of Calvisius Tullus Ruso (the grandfather of M. Aurelius), surely to learn the language.\(^\text{22}\)

II

The subject being ‘Hadrian and Greek senators’, one need not dwell on Trajan and previous emperors. But it is worth pausing to reflect on Hadrian’s own contacts before his accession. As far as is known, his first direct acquaintance with the Greek world was when he went to Athens as a consular and became \textit{archon}, in 111 or 112.\(^\text{23}\) His devotion to \textit{studia Graeca} had won him the (surely unfriendly) nickname \textit{graeculus} in his youth.\(^\text{24}\) Of course, Flavian and especially Domitianic Rome was very hellenised, and

\(^{18}\) App.2, below.

\(^{19}\) Syme stressed Trajan’s role in various places, e.g. RP II 579; IV 14f., 44f., 69; V 553f.; VI 22 (originally 1937), 107f.; id. 1958, 510f.; 1980, 92, 118. Halfmann 1979, 75ff. has a useful brief summary.


\(^{21}\) Syme, RP V 562: ‘Many of the eastern notables were reluctant to exchange personal and local primacy for a seat in the Senate, for tedious or trivial business and a sequence of minor occupations at Rome or in the provinces, even in prospect of the consulate.’ On the careers of the two Attici, App. 1, below.

\(^{22}\) M. Aurelius, ap. Fronto, Ad M. Caes. 3.2.1, p. 36 van den Hout; Ameling 1983, I 37.

\(^{23}\) The date, 112, is supplied by Hadrian’s freedman Phlegon, FGrH 257, fr. 36, XXV.

there is no need to suppose he had to go elsewhere to acquire this passion. Still, when so much is
unknown, it would be rash to say that he could not have been east of Italy in his early years. His father
Hadrianus Afer lived to the age of 39 or 40, and should have held a number of offices after the
praetorship (all that is directly attested). It is at least legitimate to guess that Afer could have been legate
to a proconsul, or himself proconsul, of a Greek province – taking his wife and children with him –
before his death at latest in early 86. A reasonable possibility, for example, is that he was a legate of
his first cousin, M. Ulpius Traianus, when the latter was proconsul of Asia in 79–80. He could even
have become proconsul of Achaia c. 81. As it happens, two out of Traianus’ three legates in Asia seem
to be known: T. Pomponius Bassus (suff. 94) – and A. Julius Quadratus.

Quadratus, a friend of Traianus’ son the emperor, was on two occasions well placed to exercise
influence on behalf of Trajan’s ward Hadrian. First, Hadrian was prefect of Rome during the feriae
Latinae, probably in 94. This appointment was in the gift of the consuls – and the pair in office at the
appropriate time that year was: M. Lollius Paullinus D. Valerius Asiaticus Saturninus and C. Antius A.
Julius Quadratus. Second, Hadrian acquired two priesthoods: VIIvir epulonum and sodalis Augustalis,
at latest by the time his inscription was set up at Athens, i.e. c. 110. The election as VIIvir has been
assumed to go with, or follow, his consulship in 108. There is no necessity nor plausible. The
priesthoods are doubtless mentioned out of chronological order, as so often, on the Athens statue-base.

Why not suppose that he became VIIvir at the time he entered the senate as quaestor in 100 or 101 – he
was, after all, very well connected? There were then two vacancies in the college of VIIvir: the
delinquent proconsul Marius Priscus had just been expelled, and L. Vibius Sabinus – whose daughter
Hadrian had just married – had died. Pliny applied to Trajan for one of the vacant priesthoods (the
augurs also needed a new member); he had to wait. One may speculate that Julius Quadratus, himself a
VIIvir, successfully nominated Hadrian, grand-nephew of his old friend Traianus.

During the Dacian wars, if not before, Hadrian had the opportunity for close acquaintance with two
of those described by the Historia Augusta as his friends expeditionis Parthicae tempore: Sosius
Senecio and Claudius Livianus. Senecio, philhellene, friend of Trajan, of Pliny and of Plutarch,
remains an enigma in one respect: his origin is unknown. For what it is worth, his father-in-law Julius
Frontinus was (surely) Narbonensian, his son-in-law Pompeius Falco, about whose extraction there has
also been debate, turns out to come from Sicily – it is, however, another matter to label Falco a
‘Greek’. Livianus, the Guard Prefect, was from Lycian Sidyma, which must count as Hellenic.

25 Cf. Syme, RP VII 619: ‘Rome was the intellectual centre of the Greek world, the goal of ambitions, the resort
talkers and thinkers. No journey to centres of Hellas explains the ardent proclivities of the young Hadrian.’
26 Afer died when Hadrian was in his tenth year, i.e. between 26.1.85 and 25.1.86, HA Had. 1.4, cf. 1.1. He reached the
age of 39 or 40 according to the letter of Hadrian to Antoninus, PFayum 19 = Smallwood 123. He had been praetor (Dio
69.3.1), presumably at 29 or 30, i.e. c. 73/5.
28 This is guaranteed by IGR IV 336 = Smallwood 456, his temple to Jupiter amicalis at Pergamum. Trajan calls him
[al]mico clarissimo viro (not quite the same as amicus clarissimus, as Halfmann 1979, 48, 114). Syme repeatedly referred to
Quadratus as a close friend of Trajan: 1958, 510; RP II 578, 637; III 1304, 1391, 1436; IV 13, 205, 315, 409; V 553, 559,
617, 679; VII 633; 1980, 76, 92.
29 The prefecture (not in HA Had.) is given by ILS 308 = Smallwood 109. On these feriae, RE 6.2 (1909) 2213–6. Lollius:
PIR2 L 320. Quadratus: I 507. The conjecture is owed to Syme, RP IV 310.
31 Cf. Syme, RP VI 421ff. for ‘a dozen early priesthoods’.
34 HA Had. 4.2.
Hadrian was archon at Athens in 112, so his freedman Phlegon recorded – probably 112–113 rather than 111–112. There seems no good reason to doubt that he held the office in person and that he took the opportunity to inspect other parts of Greece as well as Athens. This cannot be proved – or disproved – perhaps; but his presence in Achaia would explain, for example, the erection of a statue in his honour, before he was emperor, at Coronea. It is also plausible that on his way to Athens he stayed at Nicopolis, sitting at the feet of Epictetus. According to the HA, in summa familiaritate Epictetum et Heliodorum philosophos . . . habuit. When could he otherwise have made the acquaintance of the aged Stoic? This encourages the attempt to detect possible allusions in Arrian’s Discourses. For Arrian himself was surely at Nicopolis at this period. Epictetus’ remarks to the corrector Maximus and to the unnamed procurator-governor of Epirus, thought to be Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, are often quoted. A passing reference might give a clue to where Hadrian’s lodgings. Epictetus evidently held forth from time to time ‘at the house of Quadratus’. The name is not particularly uncommon, it is true. All the same, the owner could have been A. Julius Quadratus – who could also, perhaps, have attended some sessions at Nicopolis. One may at least draw attention to Epictetus’ cutting comment about bis consules: ‘if some man who has been consul twice hears this [sc. that no bad man can be truly free], he will agree with you if you add – “but you are a wise man, this does not apply to you”’. Two passages could have been directed at Hadrian himself. To be a son of God or a citizen of the universe was what counted, said the sage. ‘Shall kinship with Caesar or with any other powerful persons at Rome be enough to enable men to live in security?’ Who else but Hadrian could claim kinship with the emperor at this time? Even closer is another remark. No one could think ill of himself if he regarded himself as begotten of God. ‘But – if Caesar adopts you, no one will be able to endure your conceit.’ Irrespective of the story in the HA that Hadrian had learned when consul in 108 that he would be adopted by Trajan, something which (if true) may not have been common knowledge, many must have looked on him as the heir apparent.

Sentiments in another discourse could also have made an impact on Hadrian. Expatiating on providence and the gifts of nature, Epictetus had occasion to mention facial hair. At first sight, ‘can there be anything more useless than the hairs on a chin?’ But the beard is nature’s way of distinguishing men and women – ‘we should preserve the signs that God has given; we should not throw them away

---

37 PIR² C 913: polyonymous (Ti. Iulius Aquilinus Castricius Saturninus) Claudius Livianus. His presumed father or grandfather dedicated to Claudius at Sidyma, IGR III 579, cf. 578; Syme, RP III 1300ff. Livianus had at least one thing in common with Hadrian, appreciation of male beauty. He was the owner of the twin slave boys Hierus and Asylus, praised by Martial 9.103: if Leda had had twins like them, mansisses, Helene, Phrygiamque redisset in Idam/ Dardanias gemino cum Ganymede Paris – not naming the boys’ master, revealed by CIL VI 280 (30728) and AE 1924.15. On the choice of names, H. Solin, Namenpaare. Eine Studie zur römischen Namengebung (Helsinki 1990) 61f.

38 Diss. 257, fr. 36, XXV. Coronea: IG VII 2879.

39 As his presence in the consilium of C. Avidius Nigrinus, imperial legate in Achaia (below and nn. 50, 57), indicates: Syme, RP IV 24ff.; A.B. Bosworth, ANRW 2.34.1 (1993) 228f.

40 Diss. Epict. 3.7; 3.4. Cf. e.g. Groag 1939, 125ff.; Pflaum, CP no. 81; F. Millar, JRS 55 (1965) 142, 146f.; Syme, RP IV 24; V 446f., 453f. (Maximus); RP IV 26 (Pulcher).

41 Diss. 3.23.23. Kajanto 1965, 232 (‘SEN. 20; CIL men 165 + sl./fr. 14, one woman’).

42 Diss. 4.1.53. There were, to be sure, various other cos. bis about at the time.

43 Diss. 1.9.7; 1.3. 1. cf. Millar, JRS 55 (1965) 143. HA Had. 3.10: in quo magistratu . . . a Sura comperit adoptandum se a Traiano esse.
and confuse the sexes’. Shaving had been the norm in Roman society for several hundred years, influenced perhaps by Alexander setting this fashion. This had less effect in the Greek world: the men there stuck to their beards. Dio of Prusa registers his satisfaction at having seen in a remote outpost of Hellenism, Olbia on the R. Borysthenes, only one man who was clean-shaven. This was to curry favour with the Romans – and he was looked down on by his fellow-citizens. As emperor Hadrian is regularly shown sporting, not the luxuriant whiskers of a philosopher, but the traditional well-tended beard of the Greeks. He might of course have already stopped shaving some years before. Still, it is a plausible conjecture that his visit to Greece, when he was in his mid-thirties, was decisive, that it made him wish to look like a Greek, whether or not Epictetus’ comments had a direct influence. The HA (characteristically) has another explanation: he grew the beard ‘to conceal facial blemishes’.

While Arrian was at Nicopolis he clearly took the opportunity to visit the surrounding areas. He elsewhere reveals familiarity with Ambracia and Amphlochia, and gives details of how one sails between Acarnania, south of Nicopolis, and Leucas. Arrian was also at Delphi. By then he had presumably ended his studies with Epictetus. An inscription shows him in the advisory council of a high Roman official settling boundary disputes. This was C. Avidius Nigrinus, imperial legate with a special mission, probably soon after his consulship in the first half of 110. Nigrinus, it has been suggested, arrived after the corrector Maximus had completed his tour of duty – that Trajan sent a second special commissioner, this time a consular, may be a sign of concern for the state of Greece. The legate may have replaced the proconsul, as Pliny had just done in Pontus-Bithynia. Nigrinus was well qualified: his father of the same names and his uncle Quietus had strong links with Greece, and had been friends of Plutarch.

Hadrian’s friend Sosius Senecio was also closely linked to Plutarch. Senecio had probably met Plutarch many years before, when serving as quaestor in Achaia. Plutarch dedicated to Senecio the nine books of Table Talk, in which he recalls their conversations at Athens and Patras, and at Chaeronea, Plutarch’s home in Boeotia, where Senecio attended the wedding of Plutarch’s son, as well as at Rome. Several pairs of the Parallel Lives, on which he was still engaged at this time, were also dedicated to Senecio, as was his essay On Making Progress in Virtue. Much of Plutarch’s life was centred on Delphi, where he held an important priesthood of Apollo. It is plausible enough to suppose that Hadrian visited Delphi on his way to Athens, but whether there or elsewhere, he surely made the acquaintance of Plutarch during this stay in Greece.
At Athens Hadrian had, no doubt, ample opportunity for dinner parties with witty literary or philosophical conversation of the kind that Senecio relished. At least one of the guests at an Athenian party immortalised in the Table Talk was still at Athens. ‘King Philopappus’, as Plutarch calls him, by his full names C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, was a grandson of the last king of Commagene. Antiochus IV was deposed by Vespasian in 72: his sons and this grandson retained the royal title. Philopappus had taken up residence at Athens, of which he had become a citizen and lavish benefactor, holding office as archon. What is more, Philopappus was now a Roman senator as well (and an Arval Brother – but he is not known ever to have attended their rituals), had even been consul suffect, in 109. It had been a nice gesture to confer the fasces on a descendant of the Seleucids at precisely this moment: almost the three hundredth anniversary of the battle of Thermopylae, at which Antiochus the Great had been defeated by Rome. The consulship of Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus marked a symbolic coming together of the western and eastern élites. (It might be coincidence, of course; or, even if not, not many people may have noticed. One of the ordinarii the next year was a Scipio, of a kind: Ser. (Cornelius) Scipio Salvidienus Orfitus – a reminiscence of Magnesia, 190/189 BC?). Hadrian could easily have got to know Philopappus at Rome in the summer of 109, and could well have been invited to stay with him at Athens. In any case, it would have been difficult for a high-ranking visitor not to come into contact with the king. His sister Balbilla turns up later as a close friend of Hadrian’s wife Sabina. It is a fair bet that their friendship began, if not in 109, then at latest about 111 or 112, when Hadrian – surely with his wife – first came to Athens.

Other prominent persons likely to have entertained Hadrian or to have made his acquaintance include the Spartan notable related to Philopappus and Balbilla, Eurycles Herculanus. Plutarch dedicated an essay to Herculanus, On the Art of Self-Praise Without Incurring Disapprobation. Most of the piece is devoted to examples from Greek history, but towards the end comes some practical advice. Boasting about one’s success, some ‘act or word that found favour with the governor’, should be avoided. After attending gubernatorial banquets, people should refrain from recounting ‘gracious remarks illustrous or royal persons have addressed to them’. The time of writing is of course unknown; and not everyone accepts that Plutarch’s addressee is the man from Sparta. But the tone suggests advice to a young man. One can readily imagine Herculanus at a dinner-party given by his older kinsman

---

54 Plut. Mor. 48E, 628A–B; PIR² I 151; Syme 1980, 113. That Philopappus had expired by AD 114–115, the date implied by his funerary inscription, ILS 845 = Smallwood 207, Athens, on his ostentatious tomb, seems to be generally taken for granted. Philopappus might well, however, merely have set up the inscription when his last resting-place was complete, and could perfectly well have lived on to contemplate it with satisfaction for many years. A decision of the victor of Thermopylae, M’. Acilius Glabrio (cos. 191 BC), was referred to by Nigrinus at Delphi, SIG³ 827c (ex auctoritate Majni Acili). The cos. ord. 110: PIR² C 1446.


