Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_________________________________ ________________
Kaelyn Olivia Jack McAdams Date

Understanding the Graeculi: A Greek Roman Empire in the Third and Fourth Centuries

By

Kaelyn Olivia Jack McAdams

Doctor of Philosophy

History

Judith Evans Grubbs
Co-Advisor

Jonathan Master
Co-Advisor

Roxani Margariti
Committee Member

Accepted:

Kimberly Jacob Arriola, Ph.D., MPH
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

Understanding the Graeculi: A Greek Roman Empire in the Third and Fourth Centuries

By

Kaelyn Olivia Jack McAdams
M.A., Emory University, 2021
B.A., The Ohio State University, 2017

Co-Advisors: Judith Evans Grubbs, Ph.D., and Jonathan Master, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in History
2025

Abstract

Understanding the Graeculi: A Greek Roman Empire in the Third and Fourth Centuries

By Kaelyn Olivia Jack McAdams

This dissertation examines how and why the Roman emperors of the tetrarchy, including Constantine, changed the imperial landscape in the third and fourth centuries. In particular, it seeks to understand how these changes impacted Greeks residing in the Greek-speaking East. My analysis traces the development of the relationship between the Greeks and the Roman Empire, primarily from the reign of Trajan (r. 98-117) to that of Julian (r. 360-363), in order to properly assess the cultural history during the tetrarchy. Drawing on legal, epigraphic, material, and other textual evidence, I shed light on the social and political impact of imperial policies in the Greek and Roman world.

Hellenic culture was a pillar in the Roman world. Elite Greeks and Romans held strong ideas and opinions about oratorical and philosophical practices in Greek cities. These practices, established in Athens and cities in Asia Minor in the 4th century BCE, continued to shape the intellectual and political communities in the 3rd and 4th centuries CE. Importantly, these practices would inform the cultural basis of Greek identity and unite Greeks after they were officially citizens of the Roman Empire.

By examining Roman imperial changes alongside the works of Greeks living within the empire, this inquiry attempts to understand the various ways the Romans perceived and maintained Hellenic culture before the rise of Christianity in the fourth century, under the rule of Constantine. What it reveals is an empire that was both culturally Greek and imperially Roman.

Understanding the Graeculi: A Greek Roman Empire in the Third and Fourth Centuries

By

Kaelyn Olivia Jack McAdams
M.A., Emory University, 2021
B.A., The Ohio State University, 2017

Co-Advisors: Judith Evans Grubbs, Ph.D., and Jonathan Master, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in History
2025

Acknowledgements

I sincerely thank my co-advisor and committee chair, Judith Evans Grubbs. No one has shown the dedication and endurance she has in shaping not only this dissertation but also my understanding of the Roman world. Without her guidance, support, and invaluable feedback, I could not have completed such an extensive project. I am grateful for her mentorship throughout these challenging years and profoundly honored to have been her student.

I would like to thank my co-advisor, Jonathan Master, who has consistently supported this project and my professional growth, making time to discuss ideas with me and offering invaluable life advice when things got tough. I also owe many thanks to my third committee member, Roxani Margariti, for teaching me the importance of professionalism, guiding my academic development, and consistently dedicating her time.

A substantial thanks to my friends, colleagues, and mentors who have given their time and energy throughout my graduate career, including Georgia Brunner, Claire Seidler, Luke Hagemann, Cassandra Casias, Katrina Knight, Michael Beshay, and my *Mappa Mundi* peers. I owe an immense debt to Anthony Kaldellis, whose mentorship at Ohio State University challenged me and trained me. Thank you for taking a chance on me, even when I had so much to learn.

I would like to thank my mother, Kathryn McAdams, who supported me throughout college and graduate school, and my stepfather, Kevin Beck, for encouraging me to believe that I could achieve anything I set my mind to. To my memaw, Carolyn McAdams, who keeps me humble and encourages me to follow my dreams. Thank you to my father and stepmother, Marshall and Dawn McAdams, Papaw, and my brothers, Connor and John, who were always eager to learn more about the empire. Lastly, I would like to thank my husband, Daniel Hyman, for his unwavering support, encouragement, and love, and for always being there to listen. Without my community, none of this would be possible.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

Editions of Quoted Greek and Latin Texts

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: Roman Armies 27

Chapter 2: Roman Cities 81

Chapter 3: Roman Law and Administration 140

Chapter 4: Education 193

Conclusion 236

Bibliography 250

List of Abbreviations

Amm. Marc. = Ammianus Marcellinus

Aur. Vict. *Caes.* = Aurelius Victor *De Caesaribus*

Cass. Dio = Cassius Dio

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*

Cod. Iust. = *Codex Iustinianus*

Cod. Theod. = *Codex Theodosianus*

Dig. = *Digest of Justinian*

Euseb. = Eusebius
Vit. Const. = *Vita*
Constantini *Hist. eccl.* =
Historia Ecclesiastica

Eunap. = Eunapius
VS = *Vitae sophistarum*

Eutr. = Eutropius

Hdn. = Herodian

ILS = *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*

Lactant. *De. mort. pers.* = Lactantius *De mortibus persecutorum*

Not. Dign. [occ.] = *Notitia Dignitatum in partibus occidentis*

OGIS = *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Dittenberger 1903-1905)

Pan. Lat. = *Panegyrici Latini*

Philostr. *VS* = Philostratus *Vitae sophistarum*

List of Abbreviations

PLRE = *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Jones et al. 1971)

SHA = Scriptores Historiae
Augustae

Suet. = Suetonius

Tac. = Tacitus
Hist. =
Histories

Editions and Translations of Quoted Greek and Latin Texts

Aelius Aristides. (2017). Aelius Aristides. *Orations, Volume I.* Edited and translated by Michael Trapp. Loeb Classical Library 533. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Ammianus Marcellinus. Ammianus Marcellinus. *History, Volume I: Books 14-19.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library

Aurelius Victor. (1994). *De Caesaribus* (H. W. Bird, Trans.). Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Ausonius. (1919). *Volume I: Books 1-17.* Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Loeb Classical Library 96. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Basil. (1934). *Letters, Volume IV: Letters 249-368. On Greek Literature.* Translated by Roy J. Deferrari, M. R. P. McGuire. Loeb Classical Library 270. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Cicero. (1942). *On the Orator: Books 1-2.* Translated by E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 348. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Cicero. (1976). *In Catilinam 1-4. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco.* Translated by C. Macdonald. Loeb Classical Library 324. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Cicero. (1999). *Letters to Atticus, Volume I.* Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 7. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Cassius Dio. (1917). Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VI: Books 51-55.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 83. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Cassius Dio. (1925). Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VIII: Books 61-70.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 176. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Cassius Dio. (1927). Dio Cassius. *Roman history, volume IX: Books 71-80* (E. Cary & H. B. Foster, Trans.). Loeb Classical Library 177. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

The Codex of Justinian. *The Codex of Justinian: A New Annotated Translation, with a parallel Latin and Greek Text Based on a Translation by Justice Fred H. Blume*. Edited by Bruce Frier. Vols. 1-3. (2016). Cambridge.

The Digest of Justinian. (1998). Book Fourteen. *The Digest of Justinian, Volume 1* (REV-Revised, pp. 415–435), translated by A. Watson. University of Pennsylvania Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhn70.24

Eunapius. (2023). Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.* Edited and translated by Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Eusebius. (1999). Euseibus, *Life of Constantine*. Translated by Avril Cameron. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.

Eutropius. *(1993). Eutropius: Breviarium, translated with an introduction and commentary.* By H.W. Bird Translated texts for historians 14. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Gaius. (1988). *Institutes of Gaius. Translated with an introduction by W.M. Gordon and O.F. Robinson with the Latin text of Seckel and Kuebler.* Cornell University Press

Gregory Nazianzen. (1888). From King, Charles William. *Julian the Emperor: Containing Gregory Nazianzen's Two Invectives and Libanius' Monody with Julians Extant Theosophical Works*. London

Gregory of Nyssa. (2007). *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters : Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Anna M. Silvas*

Gregory Thaumaturgus. (2004). Chapter One: The Canonical Letter of Gregory Thaumaturgus and the Third Century Invasions. *The Goths in the Fourth Century.* Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool

Herodian. (1969). Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume I: Books 1-4.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 454. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Herodian. (1970). Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume II: Books 5-8.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 455. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Historia Augusta. *(1932). Historia Augusta, Volume III: The Two Valerians. The Two Gallieni. The Thirty Pretenders. The Deified Claudius. The Deified Aurelian. Tacitus. Probus. Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus and Bonosus. Carus, Carinus and Numerian.* Translated by David Magie. Loeb Classical Library 263. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Historia Augusta. (2022). Historia Augusta. *Volume I.* Translated by David Magie. Revised by David Rohrbacher. Loeb Classical Library 139. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022.

Julian. (1913). Julian. *Misopogon.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913

Julian. (1923). Julian. *Letters. Epigrams. Against the Galilaeans. Fragments.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 157. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

The Latin Panegyrics. (1994). *In praise of later Roman emperors: The panegyrici latini* (Vol. 21, 1st ed.). translated with an introduction by C. E. V. Nixon and B. S. Rodgers. University of California Press.

Lactantius. (1984). Lactantius, *De mortibus Persecutorum*. Trans. J.L. Creed. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Lactantius. *(2003). Lactantius: Divine institutes*. Translated by Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey. Liverpool University Press

Libanius. (1992). Libanius. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Libanius. (2000). *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture, as Observed by Libanius.* Translated by A.F. Norman. Liverpool

Libanius. (2004). *Selected Letters of Libanius: From the Age of Constantius and Julian.* Translated with an introduction by Scott Bradbury. Liverpool

Livy. (1922). Livy. *History of Rome, Volume II: Books 3-4.* Translated by B. O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 133. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Menander. (2019). Menander Rhetor. Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Menander Rhetor. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ars Rhetorica.* Edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 539. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Pausanias. (1918). Pausanias Description of Greece with an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones, Litt.D., and H.A. Ormerod, M.A., in 4 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd.

Pausanias. (1933). Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume III: Books 6-8.21.* Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 272. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933

Philostratus. (2023). Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.* Edited and translated by Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Plato. (2017). Plato. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo.* Edited and translated by Christopher Emlyn-Jones, William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Pliny the Younger. (1969). Pliny the Younger. *Letters, Volume II: Books 8-10. Panegyricus.* Translated by Betty Radice. Loeb Classical Library 59. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Plotinus. (1969). Plotinus. *Ennead, Volume I: Porphyry on the Life of Plotinus. Ennead I.* Translated by A. H. Armstrong. Loeb Classical Library 440. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Plutarch. (1920). Plutarch. *Lives, Volume IX: Demetrius and Antony. Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 101. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Plutarch. (1921). Plutarch. *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flamininus.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 102. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Porphyry. *(1982-199). Porphyry, On the Life of Plotinus Porphyre: La Vie de Plotin*, 2 vols., Luc Brisson et al. (eds.), Paris: Vrin

Suetonius. (1914). Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Volume I: Julius. Augustus. Tiberius. Gaius Caligula.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Introduction by K. R. Bradley. Loeb Classical Library 31. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Tacitus. (1925). Tacitus. *Histories: Books 1-3* (C. H. Moore, Trans.). Loeb Classical Library 111. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pseudo-Nonnius. (2001). *A Christian's Guide to Greek Culture: Pseudo-Nonnius,* translated by Jennifer Nimmo Smith.

Themistius. (2001). *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. Translated with an introduction by Peter Heather and David Moncur. Liverpool

Velleius Paterculus. (1924). Velleius Paterculus. *Compendium of Roman History. Res Gestae Divi Augusti.* Translated by Frederick W. Shipley. Loeb Classical Library 152. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924

Introduction

This dissertation has seen many iterations. As an undergraduate, I was interested in the cultural divide between Greek-speaking and Latin-speaking Romans by analyzing invective, panegyric, letters, and literary evidence from fourth- and fifth-century authors. The divide was not only a cultural one, but also a physical one, initiated after the death of Theodosius I in 395, when the empire split into two. Upon his death, the empire was divided between his two sons, with Honorius ruling in the west in Rome/Milan, and Arcadius ruling in Constantinople. My search began by reading Claudian, a fifth-century Latin author born in Alexandria, who wrote in the court of Honorius. His works highlighted the expertise of Stilicho, a half-Vandal, half-Roman soldier serving as regent for Honorius, while undermining the regents in the east, Rufinus and Eutropius. By the fifth and sixth centuries, in the works of Sidonius, Cassiodorus, and Procopius, I found that Romans writing in the West were critical of the Roman identity being claimed by Romans in the East, and vice versa. This was most apparent in Procopius' *Histories*, where he saw himself and those under Justinian as "Roman," whereas those under Gothic rule were something else.

I was, therefore, left with the question of when Greeks, defined as people living in what had been the Greek eastern half of the empire and speaking Greek, had taken on the identity of "Roman" as it is seen in the fifth and sixth centuries. The question of identity has inspired historians to think critically about how people in the past chose to identify and why that affiliation mattered. It inspired authors such as Anthony Kaldellis and Averil Cameron to re-examine the Byzantine world and understand that the "Byzantines" were Greek-speaking

Romans and referred to themselves as *Romaioi*.[1] Similarly, scholars of Late Antiquity began to examine who the barbarians were and question their role in Roman narratives. Instead of being stereotypes meant to contrast with the Romans, "barbarians" were active members in Roman communities. They fought in the armies, held citizenship, had laws and customs, and even became Christian. From the emergence of these so-called "barbarian" groups, scholars began to question what Roman identity was, and what it could be to those individuals and groups who would tangentially become a part of or interact with the Roman Empire.

I wondered, how and when did people living in Greek-speaking cities begin to see themselves as Roman? How would that be expressed? It was difficult even to discern which "Greeks" I would analyze. Following suit from Martin Hallmannsecker and Anna Heller, I cover "all parts of the Roman Empire where the polis was the dominant form of organization. This was first and foremost the eastern part of the empire with mainland Greece, the Aegean Islands, Asia Minor, Syria, and the Black Sea region."[2] I have excluded historically Greek areas such as Sicily and Egypt as well as isolated Greek settlements, because they warrant their own area of research, and were treated exceptionally within the Roman government. I chose to stop at Julian because he was the last pagan emperor, and his death marked the decline of the pagan elite within the empire.[3]

---

[1] Cameron, A. (2005). *Procopius and the sixth century*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis; Cameron, A. (2006). *The Byzantines*. Blackwell Pub. International Article Number: 9780631202622; Kaldellis, A. (2004). *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, history, and philosophy at the end of antiquity*. University of Pennsylvania Press. doi: 10.9783/9780812202410; Kaldellis, A. (2007). *Hellenism in Byzantium: The transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition*. Cambridge University Press; Kaldellis, A. (2015). *The Byzantine Republic: People and power in New Rome*. Harvard University Press. Unspecified: 40024490335

[2] Hallmannsecker, Martin and Anna Heller, editors. (2025). *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2

[3] The emperor Julian practiced ancient Greek paganism, and insisted on upholding religious rites, such as making sacrifices to the Greek gods. See Ammian. Marc. XXII.14.1, where Julian sacrifices to Jupiter.

I examine Greek identity as an ethnic and cultural category, which J. Hall reminds us "is socially constructed and subjectively perceived."[4] Hall, disregarding language and physicality as indicators of ethnic groups, suggests that connection to a "specific territory and the common myth of descent are more distinctive characteristics of ethnic groups."[5] I argue, first, that Greek identity in the third and fourth centuries comprised language, custom and religion. The third category, religion, came into question in the fourth century with the rise of Christian intellectuals who engaged with their pagan peers. This dialogue between the groups highlights the very fact that some Greeks felt paganism was vital to Greek life, whereas Christians felt their shared past and educational training were sufficient. Secondly, I claim *polis* identity, which included civic duties, that had existed in the Greek-speaking cities was replaced by an imperial Roman identity.

Somewhat contradictory to the point above, this dissertation does not extensively discuss religious change within the Roman Empire, which many have argued was the most significant indicator of change in the third and fourth centuries.[6] Instead, I attempt to address how Romans confronted, imposed, and adapted to imperial policies within which Christians and Christianity were sometimes the most apparent way to access Roman reaction and opinion. While I do not necessarily disagree that widespread religious change from a pagan society to a Christian one altered the Roman state, I wanted to explore other areas in which the Greek East was changing that appeared more secular. I have always found it interesting that the Roman state was deeply religious, and even when its subjects converted to a more rigid type of religion with a greater demand for standardization, the state was able to survive. I have concluded that while religion became standardized throughout the empire, so did the daily lives of Romans. The final two chapters discuss law, administration, and education. Regarding education, in particular, Christianity and Christians appear to have had a considerable influence on Greek intellectual life, which had been closely tied to its Hellenistic past.

---

[4] Hall, J. (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity.* Retrieved from https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.emory.edu/2027/heb31904.0001.001, 19.

[5] Hall (1997), 25

[6] Busine, A., editor. (2015). *Religious Practices and Christianization of the Late Antique City (4th–7th cent.)* Leiden: Boston; Mitchell, S. and Greatrex, G. (2023). *A History of the Later Roman Empire, AD 284-700 (3rd ed.).* Hoboken, NJ.

In an attempt to find "the beginning" without starting with Augustus, I looked to emperor Trajan who sent Pliny the Younger to be governor of Pontus and Bithynia in the second century CE. In book ten, Pliny detailed his observations of the people in Pontus and Bithynia, and frequently corresponded with the emperor when he found problems. Trajan's response about the *Graeculi* struck me.[7] Trajan's responses often instructed Pliny to guide them to a more Roman way, an effective and financially sound way, the right way, or to not interfere. Trajan (and likely Pliny as well) identified the people living in the region as Greek, hence his use of the diminutive label *Graeculi,* or "little Greeks."[8] Trajan used the term to dismiss Greek culture, belittling the Greeks for wanting to continue their tradition of competing through lavish buildings. The term *Graeculi* had a trivializing tone; in his *De Oratore* Cicero warned orators to be good so that they do not "appear so completely a sage among fools, as to have his hearers either regarding him as a clumsy Greekling."[9] The term had a history in the Roman ethos, and it was a signal to other (western) Romans to recognize the silliness of Greek traditions in contrast to the Roman customs, which, from the Roman perspective, had a respectable restraint and control that the Greeks lacked.

---

[7] This interaction and letter is described in more detail in Chapter Two: Roman Cities.

[8] Gymnasiis indulgent Graeculi; ideo forsitan Nicaeenses maiore animo constructionem eius adgressi sunt: sed oportet illos eo contentos esse, quod possit illis sufficere. Quid Claudiopolitanis circa balineum quod parum, ut scribis, idoneo loco incohaverunt suadendum sit, tu constitues. Architecti tibi deesse non possunt. Nulla provincia non et peritos et ingeniosos homines habet; modo ne existimes brevius esse ab urbe mitti, cum ex Graecia etiam ad nos venire soliti sint. Pliny the Younger, Letters, 10.40. Translated by Betty Radice

[9] Cicero, *De Oratore* 221-222. Translation by E.W. Sutton, H. Rackham.

Second, Trajan mentioned their love of *gymnasia*, and Pliny too highlighted their attempts to reconstruct civil buildings through the use of both private and government funds.[10] In both letters Trajan sought to avoid allowing too much independence for the people of the cities; instead, he wanted Pliny to fix the corruption (overspending) that was occurring in the region. At the same time, Trajan put pressure on private individuals to carry out these guidelines from Pliny and the emperor. Trajan and Pliny were both aware how important public space was in these Greek cities where the "Greeklings" lived. As Trajan noted, they loved their *gymnasia*, which revealed an established stereotype (if somewhat true) about Greek culture. His testimony provided insight into how the western Romans may have viewed Greeks living in the east.

In Ephesos, Greek elites worked to create multicultural spaces that accommodated both Greek and Roman ways of life in the first through third centuries CE. In her article, Barbara Burrell examines buildings and their inscriptions in Ephesos to reconstruct the public's "reading experience" of the city.[11] Ephesos was a repository for bilingual Greek and Latin inscriptions dating as early as the first century BCE. It was a city with a rich Hellenic history as well as an important harbor and trading center in the Roman period. Bilingual inscriptions were being used in the city until the third and fourth centuries. In 200 CE, an inscription found on a pillar of the Gate of Mazaeus and Mithridates recorded that Julia Potentilla "constructed a paving in front of the 'Auditorion' and the plaza around 200 CE, and one could stand beside the Auditorion inscription and look out onto it."[12] Burrell states this is the only inscription in which the Latin word "auditorium" is transcribed as "*auditorion*" rather than using Greek cognates such as

---

[10] See letter 10.39 in which Pliny remarked that senators who had been chosen by the emperor had paid their fees which would be used to fund the baths in Claudiopolis.

[11] Burrell, Barbara. (2009). Reading, Hearing, and Looking at Ephesos. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome.* Oxford: Oxford University Press 69-95, 69

[12] Burrell (2009), 84-85

"*akroaterion*" or "*dikasterion*" meaning "a hall of justice."[13] Burrell suggests this word was chosen due to the building's particular Roman use as the courtroom for the proconsul of Asia and his *consilium*.[14] The same linguistic trait was found on an equestrian statue base for Celsus in which the Latin "*aerarium*" became the Greek "*aiarion*."[15] In her assessment, Burrell notes that in spoken language, this is a form of "code-switching" which denotes when a foreign phrase is used in the speech of another language. The building in question (for archaeological debate see Burrell's article) was used for professional orators to argue cases before the Asian tribunal. The inscription signified a new way to label a Roman administrative building in the Greek language with a Hellenized-Latin term.

On the opposite side of the Aegean in the second century CE, Herodes Atticus was making history as a famous Athenian and Roman citizen. He fully integrated himself into Roman life by taking a patrician Roman wife and becoming the first Greek consul in 146 CE. As Maud Gleason states, "Herodes Atticus was one of a kind."[16] He simultaneously funded building projects in his own city and was a teacher. He was an example of a person capable of maintaining both a Greek identity through being an Athenian by birth and a Roman identity through holding Roman office, but generally in the second century Roman and Greek identities "were not fused."[17] As an individual, Herodes Atticus seemed to connect Roman bureaucracy as well as some aspects of Roman culture (taking a Roman wife) with his Greek culture through supporting public building projects in Athens and being a sophist. Within five decades, it seemed the landscape and demographics of Roman Greece were changing to reflect the emergence of a Greek east that adapted to its relationship to the Roman state. This change materialized in the late second through the fourth centuries CE.

---

[13] Burrell (2009) 85; See SEG 17 759 in which the word *dikasterion* is used in replacement of the Latin auditorium during the reign of Caracalla. See also Philostrat. *VS* 1.22 in which Philostratus used *dikasterion* for the same purpose.
[14] Burrell (2009), 85
[15] Burrell (2009), 85
[16] Gleason, Maud, (2010). "Making Space for Bicultural Identity: Herodes Atticus Commemorates Regilla." *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, ed. Tim Whitmarsh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 125-162, 133. Herodes is discussed again in chapters two and four.
[17] Gleason (2010), 127

Libanius, a famous teacher of rhetoric from Antioch in the fourth century CE, wrote in his autobiography that his great-grandfather, who lived in the third century, had been mistaken as coming from Italy because of a speech he so eloquently delivered in Latin.[18] But, Libanius said, "although he was versed in Latin, he originated from nowhere else but here [Antioch]."[19] His great-grandfather served as an example of bilingualism in which a native Greek speaker would have mastered the Latin language so well as to deliver it, even if Libanius embellishes in this oration. Writing in the same century, the historian Ammianus Marcellinus wrote his history in Latin "as a former soldier and Greek."[20] Even though Ammianus declared his own identity as a Greek, he chose to record his history in Latin and use Latin Roman historians as inspiration for his work, rather than using Greek authors.[21]

Alongside these attestations of Romano-Greek life, honorary inscriptions for men holding office during this time show a flourishing administrative life. Especially in the second and third centuries, bilingual dedications appear in the Greek east, like those in Ephesos.[22] It is specifically the bilingualism of Greek and Latin that strikes me as interesting, as well as an overlapping identity of Greek and Roman, especially where bureaucracy was involved.[23] These two identities seemed to be often at odds with each other in the previous centuries. Even when the two cultures were merged through the education of the Roman elite in Athens, or Greeks becoming Roman through the acquisition of Roman citizenship, it was unlikely to have an over-arching and integrated identity that was both Greek and Roman.

---

[18] Libanius. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992

[19] Lib. *Autobiography*, 3: "οἴονται δέ τινες τὸν ἐμὸν ἐπίπαππον ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἥκειν ὑπὸ λόγου τινὸς τῇ ἐκείνων γλώττῃ ποιηθέντος ἠπατημένοι. ὁ δὲ ἄρα τὸ μὲν εἶχε ποιεῖν, ἦν δὲ οὐκ ἄλλοθεν."

[20] Ammianus Marcellinus XXI.16.9: *ut miles quondam et Graecus.* Translation my own but is straightforward and a well-research statement. See Matthews (1989), chp.XVIII, p.452-472. Further discussed in the Conclusion to this dissertation.

[21] Matthews (1989)

[22] *IG*.V.495 and 547, *SEG* 11. 788; see also *SEG* 49 1478

I argue, however, that in the second century CE the Greek east was already forming a Roman identity. After all, these provinces had been under Roman rule for over two hundred years and had been in contact with the Roman state since the early Hellenistic period. Greeks had held Roman citizenship, fought alongside Roman senators as soldiers, and written under Roman rule. In the second through fourth centuries CE, there was an increase in Roman magistracies in the Greek east.[24] Similarly, as can be seen with Pliny's intervention in Pontus and Bithynia, there was a desire from the emperor to incorporate the region into the empire by making sure the people of these regions were following Roman customs for civic life. An idealized picture of this blending of Greek into Roman culture under the *Pax Romana* is found in the "Oration to Rome" by the Greek sophist Aelius Aristides. In it, he exalted the empire and praised it for its expanse and ability to maintain peace. He said:

> Vast and comprehensive as is the size of it [the Roman Empire], your empire is much greater for its perfection than for the area which its boundaries encircle…. Nor is it merely called the land of the King, while really the land of all who are able to hold it. Nor do satraps fight one another as if they had no king; nor are cities at variance, some fighting against these and some against those, with

---

[23] See Adams (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin Language.* Cambridge University, 3-8 for his definition of bilingualism, which he says, "may vary greatly across such areas as the phonological, morphological, lexical, semantic and stylistic," 7. His work includes discussion on how class impacts bilingualism, especially concerning those elite who "had freely chosen to become bilingual," 9.

[24] Roman law changed to allow people of different statuses to hold office. For example, there were proconsuls of Praetorian rank, then senatorial *correctores* could oversee 'free' cities in the empire. This could vary in every province and city and is discussed briefly in chapter two.

> garrisons being dispatched to some cities and being expelled from others. but for the eternal duration of the empire the whole civilized world prays all together, emitting, like an aulos after a thorough cleaning, one note with more perfect precision than a chorus; so beautifully is it harmonized by the leader in command.[25]

He even mentioned the ease of contacting the higher court (that of the emperor) to settle legal disputes.[26] He went on to mention the history of the Hellenic states, and how disputes plagued that history. His commentary on the Roman Empire's ability to peacefully rule over its territory could be read as an appreciation for Roman rule, particularly in terms of its systematic and universal form of governance.

I aim to understand how this process continued into the fourth century and to determine if it appears the same in all 'Greek' cities. In this way, I will identify the multiple ways cities and people became Roman and how these identities were shaped by imperial rule. "Hellene," "Hellenic," and "Greek" are more complex concepts to define, but they will be continually investigated and explored. For now, the definitions are as follows: A "Hellene" before the fourth century was someone who had received *paideia*, spoke and wrote in Greek, and participated in Greek religion.[27] After Christianity became dominant in the empire, "Hellene" became a label for someone who continued to practice the old ways of paganism, and explicitly not Christian. Therefore, "Hellenic" is the adjective used to describe that person or potentially a practice that arises from the definition of "Hellene." The historian Herodotus (484-425 BCE) created a definition of Greek identity (*Hellenikon*) in his description of events leading up to the Battle of

---

[25] Aelius Aristides, Oliver translation. *Roman Oration* 29, 898
[26] Aelius Aristides, Oliver translation. *Roman Oration* 38, 899
[27] For a definition and description of *paideia* please refer to chapter four on education.

Plataea in 479 BCE. The Athenians, piqued that anyone would believe they would desert their Greek allies for the Persians said:

> There are many important reasons that would prevent us from doing this even if we wanted to. First and foremost there are the statues and temples of the gods which have been sacked and destroyed; it is necessary for us to avenge these with all our might rather than come to an agreement with the man who did it. Then again there is the matter of Hellenicity [Hellenikon]—that is our common blood (homaimon), common tongue (homoglosson), common cult places and sacrifices (theon hidrymata… koina kai thysiai) and similar customs (ethea… homotropa); it would not be right for the Athenians to betray all this.[28]

Under Herodotus' definition a "Hellene" would share these traits, which came down to language, religion, shared ancestry, and customs (which could be defined also as same habits of life).[29] This definition changed over time, and by the Hellenistic period Polybius and Diodorus included only Greek language and Greek customs in their definitions of a shared Greek identity. In the first century CE Dio Chrysostom continued to project a concept of a shared Greekness. In his plea for the Nicomedians and the Nicaeans to get along, he begged:

> "And what is more, we are not contending for revenues either, but each side is content with what is its own; moreover, these matters, as it happens, have been clearly delimited—and so indeed is all else besides—just as if in peace and friendship. Furthermore, there is interchange of produce between the two cities, as well as intermarriage, and in consequence already there have come to be many family ties between us; yes, and we have proxenies and ties of personal friendship to unite us. Besides, you worship the same gods as they do, and in most cases you conduct your festivals as they do. In fact you have no quarrel as to your customs

---

[28] Hall (2002), 189. Hall's translation of Herodotus 8.144.2

[29] Plato used the same word in the *Phaedo* 83d: ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ ὁμοδοξεῖν τῷ σώματι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς χαίρειν ἀναγκάζεται οἶμαι ὁμότροπός τε καὶ ὁμότροφος γίγνεσθαι καὶ οἵα μηδέποτε εἰς Ἅιδου καθαρῶς ἀφικέσθαι.

> either. Yet, though all these things afford no occasion for hostility, but rather for friendship and concord, still we fight."[30]

He did not use the same terminology as his Greek predecessors but implied a similar sense of unity which bound the cities through intermarriage, religion, and bureaucrats (*proxenies*).[31] In this dissertation I will use the term 'Greek' conventionally to describe people living in Greek cities, speaking and writing in Greek, and participating in the civic life of their *poleis* (cities). The word is derived from the Latin term "Graeci," which was the Roman translation of "Hellenes," who were the inhabitants of the Greek-speaking provinces in Greece and Asia Minor. As mentioned above, Trajan used the term "Graeculi" in a somewhat belittling way to refer to people living in Pontus and Bithynia.[32] Defining "Hellene" or "Greek" becomes difficult once Roman religion is taken into consideration. As Simon Price and Fritz Graf have shown, Roman religious festivals and worship were popular in the Greek East.[33] Lastly, even Greek and Roman authors have a distinct understanding of 'ancient' Greeks, to whom they have an ancestral connection, and 'we', the Greeks who are contemporary to them.[34]

In 212 CE, the Edict of Caracalla granted universal citizenship to all free people of the Empire. Caracalla's purpose in making this grant was not only to increase revenue but also to increase the number of people worshiping the Roman gods and falling under Roman legal jurisdiction. I explore what this mass grant of Roman citizenship would have meant to Greeks in the Empire. Was it disruptive to a "Hellenic" identity? By categorizing a Roman identity as a political one, rather than a cultural one, people living in the Greek East could simultaneously be culturally Greek and legally and politically Roman.

---

[30] Dio Chrysostom *Discourse* 38.22: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ[1] τυγχάνει διωρισμένα, καὶ μήν γε καὶ τἆλλα πάντα, ὥσπερ ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ φιλίᾳ. καὶ καρπῶν εἰσιν ἀντιδόσεις καὶ γάμων ἐπιμιξίαι καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ συγγένειαι πολλαί τινες ἤδη γεγενημέναι· καὶ προξενίας δὲ ἔχομεν καὶ φιλίας ἰδιωτικάς. θεούς τε τοὺς αὐτοὺς νομίζετε καὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς πλείστας ὁμοίως ἄγετε. καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθῶν οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία ὑμῖν μάχη. τούτων δὲ ἁπάντων οὐκ ἔχθρας παρεχόντων αἰτίαν, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον φιλίας καὶ ὁμονοίας, μαχόμεθα. H. Lamar Crosby Loeb translation used.

[31] See Sheppard, A.R.R. 1984-1986 "Homonoia in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire."

[32] See Madsen (2009) for discussion on identity in Pontus and Bithynia during this period.

[33] See Price (1984) and Graf (2015). Listed in the bibliography are studies on regional interactions with the imperial cult and/or other Roman religious festivals. Plutarch answered many questions from his Greek audience about Roman religious festivals and offices in his *Moralia*.

[34] See chapter four on education for more detail.

Scope and Sources

Chronologically, I begin with the reign of Trajan (98-117 CE) in order to draw on the writings of Dio of Prusa and Pliny the Younger, who recorded the relationships between Greeks and the Roman state from eastern and western prospectives. Pliny provided the western perspective, while Dio of Prusa represented a Greek perspective, and both were writing under Trajan. I will end with the emperor Julian (r.360-363), who was the last pagan emperor. Within this period I will trace the development of Roman-Greek identities in the Second Sophistic (second and third centuries CE), the impact of the Edict of Caracalla or the Antonine Decree (212 CE) which granted universal Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the empire; the increase in imperial offices in the Greek East (third and fourth centuries CE); the establishment of Constantinople (330 CE); and lastly, the creation of the Constantinopolitan senate in the fourth century and how that fostered a Roman identity in the east.

This dissertation discusses four major facets of the empire, in which I argue one can see significant developments that create the foundation for the later empire: armies, cities, law and administration, and education. The Roman army held both symbolic and physical power as a pillar of Roman identity. Cities were forced to comply with the Roman state in order to survive, and sometimes even thrive under imperial rule. Herodotus defined law as one of the factors in a people’s common identity, and the ultimate guiding force for how people could live. And, finally, education had been a vital ingredient for Hellenic culture in the principate and an area which even Romans coveted. Each facet mentioned above seems to rely on and impact the others. Due to changes in state formation and Roman law, the educational needs of Romans evolved to meet the demand for more government officials. Shifts in educational developments altered the way certain cities, such as Antioch and Athens, defined themselves. From those four aspects, I see two clearly defined parts: first, the armies and the cities; and second, education and law.

