

## DIO OF PRUSA AND THE FLAVIAN DYNASTY\*

After his return from exile in A.D. 96 Dio of Prusa claims that even before it he had known the homes and tables of rich men, not only private individuals but satraps and kings (i.e. governors and emperors, *Or.* 7.66). Following the lead of Philostratus (*V.A.* 5.27–38) modern scholars have seen Dio as a confidant of the Flavian dynasty:<sup>1</sup> *amicus* to Vespasian, possibly a special envoy of Vespasian to the Grek east,<sup>2</sup> *amicus* to Titus, and friend and adviser to a minor member of the house T. Flavius Sabinus.<sup>3</sup> These views are important not only for the biography of Dio, but also for the general question of relations between powerful Romans, above all emperors, and Greek philosophers and other intellectuals.

On re-examination the modern orthodoxies disappear. No evidence convincingly attests Dio as *amicus* to either Vespasian or Titus. While T. Flavius Sabinus cannot definitely be ruled out as the patron whose downfall caused Dio's exile, a better case can be made for Nerva's nephew L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus.<sup>4</sup> Reasons can be found for the unhistorical elevation of Dio to the status of Flavian adviser both by Philostratus and by modern scholars, and are revealing of the presuppositions which may be brought to discussions of the role of an intellectual under the Roman empire.

Only one piece of evidence explicitly links Dio and Vespasian. Philostratus in the *Life of Apollonius* depicts Dio, Euphrates and Apollonius advising Vespasian in Alexandria at the outset of his reign on the best type of constitution.<sup>5</sup> This scene,

\* I should like to acknowledge the many helpful comments and suggestions of the late Elizabeth Rawson, and dedicate this article to her memory. I should also like to thank Ewen Bowie, John Moles, Simon Price, and Simon Swain for their help. Needless to say none of the above are responsible for any inaccuracies or infelicities which remain.

<sup>1</sup> A. Momigliano, 'Dio of Prusa, the Rhodian "libertas" and the philosophers', *JRS* 41 (1951), p. 152 (= *Quinto Contributo* 2 [Rome, 1975], pp. 966–75; at p. 972); idem, 'Dio Chrysostomus', *Quarto Contributo* (Rome, 1969), pp. 258–60; C. P. Jones, 'The date of Dio of Prusa's Alexandrian Oration', *Historia* 22 (1973), pp. 307–8; idem, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, Massachusetts–London, 1978), pp. 14–17, 44–5, 123; P. Desideri, *Dione di Prusa. Un intellettuale Greco nell'impero romano* (Messina–Firenze, 1978), pp. 138–9; G. Salmeri, *La Politica e il Potere Saggio su Dione di Prusa* (Catania, 1982), pp. 24–6; J. L. Moles, 'The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98 (1978), pp. 84–5, 93; idem, 'The Kingship Orations of Dio Chrysostom', *PLLS* 6 (1990), p. 333; B. W. Jones, 'Domitian and the exile of Dio of Prusa', *La Parola del Passato* 45 (1990), pp. 348, 354–7; S. Fein, *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den litterati* (Stuttgart, 1994), p. 232. Elizabeth Rawson was more cautious in her posthumously published paper 'Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser', in M. Griffin & J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata* (Oxford, 1989), at pp. 248–9.

<sup>2</sup> This idea has been canvassed by Jones, art. cit. (n. 1), p. 307; idem, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 44; Desideri, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 109–10; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 84; and B. W. Jones, art. cit. (n. 1), p. 355; but has been rejected by Salmeri, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 92–3.

<sup>3</sup> Thus already Emperius in Dio, ed. Arnim, 2.334; and H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 228–31; followed with more or less certainty by Momigliano, art. cit. (n. 1, 1969), p. 260; Jones, art. cit. (n. 1), p. 307; idem, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 15, 46; Desideri, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 189–91; Salmeri, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 27; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), pp. 84, 93; idem, art. cit. (n. 1, 1990), p. 333; and, presumably, by M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome, 1986), p. 44, 'Domitian suspected Apollonius (*sic*) of taking part in a plot allegedly prepared against him by the emperor's cousin Flavius Sabinus', but rejected by B. W. Jones, art. cit. (n. 1), pp. 352–3 (see below n. 33).

<sup>4</sup> See D. A. Russell (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom. Orations VII, XII, XXXVI* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 4, n. 4; with H. Sidebottom, review in *JRS* 84 (1994), p. 265.

<sup>5</sup> *V.A.* 5.27–38; apparently also referred to at Phil. *V.S.* 488.

however, is a piece of fiction,<sup>6</sup> 'simply an agreeable reworking of two standard historiographical τόποι: the discussion of the ideal constitution (Otanés, Megabyzus and Darius in Herodotus; Agrippa, Maecenas and Octavian in Cassius Dio) and the encounter of the great king and the great philosopher (Croesus-Solon, Alexander-Diogenes)'.<sup>7</sup>

Philostratus wished to give his wonder-working hero respectability as a philosopher and adviser to the great; and so forged links between him and real philosophers (Dio and Euphrates) and the emperor (Vespasian). Philostratus to some extent based the life of his hero on the life and works of Dio.<sup>8</sup> A possible inspiration for Philostratus' including Dio in the scene in Alexandria was Dio's *Alexandrian Oration* (*Or.* 32). Philostratus had drawn on the *Alexandrian Oration* for Apollonius' denunciation of the Alexandrian's passion for horse racing just before he introduced Dio as a character in the novel.<sup>9</sup> Philostratus' fiction does not prove a historical link between Dio and Vespasian.<sup>10</sup>

Dio in the *Alexandrian Oration* says that he has been sent to Alexandria by a god and compares himself to Hermes sent by Zeus (*Or.* 32.21–2). Modern scholars have suggested that he may be hinting that he has been sent to the Alexandrians by Vespasian (see above n. 2). There are three objections to this suggestion.