56 Plut. Mor. 539A, not cited in PIR² I 302; the identification was thought possible by Stein, RE 8.1 (1912) 549; rejected by Groag, ibid. 10.1 (1917) 585, because on inscriptions Herc(ulan)us is mainly called Eurycles, and because there is no direct reference to Herculanus’ Spartan origin in the essay. Hardly compelling. It would have been otiose for Plutarch to spell this out. There are at least several Laconian topics, 540D–E, 542C, 545A (really about Epaminondas, to be sure, so not necessarily welcome to a Spartan), 544E–F (improving choruses), 545A (Agisalaus). ‘Ought to be identical’, Jones 1971, 41, cf. his n. 8: ‘the treatise on philosophers and men in power may be addressed to the same man . . . 776A, with the conjecture of Pohlenz . . . Moralia 5,1 (Teubner 1957), 1, n.’ (The conjecture, ὀ Ἡρκλέανε for Ἡρωκλέανε, had already been made by P.H. Sandbach, CQ 34 (1941) 113. For what it is worth, that treatise refers to one Thales – unknown – putting ‘an end to faction among the Lacedaemonians by the music of his charms and his exhortations’. 779A. Note also 776D–E: ‘if he were skilled in discovering and collecting water, as they say Heracles and many of the ancients were . . . he would not delight in digging the swineherd’s fount of Arethusa, but in uncovering the unfailing sources of some river for cities and camps and the plantations of kings and sacred groves.’ For Herculanus’ gift of baths to Corinth, Paus. 2.3.5; Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 258.) The advice quoted: 546D–E. Note also Syme, RP 1256; IV 1f.; V 559f. (‘Plutarch cannot be acquitted of gentle malice when he dedicated to Herculanus a useful treatise: how to practise self-laudation without incurring discredit.’) More on Herculanus, App. 2, below.
Philopappus, with, for example, the legate Nigrinus – who was also active at Athens 57 – and Hadrian among the other guests.

Herculanus, ‘thirty-sixth in descent from the Dioscuri’ and a member of a family, the Euryclids, that had dominated Sparta since the time of Augustus, was related not only to King Philopappus but to the leading family of Athens, that of Claudius Atticus – through the Corinthian Vibullii.58 Atticus claimed descent from Miltiades and Cimon, and indeed from the Aeacids. There is no need to dilate here on the immense wealth of these people.59

Hadrian liked Athens – his repeated stays there as emperor make this clear. To see the Acropolis and the Parthenon and other monuments was an aspiration shared by most cultivated persons. He may have been particularly struck by the vast Temple of Olympian Zeus, inaugurated over 600 years earlier by Pisistratus, but never completed. Antiochus Epiphanes, the Seleucid king whose names Philopappus bore, had spent large sums to take the work further. It was still not finished, in spite of efforts under Augustus. Athens, in turn, liked Hadrian. He became an Athenian citizen, in the deme Besa. King Philopappus belonged to Besa as well. One may suppose that he played a part. Hadrian was then elected archon. His freedman, the learned Phlegon, probably already with him, would later register his patron’s archonship, coinciding with the consuls of AD 112 (he uses the two magistracies merely to date the year in which a two-headed baby was born at Rome). As the archonship began and ended in the summer, it is not certain whether his term began in 111 or 112. However this may be, it was a striking gesture. ‘The Boule of the Areopagus, the Boule of the Six Hundred and the Demos of the Athenians’ honoured ‘their archon Hadrianos’ with a statue. They prefaced these three lines with seven in Latin setting out their archon’s senatorial career. Few Romans of his rank had accepted this office.60

An eminent senior senator, on his way to become proconsul of Asia, may have passed through Athens in the spring of the year 112 – or a year later, on his way back – and witnessed the Roman archon carrying out his duties. Cornelius Tacitus, his Histories complete, may now have been beginning his research for a new work. Athens gets only brief mention in the surviving books of the Annals, first a paragraph on Germanicus’ visit in AD 18, going from Nicopolis to the ancient allied city, where the ‘Greeks received him with elaborate honours, expatiating on their own history and literature to make their flattery seem more dignified’. There follows an account of the – very different – stay at Athens by the Caesar’s enemy Piso.61 Hadrian was not yet a Caesar. The Athenians, however delighted with so eminent an archon, may not have displayed such elaborate flattery to him as to Germanicus. All the same, the position of Hadrian’s wife, already distinguished, became even more special in the summer of 112. Her grandmother, Trajan’s sister Marciana Augusta, died at the end of August and was promptly

57 Hesperia 32 (1963) 24, Athens. The date and status of Nigrinus is not, it must be admitted, entirely certain. Following Groag 1939, 54ff.; Syme 1971, 95f., 107, takes him to be an imperial governor, probably ‘consular, perhaps from 111 or 112 to 114’. Cf. id. RP II 720, 781ff.; IV 24ff., 298, 406; V 446, 548 (‘precisely during the season of Hadrian’s visit, it may be’). For some doubts on his status, Eck, Chiron 13 (1983) 187, n. 479. On Nigrinus’ later appointment as legate of Dacia, his role as one of the ‘four consuls’ who ‘conspired against’ Hadrian and his death, a new interpretation is offered in A.R. Birley, 1997, ch. 8.


59 App. 1, below.

60 Olympian Zeus: Strabo 9.1.6, p. 396; Vitruvius 7, praef. 17; IG II/III2 4099; Suet. D. Aug. 60; on all this, D. Kienast, Kleine Schriften (Aalen 1994) 363; Willers 1990, 31ff. Hadrian as archon, etc.: ILS 308 = Smallwood 109; Phlegon, FGrH 257, fr. 36 XXV; HA Had.19.1. That he served as archon in person, has, it is true, been denied. Proof or disproof are lacking. Other Romans: n. 11, above.

deified; on the same day Marciana’s daughter Matidia, Sabina’s mother, became Augusta. Sabina was thus *Augustae f., divae n.*

III

Hadrian was not to return to Athens for eleven years (assuming that he remained there after his archonship and joined Trajan when the emperor arrived on his way to the east in October 113). But Athens must have been in his thoughts from time to time in the interim. In Pannonia Herodes Atticus the younger, ‘still a youth’, broke down in the middle of a speech before the emperor. It must have been Hadrian, in summer 118. ‘In his humiliation he rushed to the River Danube as though he was going to throw himself in. So overwhelming was his ambition to become a famous orator that he treated the penalty of failure as death.’ Perhaps he had tried to make the speech in Latin – he might have gone direct to Pannonia from the house of Calvisius Tullus at Rome. Philostratus does not specify the subject of the address. Hardly congratulation for the accession – 118 was a bit late for this. The Athenians at about this time invited Hadrian ‘to reform their laws’. Herodes could have conveyed the request. Perhaps Hadrian offered senatorial rank to Herodes’ father Atticus, presumably by adlection *inter praetorios* – he may have acquired the *ornamenta praetoria* from Trajan in autumn 113, at Athens, it might be guessed – and to his kinsman Herculanus, in his case with appointment as quaestor to follow not long after. On the other hand, Atticus may, for the time being, have remained outside the senate; Herodes, aged about 17 or 18, may have received the *latus clavus*. To resume: Herculanus and Herodes Atticus, son or father, or both, representatives of Greece’s two ‘great powers’ of ancient times, may be the first Greeks of old Greece enrolled into the senate – and Hadrian may have had to persuade them, may have needed to assuage reluctance. He had probably made at least one ‘overseas’ Greek, from Bithynia, a senator already, namely L. Flavius Arrianus – and had quite possibly taken Arrian with him on his western journeys as his *comes*. Not nearly enough is known about his entourage on those travels or later ones: he may have travelled with an *arto comitatu* (although the Epitome de Caesaribus and a papyrus suggest the reverse), but it might not be a bad guess that some of his companions were *liberalibus studiis praediti, ferme Graeci, quorum sermonibus levaretur* – even if one denies (but why should one?) that Tacitus was thinking about Hadrian rather than, or as well as, Tiberius when he wrote these words. Herodes can later be detected in Hadrian’s company, probably on the move.

---

62 Smallwood 22; Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, nos. 824, 681, 802. For that matter, Sabina was also – or shortly would become – *divi Traiani patris proneptis*: M. Durry, ‘Sur Trajan père’, in Les empereurs romains d’Espagne (Paris 1965) 45ff. (not that she is yet so attested.)

63 Arrian, Parthica fr. 35 (Trajan’s departure from Rome on the anniversary of his adoption, which was three months before Nerva’s death, Epit. de Caes. 12.9). At Athens: Dio 68.17.2f.

64 Philos. V. soph. 2.14. On Herodes’ date of birth, App. 1, below.


66 App. 1 and 2, below.

67 Cf. e.g. Syme, RP IV 29ff.; A.B. Bosworth, ANRW 2.34.1 (1993) 229f.

Herculanus was able to launch his senatorial career by staying at home, as quaestor of Achaia. But he then, it must be assumed, moved to Rome for the next stages of the *cursus honorum*: tribune of the plebs and praetor. There followed, it is a surprise, a year as legate to a proconsul of Baetica. This appointment will need further examination shortly. As for the elder Atticus, no posts at all are known before his consulship, which would not come until c. 132.

Hadrian returned to Greece at last in early autumn 124, in time to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. During this, his first extended provincial tour, which had begun in 121, he had, obviously, continued to conduct the business of empire on the move. There is a fair chance that Arrian went with him to the west, at least to Noricum and Raetia in 122: why not in Gaul, Germany, Britain and Spain as well – and later in Africa? One or two appointments from these years may be noted: Sex. Julius Major, of Tralles (or Nysa), would become legate of III Augusta, *de facto* governor of Numidia, in 124 or 125. A man from Pergamum, L. Cuspius Camerinus, probably of Italian origin, may have attracted Hadrian’s attention there in 124: he was to become suffect consul in 126. Hadrian’s personal urging in 123, when he was in Galatia, may also have persuaded another Greek to enter the senate. C. Julius Severus of Ancyra, descendant of three tetrarchs and of a king Attalus, ἐνεκτικος of four Greek consulars, kinsman of many senators, and ‘first of the Hellenes’, was *adlectus inter tribunicios* by Hadrian. At about this time also, it may be, Arrian became proconsul of Baetica. Or so it has been assumed for some twenty-five years, since the Greek epigram by the proconsul Arrianos from Corduba in honour of Artemis became known. The latest discussion, by A.B. Bosworth, makes the identification even more appealing. Meanwhile a Spanish archaeologist, J. Beltrán Fortes, has argued from the style of moulding that the stone must belong to the third century; and that only the notion that it was a copy of a Hadrianic altar would save it for the historian. The archaeological arguments seem less than compelling: style could have been very conservative in a provincial city – and not all that many parallel altars can be cited.

If one may still retain Arrian as proconsul of Baetica in the early to mid-120s, why not guess that he chose as his legatus the Spartan Herculanus? Hadrian was at Sparta at the beginning of 125. Perhaps he encouraged Herculanus – who in normal circumstances must have been his host there – to take up the appointment.

---

69 IG V 1, 1172 = Smallwood 210. One restoration of line 7 would mean that he was quaestor twice, at Rome after Achaia. Cf. App.2, below.

70 Piso 1993, 46ff., re-reading CIL III 953 = IDR III 4.230, identifies as governor of Dacia Superior under Hadrian (between 127 and 132) a Tib. Cl. [ ], and suggests (with some hesitation) that he might be Atticus Herodes This seems hard to swallow. One could find another senatorial Ti. Claudius (not necessarily eastern). The governorship of an unarmed – and eastern – province would be less implausible for the elder Atticus.


72 A.B. Bosworth, ANRW 2.34.1 (1993) 229f. For Arrian’s presumed visit to the R. Inn (Ind. 4.15–16), I prefer the arguments of H. Grassl, ‘Arrian in DonauRaum’, Chiron 12 (1982) 245–52, that it was as *comes* to Hadrian (in 121), rather than earlier as an equestrian officer, that Arrian was there.


74 W. Eck & M.M. Roxan in Festschr. Lieb 1995, 55ff. (a new diploma). Presumably, as the editors suggest, the father of the *cos. ord.* 142, L. Cuspius Pactumius Rufinus (Halfmann 1979, no. 66).

75 Halfmann 1979, no. 62.


78 A.R. Birley 1997, ch. 15.
A most important stage of his journey in 125 came at the end of his Greek tour: Delphi. He had already written ‘to the city of the Delphians’ earlier in the year, announcing his decision on how many delegates each member-state in the Amphictyonic Council should have. Augustus had weighted the voting-rights heavily in favour of his new city of Nicopolis, and Nero had made further changes. Now, Hadrian’s letter reveals, a commission of enquiry had recommended to the Senate at Rome that the membership should be reconstituted. He refers to the proposal that the membership should be increased and a new balance established. In particular, excess votes held by the Thessalians ‘should be transferred to the Athenians, Lacedaemonians and other cities, so that the Council (synedrion) should be a common Council of all the Hellenes’. The stress on ‘a Council of all the Hellenes’ suggests that at this stage Delphi was to be the Panhellenic centre from which to revive the national self-consciousness.79

Meanwhile, it may be argued, the young Herodes Atticus had become a senator, perhaps precisely on 5 December, the traditional first day of the quaestorian year, in 124, and in Greece, as q(uaestor) imp. Caesaris Hadriani Aug. inter amicos – to accompany Hadrian through Greece and across to Rome.80

Hadrian returned to Greece in late summer 128. At Eleusis he was initiated into the higher grade of the Mysteries. Otherwise, only his second stay at both Athens and Sparta is explicitly documented.81 Since he was last at Sparta, Hadrian had accepted, in absentia, the eponymous magistracy there, the office of patronomos. Perhaps he was still in office when he returned – the Spartan year began and ended in the autumn, and Hadrian’s tenure is assignable to 127–8.82

It was appropriate – and surely no coincidence – that it was precisely Athens and Sparta that were to the fore in the Greek motherland in entering the Roman Senate. The Baetican legation held by Eurycles Herculanus was followed by a further post, legate of a legion III, evidently III Gallica in Syria. An interesting move: the Spartans were, after all, traditionally the most martial of all the Hellenes. Although Herculanus’ ancestor Eurycles had fought at Actium, no army service is known for the intervening generations, except for an equestrian military tribunate. One may offer another guess: that Herculanus was offered the legion by Hadrian at the time of his second visit to Sparta. A corollary would be that Herculanus could have travelled east with the emperor in 129, to take up his command in Syria when the imperial party arrived there.83