Each chapter is devoted to one of these areas and expands on the historical context from the first through the third centuries of the empire, continuing to the reign of Julian (r. 361-363), with a specific focus on the Greek-speaking east. In the course of the third century, a new ruling class gained power. No longer were emperors exclusively part of a long line of Roman aristocrats. Instead, power shifted to those who had been brought up through the armies and were able to lead them to success in battle. Emperors, who were soldiers, were rising from the ranks of the imperial armies and taking power for themselves. The army was yet another way in which the Roman imperial structure changed to accommodate the empire’s survival in the third century, and in doing so, overshadowed imperial relations between the emperor and the senate.

I argue that changes promoted by under Diocletian (r.284-305) and further advanced by Constantine (r. 306-337), were vital to the survival of the empire. These changes had already been occurring throughout the empire's history, but it was during the tetrarchy that the new organization of the Roman army became official. It was their innovation that enabled the fourth-century Roman army to maintain its effectiveness. Because they envisioned an army that would allow for mobility and attempted to promote merit and loyalty among the soldiers, they changed the ruling class of the Roman state. At the nucleus of the imperial change was the understanding that the Roman army was the most effective tool for gaining and maintaining power. Once that was established, other advancements could follow.

Recent Scholarship on Greeks in the Roman Empire

The relationship between the Greek world and the Roman state is not understudied. In fact, many aspects of the adoption, survival and revival of Greek culture during the Roman period have received much attention. Numerous studies have examined the relationships between the Greeks and Romans during the Hellenistic period. Erich S. Gruen was a forerunner in understanding the early relationship between the Greek east and the Roman state in the third and second centuries BCE. His work details the "complex and entangled" relationship within the development of Roman culture and Hellenism.[35] He states the Romans' attachment to their supposed Trojan origin, which immediately connected them to the Hellenistic world while also separating them by claiming a Trojan rather than a Greek identity.[36] By asserting a Trojan origin, the Romans aligned themselves with other peoples involved in the world of Homer but separated themselves because Aeneas had left that world to found a Latinate dynasty that would eventually lead to Rome. This ancestral relationship did as much to bind as it did to distinguish and henceforth revealed the ambivalence of this ancestral identity that reflected the relationship between the Romans and the Greek world.

---

[35] Gruen (1992), 2. See also Gruen (1990), *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*

[36] See Galinsky (2005) (online publication. Originally published in 1969). Galinsky's work explores the origins of Aeneas' life in Italy. Galinsky shows that it was Vergil, under the hand of Augustus, who created the Aeneas that exemplified Roman values and compared his Aeneas to Greek myths and legends in Sicily and Etruria. See chapter 4 for further discussion on the Roman adoption and creation of the legend of Aeneas.

By the end of the first century BCE, the Roman state had almost full authority over the Greek east. As a result, the Greek east played a vital role in Augustus' new empire and the structuring of Roman identity. G.W. Bowersock examines the relationship between the Greek world and the Roman emperor Augustus. He shows how political relationships established under Pompey continued to influence how the Romans ruled over the Greek east.[37] When Augustus took control of the empire, he worked to either dismantle or continue these networks. Bowersock's work details the presence of Roman elite families in the Greek East as well as Greeks who were employed in imperial service and gained Roman citizenship and office.[38] In this work Bowersock denies a "Romanization" model, saying:

> Romanization is an unnecessary postulate for eastern colonization of this age. It is chiefly a word that describes what subsequently happened in certain areas of the western empire, and did not happen in the East. For the eastern provinces, it could never have constituted a premeditated policy. The colonies there were widely scattered, but not without purpose. By a series of strategic deductions men were compensated for a service, economies were revived, and the empire was garrisoned.[39]

Later scholars expanded on Bowersock, whose work was influenced by modern discussions on imperialism, creolization, colonization, and agency.[40] His statement reflects a long history between the Romans and the Greek world which separates it from other regions and peoples of the empire. This is particularly evident in the early phases of the empire. A.J.S. Spawforth, likewise, examines how Augustus and later Hadrian worked to incorporate Greece and a Hellenic identity into the Roman cultural fabric.[41] His work further expands upon that of

---

[37] Bowersock, G.W. (1965). *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press

[38] See too Bloy, Dylan. (2012). "Roman Patrons of Greek Communities Before the title πάτρων." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. Franz Steiner Verlag, pp.168-201; for Roman benefactors in the Greek East during the Republican period. Also: Cf. Byrne, Sean. (2003). *Roman Citizens of Athens*. Leuven; Dudley, Mass: Peeters

[39] Bowersock (1965), 72.

[40] ibid

[41] Spawforth, A.J.S. (2012). *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bowersock, and looks at how emperor Hadrian continued Augustan policies towards incorporation as well as acts of benefaction to maintain an alignment with a Hellenic past in the then Greek Roman landscape.[42]

Many scholars have given in-depth attention and research to specific Greek cities.[43] For example, archaeologists Alison Frantz and John Camp have devoted their scholarly careers to the archaeology of Athens.[44] Alison Frantz focuses particularly on Athens in the late antique period, while Camp's research primarily looks at the Classical and Hellenistic period with the occasional publication on Athens in the early imperial period.[45] Susan Alcock has done extensive archaeological analysis on mainland Greece. Her book, *Graecia Capta*, delivers an alternative view of Roman Greece during the early imperial period, particularly the province of Achaia.[46] Alcock emphasizes archaeological finds, importantly settlement surveys, in order to understand this provincial region, since few Greeks living in the region left any testimony of their existence, making life in the province hard to recover based on literary evidence. *Graecia Capta* examines rural landscapes, city structures, sacred landscapes, and the imperial cult to determine how Achaia changed under Roman rule. She broadly concludes that there are two major images of early imperial Roman Greece established by modern historiography: one that is untouched by Roman rule and another a country in decline.[47] Changes in the countryside contributed to a change in the polis structure, and the population of cities declined due to a change in the provincial landscape. Her methodological approach helps us understand how Roman imperial rule changed the landscape. She also contributed to the field of Roman Greece in articles concerning Roman Athens and Athenians under Roman rule.[48] Her innovative methodology inspired scholars to approach empire and imperialism in new ways.[49]

---

[42] See also Boatwright (2000). *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, which is not exclusively devoted to the Greek east, but frequently refers to Hadrian's activities and development of Greek cities and city life.

[43] For Roman Corinth: Engels (1990), Friesen (2013), Romano (2003) & (2005), Spawforth (1996); Roman Antioch: Brent (1998), Cascana (2003), Cribiore (2009), French (1998)

[44] Frantz, Alison. (1988). *The Athenian Agora XXIV: Late Antiquity A.D. 267-700*. Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens

[45] Camp's excavation work is a continually published report with updates that can be found in *Hesperia*, the journal published from the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. See Camp. (2001). *The Archaeology of Athens*, New. Haven; London: Yale University Press, (chapters 6-7 which look exclusively at the Roman periods)

[46] Alcock (1993).

[47] Alcock (1993), 215

In the late second through the third centuries CE, Athens boomed with teachers of philosophy and rhetoric. Since Athens had a reputation for being a hub of *paideia*, many western Latin-speaking Romans flocked to it. Bowersock has examined the context and literary framework of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*.[50] He asserts that the Second Sophistic was a movement created to appease the Romans and their idea of Greek education, *paideia*. Tim Whitmarsh and Simon Swain have likewise contributed scholarship on the Second Sophistic, offering the notion that Hellenism and Hellenic identity played a role in larger Roman identity that depended on the existence of Hellenic culture.[51] These scholars work to understand the rise in Hellenic education and learning right before Christianity began to dominate the Roman world and reshape educational centers. Their work details how a Greek education was intrinsic to Roman elite sophistication and the role of *paideia* in elite culture. Through this research one can also understand the Greek response to Roman rule, since by the second century, many Greek educators and Greeks living in these cities would have been Roman citizens. After the emperor Caracalla's Edict granting all free subjects of the Empire, they would all be Roman citizens.

The historical approach can be followed through to the fourth century CE with research on Greek educators. For example, Raffaella Cribiore's work on Libanius and Edward Watts' book on schools in Athens and Alexandria show the trajectory and importance of *paideia* in maintaining both a Greek and Roman identity.[52] This research, however, is mostly focused on Athens, Antioch, and Alexandria and the movement of students to these cities (both from eastern and western parts of the empire) and thus offers a rather narrow view of Roman and Greek identity in the Greek east. Outside of these cities, culture and identity were explored and practiced in various ways.[53] Moreover, the work of Cribiore and Watts revolves around education and usually excludes anyone who was not part of the elite class. There has been much work done on Roman Asia Minor, and other provinces that were considered Greek in the ancient world.[54] This is part of the larger issue of Roman imperialism in the Greek-speaking eastern provinces.

---

[48] Alcock (1997), (1989) and (2002) on Pausanias.

[49] See for example: Mattingly, D.J. (editor). (1997). *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire.* Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology in which Alcock has contributed an article, while other scholars nod to her innovative methodology (see the introduction by Mattingly (1997), 20).

[50] Bowersock (1969)

[51] Swain (1996); Whitmarsh (2005)

As mentioned above, research concerned with the relationship between the Roman state, Greeks, Greek cities, Greek identity, and Roman identity is both expansive and thorough, and therefore much on identity is imbedded in those works. As Mattingly lays out in the introduction to *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire,* it is outdated and harmful to examine identity in a way that shows a natural bias to the colonizers and oppressors.[55] Greg Woolf also examines this in his 1996 article on Roman imperialism and the Greeks.[56] Work on cities and regions in Pontus and Bithynia has been undertaken by Jesper Madsen in *Eager to be Roman: Greek Response to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia*, who looks not only at Roman officials governing the region (such as Pliny the Younger) but also the regional response to such Roman control.[57] His model addresses both

---

[52] Cribioré (2009) and (2013); Watts (2006).
[53] The “examination” I am referring to is the examination from modern scholars. I am making a point that outside of the cities mentioned, culture and identity is studied differently.
[54] See: Dmitriev (2005); Mitchell (1979), (1990), (2009); Zuiderhoek (2009).
[55] Mattingly (2007) 10-17
[56] Woolf, Greg. (1994). Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity, and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, vol. 40* pp.116-143.
[57] Madsen (2009); Woolf (2006). I should add that these are by no means the only scholars who study Greek cities/provinces during the period, and this short historiography does not include the expansive scholarship on the

Roman intention and participation while paying mind to a local response, which does justice to both parties. This recent scholarship has successfully approached multiple methodologies which give attention to individual responses to empire and imperial rule and shows how to gauge and compare our understanding to power structures and the evidence left behind. My work will continue this trend by using an argument that is based on multiple types of sources.

Primary Sources

Throughout the entire dissertation, I utilize a variety of sources, including inscriptions, literature, coins, and law. Primary attention will be given to authors writing in the third through the fourth centuries. An important source is the Greek Philostratus, who lived from 170 CE to 250 CE. He wrote the *Lives of the Sophists* about the Second Sophistic, a Greek cultural movement of the second and third centuries. Though he was from Lemnos, he studied in Athens and had Athenian citizenship.[58] His work provides insight to the "educational, social, and political life of the Empire" during the Severan period.[59]

Other sources include Greek authors of the third and fourth centuries, with a focus on those who wrote in the genre of 'history.' For this period that includes Dio Cassius, Herodian, and even Eusebius, who wrote an ecclesiastical history. In addition, I use the *Lives of the Philosophers* by Eunapius, born later in the fourth century, which is similar to Philostratus' work but with a different literary approach. Eunapius was a pagan who, unlike other fourth century

---

matter. These two works have been mentioned because they are among a body of recent scholarship and I would like to use a similar methodological approach.

[58] From the Wright edition: Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Eunapius: Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921, xi.

[59] Ibid, xv

authors, was often critical of emperor Constantine. These sources discussed emperors, both past and~~ present~~, as well as the elites involved in political life. They show, from an eastern elite perspective, reactions against or sometimes admiration of the Roman Empire and perhaps even a sense of unity within it. Both Dio Cassius and Herodian wrote under the Severans, providing background on the political relationships and opinions of Greek speakers in the empire.[60]

Literary sources for the second half of the third century are primarily fragments. For example, Dexippus' work exists only in fragments and was later continued by Eunapius and was preserved by ninth century Byzantine author Photius in his *Biblitheca*.[61] Dexippus came from an established Athenian family and led the defense against the Herulian invasion in 267 CE. There are a few surviving inscriptions that mention him as a writer rather than a military leader.[62] His perspective was that of an active witness on the front lines, and though we do not have the original account provided by him, Konstantinos VII Porphyrogennetos, an eleventh-century Greek emperor recorded a description of the battle.[63] He said that Dexippus inspired his men to fight for Athens, and prepped the city for battle by reinforcing walls, and building wooden towers (some of which were fireproofed). Inside, his men built infrastructure that would allow them to fight from an elevated position, which would help them from being attacked themselves. Ultimately, Dexippos and his men repelled the Herulians, which is supported by Allison Frantz's claim that the Acropolis suffered little damage from the attack.[64] The attack, however, does reveal the threats that the empire was facing in the late third century. External threats, such as the

---

[60] Millar, Fergus. (1964). *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
[61] See Dexippos Brill's New Pauly entry. Millar (1969)
[62] Millar (1969)
[63] *BNJ* 100 F 29, Konstantinos VII Porphyrogennetos, Excerpts on Stratagems, 6, 80. The Herulians are referred to as "Scythians" here.
[64] Frantz, A. (1988), 2

Herulian attacks, combined with internal instability, led to an era of crisis. Due to the instability caused by such a crisis, many of our firsthand accounts are fragmentary, if not wholly lost.

There are two main literary sources that survive from the early fourth century used frequently throughout my dissertation. Those are the works of the Latin author Lactantius and the Greek author Eusebius. Both were Christian and lived through the Great Persecutions, which started in 303 CE under the emperors of the tetrarchy. Lactantius (c. 250-325), originally from a city in North Africa, was a teacher of rhetoric in Carthage and was appointed as chair of Latin rhetoric in the court of Diocletian in Nicomedia. Sometime after the outbreak of persecutions, maybe around 305 CE, Lactantius left and joined Constantine's court in Trier.[65] He was 'provoked' by the persecutions, and in particular by two men, Porphyry and Sossianus Hierocles, who were hostile to Christianity to write his *Divine Institutes*.[66] In his *Divine Institutes*, he put Christianity in conversation with Roman legal theory in order to argue the ethics and virtues of Christianity. Notably, he argued against the pagan gods, as they did not uphold the values that Romans should aspire to, while claiming that Christianity was the 'truth' and provided the ultimate wisdom that philosophers of antiquity had sought.[67] As a rhetorician, Lactantius had a deep understanding of the Roman legal tradition, and was able to craft a defense on the basis of Roman thought.

His other work, *On the Deaths of the Persecutors*, detailed the lives of the tetrarchs: Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, Constantius, Severus, Maximinus, Constantine, Maxentius, and Licinius.[68] In particular, he described the cruelty of the pagan emperors (with some mercy to

---

[65] Bowen and Garnsey (2003). *Lactantius: Divine institutes*. Liverpool University Press, 3

[66] Ibid, 2-3: Bowen and Garnsey are not convinced that the Porphyry mentioned is the philosopher mentioned by Philostratus, but Sossianus Hierocles was governor of Bithynia in 303.

[67] Ibid, 7.

[68] Creed, J.L. (1984). *De mortibus persecutorum*. Oxford

Constantius, who was Constantine's father), their cowardly deeds, and their painfully disgusting deaths. Though his account is biased as a Christian author writing about emperors who committed the most extensive empire-wide persecutions, it is one of the only accounts from someone who was a close witness to the lives of at least two emperors.

Similarly, the Greek author Eusebius lived under the tetrarchy. Eusebius was the bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and engaged with the works of other Christian thinkers, such as Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who both died in the early to mid third century. I rely on two of his works, first, his *Ecclesiastical History,* which covered the history of the church from his time through the reign of Constantine, and his panegyrical biography of Constantine, the *Life of Constantine*. According to Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall, "a key element in Eusebius' thought is the idea of mimesis, whereby the Christian ruler and his Empire are held to mirror or imitate God in heaven."[69] His *vita* (life) of Constantine portrayed the emperor in a positive light and was published after both their deaths. In both works, Constantine's conversion to and preferential treatment of Christians led to the political and military success of the empire.[70] In many ways, both Lactantius and Eusebius put the spotlight on Constantine, presenting him as the savior of the empire due to his religious pivot to Christianity, while casting the rest of the tetrarchs into darkness and minimizing their imperial legacy. Their accounts certainly impact the way modern scholarship has understood the history of this period, particularly in relation to imperial policy and public interest.

Also valuable is the evidence from letters and orations. Letters in many ways represent what happened in the daily lives of Romans. They record responses, irritations, congratulations, admirations, and the subtleties of life. Unfortunately, there are not many letters from Greek authors that survive from the third century, but there are more in the fourth century. They include pagan authors such as Libanius and Julian, as well as the church fathers Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus. Libanius also wrote numerous orations including an autobiographical oration. In it, he praised his city, spoke about the history of his ancestry and how his family had always been from Antioch, his travels to Athens and Constantinople, as well as his own feelings about teaching, travel, his health, and personal relationships.[71] Analysis of fourth century authors, both pagan and Christian, provides an understanding of life in the empire during the rise in Christianity and shows how Christians and non-Christians acquired their Roman identity and maintained a Greek one.

---

[69] Eusebius, Averil Cameron, & Stuart Hall. (1999). *Eusebius' Life of Constantine*. Clarendon Press, 35
[70] Ibid, 35

There are also important Latin sources, such as Pliny the Younger's correspondence with Trajan (book 10 of Pliny's letters).[72] This book of his letters records the dialogue between him and the emperor when Pliny governed Bithynia and provides "indispensable insight into how Roman rule was conceived from a provincial and Roman point of view."[73] Greg Woolf and others have questioned aspects of the letters. Like Madsen, I reject the inclination to toss out the source as unreliable completely and agree with Noreña, who argues that Pliny's letters in book 10 served to promote a certain favorable image for both Pliny and Trajan.[74] For the fourth century, the writings of the historian Ammianus Marcellinus are indispensable. Ammianus, himself, identified as Greek but wrote his histories in Latin and had a considerable command of the language. The extant portion of his work documents Roman history from the reign of Constantius through the death of Valens.[75] Ammianus is critical of emperors, Roman elites, and the Romans themselves, claiming that once Rome had housed all of the virtues, but at his time even the nobles had fallen from grace.[76] The conclusion of this dissertation looks at Ammianus' criticism and considers how his regard for Rome and the remembrance of the Roman state as the epitome of virtue makes him all the more Roman.

---

[71] Libanius. Oration I from: Libanius *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. P. 51-337.

[72] The other books of Pliny the Younger are not as relevant to this project, but contain correspondence with his family, friends, and proteges.

[73] Madsen (2009), 11

[74] See Madsen (2009) 13-15 for this discussion; Noreña (2007) 239 and 245-247

Finally, I use Roman legal sources, especially in Chapter Three: Roman Law and Administration, which examines the legal policies of Diocletian and Constantine. These sources are vital to understanding the lives of Romans in the third and fourth centuries. Unlike prior centuries, when Roman citizenship was not guaranteed, the third and fourth centuries saw a high volume of Roman citizens due to the Edict of Caracalla. A consequence was that anyone who was a citizen or within the empire was now expected to adopt and follow Roman law.

Diocletian wanted to standardize the lives of the Roman people throughout the empire and create a sense of order by enforcing Roman law. He was able to achieve this by reforming numerous issues within the empire, including the armies and the economy, as well as through the compilation of his rescripts. The *Codex Gregorianus* (291) and the *Codex Hermogenianus* (293-295) were collections of the emperor's *responsa* to petitioners' *libelli,* which became known as *rescripta*.[77] Petitions could be sent to any local official, such as a *dux* or governor, but the codices mentioned above were collections of replies (*rescripta*) sent explicitly to the emperor.[78]

---

[75] The first 13 books of Ammianus are lost. Book 14 picks up with the middle of the reign of Constantius.

[76] See Ammianus, book XIV, chapter 6 on his discussion of the "Faults of the Roman Senate and People."

[77] Connolly, S. (2010). *Lives Behind the Laws: The world of the Codex Hermogenianus*. Indiana University Press, 23

[78] These are further discussed in Chapter Three: Roman Law and Administration. Diocletian did not create the rescript system, but he and the other emperors of the tetrarchy heavily utilized the petition/rescript system. Unfortunately, the original petitions do not survive.

In his rescripts, he attempted to provide Romans of all backgrounds better access to Roman law and a direct line to the emperor and his citizens. These laws, alongside the cultural changes that were occurring in the late third and early fourth centuries, show the relationship between Roman citizens and the state.[79] Although neither of the codices created under Diocletian survives, fragments of his laws survive in the *Codex Justinianus*. The *Corpus Juris Civilis*, or body of civil law, was compiled by a team of jurists under the guidance of Tribonian, the imperial quaestor, between 530-533 CE. The corpus consists of four parts: *Codex Justinianus*, *Digesta*, *Institutiones*, all of which were written in Latin; and the *Novellae*, which are new laws added after the publication of the Corpus Juris Civilis, written in Greek for the Eastern Roman Empire of Justinian's day. For the *Codex Justinianus*, the compilers used laws from the *Codex Theodosianus*, *Codex Gregorianus*, and the *Codex Hermogenianus*.[80] While the *Corpus Juris Civilis* post-dates the scope of this dissertation, the *Codex Justinianus* provides access to legal decisions from the time of Diocletian through to Justinian and the *Digest*, occasionally mentioned throughout this dissertation, contains excerpts from legal commentaries by jurists of the first through third centuries. The other point I want to highlight is that by including some (though not all) rescripts from the Gregorian and Hermogenian codices, Justinian was upholding the legal foundation solidified by Diocletian and Constantine. Even when the empire was primarily situated in the east, with Constantinople at its head, the core of imperial policy was aligned with traditional Roman (Latin) legal values.

---

[79] The issues and bias in Roman law as a source are not unnoticed by me. It is to be noted that laws exist sometimes in fragments, or have been copied by later Roman jurists, which may alter the understanding of the law/edict/rescript. Second, Roman law, depending on what form it came in, was volatile and dependent on the emperor of the time. For example, rescripts could be challenged, and their validity questioned (see Harries 1999 6-30 for the complexities of using Roman law). Third, even when a law is published it was not always effective, and it is difficult to tell at what point the law became effective (for example the Edict of Caracalla in 212 CE granting universal citizenship). See Harries (1999), 77-98.

[80] The *Codex Theodosianus*, compiled by Theodosius I (r.408-450) contains some laws of Constantine, which are referenced in chapter three. The codex, compiled between 429-439 CE attempted to compile all relevant laws from the Christian emperors, starting with Constantine.

Conclusion

In my inquiry on an empire in crisis, I began to strip away the negative connotations of change. Crisis was the catalyst for change in the empire, and sources written by those who were accustomed to the advantages of living among the elite class, such as Herodian, when the empire was in a "stable" state clouded the historical understanding of how changes in the third century impacted the Roman state. In many ways, the third century reshaped the governance of the Roman Empire, but it did so in order to survive. What I argue in the following chapters is that at the heart of much of this change was the desire to stabilize and uphold the empire. What I hope to show, is that many changes that happened as a result of the third century crisis and further canonized as a new policy under the tetrarchs had already been employed by Roman emperors prior to the third century. In more ways than one, third and fourth-century Roman emperors looked to their Roman forefathers for answers to their problems.

Chapter One

The Roman Army: The Soldier's Empire

"Illyricum was actually the native land of all of them: so although they were deficient in culture, they had nevertheless been sufficiently schooled by the hardships of the countryside and of military service to be the best men for the state." – Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus*[81]

Introduction

After the Severan Dynasty, the Roman principate faced immense turmoil. Emperors lasted for only a short while, and their power was constantly being contested by fellow Romans and economic crises.[82] Externally, the empire's boundaries were often breached by barbarian invasions. For example, the reign of Probus (276-282 CE) had been primarily "a series of constant revolts from one end of the empire to the other."[83] It was not uncommon for soldiers out on a campaign to show their distaste for a current emperor, or rather their stronger affiliation toward a fellow soldier or commander, by declaring him emperor. These proclamations often happened at the empire's frontiers, as was the case of Constantine I (r.306-337 CE) in York, Britain, after his father's death. In the third century, soldiers could command their power by installing and promoting their preferred emperor, who was fighting alongside them.[84] With an army behind them, aspiring emperors could move against their opponents, often leading to civil wars and regional competition. To keep and maintain power, emperors had to please their subjects throughout the empire and, most importantly, their armies. Where there was an angry army, there was another soldier waiting to become emperor. This chapter focuses on changes made to the structure of Roman military, comprised of various units, including legions and auxiliaries, usually comprised of Roman citizens, recruits from the provinces, outside territories, and a mix of volunteer and conscripted soldiers, and the praetorian guard. More importantly, this chapter will focus on the vital role the Roman army had in shaping the job of aspiring emperors and imperial identity in the third and fourth centuries.

---

[81] Aur. Vict., *Caes.*, 39.27. "His sane omnibus Illyricum patria fuit: qui, quamquam humanitatis parum, ruris tamen ac militiae miseriis imbuti satis optimi reipublicae fuere." Translation from: Aurelius Victor: *De Caesaribus*. (1994). Translated by H.W. Bird. Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

[82] The Severan Dynasty began with the reign of Septimius Severus (r.193-211 CE) and ended with Alexander Severus (r.222-235 CE)

[83] Kulikowski, M. (2016). *The triumph of empire: The Roman world from Hadrian to Constantine*. Harvard University Press, 184

[84] Ando, C. (2000). *Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman Empire*. University of California Press; Ando, C. (2012). *Imperial Rome AD 193-284: The critical century*. Edinburgh University Press. doi: 10.1515/9780748629206; Harries, J. (2012). *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The new empire*. Edinburgh University Press. doi: 10.1515/9780748629213

Diocletian had risen through the military ranks and was declared emperor by his soldiers while on a campaign against Persia. Through his military strength and reputation, he could overpower his competitors, who were seeking to be the next emperor.[85] Throughout his reign, Diocletian gave as much attention to the structure of the army as he did to the imperial administration. As a solider himself, he understood the importance of the Roman army and how to optimize its effectiveness against invasion.

Beyond imperial stability, Roman soldiers were often the only publicly facing representatives of the Roman government and the ones who brought the Roman way of life to the provinces. The presence of the Roman army in a city impacted how it functioned, and its residents became aware of the Roman world. Likewise, being a soldier was a way in which a person identified themselves and could change their status within the empire. In more ways than one, the Roman soldier was the conduit through which Roman citizens of the provinces would interact with the imperial government. As early as the second century, there was a need for military presence along the frontiers of the empire. Without it, cities would be attacked by so-called "barbarians" and Roman citizens were at risk of being enslaved. This became even more apparent in the later third century when the army needed to maintain the borders around the Rhine, Danube, and the lands bordering Persia. According to Jill Harries, "imperial presence was necessary to inspire and reward troops," and emperors no longer relied on the approval of the Roman senate, but rather the armies protecting the empire.[86]

---

[85] Several Roman military men vied for the throne. More context will be given later in this chapter. According to fourth century Latin author Aurelius Victor, Carinus was murdered by his own men for trying to seduce their wives. After his death, Diocletian killed Aper, as justice for Carus, and had to put down Aristobulus, a praetorian prefect, and Helianus and Amandus in Gaul. It was while putting down the latter two that Diocletian appointed Maximian as his co-emperor. see Aur. Vict., *Caes.*, 39.7-13.

Armies and their authority

The power of the Roman army had been in the Roman consciousness since the time of the Republic. Its power only increased in periods of civil war. There are a few distinct moments within the history of the empire that show a pattern in which the state of the empire rested upon the loyalty and ability of the armies. The vulnerability of the Roman elites rested in the Roman army and, therefore, the emperor was scrutinized by Roman authors when he chose to enlist men who were not of higher class. Recruits devoted twenty-five years of their life to the army, which meant for many Romans, the army was their life and career. Soldiers serving in the legions often came from Spain, Gaul, and other provinces that did not include the city of Rome. Veterans from the legions often became influential members of Roman society. For auxiliary soldiers, their service was rewarded with citizenship. Both sectors worked in tandem to promote Rome's military success, but with the auxiliaries fighting on the front lines, there was hardly a balance in risk. While legions were known for close combat and for donning traditional Roman armor, auxiliary units would provide well-trained troops who could fight alongside legions but could also appear "in the form of cavalry, camel riders, slingers, archers, and the skirmishing troops that had been lost to the legions with the manipular system."[87] As Paul Erdkamp states, "the Roman army cannot adequately be described only as an instrument of combat, but must be viewed also as an essential component of Roman society, economy, and politics."[88]

---

[86] Harries, (2012), 2.

Augustus and the Roman Army

After defeating Mark Antony at the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE, Octavian (later Augustus) reunited the Roman state after nearly one hundred years of civil war. According to early second century Latin author Suetonius, Augustus waged five civil wars.[89] Once he defeated any threat to his reign, Augustus needed to decrease the number of legions to reflect the new era of peace.[90] Kate Gilliver notes that in his first acts of princeps, Augustus wanted to "remove soldiers from the active involvement in politics that they had enjoyed during the last century of the republic and the triumval period, and aimed to break the ties of loyalty to individual generals and expectation of reward that had made a major contribution to the end of the republic; instead, the army's loyalties were directed towards the emperor and members of the imperial family rather than to their own commanders."[91] Cassius Dio recorded that Augustus thought the army should be "supported, drawn from the citizens, the subject nations, and the allies, its size in the several provinces being greater or less according as the necessities of the case demand."[92] He wanted to affirm that a standing army would always be necessary, but as he ushered in an era of peace, the Roman state had less need for a large and well-supplied army spread throughout the empire. According to Cassius Dio, Augustus claimed that there should be a balance between men who are soldiers in waiting, soldiers stationed on the frontiers, and men who stay at home finding careers that are more peaceful:

---

[87] Gilliver, Kate. (2007). "The Augustan Reform and the Structure of the Imperial Army." *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Edited by Paul Erdkamp. Wiley Blackwell. Legionaries were often "depicted in armor and a helmet, carrying a large shield (*scutum*), javelin (*pilum*), and short sword (*gladius*)," 192

[88] Erdkamp, Paul. (2007). Introduction. *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell, 1

[89] Suet. *Vita Augustus*, 9. "The civil wars which he waged were five, called by the names of Mutina, Philippi, Perusia, Sicily, and Actium; the first and last of these were against Marcus Antonius, the second against Brutus and Cassius, the third against Lucius Antonius, borther of the triumvir, and the fourth against Sextus Pompeius, son of Gnaeus." Translation from: Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Volume I: Julius. Augustus. Tiberius. Gaius Caligula.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Introduction by K. R. Bradley. Loeb Classical Library 31. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

[90] Gilliver, Kate. (2007), 184.

> "The reason for such a standing army is this: far removed as we are from the frontiers of the empire, with enemies living near our borders on every side, we are no longer able at critical times to depend upon expeditionary forces; and if, on the other hand, we permit all the men of military age to have arms and to practise warfare, they will always be the source of seditions and civil wars. If, however, we prevent them from all making arms their profession and afterwards need their aid in war, we shall be exposed to danger, since we shall never have anything but inexperienced and untrained soldiers to depend upon. For these reasons I give it as my opinion that, while in general the men of military age should have nothing to do with arms and walled camps during their lives, the hardiest of them and those most in need of a livelihood should be enlisted as soldiers and given a military training. For they will fight better if they devote their time to this one business, and the rest will find it easier to carry on their farming, seafaring, and the other pursuits appropriate to peace, if they are not compelled to take part in military expeditions but have others to act as their defenders."[93]

The reforms carried out by Augustus were an attempt to limit the control of the army and extinguish hope that a soldier would benefit from a revolt. For the first time, Augustus established cohorts in the city of Rome: the *vigiles*, urban cohorts, and the praetorian guard.[94] The first two would uphold and maintain order, while the praetorian guard would support the emperor even if he left Rome. Augustus adjusted the pay of the soldiers so that they would receive a steady income with a discharge bonus, and veterans would receive land.[95] Army recruits were less likely to be conscripts during this time and instead were majority volunteers. As a result of his reforms, the Roman army became a professional army.

---

[91] Ibid,

[92] Cass. Dio. LII.27. Translation from: Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VI: Books 51-55.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 83. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

[93] Ibid

He further cemented their loyalty by requiring all legionaries to swear an oath to the emperor annually, rather than swearing allegiance to a consul or general.[96] The *imago*, which carried the image of the emperor, was adopted as the new military standard for auxiliary and legionary units, and of course, Gilliver notes that the soldiers were paid in coins that were minted in the image of the emperor. In almost any rank or unit, soldiers, and officers at any point in the *cursus honorum*, would be reminded of the benefits of staying loyal to the emperor.[97] This loyalty spread from the top down, and Augustus successfully ushered in his vision of *pax Romana*.

---

[94] *Vigiles,* which comes from the Latin adjective *vigil,* can be defined as the "watchmen" of the city, or a police-like body. Tacitus referred to a member of the *vigiles* when talking about the reign of Galba. He says: "During these same days four tribunes were dismissed, Antonius Taurus and Antonius Naso from the praetorian cohorts, from the city cohorts Aemilius Pacensis, and Julius Fronto from the police" "exauctorati per eos dies tribuni, e praetorio Antonius Taurus et Antonius Naso, ex urbanis cohortibus Aemilius Pacensis, e vigilibus Iulius Fronto." Tac. *Hist.* 1.20. In this sentence, Tacitus mentions all three institutions and men being dismissed within them because they were given financial gifts from Nero at the expense of the state, or potentially because Galba felt threatened by their loyalty to Nero. Translation from: Tacitus. *Histories: Books 1-3.* Translated by Clifford H. Moore. Loeb Classical Library 111. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

[95] Gilliver (2007), 186. "To finance the retirement benefits of 4,000-5,000 men a year, Augustus established the *aerarium militare*, the military treasury, in AD 6, which he set up with a donation of 170,000 sesterces from his own funds (*Res Gestae* 17). The treasury's income was derived from the introduction of new taxes, a 1 percent tax on sales at auction and a 5 percent inheritance tax."