First, the date of the *Alexandrian Oration* is controversial. It may well be that it should be dated not to the reign of Vespasian but to that of Trajan.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See, E. L. Bowie, 'Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality', *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978), pp. 1660–62; and Dzielska, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 43–4 (with Bowie's review in *JRS* 79 [1989], pp. 252–4); as well as Momigliano, art. cit. (n. 1, 1951), p. 152; Jones, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 14; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 83; and A. Brancacci, *Rhetorike Philosophousa. Dione Crisostomo nella cultura antica e bizantina* (Coll. Elenchos xi, 1985), p. 71; cf. G. Anderson, 'Apollonius of Tyana as a Novel', in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua* (Bangor, 1977), p. 37; idem, *Philostratus. Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* (London, 1986), pp. 129, 178–9, 231; and idem, *Sage, Saint and Sophist. Holy men and their associates in the Early Roman Empire* (London, New York, 1994), p. 136, n. 31. <sup>7</sup> Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 83.

<sup>8</sup> Bowie, art. cit. (n. 6), pp. 1668–9; Dzielska, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 43, 49, 55.

<sup>9</sup> *V.A.* 5.26/Dio, *Or.* 32.48, 50; cf. *V.A.* 4.21/Dio, *Or.* 32.58–60.

<sup>10</sup> The acknowledged fact that Philostratus' scene is fiction causes difficulties for those who wish to see Dio as an *amicus* of Vespasian. Jones (op. cit. [n. 1], p. 14) claimed that even if Dio was not a courtier of the Flavians in A.D. 69 'he was to be one soon thereafter'. Jones' contention must rest on the other supposed evidence for Dio as an *amicus* of Vespasian and Titus which is dealt with below. Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), pp. 83–5 (following a suggestion of Momigliano, art. cit. [n. 1, 1951], pp. 148–9, 152–3), advanced the hypothesis (before seemingly rejecting it) that while *V.A.* 27–38 is fiction it shows that Philostratus had some knowledge of the general terms of philosophical debate in the early years of Vespasian (and specifically of the republicanism of Helvidius Priscus). Various problems arise. The republicanism of Helvidius is extremely controversial (as Moles recognized). If Helvidius' republicanism is historical, Philostratus' giving republican views to Euphrates may just be an accident (as Moles also acknowledged). If Philostratus' information about the nature of philosophical debate in the early years of Vespasian is both true and authentic, it does not show that Dio was part of that debate (and his stance in the *κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων*, see below, suggests that he was not), and it certainly does not show that Dio was an *amicus* of Vespasian.

<sup>11</sup> In favour of a Trajanic date see now H. Sidebottom, 'The Date of Dio of Prusa's Rhodian and Alexandrian Orations', *Historia* 41 (1992), pp. 407–19; also Salmeri, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 97; and J. F. Kindstrand, 'The Date of Dio of Prusa's Alexandrian Oration—A Reply', *Historia* 27 (1978), pp. 378–83. For a Vespasianic date Jones, art. cit. (n. 1), passim; idem, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 36, 39, 134; Desideri, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 68, 110; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 84. The claim by W. D. Barry ('Aristocrats, Orators and the "Mob": Dio Chrysostom and the world of the Alexandrians', *Historia* 42 [1993], pp. 82–103) that he has provided support for Jones' dating of the *Alexandrian Oration* is far from convincing. Barry invents a schema ('Dio was anti-demos pre-exile, but pro-demos post-exile') and then appeals to it ('the *Alexandrian Oration* is anti-demos, thus it is pre-exile'). It is particularly unfortunate that the proof Barry adduces (art. cit.,

Second is a general objection that, to my knowledge, the employment of a Greek as an imperial 'envoy' to a Greek city which was not his own would be unique in the principate.<sup>12</sup> This suggests that the 'post' of 'imperial envoy to a Greek city' is a modern fiction comparable to 'adviser to a leading Roman on Greek affairs'.<sup>13</sup>

Third, a reading of *Or.* 32.21–2 which sees a reference to the emperor is extremely tendentious. Dio was prone to claiming divine sponsorship for his works. Already in the *Alexandrian Oration* he had claimed that he had chosen his role as corrector of the Alexandrians at the will of a god, Serapis (*Or.* 32.12). In the first *Oration On Kingship* Dio claimed that he was 'retelling' his 'Choice of Herakles' to the emperor by divine command (*Or.* 1.56–8). In his 'Choice of Herakles' Dio sets up a series of delicate parallels (Herakles being led to his 'Choice' by Hermes—Dio experiencing the 'Choice of Herakles' when he is told the story by a Dorian seeress—Trajan experiencing the 'Choice' as Dio retells the story), and in so doing equates himself with Hermes.<sup>14</sup>

The final supposed link between Dio and Vespasian also does not stand scrutiny. Synesius tells us that Dio wrote a work *Against the Philosophers* (κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων, *Dion* 37b). Almost certainly referring to the contents of this work, Synesius says that Dio 'hurled at Socrates and Zeno the coarse jests of the Dionysiac festival and demanded that their disciples be expelled from every land and sea in the belief that they are messengers of death to states and civic organisation alike' (*Dion* 38b). This has long been plausibly connected to Vespasian's expulsion of the philosophers in A.D. 71.<sup>15</sup> It, however, does not prove that Dio was an *amicus* of Vespasian. To use it to prove such a link one would have to presuppose that all literary works which endorsed imperial measures were commissioned directly by the emperor. While such a model was not unknown in the empire,<sup>16</sup> it cannot be considered a universal norm.