For Hadrian the visit to Sparta was more than sentimental. His plans for the Greeks, now crystallising, were indeed centred on Athens. But it was natural for him to treat with particular sensitivity the city which had shared the dual hegemony with the Athenians six centuries years before. This would in any case be welcome in contemporary Athens. Atticus’ claimed descent from Miltiades and from Cimon, the great advocate of Athenian co-operation with Sparta – and he had himself had spent some time at Sparta in his youth – fitted in beautifully. Now the Hellenes, with Hadrian the adoptive Athenian at the forefront, were actively recreating and re-enacting their glorious past, the age of the Persian Wars above all. When the Great King invaded, the Hellenes had stood together united (with a few exceptions) in ‘the League against the Mede’. Their victory at Plataea, of which the 600th anniversary had recently occurred, was still commemorated.84 Athens had sought to continue the

79 Oliver 1989, no. 75, with discussion.
80 SIG3 863, n. 1 = Smallwood 199b, unknown provenance (full publication is at last forthcoming, as Werner Eck kindly informs me). Cf. App. 1.
83 C. Julius Spartiaticus was trib. mil., Corinth VIII 2, no.68. Cf. App. 2 below on Herculanus’ family and career. For Spartan contingents in Rome’s wars, Spawforth, in Cartledge & Spawforth 1989, 116 (Parthian war of L. Verus), 191 (Caracalla and perhaps Julian).
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crusade and to liberate the Greeks of Asia. Sparta had opted out. After three decades, in the face of mounting opposition, Pericles put through the Athenian assembly, so Plutarch related, a decree ‘to invite all the Hellenes, wherever they lived in Europe or in Asia, whether in a small polis or a great one, to send delegates to Athens to deliberate on the Hellenic shrines which the barbarians had destroyed and the sacrifices owed to the gods’. Twenty Athenians of mature years had been despatched to urge their fellow-Greeks to attend ‘and take part in resolutions on peace and on the common welfare of Hellas’. Nothing had come of it, because of Spartan opposition – instead, indeed, bitter decades of conflict between the Hellenes. There can be no doubt that Hadrian and his entourage, with Atticus and Herculaneus to the fore, were consciously thinking of these events. The literature of the age is focused to the point of obsession on the people and deeds of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Perhaps it was all a charade; but for the élite, at least, it was one that gave them enormous satisfaction. Hadrian’s apparent initial notion of making the Amphictyons of Delphi the instrument for his regeneration of Hellas, the synedrion to be ‘a common council of all the Hellenes’, did not go through, perhaps because of Spartan resistance. The Spartans at some point sent an embassy to meet Hadrian at Nicopolis, either when he was leaving for Sicily in 125 or when he arrived in Greece in summer 128. Perhaps they had been anxious to explain their position on Panhellenic matters.

Whatever the details, Hadrian was now ready to implement a new and much more ambitious plan. The Amphictyonic ‘synedrion of all the Hellenes’ would, even if reconstituted, have catered only for the poleis of the motherland. Yet the Hellenes were spread far and wide beyond the boundaries of old Greece. It was probably during his second stay in Greece as emperor that Hadrian devised – or at least approved with enthusiasm – a new and grandiose programme: to create a Hellenic commonwealth for all the poleis which could prove their authentic Hellenic origins. In other words, Hadrian was to bring the abortive programme of Pericles to fruition. He would create a Panhellenion, an association of all the Hellenes, with its centre at Athens. The groundwork was – literally – done: the great temple of Heavenly Zeus, the Olympieion, was being given the finishing touches. A stately enclosure was going up around it. Within this sacred temenos the delegates of the Hellenes would convene. This was only one item in Hadrian’s Athenian building programme.

Only a few years before, probably at the time of his stay at Tarraco, Hadrian had begun to parade as the new Augustus. Plutarch, who alone records the Congress decree of Pericles, also recalls that the Athenian statesman was nicknamed ‘Olympian’. Now Hadrian – who was in addition completing the temple of Olympian Zeus – assumed this appellation: this might be said to make him the new Pericles. What procedure or ceremony produced the title is not recorded – perhaps it was conferred in the Athenian assembly? At any rate, from 129 onwards all over the Greek part of the empire he became Hadrianos Sebastos Olympios, or, indeed, Hadrianos Sebastos Zeus Olympios – for some identified him with the god.
To convene an inaugural assembly of such a body as the Panhellenion required several years of intensive planning. Lists would need to be drawn up of eligible or potentially eligible states, of which there were hundreds all over the eastern half of the empire and well beyond. Both the literature and the material remains of the age – local coinage, inscriptions and statuary – give the impression that a principal preoccupation of many a city was to demonstrate the antiquity and authenticity of its Hellenic origins. Homer and Greek mythology were deployed with remarkable ingenuity to prove foundation by deities or heroes or famous Greeks; sometimes little known, not to say invented, figures from the heroic age were produced. Such claims would need testing in some cases.91 It may not be a coincidence that Phlegon of Tralles somewhere in his Olympiades stated that Adria, Hadrian’s *ultima origo* in Picenum, where he, *quasi in alia patria*, held office as *quinquennalis*, had been founded by Dionysius I of Syracuse.92

A new interpretation has recently been proposed: the Panhellenion arose from an initiative by the overseas Greeks, to which Hadrian simply consented. But even if the brief sentence in Dio (Xiphilinus) means what is now claimed, there is no difficulty about Hadrian ‘permitting’ the Greeks to do what he had himself inspired them to undertake – of course, persons like Herodes Atticus, senior and junior, or Eurycles Herculaneus, or Polemo, had probably fed Hadrian with ideas on the subject.93 One has to speculate. It has been commented that ‘the paucity of surviving evidence makes it difficult to be sure exactly what Hadrian intended of it . . . How far it represents imperial whim and how far policy (in so far as the two may be distinguished) is, at present, impossible, to establish.’94 Still, if one accepts the arguments of D.Willers that the Olympieion at Athens which Hadrian completed was also the meeting-place for the Panhellenion, there is less difficulty in attributing the inspiration for this ‘Hellenic Commonwealth’ to Hadrian himself. At the consecration of the great building, ‘completed at last after an interval of 560 years [surely a mistake for 660]’, according to Philostratus, Polemo, in the proemium of his ‘long and wonderful discourse from the base of the temple . . . declared that his [Hadrian’s] initiative had not been without divine impulse.’95 What Hadrian’s purpose was has to be inferred from his behaviour.

It fitted neatly into Hadrian’s Panhellenic programme that he was on his way to the eastern frontiers in 128–9. The Persian empire was no more; but there was a contemporary equivalent, an Iranian power that had some pretensions to have taken its place. Invitations were being sent out at this time to client

---


92 HA Had. 1.1; 19.1, Phlegon, FGrH 257, fr. 23.

93 C.P. Jones, ‘The Panhellenion’, Chiron 26 (1996) 29–56. He translates Dio 69.16.2 as follows, 30: ‘he permitted the Greeks to build the sanctum to himself which is called the Panhellenion, and he established a competition in connection with it.’ Comparing Dio 51.20.7 – how Octavian ‘permitted the Greeks’ (of Greek and Bithynia) to establish a cult of himself in 29 BC – he assumes, 30f., that something similar happened under Hadrian; and argues, 31ff., that τὸν στύχον τὸν ἐκείνον should mean a building, specifically a sanctuary for the emperor-cult. He does not, it is strange, refer to Willers 1990. See further n. 95, below.

94 G. Woolf, ‘Becoming Roman, staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East’, PCPhS 40 (1994) 116–143, at 134. Cf. Swain 1996, 75f.: ‘The reasons why the Panhellenion was established are not fully known’, with which one must agree. When he adds that it ‘was never particularly popular with the Greeks themselves’, he is surely arguing from silence.

95 Philostr. V. soph. 1.25.3 (mistranslated in the Loeb ed., p. 112 – ‘not without a divine impulse was he inspired to speak on that theme’; in essence correctly by B.W. Henderson, The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian (London 1923) 120 – ‘Verily the God Himself has inspired the Emperor to this work.’) Willers 1990, 35ff., cites other sources and discusses the date, accepting Weber 1907, 208, 268ff. (between September 131 and September 132).
rulers and kings beyond the Euphrates to attend a ‘durbar’ in 129 – Hadrian had already held one in 123. Perhaps the Parthian Chosroes was invited to another colloquium. His position as Great King was no less under challenge than it had been for two and a half decades, but it evidently suited Hadrian to deal with him rather than with his rival Vologaeses. As a sweetener, Hadrian sent back the king’s daughter, in Roman captivity these past twelve years or more. He also offered to return the royal throne of the Arsacids, the sella regia. (In the end he kept it.)

IV

In the spring of 129 Hadrian began the new eastern tour, sailing from Eleusis to Ephesus. His arrival probably preceded by a few weeks that of a new proconsul, Juventius Celsus, the eminent jurist, cos. II ord. that year. Celsus may have found that one of his legati had been selected for him. C. Julius Severus was ‘legate in Asia in accordance with a letter and codicilli of the God Hadrian’. Severus is attested in office near Dorylaeum, regulating boundaries. The odds are that he joined Hadrian the next year in Syria, to take command of the legion IV Scythica, as a colleague of Herculanus, legate of III Gallica.

Hadrian’s activities in the years 129–130, interesting and important though they are, cannot be discussed in detail in this context. It will, however, be worth noting that his philhellenism had reached a high peak with the title Olympios, and the inauguration of the Olympieion/Panhellenion being scheduled, it may be supposed, for the spring of 132. That he decided, while in the east, to rebuild Jerusalem as a Roman colonia and prohibited the Jews ‘to mutilate their genitals’, certainly requires mention.

Hadrian was travelling with a descendant of the Seleucids, Julia Balbilla, whose brother Philopappus called himself Antiochus Epiphanes. The influence on Hadrian’s thinking of the first and most famous bearer of that name had already been seen at Athens. It had, after all, been king Antiochus IV Epiphanes who had gone a long way to completing the Olympieion. He too, like Hadrian, had promoted the cult of Zeus Olympios. Various other aspects of the character and policies of the eccentric monarch find an echo in Hadrian, of whom he seems to be almost a mirror image. In his long years as a hostage the Seleucid prince had acquired a fervent admiration for Roman ways. His behaviour at Antioch, mingling with the common people like a would-be civilis princeps, recalls Hadrian the plebis iactantissimus amor. Whatever impact these matters may have had on Hadrian – and, considering the length of time he spent altogether at Antioch, he had ample opportunity for finding out about them – Antiochus Epiphanes was remembered not least for his Jewish policy, which had provoked the uprising of the Maccabees. There was considerable debate in antiquity over the circumstances and course of events which led to the emergence of an independent Jewish state. One thing is undisputed: the Temple at Jerusalem was desecrated by the ‘abomination of desolation’. An altar to Olympian Zeus was set up in the Temple court and circumcision was strictly prohibited under pain of death. This assault on the Jewish religion had indeed been preceded by active hellenising on the part of the Jewish leadership. They had ‘petitioned the king to let them build a gymnasium in Jerusalem. And when he had granted this, they also concealed the circumcision of their private parts in order to be Greeks even when naked’,

---

96 HA Had. 13.8; cf. 12.8 (AD 123). Antoninus Pius still had the sella regia; he refused to return it, HA Ant. Pius 9.7. Oliver 1970, 93f., notes the ‘Persian’ factor in connection with the Panhellenion. See further A.R. Birley 1997, ch. 18.


as Josephus put it, paraphrasing the First Book of Maccabees and spelling out an important aspect of what had gone on.\(^{101}\)

Whether or not Antiochus had really ordered his extreme measures in 'an attempt to wipe out their superstition and introduce Greek practices, in order to change that most repulsive people for the better', as Tacitus put it in the Histories, the odds are that Hadrian believed this version. There were certainly some Jews in Judaea at this time who had tried to reverse the effects of circumcision by the process known as epispasmos, no doubt so that they could exercise naked in the Greek gymnasia without attracting adverse comment.\(^{102}\)

The harsh and hostile language of the HA, \textit{Iudaei . . . vetabantur mutilare genitalia}, may reproduce the phrasing of an imperial edict. In Greek the word used was presumably \textit{katastēmonein} – a deliberate variant of the normal \textit{peritōmēn}. As it happens, a renegade Jew had once explicitly chosen to call circumcision \textit{katastomēn}, 'mutilation', instead of \textit{peritomēn}, in his \textit{Letter to the Philippians}. To the Galatians, Paul went further: 'these agitators', who insisted on circumcision, had better 'cut themselves off', \textit{apokosōntai} – in other words, castrate themselves.\(^{103}\) In fact, the new Hadrianic prohibition – which was universal, not confined merely to the Jews – did indeed put circumcision under the same penalty as castration: death. The practice had already been banned by Domitian and Nerva. Hadrian made castration subject to the \textit{lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis}.\(^{104}\) He may charitably be supposed to have been unaware what the reaction would be, to have been led to believe that Jewish resistance to Hellenisation had now melted away. There were, indeed, signs of this.\(^{105}\)

This is not the place to say more on Antinous, whose relationship with Hadrian is an important aspect of Hadrian's attempt to become a Hellene.\(^{106}\) After the stay in Egypt in 130–1, Hadrian was in Syria again, then in Cilicia and Pamphylia. It seems that he had not visited that half of Lycia-Pamphylia in 129. Several cities were also worth a visit, such as Aspendus on the R. Eurymedon, where Cimon and the Delian League had won a great victory over the Persians 600 years before (perhaps exactly 600 years), Perge, and Attalia. The two latter could boast impressive arches in honour of Hadrian. That at Perge was erected by Pancia Magna, a senator's daughter, from an Italian settler family linked by marriage with Julius Severus of Ancyra. She had adorned it with statues of four empresses, Plotina, Sabina and Sabina’s mother and grandmother, and of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. Plancina’s brother, who had governed Cilicia and been consul, seems to have had a villa at Tibur not far from that of the emperor. These people would have been very suitable hosts for Hadrian.\(^{107}\)

Further west a stop is definitely attested, at Phaselis, on the once debatable boundary between Lycia and Pamphylia. Phaselis had had an evil reputation as a haunt of pirates, although Cicero spoke up for it: it had been taken over by those people because of its position – it had three separate harbours – but its inhabitants were really 'Lycians, \textit{Graeci homines}'. Phaselis was indeed a Greek city, founded by the Rhodians, and had been a member of the Delian League. A splendid new south gateway had been erected in honour of Hadrian’s visit. Statues were erected to him as 'saviour of the universe and of their country’, ‘on the occasion of his landing'.\(^{108}\) Sufenas Verus, governor of Lycia-Pamphylia, who had

\(^{101}\) I Macc. 1.54; Jos. AJ 12.241. Cf. e.g. E. Bickermann, \textit{Der Gott der Makkabäer} (Berlin 1937); K. Bringmann, \textit{Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa} (Göttingen 1983).


