

forgotten. Cossus is apostrophised at line 841,¹¹ and at 859 we learn of the future Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who, in Anchises' vaticination,

tertia... arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.

In the third and last disposition of the *spolia opima* the deified Romulus will be their recipient. This is now his due, and the spoils his emblem, because of the initial gesture of the father of the gods, in whose temple they would in any case have been placed.¹²

Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

¹¹ On Cossus, the *spolia opima* and Livy's famous digression on Augustus' interest in their award, see Ogilvie, op. cit. 563 f. (on 4.20.5–11).

¹² It is possible that there is a connection between the programme of statuary in the Forum Augustum and the procession of heroes in *Aeneid* 6. Though the forum was only dedicated in 2 B.C., T. Frank argues ('Augustus, Vergil and the Augustan elogia', *AJP* 59 [1938], 91 ff.) that the intellectual 'plan' of the forum was conceived by Augustus as early as 27, and his reasoning is strongly supported by H. Rowell ('Vergil and the forum of Augustus', *AJP* 62 [1941], 261 ff.). Degraffi ('Virgilio e il foro di Augusto', *Epigraphica* 7 [1945], 88 ff.) counters this view by observing that construction of the forum could not in all likelihood have begun before 12 B.C. at the earliest. But, other practical considerations aside (the emperor's impatience, for instance, at the delay in building, *Macr. Sat.* 2.4.9), there is still no reason why Augustus and his artists, poets included, should not have had the contents of the forum under consideration for many years before the actual work on it began.

ASINIUS POLLIO AND HEROD'S SONS¹

In a recent note, D. Braund² has challenged my identification³ of the Pollio (Josephus, *Antiquities* 15.343) at whose home in Rome Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus stayed in 22 B.C. as Gaius Asinius Pollio, the famous consul of 40 B.C., who was a close friend of Julius Caesar and to whom Virgil dedicated his Fourth Eclogue. Braund's argument rests upon five grounds. (1) If this Pollio were a man of the stature of Asinius Pollio, we would expect Josephus to make his identity clear and not to describe him solely as one of Herod's most devoted friends (ἀνδρὸς τῶν μάλιστα σπουδασάντων περὶ τὴν Ἡρώδου φιλίαν). (2) Josephus' reference to Pollio here is different from the definite references to Asinius Pollio elsewhere in Josephus, where he is referred to as Asinius (*Ant.* 14.138) or Gaius Asinius Pollio (*Ant.* 14.389). (3) In the latter passage his name is spelled Πωλίωνος, whereas the name of the host of Herod's sons is spelled Πολλίωνος. (4) When Herod sent two other sons to Rome, they stayed 'with a certain Jew' (*Ant.* 17.20), and hence it seems likely that the two other sons likewise stayed with a Jew. (5) Asinius' role in the elevation by the Roman Senate of Herod to the kingship of Judaea was no greater than that of any other magistrate.

In reply we may note the following.

(1) If Josephus were introducing a new character we would normally expect him to identify that person (e.g. *Ant.* 13.375 [Obedas], 15.405 [Vitellius], 17.149 [Judas the son of Sariphaeus], 19.235 [Veranius], 20.132 [Celer], etc.) or to refer to him as τις (thus, for example, in the section which follows immediately after the one in question

¹ I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr Daniel R. Schwartz of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, for several helpful suggestions in connection with this note.

² 'Four Notes on the Herods', *CQ* 33 (1983), 239–42.

³ 'Asinius Pollio and His Jewish Interests', *TAPA* 84 (1953), 73–80.

[*Ant.* 15.344] we are told of a certain Zenodorus [*Ζηνόδωρος τις*];⁴ again we hear of a certain Essene [*τις τῶν Ἑσσηνῶν*] named Manaemus [*Ant.* 15.373]; one may cite numerous other examples – e.g. *Ant.* 13.290, 14.8, etc.). In the case of Pollio (*Ant.* 15.343) we are not told who he was, nor does Josephus use the word *τις*; we are told only what he did, namely that he was zealous for Herod's friendship. Hence, we may assume that Pollio was known to the reader; the only people named Pollio who have previously been mentioned are Pollio the Pharisee (*Ant.* 15.3), who is referred to here and elsewhere in Josephus (*Ant.* 15.370) with the epithet 'the Pharisee' and who was living in Jerusalem at this time, and Gaius Asinius Pollio (*Ant.* 14.389). If the Pollio were Publius Vedius Pollio, as Syme and Grant suggest,⁵ Josephus would presumably have given the full name, in order to distinguish him from the more famous Asinius Pollio, who had been mentioned in the previous book of his *Antiquities*, and would have added a word of explanation. To be sure, there are instances where Josephus introduces characters without identifying them or without *τις*, but this is apparently due to the fact that Josephus is following a particular source, as we see, for example, in the case of Murcus (*Ant.* 14.270), after whose mention Josephus declares: 'This, however, has been related elsewhere.'