If evidence for Dio's supposed friendship with Vespasian is insubstantial, the evidence which might connect him to Titus is almost non-existent. Dio wrote *Orations* 28 and 29 as obituaries for a young athlete called Melancomas. Themistius said (*Or.* 10.139) it was rumoured (φασίν) that Titus was a lover of Melancomas. The juxtaposition of these two pieces of evidence does not demonstrate that Dio was an *amicus* of Titus.

It has been doubted that Melancomas was historical.<sup>17</sup> Possible support for the reality of Melancomas comes from the identification of an Athenodorus named by Dio (*Or.* 28.10) as a friend of Melancomas with an Olympic victor called Athenodorus mentioned by Eusebius (*Chron.* 101 Karst). The identification is possible, but there

pp. 99–100) that Dio was pro-*demos* after his exile is Dio's attitude to the *demos* in the *Euboean Oration*: a very strange reading of *Or.* 7.21–63.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Jones, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 44, 'it seems unparalleled for a Greek to be sent with such a message to a city not his own'. <sup>13</sup> Cf. Rawson, art. cit. (n. 1), p. 238.

<sup>14</sup> *Or.* 1.58–84; on which see Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1990), pp. 319–31; and for Dio's use of a 'Phaedran' setting for the 'Choice', M. B. Trapp, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-century Greek Literature', in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 143–5. Other examples of Dio being sent to places by divine mandate are *Or.* 13.9–10; *Or.* 34.4–5; *Or.* 38.51.

<sup>15</sup> Von Arnim, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 150–51; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 85.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Philostratus, *V.A.* 5.29, makes Vespasian explain his reasons for taking power to Apollonius, so that Apollonius can justify his actions to others.

<sup>17</sup> L. Lemarchand, *Dion de Pruse. Les oeuvres d'avant l'exil* (Paris, 1926), pp. 30–32: 'Mélancomas est l'athlète idéalisé, trop parfait sans doute pour avoir jamais existé' (ibid. at pp. 31–2). M. B. Poliakoff ('Melancomas, ἐκ κλίμακος and Greek Boxing', *AJPh* 108 [1987], pp. 511–18) believed a barrier placed to keep boxers in close combat proved Melancomas' style was untenable, but still believed in the boxer's historicity.

are problems. Dio says that Athenodorus was a *παγκρατιάστης*, while Eusebius' Athenodorus was a victor in the Stadion. The victories of Eusebius' athlete fell in A.D. 49, 53, and 61. Dio's Melancomas, who is said to have been a childhood friend of Athenodorus, died while still young (*Or.* 28.13; *Or.* 29.20), and the dramatic setting of his death has been identified as the *Sebasta* at Naples in A.D. 70, 74, or 78.<sup>18</sup>

There is no need to assume that Themistius' statement that Melancomas was a lover of Titus—which Themistius distanced himself from by *φασίν*—derived from a lost work of Dio.<sup>19</sup> Themistius was working from Dio, but, with the exception of the homosexual affair, all the details which he gives about Melancomas are found in Dio's *Melancomas Orations*. Rumours about Titus' love life were numerous,<sup>20</sup> and Themistius, as we shall see, was not adverse to giving emperors friends they did not have.

Even if Melancomas was an historical figure, and was the lover of Titus, Dio writing consolations for his death does not prove that Dio was an *amicus* of Titus. These orations can be interpreted as attempts to curry favour with the bereaved by someone who had no previous close connection with him, rather than as proof of a pre-existing friendship.

The unknown recipient of Dio, *Oration* 18, a handbook giving a short reading list for someone wishing to improve his public speaking, is unlikely to have been Titus.<sup>21</sup> Dio seems to represent himself as considerably younger than his addressee.<sup>22</sup> Titus was born in A.D. 41,<sup>23</sup> Dio probably at much the same time.<sup>24</sup> While Dio may have implied that his addressee was older than himself as a mark of respect, to give Titus advice after A.D. 69 on how not to trust too readily those in authority over him would have been both ludicrous and offensive.<sup>25</sup> The recipient of Dio's advice has been more plausibly seen as an important local Greek official in a large Greek city of Asia Minor.<sup>26</sup>

There appear to be no valid reasons to claim Dio as an *amicus* for either Vespasian or Titus.<sup>27</sup> One possible link with the Flavian dynasty remains.

Dio was sent into exile because he was friend and *sumboulos* to a man whose prominence caused his fall (*Or.* 13.1). The man is not named, but he is usually assumed to be T. Flavius Sabinus.<sup>28</sup> The identification is possible. Dio's friend was

<sup>18</sup> Von Arnim, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 143.