\(^{103}\) HA Had. 14.2. Cf. Paul, Ep. ad Phil. 3.2; Ep. ad Gal. 5.12.

\(^{104}\) Dig. 48.8.4.2, cf. Dio 67.2.3, Suet. Dom. 7.1.


\(^{107}\) The itinerary from Egypt to Athens is conjectural, apart from a return to Syria (Dio 69.12.2) and the landing at Phaselis (next note). The date of the battle of the Eurymedon is uncertain: perhaps as early as 470 or 469, more likely a few years later. Perge: AE 1958.76–77; JRS 55 (1965) 56ff.; AE 1965.211; Halfmann 1979, no. 31. Attalia: IGR III 771. That Hadrian was in Lycia in 129, but not in Pamphylia until 131 is argued by Wörle 1988, 40.

\(^{108}\) Cic. II Verr. 4.21; TAM II 3,1187 = SEG XXXI 1299; TAM II 3, 1191–4.
taken office at the time of Hadrian’s visit to Lycia in 129, was presumably in attendance and may now have been designated to the consulship for 132. His colleague Claudius Atticus would perhaps have been able to hold office as consul at Athens precisely during the festivities in the following spring. Meanwhile, Arrian was appointed consular legate of Cappadocia. A year or two later Julius Major would become governor of Moesia Inferior.  

V  

Counting heads when trying, for example, to compare the treatment of Greek senators by Trajan and by Hadrian – and by Antoninus Pius – is perhaps not very reliable. For Trajan’s twenty years or for Hadrian’s twenty-one the numbers of attested consuls vary considerably: over ninety *suffecti* for Trajan, only a few more than fifty for Hadrian, supplemented in each case by imprecisely dated cases, about twenty-five for Trajan, about thirty for Hadrian. Greek *ordinarii*, it might seem, are clear enough: Trajan’s pair in 105, T. Julius Candidus and A. Julius Quadratus, is not matched until 142, with L. Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus of Pergamum – clearly son of L. Cuspius Camerinus (*suff.* 126) – and L. Statius Quadratus, adoptive Athenian, followed the next year by Herodes Atticus. T. Statilius Maximus (144), may be another easterner, from Syria. Cn. Claudius Severus Arabianus (146) came from Paphlagonian Pompeiopolis, in 151 the brothers Quintilii from Alexandria Troas shared the fasces, in 155 C. Julius Severus, son of the man from Ancyra adopted by Hadrian, was *ordinarius*. Some might decline to admit the Quintilii to this reckoning, called ‘Trojans’ not Greeks, by Herodes. Statilius could be from an Italian colonial family too. All the same, what remains is impressive: five out of thirty-eight non-imperial *ordinarii* in the years 139–161. Hadrian’s score appears at first sight to be zero out of thirty-eight. But one is now allowed to count L. Catilius Severus (II *ord.* 120) as an easterner, albeit of Italian descent, from the *colonia* of Bithynian Apamea. M. Antonius Rufinus (131) can be regarded as plausibly eastern because of his *gentilicium*. By the same token, M. Antonius Hiberus (133) – although as assumed descendant of a Julio-Claudian *Augusti libertus*, he can hardly have been ‘eastern’ in any meaningful sense.

Closer inspection of one or two other names might wring some kind of eastern connection out of the consular Fasti, e.g. T. Vibius Varus (134), possibly from Asia – this would add another name to the list for Antoninus too, T. Clodius Vibius Varus (160). P. Coelius Balbinus Vibullius Pius (137) was manifestly linked somehow to the Vibullii Pii of Corinth. One might even ask if C. Trebius Sergianus

---

110 Syme, RP II 579: ‘Valid statistics are not to be had, etc.’; cf. id., RP IV 14 f., 44 f.; 69; V 553 f.
111 Smallwood, pp. 2ff. (requiring some updating in detail), supplies useful lists.
112 For what follows, a general reference to Halfmann 1979 is most cases makes further citation of evidence superfluous.
114 Cf. Herodes’ remarks, Philostr. V. soph. 2.1.11.
115 Cf. Syme 1980, 118: ‘the exuberant philhellene permits only one [Greek] to lend his name to a year, in 133’, with the note: ‘viz. M. Antonius Hiberus. However, M. Antonius Rufinus (cos. 131) might be eastern.’ Note also RP IV 315: ‘Indeed, it is not easy to detect consuls from the Greek east among the *ordinarii*, unless Antonius Rufinus (131) and Antonius Hiberus (133) be assigned to that rubric. The former is only a name, the latter goes back, so it is presumed, to an imperial freedman of the first dynasty. If Hadrian reserved his exuberant philhellenism for other spheres and countries, sparing the Fasti, that was all to the good: a mark of tact and prudence.’ Similarly, RP V 556. For Catilius, Halfmann 1979, no. 38, cf. his no. 18. Noted by Syme, RP IV 1164 n. 38; IV 23; approved, RP V 473; 555; VII 558.
116 Halfmann 1979, p. 168. Vibius Varus was, it seems probable, a late substitution as *ordinarius*, see App. 1, below. He had been legate of Cilicia, Eck, *Chiron* 13 (1983), 169ff. and n. 414, probably when Hadrian was there in 131, A.R. Birley 1997, ch. 20.
(132) could derive from, or might be connected with, Pisidian Antioch (no other senatorial Sergii except the Pauli from that place seem to have been extant). P. Calpurnius Atilianus Atticus (?) Rufus (135) has even been claimed for Syria-Transpadana is far more likely.

Syme was always inclined to stress the role of Domitian and even more of Trajan in enrolling Greeks and giving them high office — and to diminish the role of Hadrian in this respect. On present evidence, Hadrian’s choice of ordinarii does not conflict with this; if more suffects were known for his reign, that might tell another story.

Office-holding in the west by Greek senators also requires emphasis. This had already begun in a modest way. M. Pompeius Macrinus (suff. 115) and L. Antonius Albus (suff. c. 132) were respectively legionary legate and military tribune on the Rhine under Trajan. Under Hadrian, one may or may not retain Arrian as one of these western office-holders: but, even if not Arrian as proconsul of Baetica, Eurycles Herculanus as proconsular legate there; Julius Major as legate of Numidia; Pompeius Macrinus as proconsul of Africa. Others would soon follow: C. Julius Severus of Ancypa as legate of Lower Germany, A. Claudius Charax of Pergamum as legate of II Augusta in Britain — indeed, in Scotland.

One may wonder about Claudius Maximus, the philosophic mentor of M. Aurelius, legate of I Adiutrix and iuridicus pr. pr. of both Pannonias when Aelius Caesar was there. He could well derive from a Greek province.

As for the Greek ordinarii of the following reign, in particular Herodes Atticus in 143, this has often been commented on: ‘The year . . . was opened by Atticus as consul ordinarius. The best that Latin eloquence could put up in this season was the African, Cornelius Fronto. . . . He was only a suffect consul, sharing the honour with half a dozen senators’. As it so happens, another new diploma shows that Fronto was consul in 142, six months earlier than Herodes, even if only a suffect. But in any case, as
far as senators, Greek and Latin, are concerned, how important were these distinctions?126 Hadrian would marry a woman from the Italian élite.127 Fronto’s wife, Cratia – Krateia – in all probability came from the province Asia.128 While the eastern senators from the colonies or the Italian diaspora cannot yet perhaps, in the early second century, be thought of as Greeks, some of them were intermarried with the Greek élite. If L. Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus (ord. 142) of Pergamum, who adorning the new Asclepieum, is surely, from his names, a scion of an Italian immigrant family, it is hard to think of him as a ‘Latin’, any more than C. Julius Severus, who paraded as πρῶτος Ἐλλήνων (whatever that really meant), can be thought of a Celt.129 For one thing, Rufinus’ mother was probably a Pactumeia from the well-known family at Numidian Cirta, Fronto’s home town.130

On the other side, people like M. Pompeius Macrinus (suff. 115), descendant of Pompey’s Mytilenian friend, were perhaps latinised – but not exactly: after all this Macrinus was called ‘a new Theophanes’ back on Lesbos.131 The sofist was rather extreme and wilful: L. Vibullius Hipparchus Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Quir. Atticus Herodes.134 The son of Julius Major added Pythodorus to his Latin names Sex. Julius Major Antoninus. There are one or two questions regarding the Latin nomenclature of these Greek senators: one can only speculate about the reasons for the choice.135 Ti. Julius Frugi is clear enough: ‘Frugi’ had made an impact because of the eastern service of a Calpurnius Piso. A. Julius Quadratus was ‘A.f. Volt.’. Hence an incomer, it would seem – and Aristides refers to the first Quadratus coming to Pergamum ‘at the summons of the god’. Does this just mean from Phrygian Thermae Theseos? Rather from Narbonensis, it has been suggested, where Voltinia is so widespread. Macedonian Philippi which also had this tribe is, of course, a less remote alternative as ultima origo. But there could be some other explanation.136

126 Syme, RP I 59 (first published in 1938): ‘As early as the year 94, a joint consulship was held by Valerius Asiaticus, of Celtic dynastic stock from Vienna of the Allobroges, and A. Julius Quadratus, a man from Pergamum. It is not at all likely that these two exhibited a notable difference in character, education, and social standing.’


128 Champlin 1980, 26f. and nn. 33ff.


131 Halfmann 1979, no.44, descendant of his no.1. ‘Neos Theophanes’ was, however, ‘a title of honour, not an item of nomenclature’, Syme, RP III 1308

132 For these persons, Halfmann 1979. Apollonius, Ep. 71; Philostr.V. Apoll. 4.5: the sage’s disapproval of Ionians calling themselves Lucullus, Fabricius or Lucanius.

133 The name ‘Herculanus’ is, to be sure, a latinising form, as observed by Chrimes 1949, 199f.

134 Salomies 1992, 5: ‘Greeks with Roman citizenship . . . did not always follow the same onomastic rules as their Latin-speaking fellow-citizens in the west.’ He gives Herodes as an example. Since Herodes’ mother Vibullia Alcia was his father’s sister’s daughter, Herodes was no doubt in Roman law illegitimate, Ameling 1983, I 24, n. 23. Was he therefore adopted by his mother’s brother? Cf. Ameling II 62, and his stemmata, 232f.


136 G.W. Bowersock, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (Oxford 1969) 19, citing Aristides 30.9: ‘In the reign of Augustus Pergamum was a decaying city, when the god Asclepius summoned one Julius Quadratus from the village of
Of course, as S. Swain has recently stressed, it is no doubt wrong to assume that ‘the Greek élite must have been pro-Roman in all respects’. There may, indeed, as he comments, have been ‘a degree of contradiction between their Greek and Roman identities’.\textsuperscript{137} For some of these people, perhaps: that A. Julius Quadratus, who was so devoted to his Pergamum, nonetheless over four decades put in appearances at sessions of the Arval Brethren, tells us something, surely, about his attitude to Rome.\textsuperscript{138} The question has recently been posed, also by Swain, ‘why . . . Rome supported local tradition in the Greek world and encouraged Greeks to identify with their past?’\textsuperscript{139} Syme offered a rather Tacitean comment on the whole business nearly sixty years ago: ‘The Antonine Empire achieved a master-stroke in disguising the predominance of the rich under the mask and justification of ancient Roman standards of civic virtue in alliance with Greek culture.’\textsuperscript{140} This makes it all sound just like Realpolitik. As far as Hadrian is concerned, I think the answer to Swain’s question may be that Hadrian wanted to be a Greek himself. Granted, it is dangerous to try to guess motivation from actions alone with any historical figure, especially one so ambiguous and many-sided as Hadrian.\textsuperscript{141}

‘Many claims to Greek ancestry were made and easily accepted, if Greek culture and speech could be proved, through the familiar ploy of extending or creating a genealogy of descent.’ There are good examples of non-Greeks becoming Greeks in the second century AD, not least Favorinus of Arelate and Lucian of Samosata.\textsuperscript{142} But, after all, if the Galatian dynast C. Julius Severus could be called πρὸτος Ἑλληνος, Hadrianos Olympios, Athenian citizen in the deme Besa, and a new Theseus to boot,\textsuperscript{143} could claim to be a true Hellene too. One will recall Phlegon’s statement that Adria, Hadrian’s ultima origo, had been founded by Dionysius I.\textsuperscript{144} Various items converge: the beard, the Panhellenic programme, Antinous (even if, e.g. Plutarch and Dio of Prusa did not approve of homoerotic relations,\textsuperscript{145} ‘Greek love’ was, after all, very Greek), and the treatment of the Jews. Perhaps one may add to this, the particular details, closely linked to his Panhellenic programme, of Hadrian’s enrolment and treatment of ‘Greek’ senators: Athens and Sparta singled out.

---

\textsuperscript{137} Swain 1996, 70, 71.
\textsuperscript{138} Halfmann 1979, no. 17, lists forty inscriptions of Quadratus, well over half from Pergamum. For Quadratus as Arval, Syme 1980, 15f., etc. He was present in 72 (?), 78, 86, 87, 89, 105,111, PIR\textsuperscript{2} I 507.
\textsuperscript{139} Swain 1996, 71.
\textsuperscript{141} Syme more recently, RP IV 7, said of Hadrian: ‘more a Greek than a Roman’.
\textsuperscript{142} Swain 1996, 69; 43ff.
\textsuperscript{143} IG III 401–2 ≠ Smallwood 485, Athens.
\textsuperscript{144} \textsuperscript{fGrH} 257, fr. 23.
\textsuperscript{145} Swain 1996, 120ff., 125f., 214ff.
Appendix 1
The Careers of Herodes Atticus, Father and Son, and the Question of consules suffecti II after AD 103

The Bad Wimpfen diploma, showing that the elder Atticus – hereafter Atticus 146 – was suffect consul not under Trajan, at latest c. 108, but under Hadrian, c. 132, makes necessary a re-examination of his biography, most recently discussed in full by Ameling. Atticus’ date of birth is quite uncertain, since estimates of c. 68, or the early 70s at latest, have been based on his consulship having been held c. 108 or earlier. Further, Atticus is reckoned to have been at Sparta as a youth, in the agoge. Assumed to have been c. 86–93. It might have been a bit later. Some details of the life and career of Atticus’ son, hereafter Herodes, also require discussion. All that one may now infer is that Atticus was adult in the reign of Nerva (Philostr. V. soph. 2.1.2) and married not later than c. 100, to judge from the date of birth of Herodes (below). He could have been born in the late 70s. The date at which Atticus was praetorios ornamentis ornato ex s.c. (Corinth VIII 2, 58 = Smallwood 198 = Ameling II 65 no. 34; cf. AE 1977.774 = Ameling II 66f. no. 35, also Corinth – largely restored) must also now be regarded as open. It could have been under Trajan, when the riches which he ‘discovered’ and was allowed to keep under Nerva had already made him μέγας – and his mother’s as well as his father’s fortune helped to make him affluent (Philostr. V. soph. 2.1.2). This need not mean that he was given this special honour by Trajan, nor, for example, that he acquired property at Rome or in the vicinity and a reputation for conspicuous consumption at this stage. If, as generally supposed, Juvenal’s line, Atticus eximie si cenat, laetus habetur, Sat. 11.1, refers to him, the poet need not have noticed the Athenian’s lavish dinner-parties until the 120s.