[96] Gulliver (2007), 187; Tac. *Hist.*, 1.55

[97] Ibid. Gulliver says that there were many legal benefits for soldiers, and "commanders and senior officers of all military units owed their positions to the patronage of the emperor, though it is uncertain whether or not centurions were also appointed directly by the emperor. Officers of a senatorial and equestrian status owed future career promotions and magistracies to the emperor's patronage whilst centurions were probably encouraged in their loyalty by rates of pay that were vastly superior to those of the ordinary legionnaires, and by the status and future career opportunities in imperial service that the most senior centurions could attain," 187

Highlighting the Power of the Army after Augustus

In his *Histories,* Tacitus frequently highlighted the alliances of the armies in the year of the four emperors in 69 CE. Anthony Birley says he served as a praetor in 88 CE and left Rome a year later.[98] Birley suggests that during that time, he may have "been away in public service, probably with a legionary command," and returned to Rome in 93 CE.[99] He later served as a proconsul in Asia from 113-114 CE.[100] Tacitus was born into the elite and was often critical of the decline of the Roman state throughout his life.[101] In particular, he detailed the state of the Roman government after the death of Nero in 69 CE.[102] At the beginning of the *Histories*, Tacitus laid out which aspects of the Roman state exemplified the current affairs so that his audience could understand the motivation and context behind them.[103] Those aspects were: "the condition of the city, the temper of the armies, the attitude of the provinces, the elements of strength and weakness in the entire world."[104] During this chaotic time, the army played a crucial role in the future of the Roman state. Tacitus said that after the death of Nero, all rejoiced, in particular, the generals and Roman legions, because they had learned that an emperor could be made outside of Rome.[105] The army could dictate the next ruler, and their allegiances were easy to sway depending on what message they were being sold. Tacitus even suggests that in this period, soldiers learned that they had the power to choose the next emperor and that this did not need to happen in the city of Rome. When talking about the soldiers of the city of Rome, he claimed that the soldiers were:

---

[98] Birley, A. R. (2000). The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus. *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, *49*(2), 230–247. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4436577, 234.

[99] Ibid, 235

[100] Ibid. Birley references the inscription: *AE* 1890 = *OGIS* 487 from Mylasa. See also: Moore, Introduction, vii. Tacitus. *Histories: Books 1-3.* Translated by Clifford H. Moore. Loeb Classical Library 111. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

[101] Ibid.

[102] It is important to note that Tacitus' *Histories* focused on the political situation in Rome when he was most likely only fifteen years old. There is implicit bias in his account. First, that he was young when these events took place, and second that his perspective is that from an aristocrat. In his opening of the *Histories* he states that he "had no acquaintance with Galba, Otho, or Vitellius, through either kindness or injury at their hands"; "Mihi Galba Otho Vitellius nec beneficio nec iniuria cogniti," Tac. *Hist*. 1.1. His concern was the state of the Roman citizens at the time, and the state of the aristocracy.

[103] Tac. *Hist.* 1.4: "Ceterum antequam destinata componam, repetendum videtur qualis status urbis, quae mens exercituum, quis habitus provinciarum, quid in toto terrarum orbe validum, quid aegrum fuerit, ut non modo casus eventusque rerum, qui plerumque fortuiti sunt, sed ratio etiam causaeque noscantur."

[104] Ibid.

> "accustomed to swear allegiance to the Caesars, and had been brought to desert Nero by clever pressure rather than by their own inclination. Now when they saw that the donative, which had been promised in Galba's name, was not given to them, that there were not the same opportunities for great services and rewards in peace as in war, and that the legions had already secured the favour of the emperor whom they had made, inclined as they were to support a revolution, they were further roused by the criminal action of Nymphidius Sabinus, the prefect, who was trying to secure the empire for himself."[106]

Because of this influence, at least as would appear from Tacitus, it was vital to ensure the soldiers' loyalty. Similarly to Galba, Otho knew how to convince the armies to join his cause. He attempted to bond with the soldiers by saying that they were *contubernalis*, or messmates, together under Nero.[107] He took advantage of the fact that some soldiers were upset over "toilsome marches, the lack of supplies, and the hard discipline," as well as their need for money.[108] Otho began to find ways to distribute money to soldiers informally, slowly gain their approval, and convince them to join his accession to the throne. Tacitus noted that Otho's tricks (which he described using the verb *inficio*, "to stain" or "to infect") "touched the loyalty of the legions also and of the auxiliaries, who were already unsettled."[109]

---

[105] Tac. *Hist.* 1.4: "Finis Neronis ut laetus primo gaudentium impetu fuerat, ita varios motus animorum non modo in urbe apud patres aut populum aut urbanum militem, sed omnis legiones ducesque conciverat, evulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri." See too, Master (2016) in which the armies declaring an emperor outside the city is reinstated in book 2.74.4 when Vitellius is declared emperor, "Vitellius himself is proof that an emperor can be made by the army" (et posse ab exercitu principem fieri sit ipse Vitellius document). Master, Jonathan. (2016). *Provincial Soldiers and Imperial Instability in the Histories of Tacitus*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 4

[106] Tac. *Hist.* 1.5: "Miles urbanus longo Caesarum sacramento imbutus et ad destituendum Neronem arte magis et impulsu quam suo ingenio traductus, postquam neque dari donativum sub nomine Galbae promissum neque magnis meritis ac praemiis eundem in pace quem in bello locum praeventamque gratiam intellegit apud principem a legionibus factum, pronus ad novas res scelere insuper Nymphidii Sabini praefecti imperium sibi molientis agitatur. Et Nymphidius quidem in ipso conatu oppressus, set quamvis capite defectionis ablato manebat plerisque militum conscientia, nec deerant sermones senium atque avaritiam Galbae increpantium."

Jonathan Master notes that Tacitus' account shows the power of the Roman army, which in the first century CE consisted mainly of provincial soldiers. To ensure loyalty, Master argues, the identities of auxiliary troops, who had consistently been abused and mistreated, needed to change.[110] He notes that in Book 4 of *Histories* where Tacitus details the Batavian revolt, the author depicted the frustrations of Batavian born Roman citizen Julius Civilis, who led the revolt. Julius Civilis was the voice of reason and pointed out that the promise of the Roman government rarely covered the price of life. Of the benefits he said:

---

[107] Sed sceleris cogitatio incertum an repens: studia militum iam pridem spe successionis aut paratu facinoris adfectaverat, in itinere, in agmine, in stationibus vetustissimum quemque militum nomine vocans ac memoria Neroniani comitatus contubernalis appellando. Tac., *Hist.*, 1.23

[108] Tac., *Hist.* 1.23

[109] Infecit ea tabes legionum quoque et auxiliorum motas iam mentis, postquam vulgatum erat labare Germanici exercitus fidem. adeoque parata apud malos seditio, etiam apud integros dissimulatio fuit, ut postero iduum die redeuntem a cena Othonem rapturi fuerint, ni incerta noctis et tota urbe sparsa militum castra nec facilem inter temulentos consensum timuissent, non rei publicae cura, quam foedare principis sui sanguine sobrii parabant, sed ne per tenebras, ut quisque Pannonici vel Germanici exercitus militibus oblatus esset, ignorantibus plerisque, pro Othone destinaretur. multa erumpentis seditionis indicia per conscios oppressa: quaedam apud Galbae auris praefectus Laco elusit, ignarus militarium animorum consiliique quamvis egregii, quod non ipse adferret, inimicus et adversus peritos pervicax. Tac., *Hist.*, 1.26

[110] "Thus, the problem of controlling the Roman military, as Tacitus represents it, is not simply one of asserting better leadership over an unruly body; it also involves changing the identity of the fighters themselves. The way forward for the Roman Empire requires a very traditionally Roman concession: greater incorporation of subject peoples into the Roman State. To control the military and thus achieve the desired result of imperial stability requires a policy of reorienting the loyalties and values of these provincial solders—that is, manipulating their ethnic identity—in order to make them loyal Romans." Master (2016), 4; See also Haynes, Ian, (2013). Together under the Name of Romans': The *Auxilia* from Claudius to Trajan. in *Blood of the Provinces: The Roman Auxilia and the Making of Provincial Society from Augustus to the Severans*. Oxford

> "Splendid payment I have received for my efforts: the murder of my brother, myself in chains, and, from this army, the most savage threats. For these things I, previously sought for execution, demand penalties by the natural law of mankind. You Treviri, on the other hand, and the rest of the spirits of slaves, do you expect any reward for blood spilled so many times except thankless military service, endless taxation, rods, axes, and the whims of slave masters?"[111]

His speech suggested that ultimately, the burdens of being a soldier in the provinces heavily outweighed the benefits of citizenship and questioned the "inclusion" of being a part of the Roman Empire. Ian Haynes refers to the auxiliaries in the first century as "significant agents of change within provincial society."[112] In the first century, auxiliary soldiers came from the provinces and would be "identified by their tribal or geographic origin" but by the second century auxiliary units were diluted by Roman citizens who would serve in either an auxiliary unit or legion.[113]

Nerva (r.96-98), already in his mid-sixties when the senate crowned him emperor, was unable to fix the problems of the empire he inherited from Domitian, but not for lack of trying.[114] His soldiers, led by the head of the praetorian guard, mutinied against him and demanded he step down. Upon his death, he declared Trajan, who was from Hispania, his heir and the new emperor.[115]

---

[111] Master (2016), 32. Tac., *Hist.* 4.32.2: "egregium" inquit "pretium laborum recepi, necem fratris et vincula mea et saevissimas huius exercitus voces, quibus ad supplicium petitus iure gentium poenas reposco. vos autem Treviri ceteraeque servientium animae, quod praemium effusi totiens sanguinis expectatis nisi ingratam militiam, immortalia tributa, virgas, securis et dominorum ingenia?" Translation taken from Master.

[112] Haynes, Ian, (2013), 59

[113] Gilliver (2007), 193

[114] Cass. Dio. LXVIII.1-3. Nerva attempted to fix the financial state of the empire by refusing to have gold or silver statues made of him, abandoning all public forms of entertainment to cut costs, sold off personal and imperial gold or silver objects, and paid the "very poor Romans" he distributed land.

[115] Cass. Dio. LXVIII.3

Trajan (r.98-117) was the first emperor to be born outside of Italy. According to Cassius Dio, Nerva preferred to adopt a man based on merit and ability and was not "less inclined to adopt Trajan because [he] was a Spaniard instead of an Italian."[116] Trajan led successful campaigns against the Dacians, Armenians, and Parthians and styled himself in the image of a soldier. A fourth-century Latin author, Eutropius, admired the emperor for extending the boundaries of the empire "which, after Augustus, had been defended rather than honorably enlarged."[117] His successful campaigns, especially in Dacia, which contained large quantities of gold and silver mines, brought financial stability back to the empire. The *limites*, or fixed boundaries of the empire, further developed under Trajan and his successor Hadrian (r.117-138). The *limites* were designed to optimize the "effectiveness of surveillance and signal communication" and allow for a smaller number of troops to fight off an invasion.[118] Both Trajan and Hadrian led with successful campaigns throughout the empire and heavily relied on auxiliary troops. Due to their success, the empire was able to flourish economically and culturally.

Their successors, Antoninus Pius (r.138-161) and Lucius Verus (r.161-169) and Marcus Aurelius (r.161-180) inherited an era of relative peace. Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius briefly ruled together for about seven years before the death of Lucius Verus. According to Cassius Dio:

> "Marcus Antoninus, the philosopher, upon obtaining the throne at the death of Antoninus, his adoptive father, had immediately taken to share his power Lucius Verus, the son of Lucius Commodus. For he was frail in body himself and devoted the greater part of his time to letters. Indeed it is reported that even when he was emperor he showed no shame or hesitation about resorting to a teacher, but became

---

[116] "οὕτω μὲν ὁ Τραϊανὸς Καῖσαρ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο αὐτοκράτωρ ἐγένετο, καίτοι συγγενῶν τοῦ Νέρουα ὄντων τινῶν. ἀλλ᾽ οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν κοινῶν σωτηρίας ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν συγγένειαν προετίμησεν, οὐδ᾽ αὖ ὅτι Ἴβηρ ὁ Τραϊανὸς ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ Ἰταλὸς οὐδ᾽ Ἰταλιώτης ἦν, ἧττόν τι παρὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν" Cass. Dio. LXVIII.4

[117] Eutr. 8. 2-4. Translation from: Eutropius, a. 4. C. (1993). *The Breviarium ab urbe condita*. Translated with an introduction by H.W. Bird. Liverpool University Press

[118] Hadrian's wall is an example of this. Thorne, James. (2007). Battle, Tactics, and the *Limites* in the West. *Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell, 229. The developments of *limites*, and the city garrisons are important in the final chapter on cities. Their influence on the Roman people will be further expanded there.

> a pupil of Sextus, the Boeotian philosopher, and did not hesitate to attend the lectures of Hermogenes on rhetoric; but he was most inclined to the doctrines of the Stoic school. Lucius, on the other hand, was a vigorous man of younger years and better suited for military enterprises. Therefore Marcus made him his son-in-law by marrying him to his daughter Lucilla and sent him to conduct the war against the Parthians."[119]

There were two major wars, the Marcomannic and the Parthian Wars, in which both Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus had to fight. The Marcomannic Wars took place on the northern borders of the empire, along the Danube, and were waged against Germanic tribes that were attacking provinces around the Balkans. In order to fight the Germanic tribes, Marcus Aurelius deployed *vexillationes*, which were detached units from the legions.[120] Without the quick movement of the *vexillationes*, some led by Pertinax and Septimius Severus, Marcus Aurelius would not have been able to defeat the Germanic armies in 173.[121]

Lucius Verus fought in the Parthian Wars, fought in the east. Cassius Dio recorded that Lucius headed east to fight of the King of the Parthians, Vologaesus. Lucius left for Antioch, where he set up his headquarters, and rallied troops in the city to fight off the Parthians.[122]

---

[119] Cass. Dio. LXXI.1: Μάρκος δὲ Ἀντωνῖνος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐπειδὴ τοῦ ποιησαμένου αὐτὸν τελευτήσαντος Ἀντωνίνου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔσχε, προσειλήφει ἐς κοινωνίαν τοῦ κράτους εὐθὺς τὸν τοῦ Λουκίου Κομόδου υἱὸν 2Λούκιον Βῆρον. αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἀσθενὴς ἦν τῷ σώματι καὶ τὰ πολλὰ λόγοις ἐσχόλαζε (λέγεται γὰρ καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ ὢν μὴ αἰδεῖσθαι μηδὲ ὀκνεῖν ἐς διδασκάλου φοιτᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σέξτῳ προσιέναι τῷ ἐκ Βοιωτῶν φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ ἐς ἀκρόασιν τῶν ῥητορικῶν Ἑρμογένους λόγων μὴ ὀκνῆσαι παραγενέσθαι· 3προσέκειτο δὲ τοῖς ἐκ τῆς στοᾶς μάλιστα δόγμασιν), ὁ δὲ Λούκιος ἔρρωτό τε καὶ νεώτερος ἦν, τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς τε ἔργοις καταλληλότερος. ὅθεν καὶ γαμβρὸν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ Λουκίλλᾳ ὁ Μάρκος ποιήσας εἰς τὸν πρὸς Πάρθους ἔπεμψε πόλεμον.

[120] Anthony R Birley. (2002). *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography: Vol. Taylor* & Francis e-Library ed. Routledge,190

[121] I do not go into detail about these wars but wanted to highlight how emperors manipulated roman army structures to be more strategic when fighting wars on the frontiers. For more on the Marcomanic Wars see Cass. Dio, LXXII and Birley (2002).

[122] Cass. Dio. LXXI.2: Ὁ γὰρ Οὐολόγαισος πολέμου ἦρξε, καὶ στρατόπεδόν τε ὅλον Ῥωμαϊκὸν τὸ ὑπὸ Σεβηριανῷ τεταγμένον ἐν τῇ Ἐλεγείᾳ, χωρίῳ τινὶ τῆς Ἀρμενίας, περισχὼν πάντοθεν αὐτοῖς ἡγεμόσι κατετόξευσε καὶ διέφθειρε, καὶ τῆς Συρίας ταῖς πόλεσι πολὺς ἐπῄει καὶ φοβερός. ὁ οὖν Λούκιος ἐλθὼν ἐς Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ πλείστους στρατιώτας συλλέξας, καὶ τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν ἡγεμόνων ὑφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἔχων, αὐτὸς μὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκάθητο διατάττων ἕκαστα καὶ τὰς τοῦ πολέμου χορηγίας ἀθροίζων, Κασσίῳ δὲ τὰ στρατεύματα ἐπέτρεψεν. καὶ ὃς ἐπιόντα τε τὸν Οὐολόγαισον γενναίως ὑπέμεινε, καὶ τέλος ἐγκαταλειφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν συμμάχων καὶ ὀπίσω ἀναχωρήσαντα ἐπεδίωξε, μέχρι τε Σελευκείας καὶ Κτησιφῶντος ἤλασε, καὶ τήν τε Σελεύκειαν διέφθειρεν ἐμπρήσας, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Οὐολογαίσου βασίλεια τὰ ἐν

Although Lucius was able to push Vologaesus' troops back to Seleucia and destroy Vologaesus' palace at Ctesiphon, his soldiers suffered greatly.[123] Shortly after his victory, Dio claims that he allegedly tried to engage in a plot to overthrow Marcus Aurelius and was poisoned before he could carry it out.[124] This system of joint rulership, although not long lasting, was an early example of imperial power being shared in order to be at two different ends of the empire. Later, Marcus Aurelius ruled jointly with his son, Commodus.

The tumultuous reign of Commodus (r.177-192) brought another era of uncertainty in the empire. He accompanied his father at the Marcomannic Wars, and had to put down a rebellion from Cassius, a general, but otherwise he did not have to fight many external battles.[125] He ruled jointly with his father from 177-180, until Marcus' death. However, Commodus faced much internal criticism, had barely any favor with the Roman Senate, and was called a tyrant.[126] Commodus died while wrestling, and within a year, there were five emperors vying for power.[127] It was not until 193 CE when an army stationed in Pannonia declared Septimius Severus the new emperor while another army in Syria proclaimed Pescennius Niger as the emperor, that a single

---

τῇ Κτησιφῶντι κατέσκαψεν. ἔν γε μὴν τῇ ὑποστροφῇ πλείστους τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὑπὸ λιμοῦ καὶ νόσου ἀπέβαλεν, ἀπενόστησε δ᾽ ὅμως ἐς τὴν Συρίαν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν στρατιωτῶν.

[123] Ibid.

[124] Cass. Dio. LXXI.3: καὶ ὁ μὲν Λούκιος τούτοις ἐπεκυδαίνετο καὶ μέγα ἐφρόνει, οὐ μὴν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἄκρας εὐτυχίας ἐς ἀγαθόν τι ἀπέβη· λέγεται γὰρ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τῷ πενθερῷ Μάρκῳ ἐπιβεβουλευκώς, πρίν τι καὶ δρᾶσαι, φαρμάκῳ διαφθαρῆναι. In the Historia Augusta, Lucius Verus is described as a neither being a good nor a bad emperor. It says: "For it is agreed that he neither bristled with vices, nor abounded in virtues, and he enjoyed, not unrestricted power, but a sovereignty on the same terms and equal dignity with Marcus, from whom he differed, however, in the coarseness of his character and the excess of his unrestrained life. For his character was utterly ingenuous and he was unable to conceal anything." SHA, *Hist. Aug.*, *Verus*, 1.4-5. Translation from: *Historia Augusta, Volume I.* Translated by David Magie. Revised by David Rohrbacher. Loeb Classical Library 139. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022.

[125] See: Hekster, O. (2002). *Commodus: An emperor at the crossroads*. BRILL. DOI: 10.1163/9789004502321

[126] Hekster (2002); Cass. Dio LXXIII for the reign of Commodus.

[127] Cass. Dio LXXIII.22-24; LXXIV

victor emerged. The new emperor Septimius Severus (r.193-211) was born in Leptis Magna in Africa, from an equestrian family. [128]

Septimius Severus changed the rules to command a legion. Under Augustus, legions were generally led by a senator called a *legatus Augusti pro praetore*.[129] Karl Strobel argues that the field armies had been in development as early as Septimius Severus. Septimius Severus professionalized the imperial field army, and after him the armies became long-standing. Severus took his army to defeat Pescennius Niger in the east at Byzantium and to fight in the Parthian Wars.[130] Each time, however, the field army ceased to exist once the emperor returned to Rome. Septimius Severus changed the laws for soldiers. Prior to his reign, it was illegal for soldiers to marry, but he began to allow soldiers to marry.[131] This was a major change from the centuries prior, which maintained a "celibate" army, so as not to legally complicate the status of soldiers who did not have citizenship until the end of their service.[132] Elise Phang clarifies that even though marriages with soldiers were not legal, "they were not expected to abstain from sexual relationships with women. Though many soldiers formed long-term relationships with women, these unions were not legally recognized, and the resulting children were illegitimate."[133] She dismisses the idea that the ban was intended to increase army recruitments by encouraging illegitimate sons of soldiers to 'earn' their citizenship by enlisting themselves.[134]

---

[128] Elliott, P. (2014). *Legions in crisis: Transformation of the Roman soldier, AD 192-284*. Fonthill Media Limited. International Article Number: 9781781553343

[129] Gilliver (2007), 190

[130] Strobel (2007), 270; Cass. Dio. LXXX.6-10.

[131] Garnsey, P. (1970). Septimius Severus and the Marriage of Soldiers. *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, *3*, 45–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/25010598; Herodian 3.8.5 from Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume II: Books 5-8.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 455. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970

[132] Garnsey (1970) brings this up on pages 49-53.

[133] Phang, Sara. (2001). *The Marriage of Roman Soldiers (13 B.C.-A.D. 235).* Brill

[134] Phang (2001), 326-329. Garnsey (1970) suggested the theory of 'earning' citizenship through military service, 52. Instead, Phang hypothesizes that Augustus established the law to avoid paying subsidies to military families,

Historically, one of the great advantages of joining the Roman army was gaining Roman citizenship.[135] In the second century, the imperial armies relied heavily on auxilia whose members sought out their inclusion into the empire.[136] However, after Caracalla (r. 197-217 CE) issued the Antonine Edict in 212 CE, all free citizens of the empire became citizens, so it became even more important to convince Romans to join the army, especially as demand increased due to invasion at the Roman borders. Haynes argues that after the edict, “the legal distinctions between legionary and auxiliary recruits were swept away… The *alae* [wings comprised of legions] and *cohortes* [units within a legion] were no longer non-citizen formations.”[137]

In 235, Maximinus Thrax, who commanded the emperor Severus Alexander’s (r. 222-235) field army's recruit corps on the Rhine, trained numerous recruits to replenish the vexillations and legions. According to Herodian, Maximinus came from a tribe within Thrace, and was drafted into the army as a ἱππεύς because of his physical attributes.[138] Through skill, or an act of luck as Herodian claims, he was able to rise through all the ranks of the army and was “given charge of legions and commands over provinces.”[139] Due to his military experience, Severus Alexander entrusted Maximinus to train military recruits and ready them for battle.[140]

---

especially since soldiers were expensive enough. Second, she suggests that the ban could have been to discourage female citizens from moving outside of Rome and Italy to join their soldier husbands. See Phang (2001), 346

[135] Under Augustus, a soldier could earn citizenship after 25 years of service. This applied to provincial soldiers, who did not already have citizenship. Roman legions were led by Roman citizens.

[136] “What counted was not so much the place of origin as the degree of attachment to the empire, with the offer of citizenship being a powerful incentive,” Whitby, Michael. (2007). Army and Society in the Late Roman World. *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell, 519.

[137] Haynes (2013), 87

[138] Herodian was a Greek historian who wrote a history that spans the death of Marcus Aurelius (r.161-180) through the reign of Gordian III (r.238-244). Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume II: Books 5-8.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 455. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970. ἦν δέ τις ἐν τῷ στρατῷ Μαξιμῖνος ὄνομα, τὸ μὲν γένος τῶν ἐνδοτάτω Θρᾳκῶν καὶ μιξοβαρβάρων, ἀπό τινος κώμης, ὡς ἐλέγετο, πρότερον μὲν ἐν παιδὶ ποιμαίνων, ἐν ἀκμῇ δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας γενόμενος διὰ μέγεθος καὶ ἰσχὺν σώματος ἐς τοὺς ἱππεύοντας στρατιώτας καταταγείς. Hdn. 6.8.1

[139] Hdn. 6.8.1

[140] τὸν δὴ Μαξιμῖνον τοῦτον διὰ τὴν προειρημένην στρατιωτικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπέστησε πάσῃ τῇ τοῦ στρατοῦ νεολαίᾳ, ὡς ἀσκοίη τε αὐτοὺς τὰ στρατιωτικὰ καὶ ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν ἐπιτηδείους παρασκευάζοι., Hdn. 6.8.2

This would ultimately contribute to the emperor’s downfall. Maximinus appealed to the troops as a competent leader and an exemplary figure. Herodian said the troops, “of whom the greater majority were Pannonians, admired Maximinus’ courage and despised Alexander” because his mother was advising him, and because he was not funding them adequately.[141] The soldiers wanted to proclaim Maximinus, their “fellow soldier and camp-mate,” as the emperor since he brought his military expertise to the throne. As Maximinus appeared to aid in training the soldiers,

> “They threw the purple, imperial cloak over him and proclaimed him emperor, though it is not clear whether Maximinus himself was unaware of what was happening or whether he had planned this secretly. His first reaction was to refuse and throw off the purple cloak, but when they insisted at the point of the sword, threatening to kill him, he preferred to avoid the immediate danger rather than one in the future, and accepted the honour.”[142]

He then responded by telling the soldiers to back up their protest with action and to overthrow Severus Alexander. To solidify their desire to declare Maximinus the new emperor, he “doubled their pay, promised an enormous bonus of cash and kind, and canceled all punishments and marks of disgrace against them.” [143] When Severus Alexander heard of this attempt on his rule, he begged his soldiers to stand by him and fight off Maximinus and his army of recruits. As the usurper approached, however, the soldiers, once determined to defend their emperor, turned on him and acclaimed Maximinus, who was "brave and moderate, always their companion in battle and devoted to a life of military action" as emperor.[144]After his successful rebellion, Maximinus organized a special training corps for young Italians, showing the importance of structured and independent recruitment and training systems within the field armies.

---

[141] ὁ δὲ μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας ποιούμενος τὰ ἐγκεχειρισμένα εὔνοιαν πολλὴν παρὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐκτήσατο, οὐ μόνον διδάσκων αὐτοὺς τὰ ποιητέα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις πάντων προηγούμενος, ὡς μὴ μαθητὰς εἶναι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ζηλωτὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τῆς ἐκείνου ἀνδρείας. 3ἔτι τε καὶ δώροις αὐτοὺς καὶ παντοδαπαῖς τιμαῖς ᾠκειώσατο. ὅθεν οἱ νεανίαι, ἐν οἷς ἦν τὸ πολὺ πλῆθος Παιόνων μάλιστα, τῇ μὲν ἀνδρείᾳ τοῦ Μαξιμίνου ἔχαιρον, τὸν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπέσκωπτον ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἀρχόμενον, καὶ διοικουμένων τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπ᾽ ἐξουσίας τε καὶ γνώμης γυναικός, ῥᾳθύμως τε καὶ ἀνάνδρως τοῖς πολεμικοῖς προσφερομένου ἐκείνου. Hdn. 6.8.2-3. C.R. Whittaker noted that Syncellus 1.674 mentions that it was the German Rhine army that supported Maximinus rather than the Pannonians.

[142] Hdn. 6.8.4-6: ἀθροισθέντες οὖν ἐς τὸ πεδίον ὡπλισμένοι ὡς δὴ ἐπὶ τὰ συνήθη γυμνάσια, προελθόντα καὶ ἐπιστάντα αὐτοῖς τὸν Μαξιμῖνον, εἴτε ἀγνοοῦντα τὸ πραττόμενον εἴτε καὶ λάθρᾳ τοῦτο προκατασκευάσαντα, πορφύραν ἐπιβαλόντες βασιλικὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀναγορεύουσιν. 6ὁ δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα παρῃτεῖτο καὶ τὴν πορφύραν ἀπερρίπτει· ὡς δὲ ἐνέκειντο ξιφήρεις ἀποκτενεῖν ἀπειλοῦντες, τοῦ παρόντος κινδύνου τὸν μέλλοντα προελόμενος ἀνεδέξατο τὴν τιμήν

[143] Hdn. 6.8.7-8: ὡς δ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἐς εὔνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν πάνυ[1] προκαλέσαιτο,[2] τά τε σιτηρέσια ἐπεδιπλασίασε, νομάς τε καὶ δόσεις μεγίστας ὑπέσχετο, τιμωρίας τε καὶ κηλῖδας πάσας αὐτοῖς ἀνῆκεν, ἐπί τε τὴν πορείαν ἐξήγαγεν·

Campaigns against the Germans marked his reign. Herodian said he would have successfully subjugated them, had "the people at home" not suffered for his conquests and general disregard for the Roman senate, and former support of Severus Alexander. Herodian lamented that Maximinus allowed Romans to easily lose their possessions in court if accused, despite a lack of evidence.[145] C. R. Whittaker noted the potential bias in this account. He wrote that Maximinus was portrayed as the stereotypical "tyrant," but Herodian neglected to inform his audience that the emperor faced a financial burden in paying the army the money he had promised. Whittaker added that emperors,

> "who most successfully maintained the frontiers ([Septimius] Severus, Caracalla, Maximinus) also had to rely on confiscations to pay the bill. There is little evidence to suggest a deliberate policy by [Maximinus] to exterminate the bourgeois urban classes, but no doubt that the growing pluralism of the Roman empire made [Maximinus] less sympathetic to the established interests of the middle class (of which [Herodian] was one)."[146]

Instead, Herodian was convinced that Maximinus allowed tragedy to strike the rich and fortunate, because he only cared about greed and his army.[147] Maximinus was the first soldier emperor who rose from the ranks to become emperor and fought on the front lines. His priority for the empire explicitly clashed with the Roman senate, marking an undeniable break from emperors before him. This new shift would hold true for the rest of the century, and create a new power balance in the empire.

---

[144] Hdn. 6.9. 3-6.

[145] Hdn. 7.3

[146] See footnote 3 of 7.3, on p.169 of Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume II: Books 5-8.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 455. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

[147] See Haynes, Ian (2013)., 'Shifting Fortunes: The *Auxilia* under the Severans', *Blood of the Provinces: The Roman Auxilia and the Making of Provincial Society from Augustus to the Severans*: Oxford

The Third Century Crisis

Due to the numerous shifts in power, battles, and economic concerns, I will refrain from listing them all here.[148] What I would like to highlight, however, is how at the intersection of all the supposed causes of crisis sat the Roman army. The emperor was often a soldier, soldiers were needed to fight off invasion which meant more soldiers throughout the empire, and more soldiers meant more money being spend by the imperial government. The imperial structure in the third century shifted to accommodate the needs of the army, and in doing so permanently restructured the government. Since the emperor was needed at the frontiers with an army, he needed to develop a new method to stay protected with loyal soldiers and be able to move quickly.

The son of Valerian, Gallienus, developed *vexillations*, or infantry units detached from their legions, which could be stationed at a strategic point and led by their own commanders.[149] During his joint reign with his father, Valerian, the field armies were stationed in North Italy and Pannonia to fight off the threat of usurpation by Ingenuus (259 CE) and Postumus (260 CE).[150] Gallienus' field army survived after his murder, and made up "the core of the military power of Claudius II and later of Aurelian."[151]

---

[148] But consult Ando (2012) and Harries (2012); Watson, Alaric. (1999). *Aurelian and the Third Century*. Routledge.

[149] Harries (2012), 10

[150] Strobel (2007), 270

[151] Ibid.

In the mid-3rd century, legionary vexillations were strategically moved across the Roman Empire. These movements included bringing troops to the Rhine by Valerian from the East and Gallienus from the Danube in 255/56. In 258, Valerian transported vexillations from Britain and Germany to the East, forming part of his field army. These troops, led by the Macriani, later opposed Gallienus in 261 and were stationed in Sirmium. These vexillations operated as independent units with their own recruitment processes, often being replenished to maintain battle readiness. Unlike traditional legions, they lacked sub-units for training recruits and did not have the usual behind-the-lines and administrative services. Thus, these units evolved into a new type of under-strength battle legions, still called *legio*, without distinguishing them from their original mother units.

Karl Strobel emphasizes that this development was a significant characteristic of the third century's field armies.[152] He notes that a specialized system for recruiting and training recruits was established for these field armies, independent of the mother units.[153] Strobel notes that the field armies became semi-autonomous units with their own recruitment and training systems, departing from traditional legionary structures. Under Gallienus, senators lost their military influence to *equites*, who replaced them in their conventional leadership positions. In this way, the emperors sought to ensure the loyalty of their troops, especially those they instilled as leaders.[154] To avoid potential uprisings or challenges to the throne, field armies were always closely connected to the Augusti and Caesares and were placed where the emperors perceived threats. The members of the first tetrarchy, Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius I, and Galerius, fought within these field armies developed in the mid-third century.

---

[152] Strobel, (2007).

[153] See earlier mention of Maximinus Thrax on training the army recruits

[154] Mennen, I. (2011). *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193-284*. Brill. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w76vsp, 240

This system, however, did not solve the age-old problem of the soldiers' loyalty to their commander. Aureolus (r.268), Claudius II Gothicus (r. 268-270), and Aurelian (r.270-275) were all commanders who were able to rise to become emperors. When Claudius II Gothicus died, the senate declared his brother emperor, but only the army with him proclaimed him emperor, while the rest of the army refused to recognize him.[155] Instead, they (the army) chose Aurelian, who had been Claudius' right-hand man in the campaigns in the Balkans.[156]

Two significant coups resulted in enclave empires in both Gaul and Syria after the emperor Valerian was captured at the Battle of Edessa in 260 by Sassanid king Shapur I.[157] Postumus, a general who had been stationed on the Rhine frontier, supposedly killed Gallienus' son, Saloninus, and was declared emperor by the soldiers and people of Gaul.[158] Postumus, however, proved to be too stern a ruler and was killed by the Gauls and replaced by Lollianus. Lollianus was soon deposed and replaced by Victorinus, who Tetricus then replaced. While their reigns were brief, the authors of the *Historia Augusta* claimed that “all of them [were] defenders of the Roman name.”[159] The empire lasted until 271 when Aurelian defeated Tetricus the Elder, who surrendered to the emperor.[160] Even though Aurelian led Tetricus, and his son Tetricus the Younger, in a triumph, he allowed “him not only to retain his life, but also to remain in the highest position.”[161] Aurelian even allowed the young Tetricus to have achieve senatorial status. In the Historia Augusta, the author describes a mosaic at the house of the Tetrici on the Caelian Hill in which Aurelian is “bestowing the bordered toga and the rank of senator on both the Tetrici, and receiving a scepter, a crown, and an embroidered robe from them.[162]

---

[155] "He, then, moved away to the gods and the stars, and his brother Quintillus, a righteous man and the brother indeed, as I might truly say, of his brother, assumed the imperial power, which was offered him by the judgement of all, not as an inherited possession, but because his virtues deserved it; for all would have made him emperor, even if he had not been the brother of the Claudius their prince. In his time those barbarians who still survived endeavoured to lay waste Anchialus and even to seize Nicopolis, but they were crushed by the valour of the provincials. Quintillus, however, could do naught that was worthy of the imperial power because his rule was so short, for on the seventeenth day of his reignhe was killed, as Galba had been and Pertinax also, because he had shown himself stern and unbending toward the soldiers and promised to be a prince in very truth. Dexippus, to be sure, does not say that Quintillus was killed, but merely that he died. He does not, however, relate that he died of an illness, and so he seems to feel doubt." From *Historia Augusta, Volume III: The Two Valerians. The Two Gallieni. The Thirty Pretenders. The Deified Claudius. The Deified Aurelian. Tacitus. Probus. Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus and Bonosus. Carus, Carinus and Numerian.* Translated by David Magie. Loeb Classical Library 263. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

[156] Watson (1999), 47

[157] Valerian was captured at the Battle of Edessa in 260 by Sassanid king Shapur I and used as a prop. There is more information on both Gaul and Palmyra in the next chapter on Roman cities.