<sup>19</sup> *Contra* Momigliano, art. cit. (n. 1, 1951), p. 152; and Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 84. Eustathius' oblique reference to Melancomas (1324.48ff. [ad Il. 23.286; quoted by Poliakoff, art. cit. [n. 17], p. 512) merely follows Themistius.

<sup>20</sup> Suet. *Titus* 7; Julian, *Caes.* 311A.

<sup>21</sup> *Contra* Desideri, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 137–9.

<sup>22</sup> Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 93, n. 122.

<sup>23</sup> Suet. *Titus* 1.

<sup>24</sup> Jones, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 133, c. A.D. 40–50.

<sup>25</sup> *Or.* 18.16.

<sup>26</sup> Von Arnim, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 139–40; Momigliano, art. cit. (n. 1, 1969), p. 259; Moles, art. cit. (n. 1, 1978), p. 93; idem, art. cit. (n. 1, 1990), p. 333.

<sup>27</sup> An attempt to construct a prosopographical link between Dio and the Flavians by way of Dio's possible teacher Musonius would be very suspect (cf. Momigliano, art. cit. [n. 1, 1951], p. 152; Rawson, art. cit. [n. 1], p. 249). Vespasian exiled Musonius, for Titus recalled him (Hieron. *Chron.* p. 189 Helm). But Themistius' claim that Musonius was an *amicus* of Titus has rightly been seen as a fiction (Rawson, loc. cit.), which gains little support from the facts that Vespasian was a friend of Barea Soranus (Tac. *Hist.* 4.7), Soranus a friend of Rubellius Plautus (Tac. *Ann.* 16.30), and Rubellius Plautus a friend of Musonius (Tac. *Ann.* 14.59). Dio, anyway, appears as a pupil of Musonius only in a passage of Fronto (2.50 Haines) which should not be pressed too hard (Rawson, art. cit. [n. 1], p. 248, n. 84).

<sup>28</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F355; above (n. 3). That Dio does not name his patron should not surprise. To do so would not have fitted the ironic, even playful tone of the introduction of *Oration* 13 (see *Or.* 13.1, where Dio compares his fate, caused by the custom of tyrants, to that caused by Scythian

connected by intimacy and kinship to those who rule. Sabinus, the grandson of Vespasian's elder brother,<sup>29</sup> was married to Titus' daughter Julia.<sup>30</sup> He was appointed consul (*ordinarius*) in A.D. 82 by Domitian,<sup>31</sup> when a herald fatally hailed him emperor (Suet. *Dom.* 10.4), and he was killed sometime before A.D. 84.<sup>32</sup>

If Flavian connections are the only ones considered, Sabinus seems the certain choice.<sup>33</sup> Dio, however, does not explicitly say that it was kinship with the reigning imperial family that laid low his patron. The man lost his life and Dio was precipitated into exile because of links with those who were 'favoured by fortune and were ruling' (*εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων Or.* 13.1). This does not have to mean the imperial family.<sup>34</sup> During the Second Sophistic one of the senses which *archontes* could bear was 'leading Romans'.<sup>35</sup> At times it was used in this sense by Dio.<sup>36</sup> If taken in a general sense *Or.* 13.1 opens up intriguing possibilities.<sup>37</sup>

After the death of Domitian Dio was prevented by illness from reaching Rome during the short reign of Nerva, whom Dio described as an old friend (*Or.* 45.2). A strange story survives concerning Nerva under Domitian. Philostratus said (*V.A.* 7.8) that Nerva, together with Orfitus and Rufus, was charged with conspiracy and exiled.

custom which befalls a king's cupbearers, cooks, and concubines: G. Anderson, 'The *pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Roman Empire', *ANRW* II.33.1 [1989], p. 175). While Dio wants to be taken seriously about his conversion to philosophy while in exile, his condemnation of materialism and useless learning, and his exhortation to true education, which is philosophy, his tone in the introduction (*Or.* 13.1–13) and first section of this work (*Or.* 13.14–28, where Dio tells the Athenians what he had told other peoples while in exile, which was, more or less, what Socrates had told the Athenians) is light and ironic (see the frequent allusions to Aristophanes, *Clouds*: *Or.* 13.14, 19, 23). The tone changes to one of moral earnestness in the final section (*Or.* 13.29–37), where Dio takes the position of a Greek telling other Greeks the stern way he has upbraided the Romans for their failings (see esp. *Or.* 13.29–30).

<sup>29</sup> G. B. Townend, 'Some Flavian Connections', *JRS* 51 (1961), pp. 55–6; B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Titus* (London, Sydney, New York, 1984), pp. 2–4; for Tacitus' subtly condemning portraits of his grandfather and father see K. Gilmartin Wallace, 'The Flavii Sabini in Tacitus', *Historia* 36 (1987), pp. 343–58.

<sup>30</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F426; Phil. *V.A.* 7.7.

<sup>31</sup> W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (München, 1970), pp. 53–4.

<sup>32</sup> O. Murray, review in *JRS* 57 (1967), p. 250.