It is assumed that before the consulship Atticus was adlectus inter praetorios, which is no doubt correct. There is no inscription to attest it. The governorship, sc. of Judaea, by an Atticus under Trajan, reported by Eusebius, now of course lapses. If Eusebius – or Hegesippus – got this name right, another Atticus must be found. Diplomas aside, there are other inscriptions of our Atticus as consul. IG VII 88 = Ameling 1983, II no. 52, Megara, was erected by boule and demos for his benefactions and benevolence to Tib. Claudius Atticus ὑπατόν. Now to be dated to c. 132, when he was in office, or later. IG V 1, 1147 = Ameling II no. 53, Gytheum, a letter, of Hadrian, is too fragmentary to count as evidence for Atticus as consul. He is registered as [Τιβ. Κλαέωδιος Ἀττικός ὁ κράτιστος [...] , but one need not restore [ὑπατός]. It might just refer to his senatorial rank. More interesting is IOlymp. 359 = Ameling II no. 124 = L. Schumacher, EOS I 263ff., set up by his son Herodes: [Τιβ. Κλαέωδιον

146 Stein, PIR² C 802, on the son, commented: ‘Sophista is de quo agimus ipse Atticus solus nisi in consulatu ... non dicitur.’ A.J.S. Spawforth, ‘Sparta and the family of Herodes Atticus. A reconsideration of the evidence’, ABSA 75 (1980) 203–220, at 208ff., discusses IG V 1, 45 = Ameling 1983, II no. 70, which gives the career of Corinthas, who had been συν[ε]ρησοῦ Αττικοῦ τοῦ Ἡρᾶδου. This Atticus is taken to be Herodes’ son Regillus Atticus, who had thus gone through the Spartan agoge (p. 204: ‘for certain’). However, Ameling II 100 argues that this must be Herodes, although ‘diese Namensgebung für ihn sonst nicht belegt [ist].’ Accepted by Spawforth, ‘Families at Roman Sparta and Epidaurus: some prosopographical notes’, ABSA 80 (1985) 191–258, at 226.


149 ABSA 26 (1923–25) 168, C7 = SEG XI 565 = Ameling 1983, II no.33: ‘Ιεροκλής (Ιεροκλέους) Αττικός κλήσειν, discussed by Spawforth, ABSA 75 (1980) 204ff.; Ameling II 65. The same list of gerontes to which this Hierocles belonged includes a former kasan of Eurycles, assumed to be Eurycles Herculanus, cf. below. There is no need to suppose, however, that the former kassen of Eurycles and of Atticus must have been exact coevals. On the kasan relationship, n. 228, below.

150 Cf. above and n. 6. The cognomen is quite common, not least in the upper order: Kajanto 1965, 203 – the cos. 244 B.C.; Cicero’s friend; and ‘SEN. 18; CIL 210 + sl./fr. 39, women 84 + sl./fr. 26 (in Rome 128 out of a total of 359).’ For an alternative Atticus as persecutor in Judaea, A.R. Birley, JRS 85 (1995) 294 (M. Quintius Atticus, legate of IV Scythica, undated, CIL III 12250).
This shows Atticus a member of the XVviri s.f. – but not until the 130s, one must now add. His son was to achieve membership of the same college. This distinction – if he attended any gathering of the college, might have brought him into contact with some interesting people: Q. Pompeius Falco (suff. 108), C. Julius Proculus (suff. 109), M. Pompeius Macrinus (suff. 115), C. Bruttius Praesens (suff. c. 118, II ord. 139), perhaps even P. Cornelius Tacitus (suff. 97).

Philostratus in a notorious statement (V.soph. 2.1.1) makes the sophist Herodes rank Εκ πατέρων ἐξ τούς δισεπάτους (copied by the Suda, H544 Adler). This could only refer to Atticus, it was thought. He offers no parallel, and none seems to exist, for such ornamenta going to someone who had already been consul. But this suggests an explanation. In the early third century a development took place which may have misled Philostratus – a contemporary. Septimius Severus conferred ornamenta consularia on his Guard Prefect Plautianus and later made him a senator and consul – and announced 'the man was entering his second consulship [203]; and the same thing has been done in other cases subsequently', as Dio (46.46.4) disapprovingly registered. One may cite Q. Maecius Laetus, 'II ord. 215, M. Oclatinius Adventus, 'II ord. 218, P. Valerius Comazon, 'II ord. 220. Perhaps Atticus, after receiving the ornamenta praetoria, some time later got the ornamenta consularia. A precedent may be found: Claudius’ Guard Prefect Rufrius Crispinus got the praetoria in 47 (Tac. Ann. 11.4), the consularia at some later date (ibid. 16.17). If this happened to Atticus (at a moment which can only be guessed), it might have led him or his descendants, or informants of Philostratus, to suppose, or pretend, that Atticus had been a consul bis.

The problem of suffecti iterum still requires examination. Syme long ago commented: ‘Several iterated consulates of the second century, culled from the literary evidence, need to be carefully scrutinized. They must be suffect consulates, if authentic; yet none such have yet been certified by inscriptions subsequent to 103 under Trajan, Hadrian, Pius, Marcus, or Commodus. Accident can of course be invoked.’ After discussing three dubious cases from the Historia Augusta, he adds that ‘one ought not to suppress a doubt about [the elder Atticus’] second consulate’. Nearly thirty years later, Halfmann dismissed V. soph. 2.1.1 curtly: ‘sicher unzutreffend, da der iterierte Konsulat seit der ersten Hälfte der Regierungszeit Trajans nicht mehr als consul suffectus, sondern nur noch als consul ordinarius bekleidet wurde’. It is no good to call in the HA for support: tertio consules, cum ipse ter futisset, plurimos fecit, infinitos autem secundi consulatus honore cumulavit (Had. 8.4). Syme commented simply: ’That is false. The facts are there.’ It is certainly impossible to believe that there

151 Schumacher, EOS I 265f., rejects the restoration [Ὑπάτων β’], to which he had inclined, attributed to him by Ameling (who relied on an unpublished version of the paper). See below on the ‘second consulship’. Schumacher 1973, 79.

152 Schumacher 1973, nos. C 15 (Falco), 16 (Procclus), 19 (Macrinus), 22 (Praesens), 9 (Tacitus). All still alive – except, most people would assume, Tacitus. But he might have survived into the 130s: his 70th birthday would have fallen c. 127–8. One or two other XVviri were certainly out of reach, e.g. Sex. Julius Severus (suff. 127), C 24: in Moesia Inferior, Britain, Judaea and Syria. For Falco, cf. above and nn. 13ff., for Procclus, below.


154 Ameling 1983, I 27 n. 36, also compares V. soph. 1.25.6 – ἐξ ὑπάτων – but it is hard to see why this ‘αὐχ ἐν δισεπάτως zu zielten scheint’.

155 Ameling 1983, I 27.

156 Ameling 1983, I 27.

157 Degrassi 1952, 60f.


159 Halfmann 1979, 123.

160 RP I 232. Syme never wavered from this view: cf. RP II 491, 493, 685; IV 46, 319; V 555.
were **plurimi coss.** III under Hadrian: only M. Annius Verus (126) and L. Julius Ursus Servianus (134) are attested and surely neither they nor Hadrian **cos.** III 119 had a **cos. tertium** as suffect. As for **cos. II infinitos**, one can hardly find much more than half a dozen among the **cos. ord.** (On the other hand, there are only two certain **cos. II ord.** under Pius (139 and 146), surprisingly few.161)

Another, apparently more convincing, case of a **cos. II suff.** later than 103 has recently come to light. Werner Eck has kindly drawn to my attention an inscription from Larinum, G. De Benedettis and A. Di Niro, L’anfiteatro di Larinum. Iscrizioni monete sepolture (Istituto regionale per gli studi storici del Molise ‘V. Cuoco’ 1995) 21–26, no. 2162:

```
[culo cos II]...[s f fetiali][---]vinct Lugudun[---]r pr trib pleb[---]IIIviro a a a f[---]es remissa/ [---]
```

The lettering in the first line is considerably larger than in lines 2–5, except for the slightly smaller O in **cos** and, even more markedly, the II which follows it, manifestly inserted later, to the right of the top half of the S. (The lettering in the last two surviving lines, 6–7 – the editors assume there was a further line – is also somewhat larger, if less markedly, than that in 2–5.) As the editors recognise, **cognomen**, priesthoods and posts in Lugudunensis and as **monetalis** combine to identify the honorand as C. Julius M. f. Volt. Proculus, whose **cursus honorum** is known from CIL X 6658 = ILS 1040 = Smallwood 212, Antium:


Proculus was consul **suff.** in September and October 109; and, apart from the career on the Antium stone, the initial stages of which are particularly interesting, is thought later to have had some post in Baetica, under Hadrian.163 Further comment is required, since, apart from the surprising **cos.II** of the new inscription, interpreted by the editors as **cos. suff. iterum**, Proculus can now be identified in a long, fragmentary letter of Fronto.164

The editors restore the new text as follows:

```
```

---

161. C. Bellicius Torquatus, colleague of Herodes as **ord. 143**, is sometimes shown as **cos. II.** Alföldy 1977, 144 n. 28, is unwilling to accept this evidence – it would make him identical with the C. Bellicius Flaccus Torquatus Tebanianus (**ord. 124**). (But why not?) Otherwise, one would like to find a second – necessarily suffect – consulsip for Q. Lollius Urbicus (PIR² L 327), who won Pius his only imperial acclamation and was City Prefect– which before and after Pius generally led to an iteration. It would be possible to fit him in as suffect to the emperor, **cos. IV**, or to M. Aurelius Caesar, **cos. II.** in 145 (Alföldy 1977, 149, shows that there are no known suffects immediately replacing the imperial pair): a reward for his British victory. For this suggestion, A. R. Birley 1987, 275 n. 9. A new diploma of 145, dated by suffects, but without the month surviving, gives: L. Lamia Silvano L(...)s fis cos. M. M. Roxan in RMD III 165 follows K. Wachtel, Klio 74 (1992) 246–9, in identifying the first suffect as Pius’ son-in-law Lamia Silvano (HA Ant.Pius 1.7). He might have survived till 145, although Groag supposed that he ‘mature vita functum esse’ (PIR² A 206). But could the consul of 145 not be the father, **consocer** of Pius, L. Fundanius Lamia (Plautius Silvanus) Aelianus, **cos. ord. 116** (A 204; Syme, RP I 327; III 1175)? Then what follows the name could be read, not as L. – the **praenomen** of the other consul – but I [I] and one might conjecturally restore the pair as L. Lamia Silvano I [I] Q. Lollio Urbico II. When Sex. Erucius Clarus, **ord. 146** and City Prefect, died in office the next year, Urbicus was probably his successor, already a **cos. bis** on this hypothesis – which remains merely a hypothesis.

162. This makes a rather lengthy excursus necessary.

163. Evidence in PIR² I 497.

164. Klaus Wachtel, preparing the entry for ‘Proculus Iulius’ for PIR² P, was good enough to draw the Fronto passage to my attention.
The second consulship, the principal concern here, is discussed below. First, some comment on other elements:

line 2: the listing of the curatorship of public works is unsuitable between consulship and priesthoods – which are out of chronological order, as so often. Some post more distinguished than this cura is required, e.g. praefecto urbi (cf. CIL V 6980), procos. provinc. Africæ (cf. AE 1950. 66; ILS 1061), or comiti imp. Traiani (vel Hadriani) Aug. (cf. ILS 1141). The first two posts do not, however, seem to fill the space adequately.

line 3: the proconsulship of Baetica, taken to be, exceptionally, consular, must be rejected. This notion goes back a long way. Groag took a terminatio from Baetica, CIL II 2349 = ILS 5973, recording that the trifinium between three peoples, ex sententia Iuli Proculi iudic., had been confirmatu(m) ab imp. Caesare Hadriano Aug., to be evidence for our Proculus having been assigned a ‘Spezialmandat’ by Hadrian during the latter’s stay in Spain.165 Alföldy followed this view, with a refinement, suggesting that Proculus was with Hadrian as one of his comites and was assigned to the case as ‘Schiedsrichter’. He emphatically ruled out a proconsulship of Baetica.166 It would serve no useful purpose to set out the long list of opinions (mostly in favour of identification with the suff. 109), for the stone has recently been re-edited: CIL II, editio altera, pars VII, Conventus Cordubensis, edidit A. U. Stylow, adiuvantibus C. González Román et G. Alföldy (Berlin 1995) no. 776, more conveniently CIL II2 7, 776. The editor rejects as ‘vix probabile’ identification of iudex and consular: the iudex could well have given his sententia long before Hadrian’s visit; and anyway such iudices were seldom either senatorial or equestrian.167

line 4: [praef alimento]r is very dubious, even though Eck plausibly enough suggested that Proculus’ post in Transpadana (to be discussed further below) was in effect that of a ‘Sonderbeamter für die Konstituierung der Alimentarinstitution’.168 [leg.leg. VI Fer]r is surely needed here (on the lines of the Antium text) rather than in line 5, where the editors place it.

Now for the second consulship. Was it a ‘suffect’ second consulship? It could, surely, only have been held in succession to a cos. II (or more) ord. The years 112 and 113 are ruled out: suffects for Trajan VI and L. Publilius Celsus II are already known. There are ten years under Hadrian or Pius where no immediate suffect to a cos. iterum or tertium is certainly known: 118, 119, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 137, 139, 140.169 Proculus might theoretically have held office in one of these years. Another possibility is more plausible: that he was designated to a second consulship as ordinarius, but died shortly before 1 January of the year in question. There are two parallels. Three papyri from the Dead Sea give the consuls of 128 as P. Metilius Nepos II and M. Annius Libo.170 Yet the Fasti otherwise show Libo’s colleague as L. Nonius Calpurnius Asprenas Torquatus II. Metilius had presumably expired at the end of 127.171 Even clearer is the case of Cn. Julius Verus, described on his funerary inscription from Dalmatian Aequum as cos. desig. II (CIL III 8714+2732 = ILS 8974+1057+add.), but given as cos. II – for 180 – in PDura 25 (23) with C. Bruttius Praesens II; the Fasti have as Praesens’ colleague Sex. Quintilius Condianus. Verus clearly died late in 179.172 For Proculus a similar explanation is to hand. In 134 Hadrian’s aged brother-in-law, L. Julius Ursus Servianus (suff. 90, II ord. 102), at last became cos. III. Most sources give his colleague as T. Vibius Varus. But on a number of inscriptions, including some

165 RE 10.1 (1917) Iulius no. 418, 783–6, at 786 (likewise Stein, ibid. no. 414, 783).
166 Alföldy 1969, 166f.
168 Eck 1979, 158.
171 Thus PIR² M 545.
172 Degrassi 1952, 50; PIR² I 618.
from 134, Servianus is given as sole consul. On one, CIL III 10281, as colleague of Servianus stood originally another name, subsequently deleted, ending in O in the ablative and between seven and nine letters long. Why not \([\text{[Proculo]}]\) – his name erased not because he had been condemned, but simply because he had never entered office?