[158] SHA. *Hist. Aug., The Thirty Usurpers: Postumus.*

Aurelian was not as forgiving to Zenobia and the Palmyrene Empire, which lasted from 260 CE to 271 CE, when Aurelian sacked the city a second time. The empire was founded under Odenathus, who began as the king of Palmyra in 260 CE during the reign of Gallienus. After the death of Valerian, Odenathus stood as the protector against the Persians. He managed to capture the city of Nisibis, and push Sapor to Ctesiphon. After he put down Macrianus, who attempted to rival Gallienus, he was murdered by his cousin Maeonius and son Herodes.[163] Upon the death of Maeonius, Zenobia seized power as queen regent, with her sons from Odentathus, being the supposed true kings. In her reign, she was able to take control over parts of Egypt and Asia Minor, and in Alexandria, there were coins minted with her as ‘augusta’ and her son as

---

[159] “adsertores Romani nominis extiterunt,” ibid.

[160] SHA. *Hist. Aug. Tetricus the Elder*

[161] Ibid.

[162] Tetricorum domus hodieque exstat in monte Caelio inter duos lucos contra Iseum Metellinum, pulcherrima, in qua Aurelianus pictus est utrique praetextam tribuens et senatoriam dignitatem, accipiens ab his sceptrum, coronam, cycladem: “The house of the Tetrici is still standing today, situated on the Caelian Hill between two sacred groves and facing the Temple of Isis built by Metellus. It is very beautiful, and Aurelian is depicted in it bestowing the bordered toga and the rank of senator on both the Tetrici, and receiving a scepter, a crown, and an embroidered robe from them. This picture is in mosaic, and it is said that the two Tetrici, when they dedicated it, invited Aurelian himself to a banquet.” SHA. *Hist. Aug. Tetricus the Younger*

[163] SHA. *Hist. Aug. Odenathus, The Thirty Usurpers.*

'augustus.' Within two weeks, Aurelian led his army to take back Egypt in and easily seize Asia Minor.[164] Aurelian led both the Tetrici and Zenobia and her children in his triumph.[165]

Two years later, Aurelian was murdered by his praetorian guard. In his place, Tacitus, a senator and retired general, was murdered within six months of his reign. Tacitus' brother, Florianus, was declared emperor in Asia, while Probus, a commander in the east, was declared by his army.[166] Florianus quickly died, but Probus (r.276-282) remained on the throne for six years, almost entirely on the move. He, too, was eventually killed by Carus, his praetorian prefect in 282.[167] Carus, taking the purple, declared his sons Carinus and Numerian as his heirs. When Carus died by lightning strike in 283, his son Numerian took his place, but died shortly after being killed by his uncle and praetorian prefect, Aper. When it was discovered the Numerian was killed by Aper, a solider named Diocletian was declared emperor by his soldiers and put Aper to death to avenge Numerian.[168] Diocletian had to face Carinus, who had two competitors to fend off himself. Carinus was able to put them down, but eventually lost to Diocletian in 284, when his praetorian prefect, Tiberius Claudius Aurelius Aristobulus, betrayed him.[169]

These events show the Roman army's growing competency in putting down such rebellions. The military response in both Gaul and Syria to mobilize and contain imperial threats was effective and was becoming a standard in military practice. It also shows that third century emperors had to prioritize certain frontier zones, which could leave other areas of the empire vulnerable. It certainly left Rome on the back burner for the generals and emperors fighting for control of parts of or the entire empire.

---

[164] Watson (1999), 61
[165] SHA. *Hist. Aug. Tetricus the Elder*
[166] Ando (2012), 220.
[167] Ando (2012), 222. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 37.3-4; Eutr. 9.17.3; *Hist. Aug. Probus* 21.1-4.
[168] Ando (2012), 223
[169] Ibid.

There was, therefore, precedent for the armies to declare the emperor in Roman history. This precedent became most important during times of civil war, which could be escalated by armies seeking to benefit from a rising ruler who made alluring promises. In the third century, civil war and soldier emperors became the norm. What is unique, however, is that the military's importance to the throne grew while the need for the Senate's approval declined. In fact, during the third century, even the city of Rome itself became less important in terms of imperial administration and strength. Rome's power in some ways, was its historical legacy. One of the crucial developments of the third century was that imperial attention shifted to the frontiers of the empire, where Roman control was most threatened. The author of the Historia Augusta recorded the, likely fictious, interaction between senate and the army after the death of Aurelian. It says:

> "The dignity of a revered senate and the leadership of a wise army demonstrate how difficult it is to choose an emperor to succeed a good ruler. For after this very strict ruler had been killed, the army referred to the senate the business of choosing an emperor, because it believed that no one should be chosen from those who had killed so good a ruler. The senate, however, thrust this selection back on the army, knowing well that the emperors whom the senate selected were no longer gladly received by the troops. Finally, for the third time, the choice was referred, and so for the space of six months the Roman world was without a ruler, and all those governors whom either the senate or Aurelian had chosen remained at their posts."[170]

---

[170] SHA. *Hist. Aug. The Deified Aurelian*, 40: Quam difficile sit imperatorem in locum boni principis legere, et senatus sanctioris gravitas probat et exercitus prudentis auctoritas; 2occiso namque severissimo principe de imperatore deligendo exercitus retulit ad senatum, idcirco quod nullum de his faciendum putabat, qui tam bonum principem occiderant. 3verum senatus hanc eandem electionem in exercitum refudit, sciens non libenter iam milites accipere imperatores eos quos senatus elegerit. 4denique id tertio factum est, ita ut per sex menses imperatorem Romanus orbis non habuerit, omnesque iudices hi permanerent, quos aut senatus aut Aurelianus elegerat, nisi quod pro consule Asiae Faltonius Probus in locum Arellii Fusci delegitur.

During this period, the author of the Historia Augusta suggested the difficulty in assessing who would or would not be a good emperor and suit the empire best. Even if this tale is untrue or embellished, the author must be highlighting an important retrospective divide in the priorities of the empire. This account implied that the emperor needed to be a qualified and capable leader, hence the responsibility of the 'wise army' to decide who would sit on the throne as well as a leader who would respect and understand the senate and traditions of the Roman state. I argue during this period the two ideologies were at odds.

Imperial focus no doubt shifted because emperors in the late third century were often trained soldiers who prioritized fighting off barbarian invasion and assuring their fellow soldiers were taken care of. As is clear from Herodian, emperors of the time focused on sustaining their armies rather than appeasing the Roman elite class and the senate. Hermann Amon notes that in Aurelius Victor's *De Caesaribus*, Victor carefully outlines what made a "good" emperor and a "bad" emperor. Amon discusses the comparison of good or bad emperors referencing Victor's descriptions of Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian. Amon states: "Les vertus morales du prince sont un sujet important des biographies de Victor puisqu'elles servent de fondation à l'excellence de l'activité politique et militaire du bon empereur."[171] He claims that Victor pointed out the fragile balance the emperor must maintain in keeping an excellent relationship with the army and with the senate:

> "Les qualités morales du prince sont indissociables de sa clairvoyance politique et de ses aptitudes militaires. Par clairvoyance politique, il faut entendre la capacité, pour l'empereur, de maintenir une excellente relation avec les forces

---

[171] Amon, Herman. (2018). Gallien, Claude le Gothique, Aurélien et le bon empereur dans les *Caesares* d'Aurelius Victor *Interférences* [En ligne], | 2018, mis en ligne le 09 février 2018, consulté le 11 février 2018, 4

> politiques que sont le Sénat et l'armée, dans le but de garantir un régime stable et durable."[172]

I would argue, however, that this is, in fact, not a reflection on third century politics, but a view taken on by Victor that reflected the fourth century political relationships instead. Victor used Trajan and Marcus Aurelius as "good" emperors by noting their qualities of self-restraint, trust, and knowledge of "culture."[173] In the late third century, however, it became more and more apparent that emperors did not need the senate's approval. Aurelius Victor, who recorded history from the reign of Augustus through to Theodosius I (r.378-395 in his *De Caesaribus*. Aurelius Victor was alive during Constantine's reign (306-337 CE) and Theodosius I's reign (378-395 CE). He was born in North Africa and served in a number of government positions. He was the consular governor of Pannonia Secunda in 361 under emperor Julian (361-362). He studied law in Rome and served as urban prefect of Rome in 389 under emperor Theodosius. During his time at Sirmium, the capital of Pannonia Secunda, it is likely that Aurelius Victor was able to have access to the emperor Constantius II (r. 337-361). According to H. W. Bird, his time at Sirmium inspired him to write the *De Caesaribus*, which accounts for his "unstinting praise of Constantius (II) and his omission of anything that might detract from his eulogistic portrait."[174] Bird suggests that emperor Julian (r. 361-363) may have read the *De Caesaribus* while in Nassius because Aurelius Victor was then summoned to Naissus and sent back as consular governor of Pannonia Secunda, where he was honored with a statue.

---

[172] Amon, (2018), 14
[173] Ibid, 4-7
[174] Bird (1994), viii.

To Aurelius Victor, good emperors needed to be more than just skilled military men, and I would argue that Herodian felt similarly, since they were both part of the middle or upper class. The contrast, however, is that each author lived through a period of stability but in different ways, and neither were soldiers. If we are to believe Herodian, he was alive during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and had a memory of a "good" emperor who did not have to devote most of his time to military strife. Victor did acknowledge, however, the importance of strong military qualities in defining a good emperor. Victor states that the strength of the tetrarchs was their military background, while simultaneously insisting that the emperors of the tetrarchy lacked a sense of culture. Of emperor Diocletian, he said:

> "Valerius Diocletian, commander of the household troops, was selected because of his good sense. He was a great man, yet he had the following characteristics: he was in fact, the first who really desired a supply of silk, purple and gems for his sandals, together with a gold-brocaded robe. Although these things went beyond good taste and betrayed a vain and haughty disposition, they were nevertheless trivial in comparison with the rest. For he was the first of all after Caligula and Domitian to permit himself to be called 'Lord' in public and to be worshipped and addressed as a god."[175]

Likewise, Victor described Maximian as "a loyal friend who, although he was rather uncivilized, was nevertheless a good soldier of sound character."[176] In this way, he combines the legacy of third century emperors with emperors in both the first, second and the fourth centuries.

The Rise and Fall of the Tetrarchy

---

[175] Aur. Vict. *Caes. 39.1-2.* See too, that Victor notes Diocletian was not the first to do this, and references two first century emperors, Caligula (37-41 CE) and Domitian (81-96 CE).

[176] Aur. Vict. *Caes. 39.13*

It was not enough to have strong military capabilities or the ability to be victorious in battle; an emperor had to maintain order and contentment among his soldiers. This was incredibly important during civil wars as having effective leadership could stabilize the empire. The fact that the tetrarchs understood this was highlighted in the quotation from Aurelius Victor in the beginning of this chapter. In full, the quote reads:

> "Illyricum was actually the native land of all of them: so although they were deficient in culture, they had nevertheless been sufficiently schooled by the hardships of the countryside and of military service to be the best men for the state. Consequently it is evident that men are more readily made honourable and sensible by enduring adversity whereas, on the other hand, those who have not experienced misfortunes, as long as they judge everyone according to their own situations, are less considerate. But the harmony of these (rulers) has definitely demonstrated that natural ability and the experience of a successful military career, such as they received through the precedent of Aurelian and Probus, are practically sufficient to ensure merit."[177]

Here, Victor is expressing that Diocletian and Maximian while they were not cultured and uncivilized, were powerful soldiers who were well-trained and from Illyricum, which was a region famous for training soldiers. He also noted their *concordia*, or harmony, to rule together, which was in direct contrast to the pattern of Roman rule from the past sixty years. As Diocletian emerged from decades of fighting in the civil wars, his restructuring of and focus on the army exhibits that he understood its power and wanted to ensure loyalty.

---

[177] His sane omnibus Illyricum patria fuit: qui, quamquam humanitatis parum, ruris tamen ac militiae miseriis imbuti satis optimi reipublicae fuere. Quare constat sanctos prudentosque sensu mali promptius fieri, contraque expertes aerumnarum, dum opibus suis cunctos aestimant, minus consulere. Sed horum concordia maxime edocuit virtuti ingenium usumque bonae militiae, quanta his Aureliani Probique instituto fuit paene sat esse.

The four tetrarchs, according to Victor, all came from Illyricum.[178] However, a panegyric to Maximian claimed he had been born in Pannonia, where other third century rulers such as Decius, Claudius, and Probus had been from.[179] Both Illyricum and Pannonia had a history of being the birthplace of many Roman recruits. While Victor criticized the tetrarchs for being uncultured, he expressed that because they had "been sufficiently schooled by the hardships of the countryside and of military service", they were the best men for the state at the time.[180] In reflection, Aurelius Victor, himself involved in the Roman government and Western society, noted that it was better for an emperor to have military expertise rather than an affinity for culture and values during this period. I argue that his awareness to both point out the flaws in the tetrachic emperors and admit the necessity of having rulers skilled battle, was a testimony to knowing what the empire needed to survive at the time.

Second to their military expertise was their ability to rule in harmony. Victor claimed that the "harmony (*concordia*) of these (rulers) has definitely demonstrated that natural ability and the experience of a successful military career… are practically sufficient to ensure merit."[181] After Diocletian defeated Carinus in 285, he appointed Maximian, "a military man like [Diocletian] and an old friend," as a Caesar.[182] A year later, in 286, Diocletian raised him to an Augustus, which officially made Maximian almost an equal to Diocletian, "who only claimed superior authority as Senior Augustus."[183] A.H.M. Jones described their relationship by saying:

---

[178] Aur. Vict. *Caes. 39*

[179] Panegyric X from: Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*. 1st ed. Vol. 21. University of California Press, 1994. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.5973126. See 2.2 and footnote 10.

[180] Aur. Vict. *Caes. 39*

[181] Aur. Vict. *Caes., 39 "Sed horum concordia maxime edocuit virtuti ingenium usumque bonae militiae, quanta his Aureliani Probique instituto fuit paene sat esse."*

[182] Jones, A.H.M. (1964). *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 38

[183] Ibid

> "In actuality the relationship of the two is better expressed by the divine names which they assumed, Iovius and Herculius. Diocletian was the representative and vicegerent upon earth of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, king of gods and men; Maximian of Hercules, his heroic agent in rooting out the evils which oppressed the world."[184]

In Panegyric X, the author Mamertinus insists on *concordia* between Diocletian and Maximian. The panegyric was delivered in the west, in Trier around 291 CE.[185] The panegyric highlighted the brotherly relationship between Maxentius and Diocletian, and how their leadership brought peace to the empire:

> "In truth, O most sacred Emperor, one might justifiably call you and your brother the founders of the Roman Empire, for you are, what is almost the same thing, its restorers,' and although this is the birthday of this City, which marks the origin of the Roman people, it is the first days of your rule which mark the beginning of its salvation."[186]

Again, later in the panegyric:

> "Both of you are now most bountiful, both most brave, and because of this very similarity in your characters the harmony between you is ever increasing, and you are brothers in virtue, which is a surer tie than any tie of blood. And so it happens that such a great empire is shared between you without any rivalry; nor do you suffer there to be any distinction between you but plainly hold an equal share in the State, like those twin Lacedaemonian kings, the Heraclidae."[187]

---

[184] Ibid

[185] Panegyric X from: Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*. 1st ed. Vol. 21. University of California Press, 1994. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.5973126.

[186] "Re uera enim, sacratissime imperator, merito quiuis te tuumque fratrem Romani imperii dixerit conditores: estis enim, quod est proximum, restitutores et, sit licet hie illi urbi natalis dies, quod pertinet ad originem populi Romani, uestri imperii primi dies sunt principes ad salute" Panegyric X from: Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers

[187] "Sed neque illum uirtutes tuae bellicae (a) liberalitate (neque te) 5 illius opes a bellica uirtute reuocarunt: ambo nunc estis largissimi, ambo fortissimi atque hac ipsa uestri similitudine magis magisque concordes 4 et, quod omni consanguinitate certius est, uirtutibus fratres. Sic fit ut uobis tantum imperium sine ulla aemulatione commune sit neque ullum inter uos discrimen esse patiamini, sed plane ut gemini illi reges Lacedae- 10 5 mones Heraclidae rem publicam pari sorte teneatis." Panegyric X from: Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers

However, O. Seeck and I. König suggested that not all had been well between the two.[188] Instead, Seeck argued, Diocletian was "forced to recognize Maximian as emperor after his initial military successes in the West."[189] I. König claims that Diocletian's tetrarchy had not been a thought-out plan but was a response to Maximian's "unilateral promotion of his son-in-law and protégé Constantius, which forced Diocletian to promote a candidate of his own."[190] Nixon and Rodgers note that the relationship between Maximian and Diocletian must have been fairly amicable and harmonious; otherwise, Lactantius would have seized the opportunity to slam the relationship in his *De Mortibus Persecutorum.*[191]

This harmony is expressed not only in Victor's account but was imperial propaganda.[192] The message was dispersed in imperial coinage, and all representations of the tetrarchs. On a coin dated to 287 CE, Diocletian and Maximian face each other as a sign of unity, with the inscription "Imperatoribus Diocletiano et Maximiano Augustis," to show the hierarchy between the two rulers.[193] The observe of the coin depicting the two rulers on a chariot being pulled by horse.[194] *Concordia imperatorum* was the main message of the famous porphyry statue of the four tetrarchs, Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, and Constantius. According to Roger Rees, the homogeneity represented shows their *concordia*. He states:

---

[188] Panegyric X from: Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, 43

[189] Ibid, 44

[190] Ibid, 44

[191] Ibid, 44; Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* 8.1. "Quid frater eius Maximianus, qui est dictus Herculius? Non dissimilis ab eo: nec enim possent in amicitiam tam fidelem cohaerere, nisi esset in utroque mens una, eadem cogitatio, par voluntas, aequa sententia." Edition and translation used: Translated by J.L. Creed. Lactantius, *De mortibus Persecutorum*. Trans. J.L. Creed. Oxford: Clarendon Press

[192] Keeping in mind that Aurelius Victor was writing roughly seventy years after the early tetrarchy, it is possible that even he was convinced by this propaganda that was so successfully pitched throughout the empire. As is known, the tetrarchy had been short lived after the death of Constantius I and the rise of Maxentius in Rome. Both had been passed over for the role of Augusti, and instead attempted to replace their own fathers. Victor was speaking on the founding four, but to think this harmony was uncontested is most likely a deception.

[193] See coin from 287 CE, with Diocletian and Maximian facing each other as a sign of unity but also with their titles with the inscription "Imperatoribus Diocletiano et Maximiano Augustis."

[194] The obverse image being the two emperors on a chariot pulled by elephants. https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18200802. See, too, coin representing the four tetrarchs sacrificing at the altar

> "Individuality has been suppressed and instead the four figures have similar postures: the dress is military; their left hands are on the handles of their swords, their right arms around their neighbour's shoulder and their feet equally spaced. The pose is highly stylized, creating an effect of regimentation. The overriding message of the group is that their strength lies in their unity and solidarity."[195]

Indeed, without a mutual desire to work together, the tetrarchy would have fallen apart and resulted in multiple skilled soldiers declaring themselves emperor. As Victor detailed, the early formation of the tetrarchy was defined by each tetrarch needing to put down potential usurpers and threats on the empire's frontiers. In the beginning of Diocletian's reign, Carausius (286-293) retained sovereignty over Britain until he was overthrown by Allectus, his treasurer, later defeated by Constantius' praetorian prefect, Asclepiodotus. In 297 in Egypt, Achilleus was subdued through negotiations, and a similar approach was taken in Africa. Meanwhile, the Marcomanni and Carpi were defeated under Diocletian and were resettled in parts of Pannonia. This meant that there was threat of invasion in almost every frontier of the empire.

With four different Roman rulers, all bound to the empire, each of those military victories, that could not be achieved by one person alone, could be won for the Roman people. The tetrarchs were also bound as family. As T.D. Barnes notes, almost all the members of the

---

commemorating a win against the Sarmations. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Argenteus-Constantius_I-antioch_RIC_033a_(obverse).jpg
http://www.jstor.org/stable/643157.

[195] Rees, R. (1993). Images and Image: A Re-Examination of Tetrarchic Iconography. *Greece & Rome*, *40*(2), 181–200, 183. See the "Porphyry Statue of the Four Tetrarchs" in San Marco Square in Venice, Italy. Taken from Constantinople during the fourth crusade. The statue represents the four tetrarchs: Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, and Constantius.

tetrarchy were related by marriage or through adoption, which further cemented the concept of unity through familial ties.[196] The marriages, contracted around the time of receiving an imperial title of emperor or junior emperor, was thought to help prevent more civil war and usurpation. According to Harries, "the sharing of power with a family member had the further attraction of excluding potential rivals from access to military commands."[197]

In 305 CE, Diocletian and Maximian "retired," which allowed Constantius and Galerius to rise to the rank of *Augusti*.[198] During this turbulent period, Constantius and Galerius were succeeded by Severus and Maximinus Daia as Caesars. Constantius, however, died soon after becoming emperor. His son, Constantine, stationed in York, rose to power after his father's death when Constantius' soldiers declared him emperor. Galerius, unwilling but unable to stop Constantine, allowed him to have the title of *Augustus*, not *Caesar* as declared.[199] Instead, he declared Severus, an older man, to be his co-*Augusti*, and Maximinus Daia as the other *Caesari*.

---

[196] Barnes, T.D. (2010). Maxentius and Diocletian. *Classical Philology, vol. 105, No. 3 (July 2010),* pp. 318-322. The University of Chicago Press, 321: "Maximian was the father of Maxentius, Galerius his father-in-law, and Romulus his son. Maxentius' precise relationship to Constantius was more complicated. As his coinage proclaims, Constantius was related to him both by blood (cognatus) and by marriage (adfinis).15 On the one hand, Maxentius and Constantius were brothers, since Maxentius' father, Maximian, had adopted Constantius as his son when the latter was appointed his Caesar in 293: from 293 onward, therefore, Constantius was the brother of the children of Maximian. On the other hand, Constantius was also Maxentius' uncle by marriage. For his second wife was Theodora, who was either the daughter of Maximian by his first wife, whose name is unknown, as the better evidence seems to indicate (Origo Constantini Imperatoris 1; Philostorgius Historia Ecclesiastica 2.16a, possibly confirmed by Pan. Lat. 10[2].11.4), or his stepdaughter.16 Constantius was therefore an adfinis of Maxentius: specifically, he was Maxentius' brother-in-law because he had married either his sister or his stepsister. (It may be noted in passing that, though Maxentius did not advertise the fact, his relationship to Constantius made him both a *cognatus* and an *adfinis* of Constantius' son Constantine, who had in addition married his sister Fausta.)" Even Maxentius and Diocletian may have been related if Maxentius' wife, Valeria Maximilla, was the daughter of Galerius and his second wife was the daughter of Diocletian.

[197] Harries (2012), 32

[198] I say "retired" here because, both former emperors briefly come out of retirement. Noted explained below.

[199] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXV: Paucis post diebus laureata imago eius adlata est ad malam bestiam. Deliberavit diu an susciperet. In eo paene res fuit, ut illam et ipsum qui attulerat exureret, nisi eum amici ab illo furore flexissent admonentes eum periculi, quod universi milites, quibus invitis ignoti Caesares erant facti, suscepturi Constantinum fuissent atque ad eum concursuri alacritate summa, si venisset armatus. Suscepit itaque imaginem admodum invitus atque ipsi purpuram misit, ut ultro ascivisse illum in societatem videretur. Iam turbatae rationes eius fuerant nec poterat alterum extra numerum nuncupare, ut voluerat. Sed illud excogitavit, ut Severum, qui erat aetate maturior, Augustum nuncuparet, Constantinum vero non imperatorem, sicut erat factus, sed Caesarem cum Maximino appellari iuberet, ut eum de secundo loco reiceret in quartum.

In 306, Maxentius, son of Maximian, was declared emperor in Rome when the people grew upset by the tax increases and dissolution of the praetorian guard by Galerius.[200] Galerius sent Severus, with Maximian's army, to defeat Maxentius. The soldiers, however, deserted him. Lactantius claimed:

> "Meanwhile Severus marched into Italy and came right up to the walls of Rome with his army. But his troops at once uprooted their standards and left him, handing themselves over to the man they had come to fight."[201]

Galerius, enraged by this defeat, ordered Maximinus Daia to march on Rome. Maximinus' campaign, however, was unsuccessful, and fearing the same fate as Severus, he fled the scene and allowed his soldiers to disperse. This left Maxentius in control of Rome from 308-312. Upon the death of Severus, Galerius named Licinius the new *Augustus*, and Maximian briefly came out of retirement.[202] According to Lactantius, Maximian had ambitions to take out Constantine, his son-in-law, but was caught "red-handed" which resulted in the forced suicide of Maximian.[203]

Maximinus Daia (son in law of Galerius), began to model himself as an *Augustus*, despite not officially receiving the title, and tried to convince Galerius to step down. Instead, Galerius maintained his position and changed the title of *Caesar* to *filius augustorum* (son of the *Augusti*).

---

[200] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXVI: Cuius motus haec fuit causa. Cum statuisset censibus institutis orbem terrae devorare, ad hanc usque prosiluit insaniam, ut ab hac captivitate ne populum quidem Romanum fieri vellet immunem. Ordinabantur iam censitores qui Romam missi describerent plebem. Eodem fere tempore castra quoque praetoria sustulerat. Itaque milites pauci, qui Romae in castris relicti erant, opportunitatem nancti occisis quibusdam iudicibus non invito populo, qui erat concitatus, Maxentium purpuram induerant.

[201] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXVI: "Severus interim vadit et ad muros urbis armatus accedit. Statim milites sublatis signis abeunt et se <ei> contra quem venerant, tradunt."

[202] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXIX: "When he [Galerius] arrived there, he found Diocles present; his son-in-law had recently sent for him so that he could do in his presence what he had not done before, namely appoint Licinius to the position held by Severus and grant him imperial authority. So this was done with both of them present [Maximian and Diocletian] and there were thus six emperors at once time."

[203] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXX

Soon after Maximinus claimed his soldiers declared him *Augustus.* Galerius fell ill with a terrible ulcer that consumed him.[204] Right before his death, he issued an edict of tolerance for Christians in 311. With Galerius dead, Maximinus took up the title of *Augustus* and forced Licinius to co-rule the east. He reinstated laws to persecute Christians, and apparently, allowed the east to fall into ruin. Meanwhile, Licinius was betrothed to Constantine's sister, which caused Maximinus Daia to become paranoid and seek an alliance with Maxentius in Rome.[205]

In this way, the imperial alliances were cleaved. With two emperors each being joined with another on the opposing side of the empire, Constantine waged war on Maxentius in Rome in 312 and Licinius marched on Maximinus Daia in 313. Constantine used that opportunity to march on Rome to "liberate" the people of the city and defeat Maxentius himself with the army. In 312 CE, Constantine marched on Rome, at the famous battle at the Milvian Bridge. This battle would ignite Constantine's ambition for sole reign and inspire his benevolence towards Christians in the empire.[206] In 313, Licinius defeated Maximinus Daia in the east after marrying Constantine's sister. He defeated him at the Battle of Tzirallum, despite being heavily out-numbered:

> "The armies drew nearer, the trumpets sounded, the standards advanced. The Licinians launched an attack and penetrated the lines of their opponent, who in their terror could neither draw their swords nor hurl their missiles. Maximin [Maximinus] went along the lines working on the soldiers of Licinius with entreaties at one point, with gifts at another. Nowhere was he listened to; in fact he was attacked and withdrew among his own men. His army was cut to pieces

---

[204] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XXXII-XXXIV. The passage is mentioned in fuller detail in Chapter Three: Roman Law and Administration

[205] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XLIII.

[206] See Chapter Three for the full vision and discussion of Constantine's vision.

> without resistance, his large and powerful legionary force mown down by a handful of men."[207]

This left only two emperors, one ruling over each half. Constantine later attacked Licinius under the accusation that Licinius was persecuting Christians. Harries suggests that, if true, Licinius assumed that Christians were a risk to his rule, since they may favor Constantine.[208] Constantine used a land army and fleets to defeat Licinius in Hadrianople in what year?, which led Licinius to flee to Byzantium (which Constantine was to rename Constantinople), where he would lose command of the sea to Constantine's son Crispus.[209] Licinius and Constantine ruled jointly for about eleven years until 324 CE when Constantine defeated Licinius at Chrysopolis, calling him out as a tyrant and usurper.[210] After defeat, Licinius was exiled to Thessalonica, where he and his child son were killed a year later.[211]

It was clear that after Diocletian and Maximian stood down, the power structure of the tetrarchy began to unravel. Two sons of former *Augusti* sought power once their fathers stepped down, despite being passed over for the titles by the *Augusti*. Ultimately, Diocletian and Galerius recognized Constantine as *Caesares*, not *Augusti*, but refused to accept Maxentius in Rome. Likewise, Maximinus felt scorned by not receiving the title of *Augustus*. Constantine was highly praised by Christian writers such as Eusebius and Lactantius, despite being the antagonist of the tetrarchy and partially responsible for its collapse.[212] Because Constantine was able to leverage tolerance for Christians and Christianity in the empire, his inability or lack of desire to maintain the power balance of the tetrarchy was not criticized by authors of the time. Instead, the other members of the tetrarchy, from the inception to Licinius, were seen as enemies of the state who acted against the better interests of the empire. Constantine would likely have been unable to successfully take the title of ruler without his military abilities and loyal army. Likewise, I claim without the structural groundwork laid by emperors in the third century through Diocletian, Constantine would not have inherited an empire capable of ~~saving~~ being saved (?).

---

[207] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* XLVII: "Ergo propius acceditur, tubae canunt, signa procedunt. Liciniani impetu facto adversarios invadunt. Illi vero perterriti nec gladios expedire nec tela iacere quiverunt. Maximinus aciem circumire ac milites Licinianos nunc precibus sollicitare, nunc donis. Nullo loco auditur. Fit impetus in eum et ad suos refugit. Caedebatur acies eius impune et tantus numerus legionum, tanta vis militum a paucis metebatur. Nemo nominis, nemo virtutis, nemo veterum praemiorum memor; quasi ad devotam mortem, non ad proelium venissent, sic eos deus summus iugulandos subiecit inimicis. Iam strata erat ingens multitudo. Videt Maximinus aliter rem geri quam putabat. Proiecit purpuram et sumpta veste servili fugit ac fretum traiecit. At in exercitu pars dimidia prostrata est, pars autem vel dedita vel in fugam [est] <con>versa est; ademerat enim pudorem deserendi desertor imperator. At ille Kalendis Mais, id est una nocte atque una die, Nico mediam alia nocte pervenit, cum locus proelii abesset milia centum sexaginta, raptisque filiis et uxore et paucis ex palatio comitibus petivit Orientem. Sed in Cappadocia collectis ex fuga et ab Oriente militibus substitit. Ita vestem resumpsit."

[208] Harries (2012), 113

[209] Ibid.

[210] Euseb. *Vit. Const*. II-III. Edition and translation used: Eusebius, (1999). *Life of Constantine*. Translated by Avril Cameron. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press. See Eusebius, Book II, "Persecution and Tyranny Ended," 102; Book III "Constantine Superior to the Tyrants through Piety," 120; Harries, J. (2012). The victory of Constantine, ad 311–37. In *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The New Empire* (pp. 106–133). Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b463.12

[211] Ibid.

Restructuring of the army under the Tetrarchy

After almost a century of civil war, the Roman state needed stability if it was to survive. More importantly, it needed unity amongst the armies. In the 290s, Diocletian and Maximian made an effort to seem unified on a military front. An emperor and strong leader were needed in two places at once, so Diocletian appointed Maximian as co-emperor so that he and Diocletian could work together. Maximian was sent west to put down a rebellion in Gaul while Diocletian faced Carinus in Moesia.[213]

---

[212] I refrain from blaming Constantine for the entirety of the tetrarchy's demise, as Maxentius also attempted to disrupt the process. There would be no way to know, however, if this system would have succeeded past the original four, as it almost immediately broke down with the death of Constantius.

[213] Aur. Vict. *Caes. 7-8*

Even though Lactantius is hypercritical of Diocletian in his *De Mortibus Perseuctorum* regarding his policies on the empire and restructuring of the provinces, it is essential to note the structural changes Diocletian made during his reign. Lactantius claimed that Diocletian not only divided the empire into four regions, each governed by one of the tetrarchs, but mentions that each tetrarch had an army so large that past emperors who ruled on their own had less of an army.[214] In addition to increasing the number of imperial offices, Lactantius claimed that Diocletian increased the size of the army.[215] Jones attested that of the thirty-four legions under Septimius Severus that almost all, save one or two, survived, and Diocletian added thirty-five, which meant the size of the army almost doubled.[216] However, Karl Strobel argues that the size increase was not as dramatic as previously. Strobel states that the army's size had not changed dramatically under Diocletian. He estimates that the number of men was 400,000 under Septimius Severus, 435,000 under Diocletian, and 450,000 under Constantine.[217]

What Diocletian did, however, was restructure the frontier zones and guarantee that every frontier zone had its own garrison and field army.[218] Which meant that cities located on the frontiers had their own fixed (smaller) army, who could defend the city until the field army arrived. While the numbers were not necessarily increased, the army's presence was increased in these frontier zones. These field armies were under direct imperial command and were situated near the new imperial residences: Trier, Mediolanum, Aquileia, Sirmium, Serdica, Thessalonike, Nikomedia, and Antioch.