<sup>33</sup> One other candidate appears close enough to the Flavian dynasty: T. Flavius Clemens (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> F240), brother of Sabinus and likewise complete with a dynastic marriage. His wife was Domitilla (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> F418), the daughter of Titus' sister. Clemens was *cos. ord.* in 95 and killed by Domitian in the same year (Suet. *Dom.* 15.1). But Clemens cannot have been Dio's patron, for Dio stresses his many years of exile (*Or.* 40.2, 12; cf. *Or.* 1.55, where the wise woman must mean that Dio's exile has not long left to run). Similar reasoning seems to tell against the recent identification by B. W. Jones (art. cit. [n. 1], pp. 348–57) of M. Arrecinus Clemens as Dio's patron. Arrecinus had had a sister married to Titus (B. W. Jones, op. cit. [n. 29], pp. 18–19), and may have had another married to T. Flavius Sabinus, the father of the Flavius Sabinus in the text (Townend, art. cit. [n. 29], pp. 56–7). But Arrecinus was consul in A.D. 85 and may have been killed much later. Jones seems to think that Dio's exile and Arrecinus' execution took place in A.D. 93 (art. cit. [n. 1], pp. 354, 357, but cf. p. 353, n. 20). If Arrecinus was only exiled, as Jones had previously contended (B. W. Jones and R. Develin, 'M. Arrecinus Clemens', *Antichthon* 10 [1976], p. 83), he cannot have been Dio's patron.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Russell, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 4: 'a great noble'.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis* (Toronto, 1974), pp. 110–15. Part of the Greek culturist attitude was to pretend difficulty with Latin; this was allied to a deliberate imprecision in Greek descriptions of the Roman empire, see H. J. Mason ('The Roman Government in Greek sources. The effect of literary theory on the translation of official titles', *Phoenix* 24 [1970], pp. 150–59): who, however, puts all this down to literary models and thus ignores the cultural and political implications (see below n. 64).

<sup>36</sup> E.g. *Or.* 1.44; *Or.* 13.33; *Or.* 39.4; and *Or.* 79.1 if delivered in Rome.

<sup>37</sup> Although, as B. W. Jones (art. cit. [n. 1], pp. 351–2) points out, there seems to be no reason to revive the case for Mommsen's candidate Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus.

Apollonius of Tyana, an intimate of all three, prophesied in Smyrna that one of them (Apollonius, of course, knew which one) would accede to the throne. When this was reported to Domitian by the malevolent Euphrates, the tyrant ordered Apollonius to come to Rome and stand trial, so that his evidence would allow Domitian to allay his fears by executing all three (Phil. *V.A.* 7.9). In court Apollonius defended his friends (7.33) from the charges of conspiracy and himself from charges of being a wizard (7.34; 8.7). The philosopher saves his friends (8.5), but rather spoils his own case by vanishing into thin air (8.8).

The threat to Nerva's life is obvious fiction.<sup>38</sup> Nerva, the man of *quies* (Pl. *Ep.* 10.58.7), prospered under Domitian as he had under Nero.<sup>39</sup> Orfitus, presumably put in for verisimilitude, did suffer the attentions of Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 10). The consular Rufus who was threatened is otherwise unknown,<sup>40</sup> although he may be identical with, or invented from, another Philostratan consular Rufus who judged Nicetes of Smyrna.<sup>41</sup>

As we have already seen, Philostratus to some extent based the hero of his novel on Dio. Dio did suffer exile at the hands of Domitian because of his friendship with a powerful man. Thus Apollonius also runs the gauntlet, although he and his confidant secure a better result. The question arises why did Philostratus choose Nerva as the most important of Apollonius' Roman friends? Dio had been a friend of Nerva, but Nerva did not fall. One of his relatives, however, did. The significantly named L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus fell for the same reasons as Dio's patron.<sup>42</sup>

Salvius was almost certainly Nerva's nephew.<sup>43</sup> From this connection he inherited a tenuous link with the Julio-Claudian dynasty. His grandmother Plautilla's brother Octavius Laenas had married one Rubellia Bassa, great grand-daughter of Tiberius.<sup>44</sup> More important, Salvius was the nephew of the emperor Otho. On Otho's suicide Tacitus (*Hist.* 2.48) makes the emperor give his nephew shrewd advice: he must not forget he is the nephew of an emperor, nor remember it too well. Salvius is duly executed by Domitian for celebrating his uncle's birthday (Suet. *Dom.* 10.3).

Salvius was elected to a priesthood in A.D. 63.<sup>45</sup> He was still young in A.D. 69.<sup>46</sup> His age and connection with Nerva should make him suffect consul around A.D. 80.<sup>47</sup> His execution could have been early enough in Domitian's reign for him to have been the man to whom Dio was *sumboulois*.<sup>48</sup>

Dio says (*Or.* 41.6) that his grandfather won Roman citizenship for himself and Dio's mother from the emperor of the time.<sup>49</sup> Dio's father<sup>50</sup> was probably not a Roman citizen, as Dio when keen to boast of his illustrious lineage does not say he

<sup>38</sup> R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), p. 3.

<sup>39</sup> Under Domitian, Martial 8.70, 9.26; under Nero, Tac. *Ann.* 15.72.1.

<sup>40</sup> *PIR*<sup>1</sup> R133.

<sup>41</sup> Phil. *V.S.* 512. This Rufus is probably to be identified with L. Verginius Rufus, governor of Germania Superior A.D. 67/8, W. Eck, *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen vom 1.-3. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1985), pp. 28-9, 231-2.

<sup>42</sup> *PIR*<sup>1</sup> S110. That Dio carried the name Cocceianus is attested by Pl. *Ep.* 10.81.1; 82.2.

<sup>43</sup> Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 628.

<sup>44</sup> E. Groag, 'Prosopographische Beiträge', *Jahreshefte* 21/22 (1924), p. 425; followed by Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 647.