Other problems or puzzles about Proculus justify a further brief digression. First, his origo, almost universally taken as Narbonensis because of the tribe Voltinia, because he was a Iulius with the filiation \(M.f.\) and because of the cognomen Proculus – relationship with the family of Agricola’s mother Julia Procilla (Tac. Agr. 4) is conjectured or assumed. Not doubted by the editors of the Larinum stone, who assume that town was in Clustumina. Yet there is good evidence for Larinum being precisely in the same tribe as Proculus – the dedication by a descendant or homonym of Cicero’s client from Larinum, found in 1949 at Carrawburgh (Brocolitia) on Hadrian’s Wall, AE 1951.125b = RIB I 1545: \(D(eo)\) \(i(n)victo\) \(M(ithrae)\) \(s(acrum)\) \(Aul.\) \(Cluentius\) \(Habitus\) \(pra(e)f.\) \(coh.\) \(I\) \(Batavorum\) \(domu\) \(V(o)l(tin)(ia)\) \(colon.\) Sept. \(Aur.\) \(L(arin)\) \(v.s.l.m.\) E. Birley pointed out that ‘it has hitherto been supposed that Larinum belonged to the tribe Clustumina, attested by three inscriptions found there [CIL IX 731, 737, 755]. But there is no case in which Larinum is specified as the man’s origo and Clustumina as his tribe (which would prove the point); and the Carrawburgh altar shows that, at least after its receipt of a charter from Severus, the town belonged to the Voltinian tribe.’ In that case, if Proculus was a local man after all, he need not have been honoured as patronus (although he probably was patronus as well; and detailed restoration of the last lines becomes less certain).

Proculus began as monetalis, a sign of favour for plebeians, likewise the next post, quaestor of the emperor. Not, surely, a novus homo. Senatorial ascendants are to hand: filiation and tribe point to M. Julius [...] f. Vol. Ro[mu]lus, made a senator by Claudius (AE 1925.85, Velitrae), then legate of XV Apollinaris, followed by the praetorship and four senatorial posts, the latest being pro[cos.] extra [sort]em of Macedonia, and his presumed son, also M. Julius Romulus, legate to the proconsul of Sardinia in 68–9 (ILS 5947). The cognomen ‘Romulus’ for these two, putative grandfather and father of our Proculus, looks particularly appropriate (see below). \(q.\) Augustor(um) is most plausibly interpreted as referring to Domitian and Nerva, in 96. The following post, military tribune of the Syrian legion IV Scythica, looks out of place. Syme explained the timing as a product of events of 97 in that province: the governor, who had been behaving threateningly (Pliny, Ep. 9.13.10f.), and at least two legionary legates dismissed, A. Larcius Priscus, quaestor in Asia, made legate of IV Scythica and acting governor of Syria, the ignotus of ILS 1020, legate of Cappadocian XVI Flavia under Nerva, taking over VI Ferrata in Syria under Trajan.

However this may be, Proculus’ next post, described as \(ab\) \(actis\) \(imp.\) \(Traiani\) \(Aug.\), is also peculiar: \(ab\) \(actis\) \(senatus\) was the normal description; but the terminology was probably not yet fixed. (That Trajan is not called divi Traiani need not, by the way, mean he was still alive when the Antium inscription was composed – cf. ILS 1039, candidato imp. Traiani Aug. Germ. Dacici Parth.; or 1053, [quaest.] imp. Caesaris Nervae Traiani Aug. G[ermanic[i Dacici], both after Trajan’s death.) It might

---

173 Briefly discussed by Groag, RE 10.1 (1917), Julius no. 538, at 887f.; Degrassi 1952, 38f.
176 Probable Narbonensians for Syme, RP VI 216, 226, cf. 221.
be a way of indicating some ‘special relationship’ with the emperor, say in 99 – but it is not impossible that the mason confused and condensed an original which went praet. trib. pl. candidatus imp. Traiani Aug. ab actis senatus. If quaestor in 96, Proculus was probably born c. 71 at the earliest and would have been at most 38 when cos. suff. in 109. One may estimate that he was tribune of the plebs c. 101, praetor c. 103 and legate of VI Ferrata c. 104–6 – at the time of the annexation of Arabia by the legate of Syria A. Cornelius Palma. 179

It is customarily assumed that after the legionary command he was appointed leg. Aug. p. p. region. Transpadanae. Here one must discuss the passage in Fronto, Ad amicos 2.7.19, newly deciphered, p. 195f., by van den Hout (2nd ed., Teubner 1988): Proculus Iulius quindecimvir anno decimo lamentis relegatus est gratuando tullit biennium illud . . . item praeventi et quinquennium exsulis in triennium artavit . . . Proculus homo ingenio ad cetera remisso et delicato, sed in sententiis dicundis ad poeniendum paulo durior et infestior . . . plerique ad cetera viri minime severi inlautius prolati, in iudicando asperi tamen in eadem dignitate furere, videlicet spec<ct>antes, ut pro severitate, qua carebant, obtensus saevitias subornarent. (This was previously, e.g. in Haines’ Loeb ed., numbered section 9 of Ad amicos 2.7.) Although much remains incomprehensible (but one may presumably conjecture gratu<ndo> to make sense of the ninth word), this Proculus Iulius quindecimvir must surely be our man. The frequency of the combination ‘Iulius Proculus’ doubtless led Fronto (who had a friend from Cirta of this name) 180 to add the label quindecimvir; and, as often, in his archaising way he inverted nomen and cognomen. This may have been the practice of the man himself – this style could have evoked a legendary figure. Note Groag’s suggestion, ‘daß er seinen Namen nach dem sagenhaften Proculus Iulius, der Romulus’ Himmelfahrt sah, erhalten habe’. That Iulius, a homo agrestis, would have had ‘Proculus’ as a praenomen. 181 If our Proculus’ father and grandfather were called ‘Romulus’ (cf. above), the choice of ‘Proculus’ is given added point.

Fronto’s letter, to his Cirtensian friend C. Arrius Antoninus, concerned Volumnius Serenus, an elderly decurio of Concordia, formerly banished (relegatus), evidently by Proculus, for five years, a sentence reduced by the same Proculus to three years. His right to re-enter the curia thereafter had first been disputed before Lollius Urbicus, presumably in his capacity as Urban Prefect, 182 qui nihil adversus Volumnium statuit (there follows the words sed loco and a lacuna of two pages, 2.7.12, p. 191). Volumnius’ membership of the ordo was again called in question when Arrius Antoninus was iuridicus regionis Transpadanae, the first appointed, c. 165/6. 183 Volumnius was now well over 70 (seni septuaginta annos olim egresso, 2.7.18, p. 194) and had been a decurion for 45 years (2.7.7, p. 190), i.e. since c. 120. He can only have been relegatus by emperor, senate, an Urban or Praetorian Prefect – or by a provincial governor (Digest 48.22). Precisely under Hadrian one of the new consular imperial legates installed by that emperor functioned as a ‘provincial governor’ of this part of Italy. This has been shown clearly by Eck. 184

It seems too much of a coincidence that Julius Proculus the XVvir, who evidently had imposed the five year exile and then reduced it to three years, had been, according to the Antium inscription, precisely leg. Aug. p. p. region. Transpadanae. This post (whatever its purpose) is customarily assumed

---

179 Thus e.g. Pflaum 1978, 317.
180 PIR² I 255, 501; Champlin 1980, 14 and n. 62.
181 Groag, RE 10.1, 784; Münzer, ibid. 112f.; Salomies 1987, 44f.
182 PIR² L 327; Alfiöldy 1977, 287, i.e. not before 146
183 Thus most recently Piso 1993, 106–117.
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Further, Proculus’ other provincial appointment, ad census provinciae Lugdunensis, is taken to be consular, c. 111/112. Further, the post is held to have been concerned only with Transpadana in the narrower sense, regio XI. Yet Arrius Antoninus, who manifestly dealt with Concordia, in regio X (Venetia et Istria), was called iuridico per Italam regionis Transpadanae primo (ILS 1118, Concordia) or iuridico regionis Transpadanae (1119, Cirta). There seems then no impediment on grounds of job description to taking Julius Proculus to have been one of the Hadrianic legates – the order of posts in the Antium cursus, in descending order cura, Lugdunensis, Transpadana, need not be pressed.

If Proculus, cos. suff. 109, did not in fact hold office as imperial legate of Transpadana until Hadrian’s reign – and probably not before 128 – that leaves a remarkable gap in his career. It would also, at first sight, leave him with no post between legionary command and consulship, implausible even for one so favoured at the start of his career. Perhaps, then, he was in Lugdunensis before his consulship. There was no fixed status for these imperial censitores: both ex-praetors and ex-consuls are attested. The cura operum publicorum at all events will have followed the consulship, perhaps, then, immediately, c. 110–111. What ensued after the urban cura? The answer may be in Fronto’s letter: Proculus, who sentenced Volumnius to relegatio, had apparently been exiled himself, Proculus Iulius quindecimvir anno decimo lamenris relegatus est – the context is, to be sure, far from clear. Perhaps he had incurred Trajan’s displeasure – like M’. Laberius Maximus, cos. II ord. 103, in exile in 117 (HA Had. 5.5) – some time after his consulship, to be restored by Hadrian. And, since it seems essential to find something in the first part of line 2, before the priesthoods, why not suppose that, after recall by Hadrian, he was a comes of that emperor on his travels? He was, after all, so Fronto conceded, homo ingenio ad cetera remisso et delicato – this might have made him an attractive companion for the intellectual ruler. Then, in due course, Proculus could have been appointed one of Hadrian’s newly created consular legates for four regions of Italy. Finally, in 133, on this reconstruction, he was singled out to have a second consulship, as ordinarius, twenty-five years after his first as suffect, and to share the fasces with old Servianus in 134.

Proculus’ own banishment may, to be sure, be too much to stomach. It may be better to assume that the archetype from which the codex Ambrosianus derived already contained a gap, not noticed as such, between Proculus Iulius quindecimvir and anno decimo lamenris relegatus. In that case, Proculus’ unemployment after the urban cura could be ascribed to illness, disdain or his ingenium remissum et delicatum. When he gained his two priesthoods, as fetialis and XVvir s.f., remains entirely uncertain. Schumacher puts the XVvirate ‘vor ca. 113 unter Trajan’ – but he accepts the identification of Proculus with the ignorant CIL XI 4646, Tuder, a Trajanic legate of Dalmatia who had been curator operum publicorum (the only two posts preserved). No other evidence survives for this notion, and there is no need for further discussion here.

185 Groag, RE 10.1, 786; Pflaum 1978, 317; Eck 1979, 158; Franke 1993, 138; PIR² I 497; Syme 1958, 800; RP IV 317; V 432 – and elsewhere.
186 As well as items cited in the previous note, Kolb 1993, 176 ff.; Thomasson 1991, 87.
187 Thus Syme, RP V 431 ff.; Eck 1995, 44.
188 For the probable date when Hadrian’s four legateships were first established, Syme, RP V 432.
189 As conceded by Thomasson, EOS I 305 ff.; id. 1991, 87.
190 Kolb 1993, 177 puts it c. 112–113, taking the Lugdunensis post to be consular and accepting the order of posts in ILS 1040. It must be conceded that the alternative here proposed, legate (and censitor) of Lugdunensis c. 106–8, consul 109, curator c. 110–111 – and legate of Transpadana years afterwards – involves disregarding the order of the Antium cursus.
191 Cf. above and n. 68.
192 Schumacher 1973, 71 ff.; cf. e.g. Kolb 1993, 175, on the Tuder inscription.
An alternative restoration of the Larinum inscription may now be offered, sticking approximately to
the same number of letters restored in the original publication (but omitting full supplementation of
lines 6–7 or 6–8, if a further line must be supplied):
Transpadanae item ad cens pro]vinc Lugudunii[en]sis curat. operum publicorum leg leg VI Fer]
pr trib
pleb/[ab actis imp Traiani Aug tr leg IIII Scythic q Augustor] IIIviro a a a f fl [ ?Larinate]s
remissa[/pecunia? ]
This reconstruction remains a hypothesis, ‘subject to hazard’. To return to the starting-point: the
new inscription need not be evidence for coss. II suff. under Hadrian.

A little more needs saying on Atticus and Herodes. The date of birth of Herodes can only be inferred
from his age at death, 76, Philostr. V.soph. 2.1.15, presumably not long after M. Aurelius conferred with
him about the nomination of professorships at Athens, Philostr. V. soph. 2.2.1, cf. Dio 71.31.3 – in 176.
This is the last record of his existence. Hence birth c. 100 or 101 seems plausible.193 As a boy he could
easily have made the acquaintance of Hadrian when the latter was archon at Athens, 111–112 or 112–
113. As a youth he had a spell in the Spartan agoge, perhaps c. 114–115. Thereafter he was probably
sent to Rome, to the house of Calvisius Tullus; and in summer 117 made a speech before Hadrian in Pannonia (Philostr. V. soph. 2.14). His early senatorial career is known only from a Latin inscription of
unknown provenance, now in Stockholm, SIG3 863, n.1 = Smallwood no. 199b = Ameling 1983, II
inter amicos, trib. pleb., praetorem. The failure to register a post in the vigintivirate may, but need not,
mean that he did not hold one. At all events, if he was a XXvir, it would have been at age 18 or so, i.e. c.
119. Why not suppose that Herodes gained the latus clavus from Hadrian in 117 or 118, following his meeting with the emperor in Pannonia? At this stage Atticus may have been granted the
ornamenta consularia, topping up his existing ornamenta praetoria, which could be associated – it is merely a
guess – with Trajan’s presence at Athens in 113. The expression q. imp. . . . inter amicos, which is
unmatched, allows one to infer special favour. Hence the suggestion that Hadrian made Herodes his
quaestor in 124, when he was at Athens, and took him back to Rome with him in spring 125. Herodes
returned to Athens at latest in 126/7, when he was archon, aged not more than about 25.194 His tribunate
of the plebs probably fell in 128 (beginning 10 December 127), and he could perfectly well have returned to Athens, again with Hadrian, in late summer. At this stage, having seen his son’s career as a
Roman senator taking off, Atticus may have been persuaded to enter the amplissimus ordo himself,
adlected inter praetorios with a promise from Hadrian of a consulship. Herodes’ praetorship could be
assigned to 130.195 Thereafter, for his senatorial career, there is only the post as corrector of free cities
in Asia, datable to c.135–6,196 his consulate as ordinarius in 143, and his priesthood as XVvir s.f.