---

[214] "They stretched out the divided region into four parts, the armies multiplied so that each of them had more than any prior emperor had before, more than anyone managed in the empire." "In quattutor partes orbe diviso et multiplicatis exercitibus cum singuli eorum longe maiorem numerum habere contenderunt quam priores principes habuerunt cum soli rem publicam gererent" Lactant. *De mort. pers.* VII.2.2**.**

[215] Lactant. *De mort. pers.* VII: Tres enim participes regni sui fecit in quattuor partes orbe diviso et multiplicatis exercitibus, cum singuli eorum longe maiorem numerum militum habere contenderent, quam priores principes habuerant, cum soli rem publicam gererent. Jones (1964), claims"that the army was more than quadrupled is, of course, a fantastic exaggeration, but the fact adduced show that Lactantius had some solid ground for this complaint," 59

[216] Jones (1964), 60

[217] Strobel (2007), 268

[218] Strobel (2007), 269

Diocletian divided the field armies into two segments: the mobile field army and possé for the emperor (*comitatus*) and the frontier soldiers (later known as the *limitanei*).[219] When Diocletian and Maximian came to power, their assumed titles were Jovius and Herculius, respectively.[220] Under their command were the legions so-called *Joviani* and *Herculiani*, which were *comitatus* and acted as mobile field armies rather than traditional *auxilia*. These legions were comprised of veterans, and were the most senior units under Diocletian.[221] For example, Aurelius Victor describes how Diocletian quickly moved his army from Mesopotamia to fight King Narses: "At first he was seriously troubled by them (the Persians) but he quickly gathered an army of veterans and recruits and marched against the enemy through Armenia which is almost the only or at least the easier route to defeat them."[222]

The *comitatus* was a mobile body that accompanied the emperor and was "comprised not only the emperor's personal household, his bedchamber (*cubiculum*) as it was called, which was served by a eunuch *cubicularius* and a numerous subordinate staff, and his bodyguard of praetorians and other troops… but also the imperial council or *consistorium*, the praetorian prefect with his staff, and two finance ministries, and the secretariats."[223] The *comitatus*, and later the *scholae palatinae*, would replace the praetorian guard.

---

[219] Kaldellis, A. and Marion Kruse. (2023). *The field armies of the East Roman Empire, 361-630*. Cambridge University Press, 1; Lee, A. D. (2007). *War in late antiquity: A social history*. Blackwell Pub., ii; "*ripensis* appears in 325: Cod.Th. 7.20.4; *limitaneus* Cod.Th. 12.1.56 first appears in 363."

[220] Jones, A.H.M. (1964). *Volume 1*, 71. See Lactant. *De mort. pers.*, LII. "Ubi sunt modo magnifica illa et clara per gentes Ioviorum et Herculiorum cognomina. Quae primum a Dioclete ac Maximiano insolenter adsumpta ac postmodum ad successores eorum translata vigerunt?"

[221] Tomlin, Roger. 2008. A.H.M. Jones and the Army of the Fourth Century. *A.H.M. Jones and the Later Roman Empire.* Brill: Leiden; Jones part I, 54

[222] Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39.24

Historically, the *cohortes praetoriae*, or the praetorian guard, was established during the first century BCE under Octavian and Marc Antony.[224] Under Augustus, the praetorian guard had more of a political role than a military one and was "recruited almost exclusively from Italians, their pay and discharge bonuses were vastly superior to that of the legionaries, they received much more generous donatives, and only served for 16 years."[225]

Septimius Severus was criticized by second-century Greek author Cassius Dio when he made changes to the praetorian guard. Rather than selecting his soldiers from Italy, Spain, Macedonia, and Noricum, as previous emperors had, he chose soldiers from any legion.[226] According to Dio, this resulted in the ruin "of the youth of Italy, who turned to brigandage and gladiatorial fighting" since they could no longer fulfill their traditional roles in the army and filled "the city with a throng of motley soldiers most savage in appearance, most terrifying in speech, and most boorish in conversation."[227] The praetorian guard acted as the emperor's own body guard, so their loyalty needed to be unwavering. In the third century, members of the praetorian guard were proving themselves untrustworthy and power hungry. Pertinax (r.193), Elagabalus (r.218-222), Maximinus Thrax (r. 235-238), Gallienus (r. 253-268), Aurelian (r. 270-275) were all murdered by a member or members of the praetorian guard. Given that the praetorian guard had been behind a number of usurpations and civil wars in the 300 years prior to Constantine, it was no shock that he would disband such an organization. Instead, he arranged for the *scholae palatinae* to replace the guard and become an official part of the military structure.[228]

---

[223] Jones, A.H.M. (1964).

[224] See: Cass. Dio LXXV.1 for the Praetorian Guard's role in assassinating Pertinax in 193 CE. See De la Bédoyère, G. (2017). Introduction. *Praetorian: The rise and fall of Rome's imperial bodyguard*. Yale University Press. doi: 10.12987/9780300226270. Bédoyère calls the Praetorian Guard "Rome's spoilt, privileged and elite imperial bodyguard," p.1.

[225] Gilliver (2007), 196; Cass. Dio XLIII.11 and LV.23; Suetonius, *Vita Claudii* 10; Suetonius, *Vita Neronis* 10.

[226] Cass. Dio LXXV.2: μάλιστα δὲ ἐπεκάλουν αὐτῷ τινὲς ὅτι, καθεστηκότος ἔκ τε τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ τῆς Ἰβηρίας τῆς τε[3] Μακεδονίας καὶ τοῦ Νωρικοῦ μόνον τοὺς σωματοφύλακας εἶναι, κἀκ τούτου καὶ τοῖς εἴδεσιν αὐτῶν ἐπιεικεστέρων καὶ τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἁπλουστέρων ὄντων, τοῦτο μὲν κατέλυσεν, ἐκ δὲ δὴ τῶν στρατοπέδων ὁμοίως πάντων τὸ ἀεὶ ἐνδεὲς ὂν ἀντικαθίστασθαι τάξας.

[227] Cass. Dio LXXV. 2.3-6: αὐτὸς μὲν[5] ὡς καὶ ἐπιστησομένοις[6] διὰ τοῦτο τὰ στρατιωτικὰ μᾶλλον αὐτοῖς χρησόμενος,[7] καί τι καὶ ἆθλον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τὰ πολέμια προθήσων ἐποίησεν αὐτό, τῷ δὲ δὴ ἔργῳ σαφέστατα τήν[8] τε ἡλικίαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας παραπώλεσε πρὸς λῃστείας καὶ μονομαχίας 6ἀντὶ τῆς πρὶν στρατείας τραπομένην, καὶ τὸ ἄστυ ὄχλου στρατιωτῶν συμμίκτου καὶ ἰδεῖν ἀγριωτάτων καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φοβερωτάτων ὁμιλῆσαί τε ἀγροικοτάτων ἐπλήρωσε. Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume IX: Books 71-80.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 177. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Bird credits Constantine with the development of a "full-fledged" field army commanded by two new offices, the *magister peditum* and the *magister equitum*.[229] He claims that the units mostly came from Gaul and Germany and led the frontier armies. Jones thought that this meant the praetorian guard had been completely pushed out.[230] There were still praetorian prefects even though there was no longer a praetorian guard, and praetorian prefects were no longer military officials. Instead, the praetorian prefect was the highest civil and legal authority after the emperor.

The *limitanei* had been the armies stationed at the frontier but could be moved quickly if they were needed to address a crisis.[231] They were a well-trained and professional army meant to handle more of the day-to-day tasks than the field armies. They were to keep the cities safe from being pillaged, rather than aid in wars or large threats at the borders.[232] Since Diocletian increased the number of provinces, he also increased the number of legions to adjust so that there would be two legions stationed in each province. Strobel says these new legions “were only the size of the former legionary fighting-vexillations: the old legions were split into several parts.”[233] Those units were then subdivided to accommodate newly built garrisons during the tetrarchy. In short, while the size of the army did not necessarily grow immensely, the presence of Roman soldiers was stronger in the cities, and the army was also able to remain mobile with the newly established field armies.

---

[228] Bird (1994), 193. The *scholae* officially became a part of the military structure under Constantine's reign: *CIL* VI.1721

[229] Bird (1994), 193

[230] Jones (1964), 100. He suggests that there were still prefects in Africa.

[231] Jones (1964), 125, 196

[232] Strobel (2007), 269

Field armies in the Roman Empire, especially those with a long-term perspective, necessitated a cadre of long-serving, professional officers. By 253 AD, it became common for the field army's officers to be permanently serving professionals. A new corps of permanent officers, including those of equestrian rank, centurions, and non-commissioned officers, emerged as part of the regular army structure. The *protectores*, a special *collegium* for higher staff and subaltern officers, developed before the mid-third century CE, and commanders of army corps and vexillations were often appointed from this corps.[234] Diocletian was serving in the *collegium protectorum* in 284 CE when he was declared emperor by an Eastern field army.[235] By the end of the third century, the *protectores* evolved into a staff academy, within which had a hierarchy of status, providing middle- and upper-level career opportunities for centurions, non-commissioned officers, and particularly for the sons of veterans. This career path is illustrated by an officer from Mauretania, who progressed from the decurionate of Ala Parthorum to various high-ranking positions within the Legio III Augusta, Legio IV Flavia, and the general staff of the emperors Valerian and Gallienus.[236]

---

[233] ibid
[234] Strobel (2007), 273
[235] Strobel (2007), 272

Although Diocletian and Constantine were able to solidify changes to the military structure, this was a long-evolving process to fit the emperors' current needs. The members of the tetrarchy learned from their predecessors and enacted policies that were almost one hundred years in the making to respond to the instability of power. They prioritized experience and understood military ranks and loyalty. They could leverage that to their advantage and expand on existing military practices. Second to that, they diversified the Roman elite class structure by opening up positions in the army. No longer were emperors limited to individuals of senatorial status. Even the emperor could be what would have been considered an "outsider" in the first century. In fact, a majority of emperors in the late third century came from Illyricum, further aligning their identity with the Roman military rather than the Roman senatorial class.

By the fourth century, these armies were an official part of the military structure as attested in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, "an extraordinary bureaucratic survival," which included two lists of military and civil offices dating around 395 CE.[237] Roger Tomlin notes that in the *Notitia*, "military officials are generals of the various 'mobile' and frontier armies, and 'at their disposal' are all the empire's military units, which are listed by name in the 'mobile' armies, and by name and station in the frontier armies."[238] Their effectiveness, firmly established in the third century, made the mobile armies a new essential part of the Roman military structure.

---

[236] Strobel (2007), 273. Inscription *AE* 1954, 00135.]II protec[tori] / [3] item primip[i]/la[ri] protectori item / centurio(ni) IIII Fl(aviae) et pro/tectori item ce[nturi]/o(ni) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) item [dec(urioni)] / alae Parthoru[m 3]/I. Found in Mauretania Caesariensis

[237] Tomlin (2008), *145;* 395 CE marked the end of Theodosius' reign and the end of an empire unified under one emperor. Upon his death the empire was divided into eastern and western halves, given to each of his sons Arcadius and Honorius. The date of the *Notitia Dignitarum* is circa 425 under Theodosius II.

Image of a Soldier

Since the emperor, the head and embodiment of the Roman state, was a soldier, his image needed to reflect that. Throughout the third and fourth centuries, the image of a soldier and military strength meant also the strength of the empire. Haynes argues that soldiers' hairstyles often reflected those of the current emperor, perhaps to be seen as an extension of his role as military commander.[239] As a result, the military hairstyle often adapted by soldiers "reflects the impressive degree to which soldiers were incorporated into the network of ideas that helped define the face of the Empire." Beginning with Trajan, the imperial image was that of a soldier, with a few exceptions.[240]

Diana Kleiner suggests that this made sense because third century emperors "were first and foremost military men" and preferred to be identified as such.[241] She claims that many took the image of emperor Caracalla (r. 198-217), who, being unpopular with the Roman senate, "had a strong following among the troops."[242] Kleiner notes specifically, the example of Trajan Decius

---

[238] Tomlin (2008), 145

[239] Haynes (2013), chp 11.

[240] Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius adopted a philhellenic look, with grown out hair and a long beard. Commodus, likewise, followed this tradition and went as far as to be shown as the god Hercules. See: Smith, R. R. R. (1998). Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *88*, 56–93. https://doi.org/10.2307/300805. Smith quotes Paul Zanker and says: "If the emperor grew a beard, the citizens of the whole empire grew one too," 59; 9 P. Zanker, 'Btirgerliche Selbstdarstellung am Grab im romischen Kaiserreich', in *H. -J. Schalles, H. von Hesberg and P. Zanker, Die rdmische Stadt in 2.Jahrhundert n.Chr.*: Der Funktionswandel des offentlichenRaumes (I992), 339-58, at 348: 'Wenn der Kaiser sich den Bart wachsen liess, liessen sich die Burger im ganzen Reich den Bart wachsen.'

[241] Kleiner, D. E. E. (1992). *Roman sculpture*. Yale University Press, 392

[242] Ibid, 393

(r.249-251), who unlike other third century emperors, had administrative experience and was a governor of Lower Moesia, Lower Germany, and Hispania Citerior.[243] One of his portraits, known as the Capitoline Portrait of Decius, shows the emperor with the cropped military hairstyle, and short beard, reminiscent of both Caracalla and Trajan. What the artist does, however, is render the emperor as concerned, to reflect the state of the empire during his reign.[244] Another full body portrait of Decius portrayed him as the god of war, Mars, where "he is nude save for a mantle draped across the top of his chest; he also wears a helmet. Decius carries a sword in his right hand and rests his weight on his left leg; his right leg is bent and turned to the side."[245]

Unlike portraits of emperors in the third century, tetrarchic portraiture is defined by its uniformity. Kleiner notes "the most outstanding feature of imperial portraiture under the tetrarchs was the deliberate suppression of distinctiveness in favor of a communal image" which has made it hard for modern scholars to discern who is who in portraiture of the emperors of the tetrarchy.[246] Further straying from traditional portraiture, the tetrarchic art tended to be styled in an eastern provincial style. They are portrayed almost in an abstract way, but maintained short military cropped hair, and a short beard. Kleiner uses a coin of Diocletian, struck in 294 in Nicomedia, as an example. Diocletian has "a severe, block-like head and neck and large, heavy outlined and staring eye. The military cap of hair and short beard are geometrically ordered and conform closely to the shape of the skull and jaw."[247]

---

[243] Ando (2012), 120

[244] Kleiner (1992), 369

[245] Ibid.

[246] Kleiner (1992), 400; See coin with Diocletian and Maximian, 287

[247] Ibid, 405: for image of coin: https://aaeportal.com/?id=42888&cid=42888

Coinage production was vital because it was used to pay the armies. Cistophori, tetradrachms, and drachmai produced in the provinces were made to pay the Roman military at the frontiers, and precious metal coinages were used to pay soldiers "who were garrisoned in areas located far from the *limes*, areas such as Asia Minor and Greece, where there was danger of bandits."[248] Although it seems out of place to connect coinage and the armies, their growth and dynamics seemingly depended on one another in the third century. According to Haynes:

> "In the Roman world, the relationship of coin to both the urban fabric of the Empire and the very existence of the army is of intense importance. Coins illuminate the making of empire in a very particular way. Just as systems of coinage, with all their connotations of identity and authority, illustrate the interplay of power that creates provincial society, so the routine use of coin reflects the incorporation of individuals into networks of imperial power. Payment of soldiers in coin was a key factor in the dissemination of coin."[249]

There was an overlap as well between the coin and the desired imperial image. Historically, the emperor had some control over each institution, which was certainly true under Diocletian. He took the opportunity of having control over all the mints to make sure his ideal imperial image was shown. On coins the emperors represent a uniform look, often displayed as "hardy rulers with short hair, bearded, with strong, square jaws, and eyes which stare straight ahead. The neck is unnaturally thick, the lips tight, and the eyebrows sternly furrowed."[250] While Rees claims this is not exactly a "military" look, it was meant to "establish a sense of efficiency, severity, and duty—all necessary attributes of military rule."[251] Even after Constantine became sole ruler of the empire, and enjoyed a the longest reign since Augustus, he continued to don a military look. Following the eastern tradition, his portraiture showcases cropped hair, large eyes, and was inspired by Augustan-like portraiture, to connect his reign back to the founder of the empire.[252]

---

[248] Katsari, C. (2003). Organisation of Roman mints during the third century CE: The eastern provinces. *Classics Ireland*, 10, 27–53, 30; See Mitchel, (1983), *Armies and frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia: Proceedings of a colloquium held at University College, Swansea in April 1981*, 132; In the following chapter, there is more discussion on the mints and how in the third century through to the reign of Diocletian, civic authority changed. Cities had less agency in determining what went on coins, and instead that was left to the official mints. Until Gallienus, Rome was the only city that would mint precious metals. In the third century, however, more mints emerged to support the armies that were traveling with a would-be emperor.

[249] Haynes (2013), 161; Pollard (2000), *Soldiers, cities, and civilians in Roman Syria*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 179-211; Duncan-Jones, R. (1990). *Structure and scale in the Roman economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 38, 44.

[250] Rees (1993), 189

In the final chapter, I describe the "Hellenic" look, which the philosophers and sophists inspired. A Hellenic look was defined by facial hair. Famously, the emperor Hadrian shifted from a cropped military style adopted by his predecessor Trajan to a longer, trimmed beard. This style reflected that of Hellenic philosophers and was a nod to Hadrian's philhellenic attitude. Similarly, almost two hundred years later, the emperor Julian (r. 361-363) donned a philosopher's beard to show his admiration for Hellenic culture. He was so empowered by his look that he even angrily wrote a work called the *Misopogon*, "Beardhater," addressed to the people of Antioch between 361-362 CE. In it, he called the Antiochians out for making fun of his facial hair.[253] He criticized the Antiochians for not embracing their Hellenistic past enough and called them out for being weak and feminine by saying they were clean-shaven.[254] In one way or another, hair was an expression of one's identity. It is clear from the artistic renderings of the empire served as reflections for his vision of empire.

---

[251] Ibid. See coins for reference: Argenteus with portrait of Constantine

[252] Kleiner, (1992), 431-463. See: Portrait of Constantine the Great

[253] "τὸ γὰρ εἰς ἑαυτὸν γράφειν εἴτε ἐπαίνους εἴτε ψόγους εἴργει νόμος οὐδείς. ἐπαινεῖν μὲν δὴ καὶ σφόδρα ἐθέλων ἐμαυτὸν οὐκ ἔχω, ψέγειν δὲ μυρία, καὶ πρῶτον ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου. τούτῳ γὰρ οἶμαι φύσει γεγονότι μὴ λίαν καλῷ μηδ᾽ εὐπρεπεῖ μηδ᾽ ὡραίῳ ὑπὸ δυστροπίας καὶ δυσκολίας αὐτὸς προστέθεικα τὸν βαθὺν τουτονὶC πώγωνα, δίκας αὐτὸ πραττόμενος, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐδενὸς μὲν ἄλλου, τοῦ δὲ μὴ φύσει γενέσθαι καλόν" Julian. *Misopogon.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913

[254] "For I myself furnish you with an excuse for it by wearing my chin as goats do, when I might, I suppose, make it smooth and bare as handsome youths wear theirs, and all women, who are endowed by nature with loveliness. But you, since even in your old age you emulate your own sons and daughters by your soft and delicate way of living, or perhaps by your effeminate dispositions, carefully make your chins smooth, and your manhood you barely reveal and slightly indicate by your foreheads, not by your jaws as I do"; "δίδωμι γὰρ αὐτὸς τὴν αἰτίαν ὥσπερ οἱ τράγοι τὸ γένειον ἔχων, ἐξὸν οἶμαι λεῖον αὐτὸ ποιεῖν καὶ ψιλόν, ὁποῖον οἱ καλοὶ τῶν παίδων ἔχουσιν ἅπασαί τε αἱ γυναῖκες, αἷς φύσει πρόσεστι τὸ ἐράσμιον. ὑμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ ζηλοῦντες τοὺς ὑμῶν αὐτῶν υἱέας καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑπὸ ἁβρότητος βίου καὶ ἴσως ἁπαλότητος τρόπου λεῖον ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζεσθε, τὸν ἄνδρα ὑποφαίνοντες καὶ παραδεικνύντες διὰ τοῦ μετώπουB καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν γνάθων." Julian. *Misopogon.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913

Julian, like Hadrian, proved to be a competent soldier himself. He was put on the throne by his cousin, Constantius II, as Caesar in 355 CE.[255] Throughout his reign, both as Caesar and emperor, he fought against barbarian tribes. According to historian Ammianus Marcellinus when the Alemmani were attacking the city of Autun, "without putting aside his cares, and disregarding the servile flattery with which his courtiers tried to turn him to pleasure and luxury, after making adequate preparation he reached Autun on the 24th of June, like some experienced general, distinguished for power and policy, intending to fall upon the savages (*barbarus*), who were straggling in various directions, whenever chance should give opportunity."[256] He continued to fight Germanic tribes, and in 361, marched on his cousin and emperor Constantius II in Illyricum, who died, leaving Julian as the new emperor. His reign, however, was short lived. In 363 CE, Julian died fighting the Persians.[257] So, even though he modeled himself as a philosopher, Julian, like his predecessors played the part of soldier emperor.

Being a soldier

---

[255] Amm. Marc. XV.8; Translations from: Ammianus Marcellinus. *History, Volume I: Books 14-19.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 300. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950. All translations of Ammianus come from J. C. Rolfe.

[256] "Nihil itaque remittentibus curis, ancillari adulatione posthabita, qua eum proximi ad amoenitatem flectebant et luxum, satis omnibus conparatis octavum kalendas Iulias Augustudunum pervenit velut dux diuturnus viribus eminens et consiliis per diversa palantes **barbaros** ubi dedisset fors copiam adgressurus." Amm. Marc., XVI.2.

[257] "But since Julianus's strength was not equal to his will, and he was weakened by great loss of blood, he lay still, having lost all hope for his life because, on inquiry, he learned that the place where he had fallen was called Phrygia. For he had heard that it was fate's decree that he should die there. But when the emperor had been taken to his tent, the soldiers, burning with wrath and grief, with incredible vigour rushed to avenge him, clashing their spears against their shields, resolved even to die if it should be the will of fate. And although the high clouds of dust blinded the eyes, and the burning heat weakened the activity of their limbs, yet as though discharged by the loss of their leader, without sparing themselves, they rushed upon the swords of the enemy." Amm. Marc., XXV.3. More on the reign of Julian and his rule in Chapter Four: Education. Despite having a short reign, Julian managed to play a heavy role in the Roman government. He decided to change laws in favor of the pagan population, which by that point was becoming a minority within the Greek-speaking empire.,

In more ways than one, being a soldier was a difficult life. Soldiers were recruited around ages 20-25.[258] They were trained to walk about thirty miles per day (?) and carry about thirty pounds of armor or supplies.[259] Becoming a soldier in the early years of the empire was a way for many to become Roman themselves. As previously mentioned in 212 CE, most people within the empire were granted Roman citizenship. After that, soldiers who already had citizenship could gain higher status, and being employed in the army had a number of benefits.[260] First, soldiers were paid by the state.[261] Second, they were allowed certain exemptions and privileges, like not paying the emperors poll tax and receiving land upon their retirement. Much of our knowledge of soldiers in the third and early fourth centuries come from inscriptions, usually fragmentary. Often, these inscriptions can detail mobility, and life after service. Take the epitaph of Aurelius Gaius, a veteran from Phygria. The inscription shows that he traveled to twenty-four provinces, four towns, and five lands, and wrote out all of the campaigns he was a part of. This inscription, written in Greek, was found in Phygria on a stela that Gaius erected for himself and his wife and daughter.[262]

---

[258] Jones (1964), 616

[259] Elliot (2014), 114-115

[260] For more information on soldiers and rank see: Davenport, C. (2012). Soldiers and Equestrian Rank in the Third Century AD. *Papers of the British School at Rome*, *80*, 89–123. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41725318 .See AE 1978, 00415: [3 M]agnio Donato / [procurat]ori Aug(usti) n(ostri) / [agenti vice] praesidis / [in provincia B]aetica viro / [egregio 3]us Militaris / [cent(urio) leg(ionis) 3 cen]t(urio) frumentar(iorum) / [princeps pereg]rinor(um) primip(ilus!) / [bis(?) trib(unus) in cohorte(?) 3]I praetoria / [3]IATRO I[. Which seems to suggest that Magnio, in Baetica, which detailed his service and command. The inscription dates to 270-300, and suggests he was a chief of a peregrini legion, served in the praetorian guard, and potentially part of the *frumentarii*, who were a secret police, which were disbanded under Diocletian.; and *CIL* 11, 01836: L(ucio) Petronio L(uci) f(ilio) / Sab(atina) Tauro Volu/siano v(iro) co(n)s(ulari) / ordinario praef(ecto) praet(orio) / em(inentissimo) v(iro) praef(ecto) vig<i=V>l(um) / p(erfectissimo) v(iro) trib(uno) / coh(ortis) primae praet(oriae) protect(ori) / Augg(ustorum) nn(ostrorum) item trib(uno) coh(ortis) IIII praet(oriae) / trib(uno) coh(ortis) XI urb(anae) trib(uno) coh(ortis) III vig(ilum) leg(ionis) X / et XIIII Gem(inae) provinciae Pannoniae superiori(s) / it<e=I>m leg(ionum) Daciae praeposito equitum sin/gulari{or}(um) Augg(ustorum) nn(ostrorum) p(rimo) p(ilo) leg(ionis) XXX Ul/piae centurioni deputato eq(uo) pub(lico) / ex V decur(iis) Laur(enti) Lavin(ati) / ordo Arretinorum patrono / optimo. Which details the career of Lucio Petronio, who held a number of high offices, dating around 261-267 CE.

[261] Jones (1964), 623: “A recently discovered papyrus has revealed that in Diocletian's reign-- to be precise-- in the years 299 and 3oo soldiers received an annual *stipendium,* paid as under the Principate in three installments. It seems to have amounted to 6oo denarii a year for legionaries and troopers of the *alae,* to about two-thirds of this sum for infantrymen in the cohorts. The auxiliary troops at any rate received in additional ration allowance *(pretium annonae)* of 200 denarii a year.”

Historically, the Roman army had an impact on the provincial areas of the empire. Within his *Histories*, Tacitus offered a glimpse of what Romans thought of the soldiers in their city when he recounted Vespasian (r. 69-79) delivering a speech in Antioch. He told the Antiochians (in Greek) that he would remove the current legions stationed in Syria to Germany and vice versa. Tacitus recorded that the Antiochians were upset “for the provincials were accustomed to live with the soldiers, and enjoyed association with them; in fact, many civilians were bound to the soldiers by ties of friendship and of marriage, and the soldiers from their long service had come to love their old familiar camps as their very hearths and homes.”[263] His view and narrative are defined by making provincial soldiers more Roman in the first century CE by explaining how soldiers could live to reflect a Roman way of life. Therefore, the Roman army was an exposition of Roman culture, and so when it became mobile, it brought that culture to the borders.

Ian Haynes examines the role of the provincial army from Augustus to the Severans and shows how the Roman auxilia shaped provincial life in the empire. When speaking about the identity of the Roman auxiliary, he states the inner conflict is “the trade-off between a vision of civilization and the daily realities of life in the emperor’s service. For Rome, a broad balance needed to be maintained. Soldiers needed to be kept under close control, at once indulged and restrained in a manner alien to the daily lot of civilian population."[264] In the second through fourth centuries frontier cities changed drastically to welcome in Roman soldiers. Garrisons were stationed in fortifications in cities, which also held grain supplies (mostly for the armies), but also led to the development of *vici,* smaller villages outside big cities, being populated by Roman soldiers.[265] Haynes reflects that the daily routine of a soldier was not only an exemplum of his military occupation nor "existence as an instrument of Roman power" but also an example of how the "empire's network of power could intrude into daily life."[266] Haynes looks closely at the city of Dura in Syria, which has been thoroughly excavated, to discuss the Roman army and urban life.[267] Haynes' approach relies on archaeological remains, and he seeks to understand how soldiers would have physically integrated themselves into urban life.[268]

---

[262] Kovács, Péter. (2010). A Phygrian in the Pannonian Army- Some Notes on the Stela *SEG* 31, 1116. *Anodos, Studies of the Ancient World. Trnavská univerzita*, 242.

[263] Tac. *Hist.* 2.80: Tum Antiochensium theatrum ingressus, ubi illis[3] consultare mos est, concurrentis et in adulationem effusos adloquitur, satis decorus etiam Graeca facundia, omniumque quae diceret atque ageret arte quadam ostentator. Nihil aeque provinciam exercitumque accendit quam quod adseverabat Mucianus statuisse Vitellium ut Germanicas legiones in Syriam ad militiam opulentam quietamque transferret contra Syriacis legionibus Germanica hiberna caelo ac laboribus dura mutarentur; quippe et provinciales sueto militum contubernio gaudebant, plerique necessitudinibus et propinquitatibus mixti, et militibus vetustate stipendiorum nota et familiaria castra in modum penatium diligebantur.

The Roman army was the most diverse body within the Roman state. Even with the legions and auxilia becoming more Roman (in reference to citizen status), the army continued to have other positions for peoples without Roman citizenship. The statuses, though, were tied to the military. The *foederati*, or non-Romans allowed to settle within the empire who "provided valuable military service to the empire," had been a class of people in the empire during the principate. [269] It also meant that, in this case, non-Roman "barbarians" were closer to the emperor than ever before, and could even gain military titles or offices unavailable to them before.[270] Likewise, *laeti*, non-Roman Germanic farmers stationed at the borders of the empire who were under the control of the Roman military after being defeated, and *gentiles*, non-Roman barbarians allowed to live in the empire, were recruited into the army.[271] During the wars in the third century, emperors had to rely heavily on barbarian recruits, which even further changed the dynamic within the Roman armies. Although these new recruits played a lesser role in the third century up through Constantine, it did impact the Roman Empire in the fourth century, especially where it concerned leadership.[272]

---

[264] Haynes (2013), 153

[265] Elliot, Paul. (2014). *Legions in Crisis*. Fonthill, 110.

[266] Ibid.

[267] He attributes the wealth of understanding from "the rich combination of sources" including archaeology and papyri. He states, too, that the region had long been under Roman dominion, and even prior to that was a well-established city. Although it is vital to understand that legions were being stationed in cities, such as Apamae in Syria, and changing the infrastructures of cities noted above. I will expand more on this in the following chapter on Roman cities.

[268] See more in the following chapter on how the presence of the armies impacted the archaeological and economic design of cities.

[269] Stickler, Timo. (2007). The Foederati. *The Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell, 496-497. Stickler is referencing the Marcomannic Wars, where the Naristi people were defeated by Marcus Aurelius. As a result of being defeated and captured they were allowed to live within the empire if they served in the imperial army.

Being in the army, soldiers were able to move around the empire, and since many of them spoke Latin and would be stationed in Greek-speaking areas, there was a cultural exchange. Sarah Phang remarks that “the modern impression that Latin was the official and exclusive language of the army is unrealistic, as J. N. Adams’ work on bilingualism in the Roman Empire shows."[273] Thrace provides an interesting consideration of bilingualism. M.A. Speidel notes that a large number of army recruits came from Thrace, and that Thracian soldiers returned to Thrace after service. Despite having a large veteran population that undoubtedly spent their service utilizing Latin, Speidel claims that only five percent of “soldiers’ dedicatory inscriptions were written in Latin,” whereas the majority were written in Greek.[274] All military documentation, however, was recorded in Latin, and, very rarely, one could find letters written in Greek.[275] In fact, the Latin-loan words in Greek were often in reference to military words, and not daily use words. Speidel assumes that:

---

[270] See Stickler (2007), 498-499

[271] Stickler (2007), 400-500

[272] I am referencing the barbarian leaders that begin to influence Roman politics in the fourth century. See especially Stilicho, a half-Vandal regent of Honorius, and the role of Gothic Kings in the “fall” of the Roman west. For more on barbarian influence and integration see: Wienand, Johannes, editor. (2014). *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford University Press

[273] Phang, Sarah. (2007). Military Documents, Languages, and Literary. *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell; Adams, J. N. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge University Press.

[274] Speidel, M. A. (2023). *Learning Latin in the Roman Army. Social Factors in the Latinization of the Roman West*, 136. Speidel also says that when Latin was being used, it was not a perfected form of the language and proved that Latin was not as well understood as a language as Greek.

[275] Phang (2007); Speidel (2023); Note that eastern evidence from both authors comes from Judea, Egypt, and Syria.

> “It was essential, therefore, that each unit, including, of course, the auxilia, had a minimum of soldiers with the necessary linguistic competences and levels of literary… However, we can safely assume that the number of literate soldiers serving in any particular unit was generally higher than the absolute minimum needed by the administrative and tactical requirements, even though it is, of course, impossible to determine precise percentages. It is again unknown where and when these literate soldiers acquired their relevant competences, but the military authorities are known to have transferred officers, underofficers, and soldiers with required skills and training from other units when such personnel were missing.”[276]

Both Speidel and Phang agree that Latin was the main (but not the only!) language of the army and that it was not necessary for most of the soldiers to have a highly sophisticated mastery of the language. Higher officers and commanders, however, were expected to have a better understanding of the language.

Conclusion

The Roman armies were always an essential part of the empire. Soldiers were responsible for protecting the emperor, defending the empire, and, sometimes, choosing the emperor themselves. Augustus was aware of that when he made adjustments to the Roman army so that the troops would be encouraged to stay loyal to the emperor, rather than to anyone who offered them a better deal. In times of crises, soldiers were often incited to take out an emperor and instill a new one. They were the body to convince. In the third century, the Roman armies became the only functioning Roman institution that could control the rulership of the empire. I argue that developments in the Roman army from the first century through to the tetrarchy meant that the dynamic between soldier, emperor, and citizen permanently changed. Many army recruits came from Illyricum, Pannonia, Germany and Gaul, but would be stationed anywhere within the empire that the emperor found strategic. This gave the legions more power and influence than ever. In the third century, when there was a disruption of imperial power (or death of an emperor on the battlefield), it would be the soldiers who picked the next emperor. The army had become so well-integrated, that this meant the pool for the next emperor was more diverse than ever before. Unlike other centuries in which men in power came from elite Roman families from Italy, men rising through the ranks in the third century rarely, if ever, were born in Rome. These men gained popularity by showing their capabilities through military expertise. This meant that often the emperors themselves were skilled military men and were accompanied by a skilled army.