<sup>45</sup> Possibly the Salii, but cf. R. Syme, 'The Ummidii', *Historia* 17 (1968), pp. 80-81 (= *Roman Papers II* [Oxford, 1979], pp. 659-93, at pp. 667-8).

<sup>46</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.48, *prima iuventa*.

<sup>47</sup> Cos., Suet. *Dom.* 10; date, P. Gallivan, 'The Fasti for A.D. 70-96', *CQ* 31 (1981), p. 209.

<sup>48</sup> For Dio's many years of exile, see above (n. 33).

<sup>49</sup> Probably Claudius, see below n. 63.

<sup>50</sup> Pasicrates according to Photius, *Bibl.* 165A, and the *Suda* Δ1240.

was.<sup>51</sup> Pliny's attestation that Dio carried the name Cocceianus has led to the theory that Dio won citizenship in the reign of Cocceius Nerva.<sup>52</sup> A more appealing theory sees Dio winning citizenship in A.D. 71 as a reward for his vociferous support for imperial policies.<sup>53</sup> The Cocceii were riding high in A.D. 71, with Dio's friend, the future emperor, consul. A plausible reconstruction is that Dio won citizenship in A.D. 71 (both for himself and his father) as a reward for his *κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων* at the instigation of his partly homonymous patron L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus and with the support of Salvius' uncle and Dio's friend Nerva.<sup>54</sup>

Dio's links with the Flavians are therefore far from incontrovertible.<sup>55</sup> There is no good evidence to support the theory that Dio was *amicus* to either Vespasian or Titus,<sup>56</sup> and the patron whose fall caused Dio's exile may not have been a minor member of that dynasty but Nerva's nephew L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus. We have already seen that Philostratus had specific reasons in the *Life of Apollonius* for making Dio an adviser to Vespasian. More general cultural reasons can be found for the elevation of Dio by both Philostratus and modern scholars.

In reality neither Vespasian nor Titus appears to have enjoyed a close relationship with philosophers during their reigns. Under Nero Vespasian may have been a friend of the Stoic aristocrats Thrasea and Barea Soranus (see above n. 27), but in his principate he famously executed Helvidius Priscus, exiled Musonius and revoked the freedom of Greece. No philosopher can be found securely attested as an historical adviser to either emperor.<sup>57</sup>

Yet both Vespasian and Titus were usually regarded as 'good' emperors. As was demonstrated by Elizabeth Rawson, the Greeks had long had a tradition that philosophers should advise rulers and that rulers should heed philosophers.<sup>58</sup> As a result of this ideology numerous Greek philosophers put themselves forward for the position of imperial adviser, and later Greek writers allocated Roman emperors

<sup>51</sup> *Or.* 41.6; *Or.* 44.36; *Or.* 46.2–7. A problem for this theory is that Dio says his father was made a citizen of Apamea, *Or.* 41.6. Apamea was a Roman colony (D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* [Princeton, 1950], p. 1268, n. 34), and thus Dio's father should have already held Roman citizenship (F. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik unter Caesar und Augustus* [Wiesbaden, 1952], p. 21, n. 3). The idea that Apamea was a 'double-community' (A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary* [Oxford, 1966], p. 629) seems unlikely (F. Millar, review of Sherwin-White in *JRS* 58 [1968], p. 222; drawing on L. Teutsch, 'Gab es "Dopplegameinden" im römischen Africa?', *RIDA* 3.8 [1961], pp. 326–7; and accepted by S. Mitchell, 'Iconium and Ninica. Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor', *Historia* 28 [1978], p. 436). A solution would be to assume that Dio won citizenship for both himself and his father in A.D. 71, below.

<sup>52</sup> Von Arnim, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 125; E. Berry, 'Dio Chrysostom the moral philosopher', *GR* 30 (1983), p. 71. But if Dio had been given citizenship by his friend when he was emperor we would have expected Dio to take Nerva's *nomen* Cocceius as his *nomen* rather than adapt it to the *cognomen* Cocceianus. See below (n. 54).

<sup>53</sup> Moles, *art. cit.* (n. 1, 1978), p. 86, n. 59; the theory is Ewen Bowie's. See above on the *κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων*.

<sup>54</sup> Dio thus could have taken all of Salvius' names, with the exception of the name of the dead emperor Otho, and been styled L. Salvius Cocceianus Dio. Yet doubt is cast on such a conclusion by the existence of a mutilated inscription from Prusa which mentions a Titus Flavius Dio (P. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure* [Paris, 1870], no. 1113), which could refer to a relative or even Dio himself although obviously the imperial *praenomen* and *nomen* and the name Dio are very widespread. On gaining citizenship in A.D. 71 Dio could have taken the imperial *praenomen* and *nomen* and added the *cognomen* of the patron who instigated his citizenship: Titus Flavius Cocceianus Dio (cf. Sherwin-White, *op. cit.* [n. 51], p. 676).

<sup>55</sup> *Contra* Moles, *art. cit.* (n. 1, 1978), p. 84, 'the links... between Dio and the Flavians are incontrovertible'.

<sup>56</sup> See below on *Or.* 7.66.

<sup>57</sup> Rawson, *art. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 248–9.