(2) As for the fact that Pollio is referred to differently in *Antiquities* 15.343 from the way in which Asinius Pollio is mentioned in *Antiquities* 14.138, where he is called simply Asinius, the reason is that in the latter passage he is referred to as Asinius by Strabo, whose statement is there cited 'on the authority of Asinius' (we may note that elsewhere in Strabo, *Geographica*, 4.3.3, he is likewise referred to as Asinius). Moreover, we may cite numerous instances where Josephus refers to a person alternately by his *nomen gentile* (or *praenomen*) and by his *cognomen*. Thus, for example, Tiberius Julius Alexander is mentioned seven times as Tiberius Alexander (*Jewish War* 2.220, 2.492, 4.616, 5.45, 6.237; *Ant.* 20.100, 20.103), seven times as Alexander (*War* 2.223, 2.309, 2.497, 4.617, 5.510, 6.242; *Ant.* 20.100), and once as *Tiberius* (*War* 5.205), the difference in the references presumably being due to Josephus' sources or to a desire to avoid monotony. Again, Apollonius Molon is alternately Apollonius (*Against Apion* 2.148, 2.262, 2.270) and Molon (*Against Apion* 2.16, 2.236, 2.295), all within the same book of the same work. Cestius Gallus is referred to as Cestius through the *War* and generally in the *Life*; but in *Life* 374 he is called Gallus. Gessius Florus is called Gessius in *War* 2.277; but in *War* 2.280 and elsewhere he is called Florus. As to Asinius Pollio, he is referred to as Asinius not only by Strabo (4.3.3) but also by Plutarch (*Antony* 9.2 and 9.3) and by (among Roman writers) Seneca (*De Clementia* 1.10.1), Quintilian (8.3.32, 8.3.54, 9.4.76, 12.1.22), and Tacitus (*Dialogus* 21.12). More usually he is referred to, as here (*Ant.* 15.343) by Josephus, as Pollio (Virgil, *Eclogues* 3.84, 86, 88; Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae* 6.15; Seneca the Younger, *Epistulae* 100.7; Quintilian, 7.5.56, 9.3.13, 10.1.24, 10.2.17, 10.2.25, 12.6.1, 12.10.11, 12.11.28).

(3) The difference in spelling between the name of the consul Gaius Asinius Pollio (*Πωλλίωνος*, *Ant.* 14.389) and that of the host of Herod's sons (*Πολλίανος*, 15.343) is hardly significant. In the first place, the reading *Πωλλίωνος* in *Antiquities* 14.389 is far from unanimous, inasmuch as five of the major manuscripts, according to the

⁴ A comparable passage is to be seen in Suetonius' famous reference to Chrestus, the instigator of disturbances among the Jews (Suet. *Cl.* 25.4), where, as Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1980), 116, points out, if he had had in mind some other Jew called Chrestus, he would at least have added *quodam* after *Chresto*.

⁵ Ronald Syme, 'Who Was Vedius Pollio?', *JRS* 51 (1961), 30; Michael Grant, *Herod the Great* (New York, 1971), 145.