193 Ameling 1983, II 2 and n. 13, argues for a slightly later year, 102 or 103. Perfectly possible, it is true, but the
evidence makes 100 or 101 acceptable, without special pleading.
195 This dating differs somewhat from that proposed by Ameling 1983, II 2ff.: XXvir 128 – Xvir s.i. is suggested by that
scholar (but this presupposes some basic familiarity with Roman law, perhaps unlikely for Herodes); quaestor 129; trib. pleb.
131; praetor 133 (aged 30 on his estimate of the birth-year). The vigintivirate remains hypothetical. It was compulsory from
13 BC, Dio 54.26.4ff. Cf. A.R. Birley 1981, 5 n. 6, for some cases where it seems to have been omitted. But if Herodes
served, it would surely have been aged c. 18 – 20, cf. op.cit. 4ff.: at any rate not necessarily in the year immediately before
the quaestorship, as Ameling assumes. Information on the age at which the office was held is hard to come by. But note e.g.
Hadrian, Xvir s.i. before his three military tribunates (ILS 308 = Smallwood 109) which began c.95, when he was 19 (HA
Had,1.3; 2.1ff.).
196 He coincided – or clashed – with the proconsul, Antoninus, Philostr. V. soph. 2.1.8. Eck, Chiron 13 (1983) 178,
favours this year.
Herodes was apparently not married until shortly before his consulship – a son, his first (apparently), was not born until summer 142 at earliest.\footnote{Fronto, Ad M. Caes. 1.6.10 = 13 v.d.Hout (letter of Marcus); Ameling 1983, I 80, II 16 – but E. Champlin, JRS 64 (1974) 141, is unwilling to be more precise than ‘between later 143 and c. 160’. (The \textit{terminus post quem} has to be modified in the light of new evidence for Fronto’s consulship, July-August 142, not 143, above and n. 14) Later children followed, Ameling I 18ff., II 16ff.}

Considerable uncertainty remains over parts of Atticus’ life. He is never, it is a surprise, on record as \textit{archon} at Athens. Yet late in life he served as eponymous magistrate, \textit{patronomos}, at Sparta.\footnote{Evidence conveniently listed by Ameling 1983, II 74ff., nos. 45–49. His year is dated to 134–5 by Chrimes 1949, 465, which might need slight adjustment.} As such he would have had an important role in supervising the \textit{agoge}, in which he had apparently participated in his youth.\footnote{On the \textit{patronomos’} role cf. below and n. 211. Atticus in the \textit{agoge} , n. 149, above.} He had Spartan relatives – a daughter or perhaps a sister was married to a Spartan notable.\footnote{Spawforth, ABSA 75 (1980) 210ff., 219, on SEG IX 781 = XXX 407. Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, no. 251, suggests that Claudia Tisamenis may have been a sister of Atticus rather than his daughter, as proposed by Spawforth.} The revival of the re-invented \textit{agoge} was now a vital element in the Hellenic renaissance. As Kennell has acutely pointed out, the ‘Spartans did not hold themselves completely aloof from this phenomenon.’ But, as ‘the triumph of the Athenocentric view of the fifth and fourth centuries meant a Sparta usually relegated to the role of villain’, they had to stress the period ending with the Persian Wars – and their \textit{agoge}, ‘purported to be the last surviving repository of Sparta’s archaic warrior traditions’.\footnote{Kennell 1995, 94ff. Note also id., 87ff., showing that the – artificial – linguistic archaism at Sparta only begins in the 130s and is almost wholly confined to agogic texts.} That an Athenian who claimed descent from Miliadi and Cimon (Philostr. V. soph. 2.1.1), the latter philolaconian, and who himself embodied the harmonious co-operation of Athens and Sparta, should play a part in supervising Sparta’s claim to uniqueness, is entirely appropriate. Just before his death, he was made \textit{Kυθροδικάς}, apparently to administer the island bequeathed by its owner Herculanus to Hadrian and returned by him to the Spartans.\footnote{SEG XI 492 = Ameling 1983, II no. 51. See esp. Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 251ff.}

Atticus and Herodes, along with others, such as Polemo – and Eurycles Herculanus, may be supposed to have worked closely with Hadrian, in particular to design his new Hellenic Commonwealth. The emperor, several times at Athens and twice at Sparta, may, it can be guessed, have stayed at each place at one of the houses of the leading citizen.

Appendix 2

The Later Euryclids and the Career of C. Julius Eurycles Herc(u)lanus Vibullius Pius\footnote{Spartans will generally be referred to by the numbering in Bradford 1977.} It has been argued above that neither the Euryclid nomenclature of Q. Pompeius Falco nor the discovery that Julia Balbilla was Herculanus’ \‘̣\textit{ἄνεψι	ext{\text{̣}}}\’\ prove that he was born in the period c. 70–73, nor that he was made a senator by Trajan.\footnote{Cf. above, with nn. 12ff.} The only evidence for this rank is IG V 1, 1172 = Smallwood 210, Gytheum:

\begin{verbatim}
[Γ. Ιούλι]ον Εὐρυκλέα
[Ἡρκλα]όν Γ. [Ιο]λύθου
[Αύκω]ν ιοΰν, ἐκγόνον

{oίκου δύ]ξι]βού, τα[μι]ν καὶ
\end{verbatim}
None of his numerous other inscriptions mention his senatorial rank, which does not necessarily mean that he did not have it when they were set up. For example, IG V 2, 281 = Smallwood 164, Mantinea, with only his names, no rank, records his donation of a stoa with exedrae to the city and to the ἐπιχώριος θεός Αντιόνος. This was certainly after he had become a senator – the donation was not carried out until after his death, by his heirs. IG V 1, 380 = Smallwood 137, Cythera (now lost), was set up to Trajan, evidently in 116 or 117, ἐπὶ ἄρχιερεσίαν διὰ βιου τῶν (Σε)β(α)(σ)τόν (sic) φιλοσεβαστότοι τοῦ Πολέως (Γ.) Ἰουλίου Εὔ(ρο)κλεοῦς(ς) (sic) Ἦρκλανου Λουκίου Βιβούλιου [Πείου]. Failure to specify senatorial rank need not mean that he was not yet a senator; and the same inscription should not be taken to refer to his patronomate either.207

It might be thought that light would be shed on his date of birth by Herculanus’ year as eponymous magistrate at Sparta. But it is extremely difficult to reconstruct the chronology of the patronomate. There are few ‘fixed dates’ and only relative positioning (in Spartan ‘cursus-inscriptions’) produces a chronological series. Since Kolbe, in IG V 1, the only full list, with attempted dating from Nero to Severus, is that of Chrimes (which certainly requires revision in places).208 She puts Herculanus in 117/18, after Mason 7, ‘106/7’, and P. Memmius Pius 2, ‘113/14’, and before T. Flavius Charixenus 6, ‘119/20’.209 There is no information on a minimum age for the patronomos.210 What is clear is that there was a heavy financial burden, and an important role in the agoge.211 If Herculanus was born as

---

205 In line 7 Kolbe restored τοµίαν rather than δήμοι, as Foucart, cf. Groag, RE 10.1 (1917) 583, who regarded this ‘Wortstellung’ – δήμοι – as ‘ungewöhnlich’. [τοµίαν] Ἐγκαλήων, if correct, would suggest he held a second quaestorship at Rome, after that in Achaia.

206 It must be asked whether the stone is complete. One would expect at least the name(s) of whoever set up the statue, e.g. η πόλις η Γυθοτάτων (as in 1160, 1162ff., etc.). On the other hand, there seems to have been uninscribed space (‘vacat’) above line 1; for a leaf stop is placed after the numeral γ in line 11 – the numeral must, it is thought, refer to legion III Gallica, since the command of Numidian III Augusta was the equivalent of a governorship and the same probably applies to III Cyrenaica, the sole legion of Arabia some time under Hadrian (or, if the legionary legate ship were Trajanic, III Cyrenaica was in Egypt). Perhaps there was originally a second stone alongside, with details of the person or corporation that erected the monument.

207 It does not mean that he was patronomos at the time, as implied by A.J.S. Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 252 n. 23; retracted, id., in Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 111.


209 L. Petersen in PIR² I 302, citing IG V 1, 32, 34, 44, 103 (which is not relevant), 1315, puts the office ‘paulo ante annum 125’, followed by Halfmann 1979,126. Bradford 1977, Eurycles 2 Herculanus, gives IG V 1, 32B, 34 (but omitting 44), 1315, SEG XI 518, 680.


early as AD 70 or shortly afterwards, he would, on this dating, have been in his mid- to late forties when *patronomos*. This seems implausibly late. Surely so wealthy a Spartan would have been persuaded to take his turn much earlier.  

There are other ways of tackling Herculanus’ date of birth. Three men who were *kasan* to a Eurycles during the *agoge*, which means that they were about the same age as him, crop up later as *gerontes*, Aristomenes 2, IG V 1, 103, Nicippus 3, BSA 26, C6/C7, 9, and an *ignotus*, Bradford’s Frag. 150, IG V 1, 103 = SEG XI 568.4. These lists look Trajanic, for the Nicippus text is a duplicate of IG V 1, 20b, a list of *gerontes* and other magistrates in the year the Leonidean games were re-established by C. Julius Agesilaus 4, under Trajan, as is generally supposed.  

It might, however, be argued that 121 would have been an eminently suitable year – precisely the 600th anniversary of Leonidas’ heroic end. Still, the same Agesilaus 4 had been *athloletes* at another festival, the revived (or reinvented) *Olympia*, called τα μέγιστα, with the additional name Ξέφωτεσ Νερουανδεία, assumed to start up in 97 or 98, since the festival manifestly commemorated Nerva.  

But one must ask: was it really named after Nerva himself? Νερουανδεία ought, surely, to refer to *Νερούανδείας*, i.e. Trajan, the son of Nerva – or to the *Νερουανδείας*, Nerva’s descendants: Trajan, θεός Νέρωνα υἱός, and Hadrian, θεός Νέρωνα υιόν νός. Admittedly, the name Νέρωνας is awkward: *Νερουάνδειας* might have been too much of a mouthful. But what was wrong with *Νερουάνδειας*? After all, the Euryclidean games were not Ευρυκλείουδας but Ευρύκλειας. Other *-ός*, *-όν* forms point this way: *Ἀτρείδης*, *Ἀτρείδαι*, etc. Parallels for Nerva do not seem to exist – no other festivals for him are known. But that the new *‘dynasty* could have been conceived as being the *‘Nervanids*’ is at least feasible. That this notion might go back to Hadrian himself is worth a thought. As it happens, a poem attributed to Hadrian, and reckoned to have been composed in Syria in 113–114, a dedication to Zeus Caius on the eve of the first campaigning season, calls Trajan Αἰνείδης and the Parthians *Άρσοκίδαι* (Anth. Pal. 6.322). Hadrian’s need to prove his legitimacy at the start of his reign might, it could be argued, have led him to drop a hint, taken up in Sparta, that stress should be laid on the *‘Nervanids’*. 

‘In his benefactions Agesilaus [4] associated himself with a certain T. Flavius Charixenus [6]’, as Spawforth notes, adding that the latter ‘seems to have been a younger man, since he held the patronomate well over a decade later.’ The patronomates of these two are, indeed, dated by Chrimes to 95–6 and 119–20, a gap of over twenty years (which may well need revision – the year of Charixenus 6 was evidently after that of Eurycles 2 Herculanus, IG V 1, 34; the date of Agesilaus 4’s year does not

---

212 To be sure, Spawforth, ABSA 80 (1985) 226ff., puts the patronomate of the only other known Spartan senator, Ti. Claudius Brasidas 7 = 74, *praetorius vir* under M. Aurelius, i.e. between 161 and 180 (Dig. 36.1.23) (Halfmann 1979, no. 111), ‘somewhere in the decade 167–177’ and ‘relatively late in his life, perhaps when his Roman career was over and he had returned to his native city,’ Chrimes 1949, 467 has ‘c. 157/8’. Halfmann 1979, p. 188, ‘gegen Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts’; Bradford 1977 labels Claudius Brasidas 4, the *patronomos*, ‘mid II A.D.’ Neither, of course, could use Spawforth’s paper – but the dating remains very speculative. Atticus, of course, was no longer young when *patronomos* – but Herodes was *eponymus* at Athens in his early to mid-twenties, above, n. 194.  

213 Spawforth, in Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 192; accepted by Kennell 1995, 82. Spawforth’s point that Trajan’s Parthian War, ‘in the preparations for which the Peloponnesse had been actively involved’ (citing R. Baladié, La Péloponèse et la Parthie pendant la Guerre des Parthes [Paris 1980] 273ff.) afforded an appropriate context for commemoration of heroes of the Persian Wars, is well made. Chrimes 1949, 445, no. 38, 452ff., nos. 5, 6, 22, 455 n. 1, cf. n. 5, puts this *gerasia* list c. 120.  

214 This view goes back well before Kolbe, ad IG V 1, 667. Like everyone else, Spawforth, in Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 185ff., 195ff., 232, also assumes this date. There is scarcely any evidence for the cult of Zeus Uranus, to which the Urania are supposed to belong, before this time. In fact, the sole mention seems to be Herodotus, 6.56: one Spartan king was priest of Zeus Lacedaemon, the other of Zeus Uranus. IG V 1, 36A, mentioning a priest of Zeus Uranus, is from the second century A.D. (the man in question was later *nomophylax* in the patronomate of Callicrates 26, cf. n. 208 above). The label *Νερουανδείας* is not found again on other inscriptions referring to the Urania.  


seem to have any really firm basis). If the suggestion above about the ‘Urania Nervanideia’ has any force, there are various implications: *inter alia* that the patronomate of Menecles 5, in office when they were held, ceases to be a ‘fixed date’, viz. 97/8.

Leaving this aside, if the list of *gerontes* who included former ‘kasens of Eurycles’, which belongs to the year in which Agesilaus 4 ‘re-endowed’ the Leonidea, could be dated to 120 – hardly later – the question is then: how old were they then? Chrimes was clear that the old minimum age of 60 no longer applied: the *gerusia* was not now a council of elders, elected for life. Instead, a one year term, sometimes several times repeated. She proposed 50 as the new minimum. Spawforth prefers 40 – but it might have been less. Roman senators, whose title had once meant exactly the same as *gerontes*, could be as young as 24 or 25 on gaining entry to the senate as quaestor in this period. On the extreme reckoning, these ex-*kasens* – and their aristocratic ‘foster-brother’ Eurycles – need not have been born earlier than c. 95.