<sup>58</sup> Rawson, *art. cit.* (n. 1), *passim*.

philosophic advisers they in reality had not possessed.<sup>59</sup> The elevation of a supreme example of Greek culture elevated Greek culture in general and in some senses defined for the Greeks their relationship with the non-Greek political power which ruled them. The Greeks could see themselves as ruled by educated men who heeded their cultural values, and thus they could feel better about their place in the world: above all about their lack of political autonomy. At a pinch the Italian could be revealed as merely an executive power in the hands of policy-making Greeks.<sup>60</sup>

It is possible that the effects of this ideology are not confined to the ancient sources. Philostratus made Dio an *amicus* of Vespasian. Modern commentators go further and make him an envoy of Vespasian and an *amicus* of Titus as well. It is worth asking why modern scholars are so ready to elevate Dio to the position of *amicus* of the Flavians. Four factors may be relevant. First, it is commonly held that in his later years Dio was an *amicus* of both Nerva<sup>61</sup> and Trajan.<sup>62</sup> There may be a temptation to retroject such a position to Dio's earlier life. Such a retrojection, of course, has no validity. Second, Dio tells that his grandfather was *amicus* to an emperor.<sup>63</sup> A family tradition of friendship with emperors might be assumed. It should not be, for it is far from certain that such links continued over generations, let alone across changes of

<sup>59</sup> For example, among other inventions, Themistius made Epictetus an *amicus* of Pius and Marcus (*Or.* 5.63d). For Epictetus' real attitudes to being a friend of Caesar see F. Millar, 'Epictetus and the Imperial Court', *JRS* 55 (1965), pp. 141–8. Only 'good' emperors were given posthumous philosophic advisers. Such an association between a 'bad' emperor and a philosopher would give too much credit to the 'bad' emperor and degrade the philosopher. Fiction about philosophers and 'bad' emperors should show the philosopher challenging the tyrant by his free-speech and suffering persecution as a result, cf. above on Apollonius and Domitian. Thus later sources do not dwell on Domitian's association with Falvius Arrippus (*Pl. Ep.* 10.58; 60) or his possible connection with Seras (?) ὁ φιλόσοφος (C.D. 68.1.2).

<sup>60</sup> Bowie, art. cit. (n. 6), p. 1660. See Dio, *Or.* 49.7–8 for a Greek philosopher's view of how the world should be run.

<sup>61</sup> *Or.* 45.2. It is noteworthy that Dio says Nerva was a friend before the latter's principate: during which Dio was too ill to visit him.

<sup>62</sup> Although Dio was acquainted with Trajan, the degree of intimacy perhaps should not be exaggerated. Dio served on at least one embassy to Trajan, on which he possibly delivered (at least one) work *On Kingship* (*Or.* 57.11). Dio won benefits for Prusa from Trajan (more counsellors, *Or.* 44.11; *Or.* 45.7, 10; cf. *Or.* 40.14; the status of an assize centre, *Or.* 40.10, 33; *Or.* 44.11; both the above produced extra revenues, *Or.* 48.11; and possibly another source of revenue, *Or.* 44.11). But Dio was criticized in Prusa for his conduct on the embassy (*Or.* 45.3) and for its results (*Or.* 40.13–15; *Or.* 45.4). Dio failed to win freedom for Prusa (*Or.* 44.11–12). Only twice in the extant corpus does Dio claim friendship with Trajan, and both times in very guarded terms (*Or.* 45.3; *Or.* 47.22; cf. Ovid, *Ex pont.* 1.7.21, 'what acquaintance of the Caesars fails to claim their friendship', tr. P. Green). Pliny and Trajan's correspondence betrays no intimacy between emperor and philosopher (*Pl. Ep.* 10.81, 82). The only ancient evidence which does is Philostratus' fiction (*V.S.* 488; *V.A.* 5.27–38). Fein, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 231–6, gives a recent overview of modern scholarly opinions on the relationship of Dio and Trajan. Rawson (art. cit. [n. 1], pp. 250, 256), not cited by Fein, remained sceptical. I hope to return to this topic elsewhere.

<sup>63</sup> *Or.* 41.6; *Or.* 44.5; *Or.* 46.3–4. F. Millar (*The Emperor in the Roman World* (31 B.C.–A.D. 337), 2nd ed. [London, 1992], pp. 481–2) points out that at one point (*Or.* 46.3) Dio claims that his grandfather won a second fortune from the emperors. But the plural probably is just rhetoric. Dio goes on to talk of the friendship of only one emperor (*Or.* 46.4). The emperor in question was most likely Claudius (thus von Arnim, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 123). It was very unlikely to have been Nero given Dio's habitual strong hostility to that emperor (*Or.* 21.6–10; *Or.* 31.110, 150; *Or.* 32.60). Such hostility was not automatic for a Greek. The attitudes of Plutarch (C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* [Oxford, 1971], pp. 18–19, 80), Pausanias (7.17.2), and Philostratus (*V.A.* 5.41) were ambiguous. With Dio's grandfather *amicus* to Claudius (or just possibly an earlier emperor), and Dio's birth falling in the 40s (above n. 24) the former can offer no support to the historicity of Dio's claims at *Or.* 7.66 (below).

dynasty. Third, as a member of the Greek élite Dio is thought to be from one of the right sorts of social groups to be a friend of emperors. Undoubtedly this is true. Yet the lengthy lists of prosopography should not blind us to the extreme rarity of the members of the Greek élite who managed to become *amici* of emperors.<sup>64</sup> Finally, the ancient Greek ideology that a good Greek philosopher should have been honoured by the Roman emperor might still affect modern scholars. In a Thucydidean or senatorial<sup>65</sup> view real history is politico-military history. Scholars validating links between the cultural figures they are studying and those who wielded political power (and thus allowing the implication that those who wielded power were directly influenced by the cultural figures) may be thought to be attempting (albeit unconsciously) to make the ancient cultural figures more important for history.<sup>66</sup>