critical apparatus in Niese's edition of Josephus, read *Πολλίωνος*, the very same spelling that we find for the host of Herod's sons. We may note, furthermore, that for the second half of the *Antiquities* the manuscripts fall into two families; and these five manuscripts are divided between the two families, one of them, A (Ambrosianus, of the eleventh century), being the best manuscript of all, according to Samuel Naber, one of the two major modern editors of Josephus' Greek text.⁶ Moreover, we may remark that where Josephus elsewhere refers to a person named Pollio, the spelling varies: in *Antiquities* 15.3, where Josephus mentions Pollio the Pharisee, the spelling is *Πολλίων* (but in one of the manuscripts this has been corrected from *Πωλίων*, and in the tenth-century Epitome his name is spelled *Πολίων*, while in the Latin version ascribed to Cassiodorus it is Pollio). In *Antiquities* 15.370, where we have another reference to Pollio the Pharisee, it is spelled *Πολλίωνα* (the Latin version, which has Pollionem, agrees) but one of the manuscripts, P (Palatinus, of the ninth or tenth century, the best manuscript, according to Niese), has *Πολίωνα*. In *Antiquities* 19.267, where we have a reference to Rufrius Pollio, the name is spelled *Πολλίωνος*, with no variants in the manuscripts. We may see, therefore, that there are alternatives in the spelling of the name of Pollio; but the most common spelling is definitely *Πολλίων*, as is found in *Antiquities* 15.343. Moreover, the most common spelling of the name of Asinius Pollio in Greek sources (e.g. Josephus' contemporary, Plutarch, *Caesar*, 32.7, 46.2, 52.8 [to be sure, with the variant reading *Πωλλίων*]; *Cato Minor* 53.2; *Pompey* 72.4 [with variant reading *Πολίων*]) is *Πολλίων*, as in *Antiquities* 15.343. Inscriptions with Asinius Pollio's name likewise spell it Pollio (*CIL* 1².50, 6.1353, 6.9902). In Latin literature, by far the most common spelling is Pollio (e.g. Virgil, *Eclogues* 3.84, 86, 88 [to be sure, with variant spelling Polio]; Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae* 6.14, 6.15; Seneca the Younger, *De Ira* 3.23.8, *De Tranquillitate Animi* 17.7, *Epistulae Morales* 100.7, 100.9; Quintilian, 9.3.13, 10.1.24, etc.). As for the alternation of spelling with a short vowel and a double consonant as against a long vowel and a single consonant, there are parallels in Josephus in the variant readings for the names of Abner (*Ἀβένηρος*, *Ἀβέννηρος*, *Ἀβήναρος*, *Ant.* 6.58), Abela (*Ἀβίλα*, *Ἀβελλα*, *Ἀβηλα*, *Ant.* 19.275), and Amorite (*Ἀμορίτις*, *Ἀμωρίτις*, *Ἀμορρίτις*, *Ant.* 4.85).

(4) As for the fact that Herod's other sons stayed with a certain Jew, and that therefore one would have expected that his first sons would likewise have stayed with a Jew, in the first place the manuscript reading in the passage referring to the sons who stayed with the Jew (*Ant.* 17.20) is not *παρά τινι Ἰουδαίῳ*, which is Niese's emendation, but *παρὰ ἰδίῳ*, 'with a private person' (the *editio princeps* has a similar reading, *παρὰ ἰδιώτῃ*). In the second place, even if we adopt Niese's emendation, the implication of stating that the second pair of sons stayed with a certain Jew is that the first pair did not stay with a certain Jew. It surely makes better sense for the ambitious Herod to have sent his sons to a prominent Roman. Indeed, Josephus himself says (*Ant.* 15.343), immediately after declaring that Herod's sons stayed with Pollio, that permission was given them to stay with Caesar (i.e. Augustus) himself. If Pollio were an obscure Jew, the juxtaposition with Caesar himself would seem bizarre; a juxtaposition of Augustus and of his close friend Asinius Pollio seems much more likely. As to the fact that Herod did not send his second pair of sons to a prominent Roman but rather to an obscure Jew, this may be because his situation had changed, notably on account of the unpopularity which he incurred by his

⁶ The Latin version ascribed to Cassiodorus in the sixth century omits the name of Pollio altogether in *Antiquities* 14.389 and has merely C. Asinio. Inasmuch as this translation dates from several centuries before our earliest Greek manuscript, its value is considerable.

expedition against the Arabs (*Ant.* 16.293) and on account of the execution of his sons Alexander and Aristobulus (*Ant.* 17.80). We may note, moreover, that Agrippa, the grandson of Herod, was likewise (*Ant.* 18.143) brought up in Rome in a Gentile royal household, presumably again for reasons of ambition in order to strengthen connections with influential people, and was on particularly close terms with Antonia, the daughter of Mark Antony.

(5) Braund ascribes to me the view that Pollio played a greater part in the elevation of Herod to the kingship than did others.⁷ Actually I do not state this, but instead note that 'we cannot necessarily infer that Pollio had used his influence either with the Senate or with Antony and Octavian'.⁸ But there is some reason to link Pollio and Herod, since they shared close friendships with Julius Caesar, Mark Antony, and Augustus.

All in all, therefore, Asinius Pollio appears to be the most likely candidate for identification with the Pollio at whose home Herod's sons stayed.

Yeshiva University

LOUIS H. FELDMAN

⁷ art. cit. 241 n. 8.

⁸ art. cit. 78.