It must be conceded that this may seem a desperate attempt to manipulate the evidence. A less drastic way to dispose of ‘Eurycles of the three *kasens*’ as an obstacle to Eurycles 2 Herculanus having been born as late as the early 90s, would be to regard the two as separate persons. Not inconceivable, given that several Euryclid names crop up repeatedly, e.g. Deximachus (sixteen in Bradford 1977), Lachares (six altogether, three subsequent to the dynast’s father, no. 3), and one more Laco. P. Memmius Laco 4. There is also a further (C. Julius) Eurycles (3), evidently of freedman origin, in the *agoge* under Hadrian. Might one not suppose that e.g. a hypothetical son or grandson of the procurator C. Julius Spartiaticus 4, or one of his numerous siblings, was given this name? (He may have died young.)

It might help if one could establish the descent of Herculanus, to see how many generations on from Eurycles 1 he was (that he was the 36th from the Dioscuri does not, alas, tell us anything useful). There are various versions of the Euryclid stemma. It would take up too much space and try readers’ patience to reproduce them in full. One may note the main features, beginning with Eurycles 1, son of Lachares 3 (abbreviating the names). Kolbe, *IG V* 1 (1913), ad 1172, offered the following:

```
Eurycles 1
   |  
Laco 1
   |  
Spartiaticus 4
   |  
Laco 2
   |  
Eurycles 2 Herculanus  Laco 3
```

---


218 Chrimes 1949, 139f.; Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 192: ‘on the assumption that a minimum age as low as thirty must be excluded, if only because it seems too young for a body calling itself (literally) ‘the old men’, we are left with forty as perhaps the most likely age-threshold in the Roman period.’ On the – diminished – role of the *gerusia* in this period, with only twenty-three, annually elected, members (instead of twenty-eight life ‘elders’), as part of the composite *boule*, together with the *synarchia*, composed of ephors and *nomophylakes*, N.M. Kennell, ‘*IG V* 1, 16 and the *gerousia* of Roman Sparta’, *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 193–202. Note his comment, p. 200: ‘the *gerontes* do not seem to have had power by themselves’. All the more reason to suspect that they may often have been quite young (cf. further next note).

219 The age of entry to the senate was clearly established by J. Morris, ‘Leges annales under the Principate I.’, *Listy Fil.* 87 (1964) 316–337, at 316f.; 24 (the 25th year). The relevance of this point was kindly drawn to my attention by Antony Spawforth (who must not, however, be taken to agree with the use I seek to make of it).

Groag did not print a stemma, but basically accepted the relationships worked out by Kolbe.\textsuperscript{221}

Further information accrued with the publication in 1926 of Latin inscriptions from Corinth, showing a C. Julius C.f. Fab. Laco as procurator of Claudius, and C. Julius Laconis f. Euryclis n. Fab. Spartiaticus as procurator Caesaris et Augustae Agrippinae, i.e. of Nero and his mother (between 54 and at latest 59); revised texts in Corinth VIII 2 (1931) nos.67–8. These were discussed by Chrimes, who, however, imported confusion by her use of a further text, IG V 1, 374. Her stemma must thus be rejected.\textsuperscript{222}

New developments followed. In 1961, G.W. Bowersock, apart from solving the problem over Strabo 366, thanks to the new text in the Vatican palimpsest, and throwing new light on the role of the dynast, took up the question of Eurycles 1’s descendants. He argued that C. Julius C.f. Fab. Laco, procurator of Claudius, revealed by the Latin inscription (Corinth VIII 2, no.67), could not be the dynast’s son, Laco 1: he is otherwise called ‘son of Eurycles’, and Eurycles was ‘not to be obscured by a mere praenomen.’ Hence Bowersock produced an extra Laco. His stemma, while retaining Chrimes’ non-existent ‘Eurycles Herculanus qui et Deximachus’, also differs in other respects from both Kolbe and Chrimes. Omitting earlier generations and siblings, the relevant parts are as follows:\textsuperscript{223}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
Eurycles 1 \\
Laco I, the dynast (Laco 1) \\
\hline
Laco II (Laco 1), Claudian procurator & Spartiaticus 4, Neronian procurator \\
\hline
Laco III (Laco 2) \\
\hline
Laco IV (Laco 3) & Eurycles 2 Herculanus
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

PIR\textsuperscript{2}, ad I 301 (Eurycles 1), essentially reverted to Kolbe, incorporating the procuratorships; Bowersock’s dissection of Laco 1 into dynast and procurator ‘nobis non persuasit’, ibid. I 372. Spawforth likewise dissented: ‘With regard to Laco’s nomenclature, C. Iulius C.f. Laco is no more than the correct Latin form of his name, while the Greek preference for the paternal cognomen as a patronymic, rather than the praenomen, is well known.’\textsuperscript{224} All the same, the other Euryclid known to have been proc. Aug., Spartiaticus 4, called himself not C.f. but Laconis f. Euryclis n. Hence Bowersock’s view still deserves serious consideration. Spawforth’s stemma is essentially the same as those of Kolbe and PIR\textsuperscript{2}, with the addition of the link he detected with Julia Balbilla, as ἐνεστά of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{221} RE 10.1 (1917) 580 (Eurycles 1), 581 (Eurycles 2 Herculanus), 660f. (Laco 2 and 3), 839f. (Spartiaticus 4).

\textsuperscript{222} Chrimes 1949, 183ff.; stemma, 204. Her case, 196ff., that the senator Eurycles 2 Herculanus descended from the dynast Eurycles 1 only via an adoptive son, Deximachus 1 – son of Pratolaus 2 – renamed C. Julius Eurycles Herculanus, and for the Lachares of IG V 1, 94 being that man’s son (rather than Lachares 3, the father of the dynast Eurycles 1), was based on various misconceptions. On Deximachus, she misled J. Kent, Corinth VIII 3 (1966) ad nos. 314a–e, but was convincingly refuted by Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 256ff., who ibid. 80 (1985) 193ff., has further clarified the identity of Deximachus the son of the dynast Eurycles 1 (IG V 1, 141; SIG\textsuperscript{3} 788), his second, the eldest being Rhadamanthys (IG V 1, 141), who must have died young, the third Laco 1, successor to the role of dynast. This Deximachus is to be distinguished from Deximachus 1, son of Pratolaus 2, whose brother Sidecitas 4 became the ancestor of the Laconian Memmii. Chrimes, by the way, was in favour of the Laco known from coins issued under Claudius ΕΠΙ ΛΑΚΩΝΟΣ, now Grunauer–v. Hoerschelmann 1978, 79ff., being Laco 2 not Laco 1.


\textsuperscript{224} ABSA 73 (1978) 254 n. 33. He stuck to this position in Cartledge–Spawforth 1989, 102.
\end{footnotesize}
Eurycles 2 Herculanus, on his view a first cousin (but see above and n. 17). Meanwhile S. Grunauer–v. Hoerschelmann had shown that coins of Laco were issued not only under Claudius but under Tiberius. Hence, it seemed, Laco 1 not only inherited his father’s position, but got it back under Claudius after returning from the exile imposed in AD 33 (Tac. Ann. 6.18); and was then made a procurator by Claudius, a position which Spartiaticus 4, his son on this view, also had under Nero.225

Halfmann, not commenting on, but apparently rejecting, Bowersock’s dissection of Laco 1 into dynast and procurator, and without printing a stemma, follows Chrimes in making Herculanus son, rather than brother, of Laco 3. He appears to assume the following226:

```
Eurycles 1

| Laco 1, dynast & proc.
|

Spartiaticus 4, proc.

Laco 2

Laco 3

Eurycles 2 Herculanus
```

Herculanus was son of a C. Julius Laco, IG V 1, 971, 1172 – but of which Laco? There were at least three members of the family in successive generations called C. Julius Laco: 1, on the ‘standard view’ the dynast, son of Eurycles 1, late in life, after rehabilitation, made a procurator; 2, his son, patronomos; ibid. 280; 3, the son of the patronomos, who substituted for his father in that office, ibid., and later held it himself, ibid. 480. Dating patronomates is not easy (cf. above). Chrimes assigned the patronomate of Laco 2 to ‘hardly later than the end of Vespasian’s reign’, more specifically to ‘about AD 75’. The date depends on ‘a point which hitherto seems to have escaped notice’,227 the career of Thrasybulus Callicratis f., kasa in the Paidikos Agon, i.e. a youth of between 16 and 19,228 in the year Laco 3 substituted for Laco 2. This Thrasybulus was a near contemporary of two others who were in the Gerusia when C. Julius Philoclidas 3 was patronomos, IG V 1, 97, which she dates to c. AD 120.229 Chrimes felt that her date of c. AD 75 for the patronomate of Laco 2 was still late enough to make it likelier that Eurycles 2 Herculanus was son, rather than brother, of Laco 3.230

---


226 Halfmann 1979, 125ff., on his no. 29 (Eurycles 2 Herculanus). (One irritation needs to be removed en passant: Spartiaticus, procurator at the beginning of Nero’s reign, and certainly a grandson, not a son, of the great Eurycles, is restored as ‘35th from the Dioscuri’ on IG V 1, 463: ἄ [πόλις] Γ. Ἰουλίουν Σπαρτιατικόν, Ἀδίκονος υἱόν, ἐγγονον Ἔυρυκλέους, λέ ἀπο Διος]κόρο[ν, ἄρχερετα τόν Σαβόν] πάντα] [προτόν]. Accepted by Halfmann 1979, 127, with no indication that λέ is restored. But this must be wrong: Herculanus is ‘36th’, IG V 1, 971, 1172.)

227 Chrimes 1949, 191 and n. 2, 463 (she puts Laco 3’s own term c. 82–3); accepted by Bowersock, JRS 51 (1961) 118 n. 57.


229 This may be right, but cf. above and nn. 218–219 on the age of gerontes.

230 Chrimes 1949, 191. Incidentally, 188ff., she argued that the Laco who coined under Claudius was probably Laco 2, not Laco 1. It is, indeed, perfectly feasible that the Laco whose name is now known from Tiberian coins (cf. above) was different from the Laco who coined under Claudius, cf. above and n. 166f. Chrimes further argued, 189 n. 3, as later Halfmann 1979, 126, from the Euryclid names of Q. Pompeius Falco, that Eurycles 2 Herculanus’ entry to the senate must have been Trajanic. But her reference to some sort of ‘legal adoption’ shows that she misunderstood the condicio nominis ferendi. Cf. above and n. 16.
For the sake of argument, one further, perfectly feasible, stemma may be offered:

```
  Eurycles
  /     \
Lachares 2 (=?3)     Eurycles 1
  /     \
  Rhadamanthys       Deximachus       Laco 1
```

Laco proc. Spartiaticus 4 Cratinus Argolicus Pantimia
(m. Pompeia Macrina)

Laco 2

Laco 3 ?Eurycles of the three *kasens*

Eurycles 2 Herculanus

A remaining uncertain factor is the age of marriage. If Laco 2 were the postulated husband of a princess of Commagene, Laco 3, on this hypothesis the parent of Eurycles 2 Herculanus, would need to have married when in his early twenties – and could hardly have been old enough to have substituted for Laco 2 as *patronomos* c. AD 75. Some other marriage connection must be postulated to make Julia Balbilla – and her brother the consul Philopappus – cousins of some sort of Herculanus.²³² Herodes Atticus, it may be recalled, was quite likely not married until he was over 40²³³ – and Herculanus is not known to have married at all. At any rate, no widow or offspring survived him. These people – for

---

²³¹ On Lachares 3, cf. Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 258, an unpublished Spartan decree referring to Λαχαρέως Ἡροκλείδης. Hence, as he points out, there is no warrant for restoring Lachares 3’s father’s name as Ἡροκλέος in IG V 1, 94 and 265; and the name Herc(u)lanus is thus not attested except for Eurycles 2. Hence Lachares 2 (according to Bradford 1977), a son of Eurycles honoured at Athens, IG II 5, 1171B, is surely the same as Lachares 3. If so, a further Eurycles, omitted by Bradford (but accepted elsewhere, e.g. Groag, RE 10.1, 580). For the two elder sons of Eurycles 1, see Spawforth, ABSA 80 (1985) 193ff. (Lachares 4 may be the same as Lachares 5, father of Agesinicus 2. If so the latter was a cousin of Laco 1. Chrimes 1949, 204, makes Agesinicus 2 a brother of Eurycles 1, while Bowersock, JRS 51 (1961) 118, puts him two generations earlier, and also has a Leonidas as his brother, citing IG V 1, 610 – but Bradford 1977 makes this person Leonis 1, daughter of Lachares 6.) Where Julia Balbilla or her aunt are to be fitted in is an open question, see next note.

²³² Spawforth, ABSA 73 (1978) 249ff., combined IG V 1, 489+575 to show that the ἀνευσία who took charge of erecting the νεκρός for Herculanus at Sparta was Balbilla (a first cousin on his view; but cf. above and n. 17). He then acutely cited, 253ff., the proximity of dedications near Megalopolis to Cratimus and Pantimia, siblings of Spartiaticus (cf stemma), IG V 2, 541–2, and to Philopappus, Balbilla’s brother the suff. 109, to conjecture that one of the fugitive King Antiochus IV’s daughters (Jos. BJ 7.234) married Laco 2 (Herculanus’ father on this view), c. 72. In that case, Laco 3 could then only have been substitute *patronomos* c. AD 75 if he were the product of a – considerably earlier – first marriage of Laco 2. Spawforth implies this, ibid. 254 (a reference to Laco [2]’s ‘other son’, with his father ‘shortly to be found holding office’ at Sparta); but his stemma, 261, makes Laco [3] younger son of the king’s daughter (Julia) and Laco [2]. One could solve this imbroglio by postulating e.g. that Cratimus, brother of Laco the procurator – and great-uncle of Herculanus (on my own hypothesis) – was the bridegroom of the king’s daughter. His niece and nephew, Balbilla and Philopappus, would then be first cousins once removed of Herculanus’ postulated father Laco 3 and first cousins twice removed of Herculanus himself – still quite enough for Balbilla, on IG V 1, 489+575, to call herself ἀνευσία of Herculanus. (If one supposed elderly bridegrooms married barely nubile brides, one could manage with less generations and still bring down Herculanus’ birth to the 90s. Cf. above and n. 197.)

²³³ Cf. above and n. 197.
reasons about which one can only speculate – may have deferred matrimony as long as possible. Too long, perhaps, in Herculanus’ case: the Euryclids died out with him. 234

To conclude, one may suggest that Herculanus was born towards the end of Domitian’s reign, that Plutarch’s advice was directed to him when he was in his late teens, c. 113; that he was *patronomos* as a young man in his early twenties; that he entered the senate, as quaestor of Achaia, not long after Hadrian’s accession, was tribune c. 123, praetor c. 125, and legate (to Arrian) c. 126–7, and legionary legate in Syria c. 129–130. He may, or may not, have risen further before his death c. 136–7.
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