To return to the text first cited. If read in context (and without an adopted cultural bias) not too much stress should be placed on Dio's statement that he had known the homes and tables of satraps and kings (*Or.* 7.66). This rhetorical flourish was a part of Dio's intention to create a rustic utopia in the first section of the *Euboean Oration*.<sup>67</sup> It is uncertain that in reality Dio was shipwrecked on Euboea, or that he met two families of isolated hunters.<sup>68</sup> His narrative has many parallels with the Greek novels.<sup>69</sup> To further his moral message of the virtue available to the poor, Dio wanted to make a contrast between the homes and tables of the worldly great and the

<sup>64</sup> Very few of the Greek élite became senators, let alone intimates of emperors. Down to the end of the second century H. Halfmann (*Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* [Göttingen, 1979], pp. 100–206) could only find 150 senators definitely from the east (and another thirty who might have been, *ibid.*, pp. 207–13). Early in the second century the second rank city of Prusa could find at a stroke one hundred extra members of its council. It is far from certain that even Roman citizenship was widespread among the Greek élite by A.D. 212: K. Buraselis, *ΘΕΙΑ ΔΩΡΕΑ. ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΠΑΝΩ ΣΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ ΤΗΣ ΔΥΝΑΣΤΕΙΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΗΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ Constitutio Antoniniana* (Athens, 1989), pp. 120–48. One must beware of falling into the trap of believing in an undifferentiated Graeco-Roman élite. For a thorough, nuanced discussion of élite Greek feelings towards Rome see S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford, 1996); also H. Sidebottom, 'Herodian's Historical Methods and Understanding of History', *ANRW* II.34.4 (forthcoming). Recently G. Woolf ('Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East', *PCPhS* 40 [1994], 116–43, at 125 ff.) has argued that the marginal role played by material culture in Greek self-definition allowed Greeks to adopt Roman cultural artefacts (esp. gladiatorial games and Roman styles of bathing) without compromising their 'Greekness'.

<sup>65</sup> It may be significant that, as Simon Price noted (*Rituals and Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge, 1984], p. 18), scholars studying the Roman empire have tended to adopt the attitudes of members of the Senatorial upper-class, 'whose social position many have shared or desired'. For the Senatorial class history was primarily politico-military history (Syme, *op. cit.* [n. 38], pp. 130–56).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Ewen Bowie's argument ('The Importance of Sophists', *YCS* 27 [1982], pp. 29–59) that Greek sophists should be studied against a Greek cultural background and not for their socio-political links with high-placed Romans. In a recent, provocative article P. A. Brunt ('The Bubble of the Second Sophistic', *BICS* 39 [1994], pp. 25–52) more or less follows Bowie in depreciating the importance of Sophists in Roman history, but goes on to depreciate their importance in the life of the Greek cities and in Greek culture, as well as doubting the very existence of a Greek renaissance.

<sup>67</sup> P. A. Brunt, 'Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics', *PCPhS* 19 (1973), pp. 9–34.

<sup>68</sup> Russell, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 8–9.

<sup>69</sup> See G. Anderson, *Studies in Lucian's comic fiction* (Leiden, 1976), pp. 94–8; F. Jouan, 'Les Thèmes romanesques dans l'Euboïcos de Dion Chrysostome', *REG* 90 (1977), pp. 38–46; R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 66–7. S. Swain ('Dio and Lucian', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context* [London, 1994], pp. 166–72) plays down the novelistic elements in the narrative, instead finding in the *Euboean Oration* a novelistic morality.

happiness of the poor yet free rustics with whom he claimed to have feasted.<sup>70</sup> The dramatic date of the feast at which this realization most forcibly struck Dio was during his exile. In dramatic context for the contrast to strike Dio at all it was necessary that he should claim to have already known the highest of the worldly great before his exile.

To sum up, Dio does not appear to have been a confidant of the Flavian dynasty. No evidence can be adduced which supports the modern orthodoxies that Dio was *amicus* to Vespasian, let alone Vespasian's 'special envoy to the east', or to Titus, or that the patron whose fall caused his exile was a minor member of the dynasty T. Flavius Sabinus. Instead it has been argued that Dio's patrons before his exile were the consul of A.D. 71 Nerva and his nephew L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus. By their intercession Dio may have won the citizenship for himself and his father in A.D. 71, and Cocceianus' fall sometime after A.D. 80 probably precipitated Dio's exile.

The readiness of ancient Greek writers to elevate Greek philosophers like Dio to the role of imperial adviser has been argued to stem from a desire to inflate the political importance of Greek cultural figures, and thus to some extent to redefine the place of the Greeks in the Roman empire (ameliorating the lack of political autonomy which divorced Greeks from making traditional Thucydidean history). This ideology still has some influence in modern discussions of Greek culture and Roman power.

*Corpus Christi College, Oxford*

HARRY SIDEBOTTOM

<sup>70</sup> Cf. the contrast at *Or.* 7.80 of rustic weddings and those of the rich. At *Or.* 7.81 Dio says he has told the preceding tale to illustrate the advantages held by the poor.