---

[276] Speidel (2023), 145

The competition for the throne resulted in major civil wars that took over the empire between 235-284. When Diocletian was declared emperor by his soldiers in 284 CE, he, like Augustus, sought to create a new imperial structure to prevent a collapse in power by considering the relationship between soldier and emperor, while also strategically protecting the physical borders of the empire. He took already evolving military organizations and made them permanent structures.

Promoting this unity was vital, as reflected in coins and statues. The emperors wanted to reassure the citizens that despite having four rulers, they were actively working together, and therefore, no one needed to fear another civil war. Likewise, this projection of unity among the rulers simultaneously served as a beacon to the soldiers. It said that although each tetrarch had an army and borders to protect, they were all part of one Roman army.

Constantine was careful in his ambitions for power as a sole ruler. Rather than make an all-out campaign to usurp the other tetrarchs, Constantine depicted his competitors, Maxentius, Maximian, and Licinius, as usurpers and tyrants. He was the liberator and ended conflict rather than generating it out of greed for sole rulership. Much like Diocletian, Constantine experienced and knew the power the military had. He managed to escape a legacy of civil war and instead maintained order within his armies and even managed to stabilize the Roman government.

Although the armies did not directly or exclusively influence identity in the Greek-speaking East, they were a pillar in building the image of imperial power in the third and fourth centuries. To accommodate an increasingly powerful army strategically stationed at the borders of the empire cities had to change. Both physically, so there was infrastructure to support the influx of tenants, and socially to adjust to the demands of the emperor. The new military structure allowed for stability around the Roman borders that had not existed in the Roman world for almost a century and was more formally established in the fourth century after Constantine. Following in the footsteps of Augustus, Constantine renewed the *pax Romana* and brought it to Constantinople. That stability enabled cities to flourish, develop economies, and focus their efforts on urban development.

Chapter Two: Roman Cities

> "To ensure that terror was universal, provinces too were cut into fragments; many governors and even more officials were imposed on individual regions, almost on individual cities, and to these were added numerous accountants, controllers, and prefects' deputies." Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorm*[277]

Introduction

Perhaps calling this chapter "Roman Cities" is misleading for two reasons, as I will discuss not only cities, but also provinces and identity and attempt to understand how these three things intersect. Second, I focus mainly on Greek cities that had been under Roman rule for centuries. I avoided naming this chapter "Greek Roman Cities" or "Roman Greek Cities" because I wanted to highlight a distinctive change in city administration under Diocletian that lasts throughout the fourth century. In this chapter, I question what a Greek city was in the Roman world in the first through fourth centuries CE. When Pausanias, a Greek author from the second century CE, visited Panopeus, he hesitated to call it a city because it had "no government offices, no gymnasium, no theater, no market-place, no water descending to a fountain" and the people lived "in bare shelters just like mountain cabins."[278] He did say that the Phocians, the people who lived in Panopeus, had a boundary for the city and even sent delegates to the Phocian assembly.[279] Cities were physical representations of the people who lived within them and needed to support their ways of living. In the Hellenic context, as the quote from Pausanias would suggest, this meant that every Hellenic city required institutions, such as a *gymnasium* or a market, that supported a Greek way of life. What I intend to understand is whether the Greek way of life changed in the late third century, and if so, in what ways the cities reflected that change, and to what extent the Roman Empire influenced or forced that change. I titled the chapter "Roman Cities" as a statement that attests to the reality that Greek cities in the first through third centuries were, in fact, Roman cities.[280]

---

[277] Lactant. *De mort. Pers.* 7.4. Et ut omnia terrore complerentur, provinciae quoque in frusta concisae; multi praesides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac paene iam civitatibus incubare, item rationales multi et magistri et vicarii praefectorum..

[278] Panopeus was a city in the province of Boeotia. Pausanias 10.4.1: "στάδια δὲ ἐκ Χαιρωνείας εἴκοσιν ἐς Πανοπέας ἐστὶ πόλιν Φωκέων, εἴγε ὀνομάσαι τις πόλιν καὶ τούτους οἷς γε οὐκ ἀρχεῖα οὐ γυμνάσιόν ἐστιν, οὐ θέατρον οὐκ ἀγορὰν ἔχουσιν, οὐχ ὕδωρ κατερχόμενον ἐς κρήνην, ἀλλὰ ἐν στέγαις κοίλαις κατὰ τὰς καλύβας μάλιστα τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, ἐνταῦθα οἰκοῦσιν ἐπὶ χαράδρᾳ. ὅμως δὲ ὅροι γε τῆς χώρας εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς ἐς τοὺς ὁμόρους, καὶ ἐς τὸν σύλλογον συνέδρους καὶ οὗτοι πέμπουσι τὸν Φωκικόν." Translation from: Pausanias Description of Greece with an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones, Litt.D., and H.A. Ormerod, M.A., in 4 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1918. See also: Bernini, Julie. (2024). Gymnasia and Baths. *Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. Oxford University Press*, 370; Jones, A.H.M. (1964). *The Later Roman Empire 284-602, vol 2*. Oxford, 734.

[279] Ibid.

When Greek cities and provinces were incorporated into the empire, the *polis* (city), *politeia* (constitutional system), and *politeuma* (body of citizens) coexisted and merged with the *cives* (citizens) and the *civitates* (political entity composed of citizens, or cities) of the Roman government. The Roman Empire was a collection of *civitates* and *poleis*, for which A.H.M. Jones provided the metaphor: "Constitutionally and administratively, then, the cities were the cells of which the empire was composed."[281] The Roman Empire needed the provinces for financial, material, and military resources, but required that cities function as independently as possible. According to Giovanna Merola: "For centuries, the Romans did use cities to administrate the territory they controlled, resorting as little as possible to direct interventions in Italy and in the provinces."[282] After Diocletian, however, all cities within the empire were encouraged to follow a Roman administrative standard. I seek to understand the impact of these new standards, and how people living in the cities adapted.

---

[280] This statement is not an attempt to take away the Hellenic and Greek culture that existed in cities in the Greek east. Instead, what I am trying to argue, is that identifying a city as Roman or Greek in during these centuries is complex, and "Greek" cities could be just as Roman in the late third and fourth centuries. This chapter shows the slow trajectory of cities in this region to be both, and after the third century, very much administratively distinct from prior centuries.

[281] Jones, A.H.M. (1964).

[282] Merola, Giovanna. (2024). The Legal Status of the Greek *Poleis* in the Roman Empire. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 115

A.H.M. Jones and David Magie studied Greek cities under Roman rule, but according to Martin Hallmannsecker and Anna Heller, their works subscribed “to a Classical-centered and Romanocentric view of the *polis* model, treating its Imperial phase as a degenerated annex and period of decline and decadence.”[283] Instead, in an edited volume on Greek cities in the Roman empire, scholars acknowledge “the full vitality of the Greek civic model in the Roman Empire” and re-examine the “local societies, identities, as well as political and cultural life” within these cities.[284] In this chapter, I aim to examine how Greek people were becoming Roman by gaining citizenship and how they understood themselves as subjects of the Roman Empire, but also how they eventually saw themselves as active members within the Roman government and/or as members within a Hellenic community. Second, I aim to examine how Roman rulers treated the Greek people, provinces, and cities.[285] Then, I look at what I understand to be the consequences of those changes in administration and how they impact the cultural landscape of cities.

Greek Cities under Roman Rule

Many Hellenic territories that kings had been ruling fell under Roman rule either by being seized by Roman commanders or being willed to the Roman state in the second and first centuries BCE.[286] In 196 BCE, after the second Macedonian War, anyone under the rule of Philip

---

[283] Jones, A.H.M (1971). *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*; Jones, A.H.M. (1940). *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*; Magie, David. (1950). *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*; Hallmannsecker, Martin and Anna Heller. (2024). “Introduction.” *The Oxford handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press, 1

[284] Ibid, 1

[285] I typically exclude Roman Egypt, as I have in other chapters, since it does act as an anomaly. It was certainly an important place for Greek culture and education (especially in Alexandria), and is referenced in the Education chapter, but otherwise is not included in this study. Likewise, the Greek cities in Italy known as Magna Graecia, are excluded. Mostly because they were not part of the Hellenistic empire and likely had a different cultural urban landscape than what we see in Achaia, Thrace, Macedonia, Pontus-Bithynia and Asia Minor.

[286] For example, the Pergamon Kingdom was handed over to the Romans by Attalos III. See: Chin, M. J. H. (2018). OGIS 332 and Civic Authority at Pergamon in the Reign of Attalos III. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, *208*, 121–137. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45147264

V of Macedonia was subsumed into the Roman state. Upon the death of Attalos III (r.138-133 BCE), the last king of Pergamon, “the Roman people” were made the heirs to the kingdom.[287] Tiberius Gracchus (d. 133 BCE), brother of Caius Gracchus and son of the censor Tiberius Gracchus, wanted to give the money from King Attalus to Roman “citizens who received a parcel of the public land, to aid them in stocking and tiling their farms. And as regarded the cities which were included in the kingdom of Attalus, he said it did not belong to the senate to deliberate about them, but he himself would submit a pertinent resolution to the people.”[288]

According to Giovanna Merola, the situation of the Greek East as a territory, economy and tributary changed after the Third Mithridatic War (73-63 BCE).[289] It was Gnaeus Pompey (106-48 BCE) and his armies who forever changed the landscape of the Greek East. Claude Eilers argues that “his conquests had redrawn the map of the eastern Mediterranean and his reorganization of the region fundamentally alters the geopolitical landscape” in the east.[290] After his conquests some territories became Roman provinces. In contrast, others were ruled by local dynasts loyal to Rome “or useful to Pompey, men who could be trusted to govern in Rome’s interests.”[291] Much of Mithradates’ former kingdom of Pontus was added to the Roman province of Bithynia. At the same time, the rest was given to Deiotaros, who was a Galatian tetrarch who held the title of 'king.'[292]

---

[287] Plutarch, *Life of Tiberius Gracchus*.14: Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ Φιλομήτορος Ἀττάλου τελευτήσαντος Εὔδημος ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ἀνήνεγκε διαθήκην ἐν ᾗ κληρονόμος ἐγέγραπτο τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ Ῥωμαίων δῆμος, εὐθὺς ὁ Τιβέριος δημαγωγῶν εἰσήνεγκε νόμον ὅπως τὰ βασιλικὰ χρήματα κομισθέντα τοῖς τὴν χώραν διαλαγχάνουσι τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπάρχοι πρὸς κατασκευὴν καὶ γεωργίας 2ἀφορμήν.
[288] Plutarch, Life of Tiberius Gracchus, from: Plutarch. *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flamininus.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 102. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921
[289] Merola (2024)
[290] Eilers, Claude. (2003). Pompey’s Settlement to the Death of Augustus. *A companion to the Hellenistic world*. Blackwell Pub. Lt. doi: 10.1002/9780470996584, 90.
[291] Ibid.

The province that suffered the most change, however, was Syria which had formerly been a part of the Seleukid dynasty. Eiler claims that Roman Syria became a playground for Roman affairs, and the people of Syria were often the victims of corrupt governors seeking to enrich their own positions or pocket money from taxes originally intended for other purposes.[293] Although Roman governors typically left the people in their provinces to exist autonomously, they had the flexibility to squeeze money from the provinces at their will. Eiler cites the example of M. Iunius Brutus, who gave an illegal four percent loan to the city of Salamis when it needed money.[294] To govern a province was to have full imperium over the area. John Richardson says: "The imperium, which was the reason for the allocation of a *provincia* to a particular individual magistrate or promagistrate and was the basis of all his activity including jurisdiction, made its holder effectively independent of control during his tenure of his *provincia*. He was, after all, essentially a military commander, entrusted with a specified task, and as such acted in an untrammelled fashion, especially when any distance from Rome."[295] Athens, in particular, was a city in which Hellenistic kings and Roman patrons gifted buildings and food in an effort to show their respect for Hellenic civic culture.[296] Even when the Hellenistic dynasties collapsed, Roman patrons continued to adorn the city in ways unmatched by previous patrons.

---

[292] Ibid. Eiler's says "Pompey showed similar generosity towards Ariobarzanes I, king of Cappadocia. He had been a loyal ally of Rome for decades, and Pompey confirmed and expanded his kingdom, though he soon resigned in favor of his son, Ariobarzanes II." Eiler also notes that Cilicia had long been a Roman province and "became one of Rome's most important eastern provinces and continued to grow in the coming years," 91.

[293] "The most dramatic change in Pompey's reorganization took place in Syria, where the Seleukid dynasty, which had been near death for decades, was not revived. What remained of the once great empire now became the Roman province Syria. In theory, its governors were to hold office for one year and then return to Rome. In practice it was not so: most held office for two or three years and used the extended terms to pursue their own ambitions. In the coming decades, for example, it was used by Gabinius as a base from which to meddle in Egyptian affairs, and by Crassus to launch his ill-fated invasion of Parthia (A. Sherwin-White 1984: 271-89)." Eilers (2003), 91. See Cicero's *Pro Flaccus* 27-33, for the issues between governors and their provinces.

[294] Eilers (2003), 91-92. See Cicero, *Atticus*, 6.1.6.

[295] Richardson, John. (2016). Provincial Administration. *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Law and Society.* Edited by Paul J. du Plessis. Oxford University Press

Other cities and provinces, especially those caught in the crossfire of civil war, were not as fortunate. As the Greek east began to recover financially in the mid-first century BCE, war broke out between Caesar, Crassus, and Pompey. The burdens of war fell heavily on the Greek east, "which not only became an important theatre of war, but also an important recruiting ground for troops, and the treasury that both sides used to fund their efforts."[297] Pompey requested troops from Deiotaros of Galatia and Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, and when he was defeated, Caesar imposed a heavy fine on them both as a result of their alliance with his enemy.[298] Caesar's ascension to power ultimately benefitted the east. He allowed local city officials to control tax-collection rather than Roman *publicani,* Roman equestrians who conducted tax-collection on behalf of the Roman state.[299]

When Caesar was assassinated in 44 BCE, those who conspired against him fled to the Greek east to generate revenue from the provinces to support their armies needed to fight the members of the triumvirate.[300] Fighting broke out between the two factions in Macedonia, and Brutus and Cassius were defeated at Philippi in 42 BCE. The provinces of the Greek east then fell under the control of Marc Antony, who reinstated policies instituted by Caesar.

The restoration of the east was short-lived due to the outbreak of another civil war between Octavian and Marc Antony. Once again, this put pressure on the Greek east to support the wars between the Romans. First century CE Greek author Plutarch, recorded that the people of Chaeronea were forced to supply grain, and were actively preparing to send grain to Antony's army when they heard about his defeat:

---

[296] Ibid.
[297] Eilers (2003), 93
[298] Ibid, 94
[299] See: Badian, E. (1972). *Publicans and sinners: Private enterprise in the service of the Roman Republic*. Cornell University Press, for more on corrupted group of *publicani*.
[300] Brutus and Cassius against Marc Antony and Octavian.

> "These were in a wretched plight, and had been stripped of money, slaves, and beasts of burden. At any rate, my great-grandfather Nicarchus used to tell how all his fellow-citizens were compelled to carry on their shoulders a stipulated measure of wheat down to the sea at Anticyra, and how their pace was quickened by the whip; they had carried one load in this way, he said, the second was already measured out, and they were just about to set forth, when word was brought that Antony had been defeated, and this was the salvation of the city; for immediately the stewards and soldiers of Antony took to flight, and the citizens divided the grain among themselves."[301]

Greek cities and the Roman Empire (1st-3rd Centuries)

After defeating Marc Antony in 31 CE, Octavian began to carry out his plans for the *Pax Romana*. This included venturing to the Greek east to settle city matters and imposing new rules, restrictions, or privileges to cities that supported him against Antony and Cleopatra. According to Cassius Dio:

> "[from the] Athenians he took away Aegina and Eretria, from which they received tribute, because, as some say, they had espoused the cause of Antony; and he furthermore forbade them to make anyone a citizen for money. And it seemed to them that the thing which had happened to the statue of Athena was responsible for this misfortune: for this statue on the Acropolis, which was placed to face the east, had turned around to the west and spat blood. Augustus, now, after

---

[301] Plutarch, *Life of Antony*, 68.4: Ἐκ τούτου Καῖσαρ μὲν ἐπ᾽ Ἀθήνας ἔπλευσε, καὶ διαλλαγεὶς τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὸν περιόντα σῖτον ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου διένειμε ταῖς πόλεσι πραττούσαις ἀθλίως καὶ περικεκομμέναις χρημάτων, ἀνδραπόδων, ὑποζυγίων. ὁ γοῦν πρόπαππος ἡμῶν Νίκαρχος διηγεῖτο τοὺς πολίτας ἅπαντας ἀναγκάζεσθαι τοῖς ὤμοις καταφέρειν μέτρημα πυρῶν τεταγμένον ἐπὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἀντίκυραν θάλασσαν, 5ὑπὸ μαστίγων ἐπιταχυνομένους· καὶ μίαν μὲν οὕτω φορὰν ἐνεγκεῖν, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν ἤδη μεμετρημένοις καὶ μέλλουσιν αἴρεσθαι νενικημένον Ἀντώνιον ἀγγελῆναι, καὶ τοῦτο διασῶσαι τὴν πόλιν· εὐθὺς γὰρ τῶν Ἀντωνίου διοικητῶν καὶ στρατιωτῶν φυγόντων διανείμασθαι τὸν σῖτον αὐτούς. Translation from: Plutarch. *Lives, Volume IX: Demetrius and Antony. Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 101. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

> transacting what business he had in Greece, sailed to Samos, where he passed the winter; and in the spring of the year when Marcus Apuleius and Publius Silius were consuls, he went on into Asia, and settled everything there and in Bithynia. For although these provinces as well as those previously mentioned were regarded as belonging to the people, he did not for that reason neglect them, but gave most careful attention to them all, as if they were his own. Thus he instituted various reforms, so far as seemed desirable, and made donations of money to some, at the same time commanding others to contribute an amount in excess of the tribute. He reduced the people of Cyzicus to slavery because during a factious quarrel they had flogged and put to death some Romans. And when he reached Syria, he took the same action in the case of the people of Tyre and Sidon on account of their factious quarrelling."[302]

By the time Augustus became sole ruler of the empire, much of the Greek speaking east had already been incorporated into the empire with varying degrees of status, but Augustus made sure to use his imperial power to punish or reward certain cities that supported him, as rulers before him had.

Most importantly, however, Augustus needed to rebuild the cities and provinces that had been depleted from years of Roman civil wars. Following the battle of Actium, Octavian settled debts and provided grain.[303] He put Egypt under the rulership of equestrian governors, "the older, wealthier and more peaceful provinces became 'public' provinces, governed by proconsuls selected by seniority and the lot," and legates chosen by Augustus governed other provinces now

---

[302] Cass. Dio.LIV.7: Ἀθηναίων δὲ τήν τε Αἴγιναν καὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν (ἐκαρποῦντο γὰρ αὐτάς), ὥς τινές φασιν, ἀφείλετο, ὅτι τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐσπούδασαν, καὶ προσέτι καὶ ἀπηγόρευσέ σφισι μηδένα πολίτην ἀργυρίου ποιεῖσθαι. καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐς ταῦτα ἔδοξε τὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματι συμβὰν ἀποσκῆψαι· ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀκροπόλει πρὸς[3] ἀνατολῶν ἱδρυμένον πρός τε τὰς δυσμὰς μετεστράφη καὶ αἷμα ἀπέπτυσεν. ὁ δ᾽ οὖν[4] Αὔγουστος τό τε Ἑλληνικὸν διήγαγε καὶ ἐς Σάμον ἔπλευσεν, ἐνταῦθά τε ἐχείμασε, καὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῷ ἦρι ἐν ᾧ Μᾶρκος τε Ἀπουλέιος καὶ Πούπλιος Σίλιος ὑπάτευσαν κομισθεὶς πάντα τά τε ἐκεῖ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ διέταξεν, οὐχ ὅτι τοῦ δήμου καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰ πρότερα ἐδόκει εἶναι ἐν ὀλιγωρίᾳ αὐτὰ ποιησάμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ πάντων σφῶν ὡς καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὄντων ἐπιμεληθείς· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα ὅσαπερ καὶ προσῆκον ἦν ἐπηνώρθωσε, καὶ χρήματα τοῖς μὲν ἐπέδωκε τοῖς δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν φόρον ἐσενεγκεῖν προσέταξε. τούς τε Κυζικηνούς, ὅτι Ῥωμαίους τινὰς ἐν στάσει μαστιγώσαντες ἀπέκτειναν, ἐδουλώσατο. καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τοὺς Τυρίους τούς τε Σιδωνίους διὰ τὰς στάσεις ἐποίησεν, ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ γενόμενος.

[303] Eilers (2003), 98; Cass. Dio, XXXI.66; Plutarch, *Life of Antony*, 68.

'imperial' provinces.[304] This was intended to reduce the risk of another rival, especially in areas with a history of tension toward him. By granting an equestrian the authority to govern a province, August aimed to strengthen loyalty among his own elites and gain more control over regions likely to rebel against Roman rule. Concerning the eastern provinces, Dio said Augustus:

> "Wished even so to be thought democratic, while he accepted all the care and oversight of the public business, on the ground that it required some attention on his part, yet he declared he would not personally govern all the provinces, and that in the case of such provinces as he should govern he would not do so indefinitely; and he did, in fact, restore to the senate the weaker provinces, on the ground that they were peaceful and free from war, while he retained the more powerful, alleging that they were insecure and precarious and either had enemies on their borders or were able on their own account to begin a serious revolt. His professed motive in this was that the senate might fearlessly enjoy the finest portion of the empire, while he himself had the hardships and the dangers; but his real purpose was that by this arrangement the senators will be unarmed and unprepared for battle, while he alone had arms and maintained soldiers. Africa, Numidia, Asia, Greece with Epirus, the Dalmatian and Macedonian districts, Sicily, Crete and the Cyrenaic portion of Libya, Bithynia with Pontus which adjoined it, Sardinia and Baetica were held to belong to the people and the senate,"[305]

And of the others:

> "These provinces, then, together with Coele-Syria, as it is called, Phoenicia, Cilicia, Cyprus and Egypt, fell at that time to Caesar's share; for afterwards he gave Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis back to the people, and for himself took Dalmatia instead. This same course was followed subsequently in the case of other provinces also, as the progress of my narrative will show; but I have enumerated these provinces in this way because at the present time each one of them is governed separately, whereas in the beginning and for a long period thereafter they were administered two and three together. The others I have not

---

[304] Eilers (2003), 98

[305] Cass. Dio. LIII. 12.1-4

> mentioned because some of them were acquired later, and the rest, even if they were already subjugated, were not being governed by the Romans, but either had been left autonomous or had been attached to some kingdom or other. All of them which came into the Roman empire after this period were added to the provinces of the one who was emperor at the time."[306]

Asia, Achaea, and Macedonia were among those governed by a proconsul.[307] Augustus established this new system of governing in which the emperor appointed ex-consuls and ex-praetors to act on his behalf in the provinces. He further restricted their power by not allowing them "to raise levies of soldiers or to exact money beyond the amount appointed, unless the senate should so vote or the emperor so order; and when their successors arrived, they were to leave the province at once, and not to delay on the return journey, but to get back within three months."[308] In this way, the emperor had more control over the terms of governors and who was ruling where. Richardson claims that under this new structure, the very idea of a *provincia* had changed to refer more frequently to an area of land controlled by the Romans and specifically imply that it is a part of the Roman Empire.[309] I argue that it also allowed the emperor to save face: by preventing corruption through tax exploitation, the emperor (Augustus) could appear merciful and benevolent. At the same time, he was able to seize land resources and taxes from the people directly for the state. By allowing a mix of public and private provincial land ownership, Augustus was able to enrich both the imperial treasury and governors.

After Tiberius (r. 14-37 CE) seized Cappadocia and made it a province, most of the Greek-speaking East was under Roman dominion in some capacity. Not all cities and provinces were treated equally. Merola claims "some cities were granted a very privileged status, so-called freedom, the meaning and value of which greatly depended on time and place: it does not mean independence or sovereignty, but autonomy in various forms and degrees"[310] Athens, for example, had been allowed to exist "legally autonomous, and free to conduct its own internal affairs."[311] Freedom, in this context, could mean "permission to use their own laws, the absence of a garrison or immunity from tribute, but not necessarily all of these together."[312] It could also mean that they were "exempt from governor's visits and judicial supervision."[313] In 67 CE, Nero (r. 54-68) supposedly, "freed" the Greek cities.[314] The so-called freedom was soon revoked by his successor Vespasian who "ordered that they all pay tribute and be subject to a governor, saying that the Greek people had forgotten how to be free," because war had broken out among the Greeks.[315] So, even if a city were "free" it was never sovereign throughout the time of the empire. The exception seems to be Aphrodisias in Caria, whose citizens sided with Augustus during the war against Marc Antony and were therefore granted free status from the beginning. In a letter to the people of Samos sent in 31 BCE Octavian ~~said~~ wrote:

---

[306] Cass. Dio. LIII.12 7-9.
[307] Ibid; Cass. Dio. LIII.13-15.
[308] Cass. Dio. LIII.15.6
[309] Richardson (2016), 118

> "Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of Divus Julius, wrote to the Samians underneath their petition: you yourselves can see that I have given the privilege of freedom to no people except the Aphrodisians, who took my side in the war and

---

[310] Merola (2024), 116: Jones, A. H. M. (1939). '*Civitates liberae et immunes* in the East', in *Anatolian Studies presented to W. H. Buckler*, ed. W. M. Calder and J. Keil, 103–17. Manchester; De Martino, F. 1973. *Storia della costituzione romana* II^{2}. Naples, 364-71; Ferrary, J.-L. 1999. 'La liberté des cités et ses limites à l'époque républicaine', *Mediterraneo Antico* 2/1: 69–84; Ferrary, J.-L. 2017. *Rome et le monde grec. Choix d'écrits*, 181–94. Paris) and Ferrary, J.-L. 2014. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique* (2nd ed.). Rome; Dmitriev, S. 2017. 'The Status of Greek Cities in Roman Reception and Adaptation', *Hermes* 145: 195–209.

[311] Eilers (2003), 92.

[312] Merola (2024), 124

[313] Gleason, Maud. (2006). Greek Cities Under Roman Rule. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell, 231

[314] Pausanias, Description of Greece, Achaia, XVII.1-6. The quote on Nero freeing Greece: χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον ἐς Νέρωνα ἡ βασιλεία περιῆλθεν ἡ Ῥωμαίων, καὶ ἐλεύθερον ὁ Νέρων ἀφίησιν ἁπάντων, ἀλλαγὴν πρὸς δῆμον ποιησάμενος τὸν Ῥωμαίων· Σαρδὼ γὰρ τὴν νῆσον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα εὐδαίμονα ἀντὶ Ελλάδος σφίσιν ἀντέδωκεν

[315] καὶ σφᾶς ὑποτελεῖς τε αὖθις ὁ Οὐεσπασιανὸς εἶναι φόρων καὶ ἀκούειν ἐκέλευσεν ἡγεμόνος, ἀπομεμαθηκέναι φήσας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. Translation from: Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume III: Books 6-8.21.* Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 272. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

> were captured by storm because of their devotion to us. For it is not right to give the favor of the greatest privilege of all at random and without cause I am not willing to give the most highly prized privileges to anyone without good cause."[316]

Some cities had entirely different legal statuses and purposes within the empire. Roman *coloniae* were settlements of Roman citizens within a province outside of Rome.[317] *Coloniae* had existed as early as 491 BCE, grew in the third century BCE, and continued to increase under Augustus. Corinth, for example, became a Roman colony under Julius Caesar in 44 BCE.[318] A *colonia* was governed by Italian laws, and acted as if it were a city in Italy. Some cities in the Greek east were granted the status of *coloniae*, "but without any Roman settlers and usually not free of direct taxes."[319] These statuses were constantly changing, meaning cities had to maintain a good relationship with the Roman emperor to retain or gain a certain status.

The empire continued to develop in the second century under Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, who secured the northern borders and the regions between the eastern and western parts of the empire. After the revolt of Avidius Cassius, Marcus Aurelius further limited the senatorial ability to govern provinces by outlawing any senator from ruling a province in which they were born. Avidius' familial history in the Syrian province, as well as his rulership and influence, meant that he was well-loved in the region. Despite being loyal to Avidius Cassius, the Antiochenes were not punished by Marcus Aurelius. Their treatment was recorded in the *Historia Augusta*:

---

[316] Translation from Chaniotis, Angelos. (2016). Memory, Commemoration & Identity in an Ancient City: The Case of Aphrodisias. *Daedalus*, Vol. 145, no. 2 (Spring 2016), pp.88-100, 91

[317] Sherwin-White, A. N. (1973). *The Roman citizenship*. Clarendon Press; Livy 7.27.9, where Livy explained that the Roman people had thirty colonies at the time of the Second Punic War, or the late third century BCE; See also *Roman and local citizenship in the long second century CE*. (2021). Oxford University Press, edited by Myles Lavan and Clifford Ando.

[318] Corinth was sacked by Lucius Mummius in 146 BCE; Pausanias 2.1.2; Strabo 8.6.23; Cassius Dio XXI and XLII.50.1 for Caesar's "restoration" of Corinth. See Romano for more information about the archaeological information on Corinth as a colony: Romano, D. G. (2003). City Planning, Centuriation, and Land Division in Roman Corinth: Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis & Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis. *Corinth*, *20*, 279–301. https://doi.org/10.2307/4390729

[319] Gleason, Maud. (2006), 231

> "He did not punish the citizens of Antioch, who had sided with Avidius Cassius, but he pardoned them, together with other cities which had aided Cassius, although at first he was deeply angered at the citizens of Antioch and took away their games and many of the distinctions of the city, all of which he afterward restored."[320]

Armies and Their Impact on Eastern Urban Spaces

In the previous chapter, I discussed changes in the Roman army from the first to the fourth century. I briefly mentioned how the presence of soldiers affected the daily lives of Romans, and the demand they put on the empire's resources. The auxiliary and legionary troops were stationed throughout the empire, leading to the establishment of new communities along the empire's *limites*. The conquests of Trajan and Hadrian led to the construction of walls and fortifications along the new borders of the empire. The Roman armies had a profound impact on life in the Roman provinces, particularly outside of cities. The presence of soldiers led to the development of *vici*, which were smaller villages that existed outside of but in proximity to military camps.[321]

The presence of the armies significantly changed city life along the borders. This was certainly true for Dura-Europos located at the *limes* at the eastern border. Dura-Europos was taken over from the Parthians by Trajan and annexed into the empire by 160 CE. Ian Haynes looks closely at the city of Dura-Europos in Syria, which has been thoroughly excavated, to discuss the Roman army and urban life.[322] He attributes the wealth of understanding from "the rich combination of sources" including archaeology and papyri. He states, too, that the region had long been under Roman dominion, and even prior to that was a well-established city. Haynes explains that Dura-Europos "not only preserves important insights into life in a Roman base; it also remains the only case where both the 'civilian' and 'military' parts of a city have been extensively excavated."[323]

---

[320] SHA. *Hist. Aug., Avidius Cassius*: Antiochensis, qui Avidio Cassio consenserant, <non punivit> sed et his et aliis civitatibus, quae illum iuverant, ignovit, cum primo Antiochensibus graviter iratus esset hisque spectacula sustulisset et multa alia civitatis ornamenta, quae postea reddidit.

[321] Elliot, Paul. (2014), 110. Note that *vici* are not cities but are settlements outside of the cities.

When Caracalla expanded citizenship in 212 CE, he significantly increased the number of those who fell under the *ius civile*. Lina Girdvainyte suggests that people continued to identify with their city statuses, which resulted in multi-status identity.[324] Girdvainyte argues that there was no conflict in having citizenship in more than one place. She claims that Roman citizenship was performed "particularly through acts which required the use of the Latin language, participation of other citizens as witnesses, and/ or the presence of a Roman magistrate," and local citizenship was "acted out and asserted in a plethora of political, social, and cultural contexts."[325] This was not a new phenomenon, but rather shows how Caracalla's edict did not completely upset civic norms and traditions on an individual level. Rather, it shows that he acted above the imperial precedent to expand citizenship on such a large scale.

Greek cities and Roman Patronage (1st- 3rd Centuries CE)

---

[322] Haynes, I. (2013), 146
[323] ibid
[324] Girdvainyte. (2024). Greek and Roman Citizenships. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press
[325] Girdvainyte (2024), 140

The provinces fed the city of Rome. Through extraction of taxes and manpower, Roman provinces provided additional armies and money to fund wars, building projects, and administrators. The Romans required both a land and poll tax in all its provinces, but these varied in form and rate throughout the empire. According to Peter Garnsey, taxes were generally kept low to avoid revolts and rebellions, with the exception of "recently conquered peoples for whom subjection to formal taxation was a new and humiliating experience."[326]

Once the Roman Empire took over most of the Mediterranean territories, they had control and power over grain supplies, which left cities and provinces at the mercy of the Roman government, including Roman soldiers, to facilitate providing food to the people and relief after environmental disasters or invasion. Garnsey argues that this level of control "had the paradoxical result of undermining civic patriotism among the wealthy and reducing the capacity of communities to cope with subsistence crises."[327]

Historically, Greek cities had wealthy patrons who supported the foundation of public buildings, statues, and games. These wealthy patrons would receive statues dedicated to their honor by the city as a thank you for their gift. The practice of *euergetism* involved an act of giving, usually in the form of paying for a new building, and in return, the giver would receive certain honors from the *polis*, reflected in a dedicatory inscription. This practice was heavily employed by Hellenistic Kings seeking the favor of Greek cities, who needed military or economic support. In Athens, Athenians would grant Hellenistic dynasts membership in the *ephebeia,* which allowed them to gain Athenian citizenship.[328] According to O.W. Reinmuth:

---

[326] Garnsey, P. (1988). *Famine and food supply in the Graeco-Roman world: Responses to risk and crisis*. Cambridge University Press, 244-246.

[327] Garnsey (1988), 258

[328] The *ephebia* was made a requirement in the fourth century BCE. Reinmuth, O. W. (1948). The Ephebate and Citizenship in Attica. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, *79*, 211–231.

"Ephebic training, which at the outset was required of all young men of Attic birth before they could become citizens *de facto*, later became a means of obtaining Attic citizenship by young men of non-Attic birth who enrolled in the *ephebia*."[329] Reinmuth affirms that while citizenship *de jure* (by law) was given by birth or granted once men were registered in the demes, they were not able to vote, attend meetings of the *ekklesia*, exempt from liturgies, and did not pay taxes, until after enrollment in the *ephebia*.[330] In the second century BCE, membership to the *ephebeia* was opened to foreigners and gave them equal standing as any other citizen in Athens.[331] The *ephebeia* required not only military service, but also required educational training in philosophy, literature, rhetoric, and music.[332] The system was designed to train a young man generally in all areas of Athenian culture so he would be a well-informed member of the *politeia*.

In the Hellenistic periods there were other advantages to *euergetism* outside of direct membership into city life. Erecting monuments in Athens or being honored with a dedication carved into a stele set up in the city, broadcast the dynast's power to a larger Greek audience. More importantly, however, it would increase the likelihood that other Hellenistic kings, or those associated with them, would appreciate his power. The same was true for Romans who patronized Greek cities. Plutarch claims that there were colossal statues of Eumenes II and Attalos II originally in Athens, which were later reinscribed in the name of Marcus Antonius.[333] Roman patronage of Greek cities had occurred since the time of the Republic, and as mentioned

---

https://doi.org/10.2307/283362; Oliver, G. J. (2007). Citizenship: inscribed honours for individuals in Classical and Hellenistic Athens. In J.-C. Couvenhes & S. Milanezi (Eds.), *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate* (1–). Presses universitaires François-Rabelais. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pufr.2899

[329] Reinmuth, O. W. (1948). 21; Taken from TAPhA 78 (1947), 433.

[330] Ibid, 212.

[331] See IG 2^2. 1008 and O.W. Reinmuth (1929). *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebia*, University of Nebraska Studies in Language. Note that after 146 BCE, Athens was under Roman control.

[332] Reinmuth (1948), 230

[333] Plutarch, *Life of Antony*. 60.6

above, became popular under the triumvirs in the first century BCE.[334] Claude Eilers argues that the relationship between the Roman idea of patronage and the Hellenistic understanding vary and should be understood through the nuances of the language found in honorary inscriptions.[335] He states that “the Greeks had a rich vocabulary for city benefactors” but the common term was benefactor (*εὐεργέτηc) which was distinct from a patron (πάτρων) but often used together.*[336] *All titles were granted to Roman patrons by the cities, and implied different relationships. For example, a benefactor and a proxeny (πρόξενο*c) held privileges such as property ownership, asylum, and exemption from taxes (full or partial). Eilers states that proxeny closely mirrors Roman patronage, which suggested an on-going relationship, with the difference being that Roman patronage was inherently between a patron and client of unequal status, and the proxeny title was, in theory, among equals.[337] It was through these institutions that Romans could insert themselves into Greek civic life.

While *euergetism* did not cease under Roman rule, it began to decline as the Roman state increasingly interfered with local affairs.[338] The intricate relationship between the Roman state and local benefactors is evident through the eyes of Pliny the Younger and Emperor Trajan. Early in the second century CE, Pliny the Younger became governor of Bithynia and Pontus because there was evidently "need for many reforms."[339] While he was governor, Pliny corresponded with the emperor Trajan about problems in the region. In letter 10.33 Pliny lamented about a widespread fire in Nicomedia that was unable to be tamed since there was not the proper equipment in the town. He asked if he should assemble a group of firemen for the area, but instead Trajan stated that Pliny should provide the equipment to private property since "it is societies like these which have been responsible for the political disturbances in your province, particularly in towns. If people assemble for a common purpose, whatever name we give them and for whatever reason, they soon turn into a political club."[340] This correspondence reveals that Trajan knew the potential consequences of giving the people living in the region a reason to assemble and assumed in some way they would revolt. Instead, he encouraged Pliny to provide the necessary tools and maintain the peace. By prioritizing their imperial control, the Romans diminished the locals' ability to protect themselves from fire, thereby exposing them to harm.

---

[334] See: Eilers, Claude. (2002). *The Appearance of Patrons in the Greek East. Roman Patrons of Greek cities.* Oxford, 109-112; Badian, E. (1958). *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 b.c.).* Oxford

[335] Eilers, Claude. (2002). *The Appearance of Patrons in the Greek East. Roman Patrons of Greek cities.* Oxford

[336] Eilers claims in footnote 8 on page 111: “The inscription is *IG* xiv 277 (= *CIL* x. 7240), which is a base with a Greek inscription at the top of one side, which reads *οἱ δεκορίωνεc |Μ.Οὐαλέριον Διογνήτου | Μήγα υἱὸν Χόρτωνα | εὐεργέταν* (‘the *decuriones* (honoured) M. Valerius Chorto, son of Diognetes Megas, benefactor'); on another side of the same base is an inscription in Latin: ‘ordo et populus civit. Lilybit. | patrono perpetuo’ (‘the council and people of the city of Lilybaeum, for their lifelong patron'). Since no name has been preserved in the Latin inscription, it is not clear whether it honours the same man, or whether the base has been reused for someone else. Even if the two inscriptions honour the same man, *patrono perpetuo* is no more a translation of *εὐεργέταν* than *ordo et populus* is of*οἱ δεκορίωνεc* In other bilingual texts *patronus* is consistently rendered *πάτρων*: e.g. C135 and C61. C. Flavonius Anicianus Sanctus was *patronus coloniae* of Pisidian Antioch in a Latin inscription (B. M. Levick, ‘Two Pisidian Colonial Families’, JRS 48 (1958), 74–8 at 74) and *πάτρων τῆc κολωνείαc* in a Greek one (*I. Eph.* iv 1238).” Eilers engages directly with Glenn Bowersock’s (1965) work which claims that *εὐεργέτηc was a direct equivalent to the Roman patronus, and claims that Bowersock is not completely understanding the relationship.*

[337] Eilers (2002), 112. He goes further into the claim suggesting *hospitium publicum*, is probably closer.

[338] Garnsey (1988), 267

In another letter, Pliny wrote to the emperor that the people of Nicaea and Claudiopolis were not efficiently utilizing the funds allocated for public building projects.[341] Pliny asked

---

[339] Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 10.32. "Meminerimus idcirco te in istam provinciam missum, quoniam multa in ea emendanda adparuerint." The letter was a response from emperor Trajan addressing prisoners who were sentenced to the mines or the arena, but instead were acting as *publici servi* and receiving an annual salary. Pliny the Younger. *Letters, Volume II: Books 8-10. Panegyricus.* Translated by Betty Radice. Loeb Classical Library 59. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

[340] Tibi quidem secundum exempla complurium in mentem venit posse collegium fabrorum apud Nicomedenses constitui. Sed meminerimus provinciam istam et praecipue eas civitates eius modi factionibus esse vexatas. Quodcumque nomen ex quacumque causa dederimus iis, qui in idem contracti fuerint, hetaeriae eaeque brevi fient. Satius itaque est comparari ea, quae ad coercendos ignes auxilio esse possint, admonerique dominos praediorum, ut et ipsi inhibeant ac, si res poposcerit, adcursu populi ad hoc uti. Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 10.34.

[341] Pliny the Younger *Letters* 10.39.; See also Madsen, J. M. (2009). *Eager to be Roman Greek response to Roman rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. Duckworth. doi: 10.5040/9781472540669 for more on Roman interactions with the people of Pontus and Bithynia.

Trajan to send architects from Rome to help efficiently finish these buildings. Trajan responded as such:

> The future of the unfinished theatre at Nicaea can best be settled by you on the spot….But, once the main building is finished, you will have to see that private individuals carry out their promises of adding to the theater. These poor Greeks *[Graeculi]* all love a gymnasium: so it may be that they were too ambitious in their plans at Nicaea. They will have to be content with one which suits their real needs. As for the bath at Claudiopolis, which you say has been started in an unsuitable site, you must decide yourself what advice to give. You cannot lack architects: every province has skilled men trained for this work. It is a mistake to think they can be sent out more quickly from Rome when they usually come to us from Greece.[342]

Trajan's response provides a critical look into how he viewed Greek life. Trajan (and likely Pliny as well) identified the people living in the region as Greek, hence his use of the label *Graeculi,* or "little Greeks." He mentioned their love of gymnasia, and Pliny too highlighted their attempts to reconstruct civil buildings through the use of both private and government funds.[343] Julie Bernini claims that "while not all cities had a gymnasium, it was apparently still seen as a characteristic monument and institution of the Greek city in the 2nd century AD," and that it was essential for a city in order to perform civic activities in the Hellenistic world.[344] Trajan sought to avoid allowing too much independence for the people of the cities where it concerned raising taxes and misuse of funds, while also attempting to allow some autonomy where it concerned keeping the people of Pontus and Bithynia content. While it is not explicitly said by Trajan or Pliny, Trajan's response about the "Graeculi" and their love of a *gymnasia* implies that he knew it was a cultural necessity. Second, the response implied a patronizing attitude towards the people in the city who, it would seem to the emperor, had non-Roman priorities and thought their needs were trivial.

---

[342] Quid oporteat fieri circa theatrum, quod incohatum apud Nicaeenses est, in re praesenti optime deliberabis et constitues. Mihi sufficiet indicari, cui sententiae accesseris. Tunc autem a privatis exige opera, cum theatrum, propter quod illa promissa sunt, factum erit. Gymnasiis indulgent Graeculi; ideo forsitan Nicaeenses maiore animo constructionem eius adgressi sunt: sed oportet illos eo contentos esse, quod possit illis sufficere. Quid Claudiopolitanis circa balineum quod parum, ut scribis, idoneo loco incohaverunt suadendum sit, tu constitues. Architecti tibi deesse non possunt. Nulla provincia non et peritos et ingeniosos homines habet; modo ne existimes brevius esse ab urbe mitti, cum ex Graecia etiam ad nos venire soliti sint. Pliny the Younger, *Letters*, 10.40.

[343] See letter 10.39 in which Pliny remarked that senators who had been sent by the emperor had paid their fees which would be used to fund the baths in Claudiopolis.

[344] Bernini, Julie. (2024), 370

Gymnasia were Greek buildings that supported athletic training, a crucial part of *paideia*. When referring to Pertinax's (r. 193) son upon his ascension to power, Herodian says rather than bring his son to live in the palace in Rome, he left his son "in the family home, to be educated and carry on all his activities at his usual schools and gymnasia as a private citizen like everyone else without any imperial pomp and show."[345] Dio Cassius, too, said that Pertinax refused to give his son the title of Caesar until he completed his education (παιδευθῆναι).[346]

Public games were important in Hellenistic cities, and, as has been mentioned above, continued to play their role in Hellenistic identity even while being a part of the Roman empire. There are parallels in the Latin west such as the *ludi* which included chariot racing and theater and *munera* in which gladiators fought and *venatores*, or hunters in the arena, would fight animals as a form of spectacle.[347] However, Sofie Remijsen asserts that "the protagonists of the *ludi* and *munera* were not highly respected citizens who had volunteered to participate, but a mix of slaves and free men, whose citizen rights had been confined."[348] *Euergetism* and benefaction, another cultural touchstone of both Greek and Roman culture, also played into the games. Games provided an opportunity for every member of Roman society, male or female, free or enslaved, emperor and subject alike, to be together in one space. Herodes Atticus, an Athenian and Roman citizen, was a prominent patron of the city of Athens. He erected the Panathenaic stadium, which housed some of these Olympic games.[349]

---

[345] Hdn. II.4: οὕτω γὰρ μέτριος καὶ ἰσότιμος ἦν ὡς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἤδη μειράκιον ὄντα μηδὲ[6] ἐς τὴν βασίλειον αὐλὴν ἀναγαγεῖν,[7] ἀλλ᾽ ἔν τε τῇ πατρῴᾳ μένειν οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἐς τὰ συνήθη προϊόντα διδασκαλεῖα καὶ γυμνάσια ἰδιωτεύοντα ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς παιδεύεσθαί τε καὶ πάντα πράττειν, οὐδαμοῦ τῦφον ἢ πομπὴν παρεχόμενον βασιλικήν.

[346] Cass. Dio. LXXIV: εἴτ᾽ οὖν ὅτι μηδέπω τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐρριζώκει, εἴτε καὶ ὅτι ἐκείνην τε ἀκολασταίνουσαν οὐκ ἠβουλήθη τὸ τῆς Αὐγούστης ὄνομα μιᾶναι, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν παιδίον ἔτι ὄντα οὐκ ἠθέλησε, πρὶν παιδευθῆναι, τῷ τε ὄγκῳ[4] καὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι τῇ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος διαφθαρῆναι. ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ αὐτὸν ἔτρεφεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὑτῷ[5] πρότερον ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ εὐθὺς ἡμέρᾳ ἀποθέμενος.

[347] Remijsen, S. (2015). Looking at Athletics in the Fourth Century: The Unification of the Spectacle Landscape in East and West. In R. Dijkstra, S. van Poppel, & D. Slootjes (Eds.), *East and West in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century: An End to Unity?* (pp. 121–146). Brill. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w8h14q.12

In the Greek context, the games would be referred to as *agones*.[350] Unlike the western *ludi*, the *agones* were competitions among free citizens who would volunteer to compete with their peers in theatrical or athletic categories. Remijsen claims that the *agones* were an acceptable alternative to the Roman version of games, and that emperors even enjoyed the games.[351]

Michael Peachin claims that it was the expectation that the Roman emperor would be present at the games, and generally emperors were expected to make public appearances throughout the empire.[352] The emperor was not only a spectator at the games; the games provided a civic arena in which people "could approach him with petitions and he was expected to react to these in an interested, civil manner."[353] This exchange generated harmony among the emperor and his subjects, particularly in the Greek cities where the games were being celebrated. In the second and third centuries, there were more *agones* than any prior century, which allowed local elites to build the relationship between the Roman emperor and the host city.[354] The benefit was mutual when, in the third centuries during years of civil war, emperors needed to suppress animosity and curry favor in the cities.

---

[348] Remijsen (2015), 121

[349] Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. (2017). Favorinus and Herodes Atticus. *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford

[350] Remijsen (2015), 122

[351] Ibid. Remijsen cites that Augustus attended the *agones* in Naples before his death (Suet., *Aug*. 98.5; Vellius Paterculus 2.123.1; Cass. Dio., 55.10.9). She says that emperor Nero (r. 54-68 CE) tried to replicate the games called Neroneia but that ended with his *damnatio memoriae*, but emperor Domitian (r.81-96 CE), was able to bring the *agones* to the Capitolian games in Rome. Maria Letizia Caldelli, L'Agon Capitolinus. Storia e protagonisti dall' istituzione domizianea al IV secolo (Rome,1993), pp.37–43,53 90. See also Robert, Louis. (1970). DeuxconcoursgrecsàRome. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres* (1970), pp.6–27 for the *agones* introduced in Rome in the third century.

[352] Peachin. (2006). Rome the Superpower: 96-235 CE. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell, 151.

[353] Remijsen (2015), 122

The Panhellenion

Hadrian (r.117-138 CE) was a philhellene, or lover of Hellenic culture. He served as an archon in Athens in 112 CE.[355] In 131/2 Hadrian founded the Panhellenion, which was a league of Greek city-states.[356] This new league was intended to reflect the Greek cities that had their origins in the archaic and classical periods, and to group together Greek cities willing to participate in classical Greek traditions.[357] This included Greek cities in the Roman provinces of: Achaia, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, Asia, Crete and Cyrene, and Pisidia.[358] For example, they celebrated the First Fruits tradition in which "all Greeks were urged to contribute First Fruits of grain."[359] To become a member of the league, cities had to "declare their membership in the Hellenic genos through direct descent from its original formative elements—the Ionians, the Dorians, and the Aeolians. Consequently, only cities that could prove this kind of descent could aspire to enrollment in the Panhellenic Council founded by Hadrian."[360]

---

[354] Remijsen (2015), 123

[355] Birley, Anthony R. (1997). Hadrian and Greek Senators. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 116, pp.209-245., 212

[356] IG 4^2 1.384 recorded the foundation of the Panhellenion in Epidaurus.

[357] Spawforth, A. J. S. (2011). Hadrian and the legacy of Augustus. In *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution* (pp. 233–270). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[358] Spawforth (2011), 252

[359] Clinton, K. (1989). Hadrian's Contribution to the Renaissance of Eleusis. *Bulletin Supplement (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies)*, *55*, 56–68. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43768503, 57; IG II^2 2956-57; IG I^3 78

[360] Romeo, I. (2002). The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece. *Classical Philology*, *97*(1), 21–40. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1215544, 21

There is debate on whether the league was generated from imperial intervention from Hadrian, or if the league originated from members of Greek cities who wanted to be reunited as a league.[361] Regardless, the league needed to get Senate approval before being formally recognized, and the entire system seemed to reflect an imperial imposition to revive ancient legacies as they saw it, rather than as the Greeks saw it. A. Spawforth notes that the Panhellenion emphasized cities in Europe that had “notable” histories, like Athens, Sparta, and Argos.[362] This meant that Greekness was linked to the ‘old’ cities of Greece (such as Athens and Sparta) and birth, rather than through *paideia* or language. What Hadrian and the Romans defined as Hellenistic or Greek was shaped by their ideas. Spawforth and Romeo argue that this led to the exclusion of specific individuals who would have been perceived as Macedonians by the Romans.[363]

Under Hadrian, a notably philhellenic emperor, Athens received special attention. Mary Boatwright asserts that “no Roman emperor devoted as much personal attention to cities throughout the empire as did Hadrian.”[364] She goes on further to say: “Although the pattern was thus set for Hadrian’s benefactions with cities, he seems to have gone further than required.” So much so that his successor, Antoninus Pius (r. 138-161), inherited public building projects that “consisted largely of roadwork, some restoration, and completion of works begun or promised by Hadrian (for example, the aqueduct at Athens).”[365] Marcus Aurelius (r.161-180), followed in the footsteps of Hadrian, and held Hellenic culture in high respect. He was even taught by the famous Roman senator of Greek origin, Herodes Atticus.[366]

---

[361] Romeo (2002), 22; Cass. Dio. LXIX.16.2; IG $2^{2.}$1088 and IG 2^{2}.1090.
[362] Spawforth (2011), 253
[363] Spawforth (2011), 253 and Romeo (2002)
[364] Boatwright, M. T. (2018). *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Princeton University Press. doi: 10.1515/9780691187211, 12
[365] Boatwright, M. T. (2018), 12

Likewise, Philhellenic emperors would participate in famous Greek cults. Hadrian participated in the Eleusinian mysteries three times as emperor, but may have been initiated before his reign as emperor.[367] Hadrian was responsible for reviving the popularity of the Eleusinian mysteries, and generally reinstating classic Hellenic institutions that had been not been in use since the classical period.[368] Hadrian's establishment of the Panhellenion, however, revived an ancient idea of Hellenic identity, and mainly emphasized the superiority of mainland Greece.[369] Iliana Romeo claims that:

> "The Panhellenic ideology elaborated within the circle of the Greek cities of Asia Minor ultimately determined that authentic Greekness should derive only from the historical centers of Hellenism, among which Athens naturally assumed the most important role. The Hadrianic League of Greek cities, though born in the heart of the Asiatic sophistic movement, could not then fail to find in Athens its natural base and in Hadrian its obvious champion."[370]

---

[366] Mitropoulos, Giorgos. (2022). Politics of the Past: Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in Achaea. *The Province of Achaea in the 2nd Century CE*. Routledge. For more on Herodes Atticus, see: Gleason, Maud. (2010). Making Space for Bicultural Identity. *Local knowledge and microidentities in the imperial Greek world*. Cambridge University Press. See also Chapter Four: Education.

[367] Clinton, K. (1989). 56. See IG II^2 3620: "ἡ πόλις; Λ · Μέμμιον ἐπὶ βωμῶι Θορίκιον τὸν ἀπὸ δᾳδούχων καὶ ἀρχόντων; καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθετῶν, τὸν καὶ αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρχῶν καὶ λιτουργιῶν · ἄρξαντα τὴν ἐπώ- νυμον ἀρχὴν καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ ἐπιμελητὴν γυμνασιαρχίας θεοῦ Ἁδριανοῦ · καὶ ἀγωνοθέτην τρίς, πρεσβευτήν τε πολλάκις περὶ τῶν με- γίστων ∶ ἐν οἷς καὶ περὶ γερουσίας · μυή- σαντα παρόντος θεοῦ Ἁδριανοῦ, μυήσαντα θεὸν Λούκιον Οὐῆρον Ἀρμενιακὸν Παρθικὸν καὶ Αὐτοκράτορας Μ ∶ Αὐρήλιον **Ἀν**τωνῖνον · καὶ Μ · Αὐρήλιον Κόμμοδον Γερμανικοὺς Σαρματικούς, [λ]ιτουργήσαντα τοῖν θεοῖν · ἔτεσι Νς, τὸν ἀ]π' ἀρχιερέων · τὸν φιλόπατριν." Which attested the presence of Hadrian at the initiation of Lucius Verus, Marcus Aurelius, and Commodus.

[368] Clinton (1989), 57

[369] Romeo (2002), 37

[370] Ibid.

When Marcus Aurelius came to Athens and was initiated into the Mysteries, he not only bestowed honors upon the Athenians but also, for the benefit of the whole world, established teachers at Athens in every branch of knowledge, granting these teachers an annual salary.[371]

Commodus, though a supporter of the games, failed to impress the Roman senate, army, and people.[372] His death left a power vacuum, described in the previous chapter, that allowed for multiple men vying for power. In the end, Septimius Severus emerged as the victor and brought a brief moment of respite for the empire. His wife, Julia Domna, an elite woman from a prominent family in Syria, was a patron of the arts.[373] Centers of knowledge in the Greek east received a boost in support in the second century CE under Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius.[374] However, by the third century, patronage and rule in any form had declined. Instead, emperors focused on simply maintaining the cities and government.

Third Century Crisis: Breach of the Cities

In the previous chapter, I detailed the civil wars that took over the empire in the mid-third century, following the reign of Maximinus Thrax (r. 235-238). Around the mid-third century, it seems there was enough turmoil and chaos to disrupt the daily lives of Romans everywhere. Maintaining the frontiers was of new importance, and it required "massive military resources and the frequent personal presence of emperors to maintain security."[375] Throughout the third century, Germanic Gothic tribes and the Persians were demanding military attention at multiple ends of the empire's borders. Gothic tribes penetrated and threatened cities in mainland Greece, leaving ruins in their wake. Many cities were completely destroyed, as can be attested by the archaeological record, especially in Athens, Corinth, and Argos.[376]

---

[371] Ὁ δε Μᾶρκος ἐλθὼν ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ μυηθεὶς ἔδωκε μὲν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τιμάς, ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις διδασκάλους ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐπὶ πάσης λόγων παιδείας μισθὸν 32ἐτήσιον φέροντας. Cass. Dio. LXXII.

[372] See previous chapter for the context of Commodus' demise.

[373] More in the final chapter, Chapter Four: Education

[374] For more information and context, see Chapter Four: Education.

[375] Harries (2012), 2

In the Balkan region, on the European side of the empire, the armies had to constantly deal with raiders, who "ravaged the coast of Asia Minor in 252 and 258."[377] Because armies were needed elsewhere in the empire, the regions around the Balkans were left to defend themselves and suffered as a result of the lack of support in the garrisons. Gregory Thaumaturgus, a bishop in Neocaesarea in Pontus around the time of Decius, recorded his responses to a neighboring bishop asking about "the conduct of Romans during and after the Gothic invasions of Pontus and the breakdown of law and order than attended them."[378] Through these responses, it is clear the lethal impact these raids had, and the violence that occurred in them. In the first canon, Gregory contemplated the chastity of women where it concerned rape brought on by pillaging from barbarians. He responded:

> "So too in the case of women captives defiled by barbarians who offered violence their bodies. If a person's past way of life convicts this person, as it is written, of going after the eyes of fornicators, then clearly the state of fornication is suspect even in a time of captivity… but if a women has lived in the highest chastity, and in her former life has shown herself pure an beyond all suspicion, and now falls into a wanton act through force and compulsion, we have an example to teach us in the book of Deuteronomy."[379]

---

[376] Dickenson, Christopher. (2017). *On the Agora*. Brill; Frantz, A. (1988). *Late antiquity, A.D. 267-700*. American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

[377] Potter (2006). The Transformation of the Empire: 235-337 CE. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, 104

[378] Heather, Peter and John Matthews. (2004). Chapter One: The Canonical Letter of Gregory Thaumaturgus and the Third Century Invasions. *The Goths in the Fourth Century.* Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool, 1

[379] Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Canon 1*. Translated by Peter Heather and John Matthews.

In the proceeding canons, Gregory responded about men who no longer act according to Roman law and did not respect their neighbor's property during the invasions. [380] While these canons are an attempt to understand whom to admit into the church, it shows a larger, two-fold problem presented by the barbarian invasions. The first was the destruction and violence caused by the raiders themselves on the people living in the cities, their buildings and homes. The second was the behavior of the Roman people themselves, who saw the opportunity to steal from their neighbors or join the barbarian tribes in the raiding amidst the chaos.[381]

Norbert Hanel states:

> "Finally, in the 60s and 70s of the third century hostile invasions caused the total withdrawal of the Roman army from those territories of the empire which could not be held any longer (parts of Germania Superior and Raetia north of the Danube, Transdanubian Dacia"[382]

In 267 CE, Athens was sacked by Herulian invaders who had been attacking cities in mainland Greece. Before that, according to Fergus Millar, Athens was vibrant and served as an example of a thriving civic government.[383] Millar shows the continuity of Athenian ancestry among third-century archons and city council members.[384] In the final chapter, I will detail the academic and government careers of Athenians in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, which backs Millar's claim that Athenian society and intellectual circles were rich with students, thinkers, and citizens who sought careers in public service. P. Herennius Dexippus, a prominent Athenian historian and politician in the third century, led 2000 Athenians against the Herulians.[385] Alison Frantz studies the archaeological effects of the sack, which left the city in ruin. Her work shows that in the Herulian raid "the Agora lost, temporarily at least, all of its monumental character as a civic center, and although some of its functions were restored, it suffered encroachments from small industries, most of these after a considerable period of desolation."[386]

---

[380] Ibid, *Canons* 4-7.

[381] More on this in the next chapter on Roman Law.

[382] Hanel, Norbert. (2007). Military Camps, *Canabae*, and *Vici*. *The Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell

[383] Millar, Fergus. (2002). P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions. *Rome, the Greek World, and the East.* University of North Carolina Press, 272-277.

[384] Millar (2002), 276; IG II^2, 3679 the family of Honoratiane Polycharmis, who traced her family tree back six centuries.

On the eastern front, the Persian army under the Sassanid Empire was a formidable foe to the Roman army. In 250 CE, Sapor I was able to sack the city of Antioch and attack cities along the eastern borders. This left the province of Syria particularly vulnerable and often meant that cities had to defend themselves if the emperor and his army could not arrive in time. The situation left the relationship between the Roman emperor and the people in the cities fraught.[387]

External foes were not the only cause for concern. During this period of instability two enclave "empires" formed in Gaul and Palmyra in 260 CE. According to fourth-century Latin author Eutropius: "While Gallienus was abandoning the state, the Roman empire was saved in the west by Postumus and in the east by Odenathus."[388] Postumus created the Gallic empire, which consisted of territories of Germania, Gaul, Britannia, and Hispania (briefly). The Gallic Empire lasted until Emperor Aurelian (r. 270-275) suppressed it in 274.[389] Little is known about Postumus before his accension to the purple in Gaul. He was a military commander under Gallienus who revolted and set up his own capital at Trier.[390] He was able to sway the Gauls, who happily accepted his rule. In 265, Gallienus attempted to gain back control over Gaul and the western provinces under its command but was unsuccessful. Postumus died in 269, when a rebellion led by Lollianus broke out. Lollianus, however, killed by the soldiers shortly after, and was replaced by Victorinus, who met the same fate. In his place, Marius came to power for three days. He was replaced by Tetricus, who was a Roman senator and governor of Aquitania.[391] According to the *Historia Augusta,* the empire could have been run well under Tetricus, but Aurelian was able to defeat him, and therefore, he proved too weak. Aurelian showcased him in a triumph, humiliating Tetricus, but according to the *Historia Augusta*, Tetricus continued to "remain in the highest position," and he became a *corrector* over Italy.[392]

---

[385] Millar (2002), 277; Frantz (1988), 2

[386] Frantz (1988), 3-4

[387] Potter (2006), 162: "They may be seen as local notables undertaking local defense. This model certainly fits the case of Uranius Antoninus of Emesa, mentioned above, as well as the Palmyrene response to Sapor's invasion in 260. In addition to these people, we know, albeit only from coins, of two men with Celtic names in the west, and of two more men in the east, Jotopianus and Mariades, who led insurrections in Syria under Philip and Decius. Jotopianus may have been engaging in some sort of protest. Mariades seems to have been a highly successful brigand with connections in the ruling class of Syria. He is said to have had supporters who betrayed Antioch to Sapor in 252 (FHG 4.192 F. 1). Breakdowns in imperial control of this sort would continue into the 270s: we have evidence, both from literary and archaeological sources, of a revolt in Cilicia, as well as record of a civil war in Lower Egypt, in which one group in the province called in the Blemmyes, a Nubian tribe, to attack Coptos (Zos. 1.69.1–71.1)." Potter, David. (1990). *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire: A Historical Commentary on the Thirteenth Sibyline Oracle*. Clarendon Press, 39-40; Mitchell, Stephen. (1995). *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. Clarendon, 177-217. See below for more information on Antioch.

The Palmyrene empire (260-273) began under Septimius Odenathus, who was born into a prominent family in Palmyra, Syria.[393] Odenathus had aided in fighting off the Persian army, and after had even attempted to overthrow Gallienus.[394] When this attempt was unsuccessful, Odenathus betrayed his allies involved in the failed assassination, and he joined Gallienus who gave him the title of *corrector totius orientis*, which allowed Odenathus to command Roman troops.[395] Odenathus succeeded in fighting off the Persians under Sapor, and carried out victory celebrations in Antioch. He even went as far as to call himself and his son the "King of Kings."[396] When Odenathus died in 267, his wife, Zenobia, quickly attempted to maintain the empire by appointing herself as queen and regent, and salvage the alliances her husband had created in the east. According to Alaric Watson:

---

[388] "Ita Gallieno rem publicam deserente Romanum imperium in Occidente per Postumum, per Odenathum in Oriente servatum est." Eutr., 9.11. Eutropius was born circa 320 CE, and a contemporary of Ammianus Marcellinus.
[389] Drinkwater, J. F. (1987).
[390] SHA. *Hist. Aug., Lives of the Thiry Pretenders: Postumus*.
[391] Ibid; Eutr., 9.13.1; Aur. Vict., *Caes.* 35.4-5.
[392] SHA. *Hist. Aug., Lives of the Thiry Pretenders: Tetricus the Elder*.
[393] Sommer, Michael. (2018).
[394] Potter (2006), 161

> "Zenobia began to press her claim to exercise control over those parts of the empire which had lain within her husband's competence, and increasingly expected compliance from the Roman administration in the region. This included not just the Syrian desert and Arabia, but the whole region from Asia Minor to Egypt. She was fully conscious that she possessed the military might to back her claim, and also that, at least south of Cappadocia, she could count on considerable local support for her cause"[397]

Zenobia led an attack on Egypt and attempted to take Alexandria. Her army was successful, especially since she had some support within Egypt, and effectively took Egypt as a part of her empire. From there, she attempted to take parts of Syria and Asia Minor and managed to take Antioch, but certain areas in the northwest region had too many supporters of Rome and refused to concede to Zenobia.[398] Eventually, her rule became too much for Aurelian? when she began to mint coins with the title: V(ir) C(onsularis [or 'Clarissimus']) R(ex) IM(perator) D(ux) R(omanorum), stating that her son Vaballathus, was the king. Watson wrote that several inscriptions call Vaballathus the king, or an *autokrator*, in Judaea, Arabia, and Syria, with no mention of the emperor Aurelian.[399] In 272, the mint in Alexandria began minting coins of

---

[395] Ibid.
[396] Ibid.
[397] Watson (1999), 61
[398] Ibid, 64
[399] Ibid, 68

Vaballathus and Zenobia, with no mention of the emperor, referring to them as "augustus" and "augusta."[400]

First, Aurelian marched on Egypt and retook it within weeks. He then marched across Asia Minor, and "recovered control with comparative ease."[401] After much fighting, Aurelian was able to take back Antioch and Emesa. He spared Zenobia, but only after publicly parading her around the cities in the east and humiliating her.[402] Not soon after, however, the Palmyrenes "slaughter[ed] the garrison of 600 archers, together with their captain" and proclaimed a son of Zenobia, Septimius Antiochus, as king.[403] This caused Aurelian to march on Palmyra again. Emperor Aurelian was able to squash the rebellious empire in 273 during his second march against Palmyra. According to Watson, Aurelian allowed his soldiers to pillage the city mercilessly.

After leading successful military campaigns against usurpers, Aurelian attempted to redraw provincial lines and gain back the territories along the Balkan Mountains that had been lost by prior third-century emperors.[404] The *Historia Augusta* claims:

> "On seeing that Illyricum was devastated and Moesia destroyed, he abandoned the province of Transdanubian Dacia, which had been formed by Trajan, and withdrew both soldiers and provincials, giving up hope that it could be retained. He established the people whom he evacuated in Moesia, and he named this district, which now divides the two provinces of Moesia, his Dacia."[405]

---

[400] Ibid, 69

[401] Ibid, 72

[402] Ibid, 78-80

[403] Ibid, 81

[404] See Eutr. 9.8.2 and 9.15.1 and Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 33.4 for the loss of the north Danube region under Gallienus.

[405] SHA. *Hist. Aug*. The Deified Aurelian. 39: "cum vastatum Illyricum ac Moesiam deperditam videret, provinciam Transdanuvinam Daciam a Traiano constitutam sublato exercitu et provincialibus reliquit ex ea populos in Moesia conlocavit appellavitque suam Daciam, quae nunc duas Moesias dividit."

Of Aurelian's reign, the author of the *Historia Augusta* spoke highly of his reconquests of Roman lands. Aurelian sought to take back regions around the Danube and Balkans that his predecessors had left to their own fate. The author remarked, with considerable exaggeration:

> **"**By his victories he won back Illyricum and returned the districts of Thrace to the laws of Rome. He restored the east to our jurisdiction, which had been crushed down (shamefully!) beneath the yoke of a woman, he defeated and routed and destroyed the Persians, still mocking the death of Valerian."[406]

Due to the general success of Aurelian's reign, Diocletian inherited a throne more peaceful than his predecessors. He still, however, needed to make peace within the empire. Perhaps informed by the past fifty years and contemporary challenges, he first split the empire into two, and then four. In doing so, he made the empire separately governable by four rulers, who acted as emperors for their regions.

City Administration 3-4th Centuries

Provinces in the empire were consistently being reconsidered, restructured, and governed in new ways. When Diocletian secured power for himself and his co-rulers, he restructured the provinces by almost doubling them. Lactantius, who did not speak fondly of Diocletian's reign, states that Diocletian wanted "to ensure that terror was universal," by cutting the provinces "into fragments; many governors and even more officials were imposed on individual regions, almost on individual cities, and to these were added numerous accountants, controllers, and prefects' deputies."[407] The record of his division of the empire is most clear in the *Verona List*, according to Roger Rees, which gives insight into the organization of the dioceses.[408] There were twelve dioceses, which encompassed the provinces in their region.

---

[406] Ibid. "illo vincente Illyricum restitutum est, redditae Romanis legibus Thraciae. 9ille, pro pudor! orientem femineo pressum iugo in nostra iura restituit, ille Persas, insultantes adhuc Valeriani nece, fudit, fugavit, oppressit. illum Saraceni, Blemmyes, Exomitae, Bactriani, Seres, Hiberi, Albani, Armenii, populi etiam Indorum veluti praesentem paene venerati sunt deum." Here the author is exaggerating and using the expeditions of Alexander the Great to reference Alexander Severus, who was put on the throne at a young age and killed by his soldiers.

With the provinces doubled, Diocletian also reconfigured their governance. Under his reign, all governors were of equestrian rank, and "senators had no place in the government structures."[409] There were twelve dioceses, and each were headed by a *vicarius*, a new office in which the *vicarius* held equestrian rank and acted on behalf of a praetorian prefect.[410] By increasing offices, Diocletian spread the responsibilities of the state and made it more efficient. This was especially true where it concerned tax collection. Since the *vicarius* managed the judicial and financial agencies within their dioceses, the governors' workload became lighter. As a result, they could put more energy into tax collection. Diocletian simplified the process of tax collection with the *annona militaris*, which established a tax rate based on needs rather than a fixed rate.[411] Hugh Elton explains the levy system:

> "Was based on land units (*iugera*) and head counts (*capita*), assessed for every farm, village, and city (many of which had previously been exempt) following extensive local surveys. Although the way in which these were calculated varied regionally, this did not affect the calculations of the prefect. When the system was

---

[407] Lactant., *De mort. Pers.* 7.4. Translated by J.L. Creed: Et ut omnia terrore complerentur, provinciae quoque in frusta concisae; multi praesides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac paene iam civitatibus incubare, item rationales multi et magistri et vicarii praefectorum

[408] Rees, R. (2004). *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrmzd, 25. The *Verona List*, a seventh-century manuscript which details the Roman provinces in late antiquity. Rees claims that the motivation behind the provincial restructuring cannot be confirmed, but it can be speculated that there was a military reason behind it, 25.

[409] Rees (2004), 25

[410] Ibid, 26; Second, Diocletian changed city organization.

[411] Elton, Hugh. (2006). The Transformation of Government under Diocletian and Constantine. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell, 202

> introduced, censuses were made, but these were rarely adjusted. It was possible, though, to adjust taxation rates."[412]

The other area in which governors were vital was the legal cases of Roman subjects. The rescripts, "clearly intended to provide governors with access to legal decisions," were made throughout any province of the empire and were intended to provide governors access to legal decisions determined outside their province but relevant for the entire empire.[413] Elton claims that governors rarely used the rescripts, and instead "returned appeals to the lower courts."[414] Noel Lenski demonstrates the rescript system even applied to those seeking to raise their town to city (*civitas* or *polis*) status.[415] He highlights two cities, Tymandus in Pisidia and Heraclae Sintica, of which I will discuss the former. When cities gained status, citizens gained autonomy to govern themselves, have an assembly and magistrates, control over their religious practices, and control over legislation and court systems.[416] The inscription from Tymandus, written in Latin, asked for the right to self-govern (*ius civitatis*), and expressed the difference from the honorific title of city (*nomen civitatis*), which did not have legal advantages.[417] The emperor, who Lenski notes is not clear but is certainly a tetrarchic emperor, was willing to grant the city this honor should it have enough people to govern themselves and form a *curia*.[418] Second, the emperor wanted to ensure they were in control of their own religion, in this case a pagan one that showed devotion to Hercules.[419] With both the governing body and religious practices established, the city could achieve this legal status.

---

[412] Elton (2006), 202-203; Fergus Millar, Fergus. (1993). *The Roman Near East*. Harvard University Press, 193-196.
[413] Richardson (2016), 122. I talk more about the rescripts in the Chapter Three: Law and Administration; Elton. (2006), 204
[414] Elton (2006), 204
[415] Lenski, Noel. (2016). Approaching Constantine: The Orcistus Dossier. In *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics* (pp. 87–113). University of Pennsylvania Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19dzdhr.8, 89-92
[416] Lenski (2016), 89
[417] Ibid, 90; *CIL* 3:6866 = *ILS* 6090 and *AE* 2009: 1474
[418] Lenski (2016), 90

Rees attributes the separation of civil and military offices to Constantine, not Diocletian. The changes made by Diocletian facilitated the separation of civil and military offices. For example, generals (*duces*) had military responsibilities while the governors (*praesides*) had judicial and fiscal responsibilities. He hypothesizes that in separating the tasks, Diocletian had "aimed to minimize the chance of success any internal challenge to his rule might have."[420] Elton notes that while the jobs were typically distinct, there is epigraphical evidence that would suggest sometimes *duces* would carry out civic duties.[421] It would appear that the prior statuses of cities that existed in the first and second centuries held less, if any, importance in the third and fourth centuries as Diocletian prioritized state taxation.

Finally, Diocletian attempted to fix the economy that he inherited through price freezes and coin production.[422] He passed an edict on maximum prices in 301 CE. It is hardly disputed that the price freezes were ineffective in curbing the economy (cite some in the note who prove your point). What did happen, however, was that through controlling coin production, emperors took away a liberty that cities had in expressing their allegiance for a leader. Where there are soldiers, there are payments to be made, and in the third century the soldiers were a mobile unit. The new restructuring of the Roman army and the economy of the third century influenced how money was made. Prior to Diocletian, civic mints were responsible for minting coinage, especially in Greek cities. This was important not only for monetary reasons but also for imperial expression. For example, in the first centuries BCE and CE, Roman leaders, such as Pompey the Great and Marc Antony, would mint coins eastern territories that engaged with local iconography or values (or something) with their traveling military mint.[423] There were two different types of mints: official mints, which produced gold, silver, and bronze according to the denarius weight standard, and provincial mints, which produced coins according to the Hellenistic weight standards. Only in the third century did the emperor gave permission to issue new precious metal coins bearing his symbols.[424]

---

[419] Lenski (2016), 92

[420] Rees (2004), 27

[421] Elton (2006), 201; *ILS* 4103 in Elton, see *Cod. Iust.* 4.42.1 for cases in which *duces* acted outside of their military duties.

[422] Elton, Hugh. (2006), 203-205

During the principate, the emperor "was considered responsible for both the financial imperial policy and the minting of precious-metal coinages."[425] Katsari claims the Roman budget heavily depended on the payments the state needed to pay, especially where it concerned paying Roman troops. Because Roman troops were paid via minted coins, the emperor (and the state), needed direct control of coin production.

According to Constantina Katsari, most precious metal coins were minted in Rome. Bronze coins, which were lower in value, mainly were minted in provincial cities. In the third century CE, however, this changed due to "recurring political instability, continuous military campaigns, and a radical transformation of the currency system."[426] Between 292 CE and 296

---

[423] See: Carbone, Lucia. (2021).Coinage in the Roman Provinces: Conference Highlights, part 1. Posted via the American Numismatics Society on their website. URL here: https://numismatics.org/pocketchange/rbw1/; Bowersock, G.W. (1965). *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford, 42-49; See Andrade, N. J. (2013). Antiochus IV and the limits of Greekness under the Seleucids (175–63 BCE), in *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (pp. 37–66). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for how the Greeks in Asia Minor would express their identity while under Seleucid reign in the second and first centuries BCE.

[424] Herodian 2.15.5, and 1.9.7; Dio LXXX.4.7

[425] Katsari, C. (2011). *The Roman Monetary System: The Eastern Provinces from the First to the Third Century AD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39

[426] Katsari, Constantina. (2003). "Organisation of Roman Mints during the Third Century CE: The Eastern Provinces." Classics Ireland, vol 10. Pp.27-53, 28

CE, Diocletian issued mint reforms.[427] Some of the issues of coinage and coin productions were handled by his new office of the *vicarius*, who was responsible for establishing mints within their dioceses. Mints were most prominent in the new imperial capitals such as Nicomedia and Sirmium.

Imperial Capitals

When Diocletian divided imperial power among four tetrarchs, each ruler developed his own capital. These capitals included: Nicomedia, Sirmium, Mediolanum (Milan), and Augusta Treverorum (Trier). Rees explains the possible strategy behind establishing the new capitals:

> "The north Italian cities Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia were closer to the main military areas than Rome was; in Gaul, Trier was well placed as a base from which to resist incursions from across the Rhine; Sirmium and Serdica were close to the Danube front and Thessalonika was en route to the eastern frontier; likewise Nicomedia and Antioch were important strategic locations in dealings with Persia."[428]

Jones noted how the choice of capital could affect the provinces around it and cities within. When Diocletian chose to reside in Nicomedia, the trade along the coast of the Propontis "and along the roads which led, by Hadrianopolis and by Aprus, to the west" in Thrace must have been greatly stimulated.[429] While these cities existed before the tetrarchy, they were further fortified to house the emperor and his army. Lactantius reported that emperor Diocletian heavily adorned the city of Nicomedia, saying:

> "Here public halls, there a circus, here a mint, and there a workhouse for making implements of war; in one place a habitation for his empress, and in another for

---

[427] Rees (1993), 188. Rees notes that C.H.V. Sutherland dates the reforms to 294 CE. See: C.H.V. Sutherland. (1967).

[428] Rees (2004), 27

[429] Please note that Nicomedia was in the province of Pontus and Bithynia, not Thrace. Jones (1971), 27

> his daughter. Presently, great part of the city was quitted, and all men removed with their wives and children, as from a town taken by enemies; and when those buildings were completed, to the destruction of whole provinces, he said, "They are not right, let them be done on another plan." Then they were to be pulled down, or altered, to undergo perhaps a future demolition. By such folly was he continually endeavoring to equal Nicomedia with the city Rome in magnificence."[430]

Rome and Italy

To accommodate the need for imperial presence at the empire's frontiers, military capitals emerged in the third century, which meant emperors were not residing in the city of Rome (with the exception of Maxentius). The changes in the army, along with changes in the administrative sector of the empire, increased the accessibility of the imperial government in Roman frontier cities, but left the city of Rome devoid of an emperor. What I would like to highlight in the third century is what Jill Harries says about the city of Rome, and the senate. Because the emperor was needed elsewhere, he barely had the time or energy to focus on the Senate. Likewise, higher military and administrative offices were being granted to career soldiers, and to wealthy non-senatorial citizens outside of Italy. This allowed the senatorial class in Rome to have more autonomy than ever before, and in many ways marked a turning point in Roman history, where the city of Rome and its inhabitants were a distinct entity from the emperor, who did not require their loyalty or approval. However, Harries notes that the successors of Philip the Arab (Decius (249-251); Trebonianus Gallus (251-253); Valerian (253-260) and Gallienus (253-268)) all had ties to the city, and in 270 CE Aurelian built new walls for the city, which "demonstrated continuing imperial concern for the security of the city."[431]

---

[430] Translation provided from Kyrtatas in the article, so it was used here rather than the JL Creed translation used elsewhere. From Kyrtatas, D. J. (2020). Religious Conflict in Roman Nicomedia. In M. J. Kelly & M. Burrows (Eds*.), Urban Interactions: Communication and Competition in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (pp. 147–180)*. Punctum Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv19cwdm9.8, 180; Lactant., *De mort. pers.* 7.8-10: Huc accedebat infinita quaedam cupiditas aedificandi, non minor provinciarum exactio in exhibendis operariis et artificibus et plaustris, omnia quaecumque sint fabricandis operibus necessaria. Hic basilicae, hic circus, hic moneta, hic armorum fabrica, hic uxori domus, hic filiae. Repente magna pars civitatis exciditur. Migrabant omnes cum coniugibus ac liberis quasi urbe ab hostibus capta. Et cum perfecta haec fuerant cum interitu provinciarum, "non recte facta sunt", aiebat, "alio modo fiant." Rursus dirui ac mutari necesse erat iterum fortasse casura. Ita semper dementabat Nicomediam studens urbi Romae coaequare.

This raises the question: What was the function and importance of Rome during the tetrarchy? Its symbolic importance as a cultural capital remained. As long as there was no disruption to the power of the emperor, who now lived elsewhere, Rome and the Romans within the city were left the responsibility of running the city. Rees states: "The Tetrarchs hardly ever went to Rome."[432] In prior years, would-be emperors needed to be declared emperor by the Senate in Rome, and it is not clear if Diocletian even visited when he ascended to power in 285 CE.[433] He perhaps visited twice, with his second visit being his *vicennalia* on November 20th, 305 CE. According to Lactantius, Diocletian fled the city on January 1st 306, because he could not "endure the outspokenness of the people of Rome."[434] He says further:

> "Impatient and sick in mind, he rushed out of the city just as January 1st was impending—the day on which his ninth consulship was to be bestowed upon him. He could not bear to wait the thirteen days needed for him to enter upon his consulship at Rome rather than Ravenna."[435]

In his restructuring of the empire, Rome was included in the Italian provinces and was subject to taxes as other provinces were.[436] Prior to his reign, Rome's citizens were exempt from these taxes, so by making Romans (those who lived in the city of Rome) pay a previously exempted tax Diocletian further showed how the city had lost its exceptionalism. Any imperial archive would be held in the nearest tetrarchic capital, rather than Rome as in the past. The praetorian guard in Rome was decreased, and citizens of Rome "would have to wait for an imperial visit, or write, or travel to petition to an emperor in person, to receive legal pronouncement."[437]

---

[431] Harries (2012), 4; Watson, (1999), 143-152.

[432] Rees (2004), 28

[433] Rees (2004) speculates that Diocletian may or may not have visited Rome in 285, while Simon Corcoran claims he did not visit until his vicennalia. Corcoran, Simon. (2008). *Diocletian. In Lives of the Caesars*, A.A. Barrett (Ed.). https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1002/9781444302950.ch10

[434] Lactant. *De mort. pers*. 17.1

[435] Lactant. *De mort. pers* 17.2-3

[436] Rees (2004), 29

In this way, Rome was almost reduced to the same level of importance as other Western cities in the empire, save for its attention to building projects and maintenance.[438] John Curran notes that prior to Diocletian, there had been a fire in Rome that damaged several essential buildings in the city center, unrest with the praetorian guard, and a waning presence of emperors.[439]

The tetrarchs' lack of interest in Rome and the Roman Senate would further fracture the relationship between the emperors and the Senate. When Maxentius arose as a usurper, he established Rome as a seat of power and the senate clearly supported him. Constantine treated Rome differently. It was the site of his conversion in 312 CE, and where he conquered Maxentius.[440] After defeating Maxentius, Constantine 'liberated' the city and the senators from him. He and his army marched through the Campus Martius to the Forum in an *adventus* into the city that almost acted as a triumph.[441] Curran claims: "Two features are outstanding in

---

[437] Ibid.

[438] For building projects in Rome in the third century see: Curran, John. (2000). *Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century*. Clarendon Press

[439] Curran (2000), 43

[440] In a panegyric delivered in Trier, the author says: "Then, after the body [Maxentius] had been found and hacked up, the entire populace of Rome broke out in vengeful rejoicing, and throughout the whole City where it was carried affixed to a spear that sinful head did not cease to suffer disfiguration, and meanwhile, in the customary jests of a triumph, it was mocked by insulting its bearer, since he suffered the deserts of another's head." XII Panegyric of Constantine Augustus, XII. 18.3, C. E. V., Rodgers, B. S., & Mynors, R. A. B. (1994). Panegyric of Constantine Augustus, by an Anonymous Orator (313). In *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (1st ed., Vol. 21, pp. 288–333). University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.5973126.13

[441] Curran (2000), 72. Pan. Lat. 12 (9), 18, 3 and Pan. Lat. 4 (10), 31, 5.

Constantine's relationship with the centre of Rome: his use of ceremony and his architectural impact."

In memory of his beneficence, Constantine erected an Arch and erased the stain of Maxentius by *damnatio memoriae*.[442] He erected a colossal statue of himself in the Basilica of Maxentius, which the Urban prefect may have used for judicial purposes.[443] Constantine disbanded the praetorian guard, and destroyed the camp of their cavalry-unit, the *equites singulares*.[444] On top of the camp he built a church, known as the Basilica Constantiniana.[445] Curran argues that much of Constantine's generosity to the city of Rome came from the buildings of Maxentius, which were "undeniably grand."[446] He continues:

> "They [the buildings] were clearly the work of an emperor who had a strong sense of the city's past as well as a desire once again to make Rome a genuine imperial capital around the person of a resident emperor by reviving its monumental center. It would have been quite unprecedented for a new emperor to tear down the buildings of his predecessor as a political gesture. Such an action might, in any case, have rebounded on Constantine leaving his actions open to interpretation as a punishment inflicted on the city for supporting Maxentius. Thus the best course of action was to use the grandeur of what remained standing as a testament to the clemency, power, and *romanitas* of the new emperor. Once Constantine's wishes became clear, the Senate obliged, dedicating first a golden statue in Constantine's honour to some unknown god and overseeing the dedication of a golden shield on behalf of Italy."[447]

---

[442] Curran (2000), 76

[443] Curran (2000), 82

[444] Curran (2000), 76 and 96.

[445] Now known as the St. John Lateran. Curran (2000), 96

[446] Curran (2000), 80

[447] Ibid.

Constantine took advantage of the already built monuments and used them to suit two needs at once. He was not only able to successfully take back Rome by force from Maxentius, but he was able to keep the city from ruin.

Hellenic Urban Culture in the Fourth Century

Euergetism and benefaction did not completely die in the late third and fourth centuries, but it did change, especially where it concerned supporting public building and entertainment. A.H.M. Jones says:

> "Liberality was a part of the pagan code. The rich were expected to spend their money lavishly for the benefit of their fellow citizens, subscribing to public buildings, maintaining the gymnasia and baths, buying corn for distribution at a fair price in time of famine, and above all providing games and other entertainments. The standard of generosity expected was high, and there were men who reduced themselves to poverty by their benefactions. This kind of liberality reached its apogee in the second century A.D. but the spirit survived in pagan circles down to the end of the fourth century at any rate: Libanius' letters are full of the praises of wealthy pagans who have impoverish themselves in the service of their cities."[448]

Jones claimed that while Christians did not participate in older forms of benefaction, they did believe in charity to the poor and in particular "to widows, orphans, strangers, and the sick."[449] The church did not participate in adorning their cities with lavish public buildings, but they would build churches, support and endow clergy, and "supported thousands of monks."[450] Where there is overlap, however, is in the motivation behind acts of benefaction. Jones attested that "vainglory no doubt played its part, particularly in the erection of churches—as in pagan times benefactors were far more willing to put up a new building which would commemorate their name than to make provision for repairs."[451] Jones does clarify, however, that a more powerful motivation was to save one's soul by supporting the church.

---

[448] Jones (1964), 971

[449] Ibid.

[450] Ibid, 972

When the tetrarchs built their capital cities, they provided new infrastructure to support their presence. Outside of Rome, these cities reflected the patronage of the tetrarchs. Because the emperors of the tetrarchy were usually busy fighting wars along the borders of the empire or fighting amongst each other, it was difficult to use money needed to support soldiers and tetrarchic capitals for building projects elsewhere. Alternatively, emperors may have prioritized the needs of the empire and not seen the need to continue supporting civic building projects in the provinces. This may have been true until the reign of Constantine, who ushered in a new era of peace similar to that of Augustus. An era of peace allowed Constantine to focus on other areas of the empire that did not include fighting wars and putting down rebellions. He stopped Christian persecutions and allowed a new religious class to thrive. Likewise, he built a new capital, Constantinople, to twin Rome herself. He established himself permanently in Constantinople and created a new society in the Greek-speaking east.

I would like to conclude this discussion of cities by pairing two influential and powerful cities as they existed in the fourth century: Constantinople and Antioch. Constantinople, a city born from emperor Constantine's vision of a new capital to rival Rome, stood as the capital of the empire. Likewise, Antioch, which had a deep history with the Roman Empire, became a civic pillar in the Roman world as a hub for education, culture, and religion. The two cities, together with their people, define power, influence, and Greek and Roman culture in the fourth century.

---

[451] Ibid, 972

Constantinople

In 330 CE, Constantine changed forever the city of Byzantium, which would now become his new capital: Constantinople. When Constantine founded Constantinople, it replaced Nicomedia as the capital of the eastern Roman Empire. The *Notitia Dignitatum* notes that there were two prefects for two cities in the empire: Rome in the west, and Constantinople in the east, further connecting the two as twin cities with seemingly equal administrative importance. The city had a forum, with a senate house situated in the northern arc, with a bronze colossus of Athena and statues representing the myth of the Judgment of Paris surrounding the building. The Senate House doors were taken from Ephesos and were decorated with a rendition of the gigantomachy. According to Anthony Kaldellis, "The forum was thus a grand architectural image of the Constantinian cosmos, linking the City to Troy, Rome, and victory, and the Apolline order of Augustus. It marked a glorious new beginning, fueled by civil war and built from its spoils."[452]

The city's location was a statement on Constantine's victory over Licinius, whom he defeated in 324 CE. Kaldellis likens this to Augustus' founding of Nikopolis after his defeat of Marc Antony in 31 BCE. This was yet another way in which Constantine modeled himself from Rome's first emperor. Constantine even took a statue from Nikopolis to be placed in the center of the Hippodrome, a site where people congregated to watch the chariot races.[453] More importantly, however, the city was Roman, founded by traditional Roman rites and Roman religious features such as a Capitolium, temples to Kybele and Fortune, and a hippodrome.[454] Likewise, administratively, the city mimicked Rome by establishing a *cura annonae*, allowing its citizens to be exempt from provincial service, and having fourteen administrative regions.

---

[452] Kaldellis, A. (2021). *The New Roman Empire: A History of Byzantium* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197549322.001.0001, 11-12. The city's location was a statement on Constantine's victory over Licinius, whom he defeated in 324 CE. Kaldellis likens this to Augustus' founding of Nikopolis after his defeat of Marc Antony in 31 BCE. This was yet another way in which Constantine modeled himself from Rome's first emperor.

The new capital was strategic. I already mentioned that it was a monumental statement to Constantine's victory over Licinius, but it also had geographic advantages. First, history made clear that the empire tended to "fracture" at the Bosporos, with Greece and Asia Minor being part of the eastern side.[455] Second, it was close to the eastern border where the threat of foreign invasion and conquest was constant. Third, the capital was situated in an area of the Bosporus that was difficult to penetrate, which allowed the city to have built-in protection and a clear view of any incoming fleet. Lastly, by making Constantinople a major cosmopolis rather than a military base, Constantine and his successors enticed eastern elites to be involved in the city, which created new career opportunities and, importantly, a new senate.

Thus, Greek elites from the eastern provinces were drawn into Roman society, which had become the focal point of the imperial state. Eusebius in his Life of Constantine, recorded a speech of Constantine given to the provincials in the east.[456] The speech, which focused on the supremacy of Christianity over the heathenism of paganism, sought to inspire eastern citizens to unite under Constantine and embrace his Roman empire. He set himself against the tetrarchic emperors who were "exceedingly harsh because of their savage [pagan] ways," and "were mentally sick and embraced savagery [paganism] rather than gentleness."[457] Those emperors ruined the state with civil wars and their lack of virtue. Constantine said that Christians were forced to hide among "barbarians" in the east, but now they exist as the Roman race (*Ῥωμαίων γένος*).[458] He was a savior of the Romans and the Christians, who were now under the umbrella of the Roman race.

---

[453] Kaldellis (2021), 13-14

[454] Kaldellis (2021), 13: "Constantinople was created between 324 and 330 through a series of arcane Roman rites. There was the limitatio in 324, when Constantine delineated the walls in the ground with a spear; the inauguratio, when omens were taken and a horoscope cast; and finally the consecratio and dedicatio of 11 May, 330, when the City was endowed with its new identity. Experts in traditional cult ensured that the rites were performed properly and the emperor made a "bloodless sacrifice," one appropriate for a Christian, that bound the City to its new names."

[455] Kaldellis (2021), 16: Frequent rivalries showcased this fracture. For example: Octavian and Marc Antony and Vitellius and Vespasian, where Antony (43-31 BCE) and Vespasian (69 BCE) in Alexandria; Septimius Severus and Pescennius Niger, whom the latter set up in Antioch (193-194 CE); Aurelian in Byzantion (271-272 CE) and followed by Licinius and Maximin Daia who also used Byzantion as a base in 313 CE.

[456] Provincials being those in Anatolia. See Euseb. *Vit. Const*. II.55, where Constantine called upon god to protect the Anatolians, his audience: Σὲ νῦν τὸν μέγιστον θεὸν παρακαλῶ· εἴης πρᾶός τε καὶ εὐμενὴς τοῖς σοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς, εἴης πᾶσι τοῖς σοῖς ἐπαρχιώταις ὑπὸ χρονίου συμφορᾶς συντριβεῖσι, δι' ἐμοῦ τοῦ σοῦ θεράποντος ὀρέγων ἴασιν. καὶ ταῦτά γε αἰτῶ οὐκ ἀπεικότως, ὦ δέσποτα τῶν ὅλων, ἅγιε θεέ.

Themistius, a fourth-century pagan Greek orator, was close to the emperor Constantius II (r. 337-361). Themistius held a teaching position in Constantinople but later became a member of the senate in 355 CE. Even after Constantius' death, emperors continued to show Themistius favor, and he gave speeches for Jovian (r. 363-4), Valens (364-78), and Theodosius (379-95).[459] In 357 CE, Constantius went to Rome, and Themistius arrived as a representative of the Constantinople Senate deliver a speech. The context for the visit was to stabilize the relationship between the eastern and western halves of the empire. There were two rebellions in the west, first in (date) under Vetranio and then in (date) under Magnentius, that caused severe disruptions throughout the empire. Constantius II prioritized putting down the usurpers who had killed his brother and co-ruler, Constans (r. 337-350), and allowed his cousin Gallus to rise to Caesar to oversee the eastern empire in Antioch during his absence.[460] Constantius, likely threatened by Gallus, invited Constantinus to meet him in Italy. Still, Constantinus was murdered while on his way, and Constantius did not replace him in the east until 355 CE. At the same time, barbarian tribes such as the Alamanni and Franks, were threatening Gaul, and the Persians were attacking the eastern borders. Constantius appointed his cousin and half-brother of Gallus, Julian, Caesar in order to fight these attacks in 355 CE while he went to Rome. In short, this visit to Rome was an attempt to bolster the morale of the empire's people and promote unity within the empire. In the speech, Themistius, potentially trying to convince Constantius of the importance of Constantinople, connected the twin cities.[461]

---

[457] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* II.48-49.

[458] Euseb. *Vit. Const.*, II.53: Ἀλλὰ τί ταῦτα; αὐχοῦσι νῦν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις οἱ βάρβαροι οἱ τοὺς κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ ἐξ ἡμῶν φεύγοντας ὑποδεδεγμένοι καὶ φιλανθρώπῳ τηρήσαντες αἰχμαλωσίᾳ, ὅτι οὐ μόνον τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῆς σεμνότητος αὐτοῖς κατέστησαν ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ἔχειν. καὶ νῦν τὸ Ῥωμαίων γένος κηλῖδα ταύτην διηνεκῆ φέρει, ἣν οἱ κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς οἰκουμένης ἐλαυνόμενοι Χριστιανοὶ καὶ βαρβάροις προσφεύγοντες προσετρίψαντο.

[459] Heather, Peter and David Moncur. (2001). *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. (2001). Translated with an introduction by Peter Heather and David Moncur. Liverpool, ix.

Themistius compares Rome and Constantinople directly with the Greek past by saying:

> "For she does not proclaim the crown at Olympia or Delphi nor assemble the Greeks at the Panathenaia or the Dionysia, as the ancient Athenians once did in flattery of their Macedonian masters, but it is in the city which rules cities [Rome] that she who through you rules in second place binds the brow of him who rules mankind, and indeed makes this city, which alone is more prestigious than the one giving it, a witness of the honour. Thus is our theatre more glorious and equal to the crown and its proclamation…. And because of the city [i.e. Rome] our celebration becomes quite complete. For she [Constantinople] who shares both its Tyche and name [i.e. New Rome] takes her share and is present among the celebrants. A dance is formed which in its three perfect elements is the most perfect of all. The queens join their voices in song, the coryphaeus leads to and the whole of the earth and sea add their voices of good omen. Their hymn calls all the tribes in the east and all the races in the west with harmony, the victories rise up into the heavens with the sun and joining it on its bright journey to the west come down to earth with the king in the metropolis of triumphs. Surely this dance seems on a par with those of Daedalus, which that man, as Homer says, wrought

---

[460] Heather, Peter and David Moncur (2001), 115-116.

[461] Heather, Peter and David Moncur. (2001), 120-122

> for Ariadne at Knossos; or rather, since the creator of the dance is superior, is not what follows also so."[462]

Thus, Themistius, in his role as ambassador for the eastern court, joined Rome and Constantinople as the two cities of the Roman empire in which the emperor must care for and foster. He mentioned their similarities and stated that it was vital for the people of both to join in supporting the Roman state.

Constantinople was seen as a capital by both eastern and western authors in the fourth century. Ausonius of Bordeaux, a fourth-century Gallic poet, rated the cities in the empire in his *Order of the Famous Cities*.[463] He ranked Rome first, simply saying, Rome was "first among cities, the home of the gods, is golden Rome."[464] Second, was Constantinople, which was "rising and by the loftiness of the new achievements eclipses old-time renown."[465] In third place, was Carthage in North Africa, and in fourth and fifth were Antioch and Alexandria, of which Ausonius said:

> "Both hold the same rank. These also doth frenzied ambition drive into rivalry of vices: each is disordered with her mob, and half-crazed with the riots of her frantic populace. This, fertile and secure, vaunts herself because she has the Nile for bulwark and is deep-embayed in her sheltered site; that, because her rival power confronts the faithless Persians. Ye, too, go forward equal and uphold the Macedonian name. Great Alexander founded thee; while she claims that Seleucus

---

[462] Themistius, *Oration* 3. 41a-42 from *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. (2001). Translated with an introduction by Peter Heather and David Moncur. Liverpool

[463] Translation and edition used: Ausonius. *Volume I: Books 1-17.* Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Loeb Classical Library 96. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

[464] Ausonius, Ordo Urbium Nobilium, 1.1: "Prima urbes inter, divum domus, aurea Roma."

[465] Ausonius put Carthage, which had historical precendence, in a close third behind Constantinople. Ausonius, Ordo Urbium Nobilium, 2.5-7: vetus hanc opulentia praefert, hanc fortuna recens; fuit haec, subit ista novisqueexcellens meritis veterem praestringit honoremet Constantino concedere cogit Elissam.

> whose birthmark was an anchor, whereof the branded likeness is wont to be the sure token of his race; for through his whole succeeding line this natal sign has run."[466]

Ausonius rooted both cities with their ancient founders and history, but described both as containing riotous inhabitants during his time. These rioters likely refer to the students and professors who flocked to these cities to study philosophy and rhetoric, establishing both cities as intellectual centers of the fourth century.

Antioch[467]

Fourth century orator and teacher of rhetoric, Libanius, is, perhaps, antithetical to my argument that those living in the Greek east began to see themselves as "Romans." Instead, he was adamantly Antiochene. In his autobiography, he stated that "it is conducive to good fortune to be a citizen of a great and famous city" when referencing his home city of Antioch. In *Oration 11, Antiochikos: In Praise of Antioch,* he highlights the uniqueness of Antioch, its history, and the resilience of the land and its citizens. The oration was given for the Olympia, "a festival sanctioned and sponsored by the Roman state at which Antiochenes presented their urban community to a wider regional audience" at the site of Daphne.[468] This oration was given soon after Julian rose to the rank of Caesar.[469] Libanius attributes the greatness of Antioch to the pagan gods. A.F. Norman argues:

---

[466] Ausonius, *Ordo Urbium Nobilium*, 3 & 4.3-13.

[467] This is the Antioch of Syria, not Antioch of Pisidia, in the province of Galatia. See also Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. (1972). *Antioch: City and imperial administration in the later Roman Empire*. Clarendon Press for a comprehensive study of Antioch of Syria.

[468] Bjornlie, S. (2023). Urban Crises and the Contours of the Late Antique Empire through the Lens of Antioch. *Studies in Late Antiquity:A Journal*, *7*(2), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1525/sla.2023.7.2.184, 191; Norman, A.F. (2000). *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture, as Observed by Libanius.* Liverpool, 1-7.

[469] Norman (2000), 4; or perhaps earlier under the reign of Constantius in 356 CE.

> "His insistence upon the harmony between the ancient and the modern and upon the role of the gods in the creation of the city reinforces that same sense of spiritual uplift and transmits it to his own time, enabling him to round off the whole with a recitation of the glories of Daphne, where the festival reached its climax, and a reminder that twice within living memory emperors had acknowledged its sanctity by the prestigious act of assuming presidency of the Games."[470]

Libanius, respecting the traditional format of panegyric, begins by praising the land itself. He claimed that the gods blessed the land, making it the perfect basin for fertility and agriculture throughout every season. Of agriculture, he referenced Cicero's discussion of the ancient granary of Rome in Sicily, and Homer's myth of Demeter, he stated:[471]

> "Demeter loved our land so much more than Sicily that while Hephaestus put only one golden furrow on his shield, she has made a large portion of our land golden in colour with the corn, the like of which you can find nowhere else, the gift of her who really is the golden goddess."[472]

As a rhetor, Libanius used literary references from both Latin and Greek authors. Whether intentionally or not, Libanius was connecting his audience to the Roman and Hellenic past. Importantly, he situated Antioch in its mythic past, drawing on the story of the Argive Ianchus, the father of Io, whose men decided to settle in Antioch because they enjoyed the land.[473] One of the Argives, Triptolemus, would found the city with the name Ione, to honor Io, and a temple named after Zeus Nemeius.[474] The city would be called Nemeius, then Epicarpius.

---

[470] Ibid.

[471] Norman (2000), 11 footnote 11. "Sicily, the granary of Rome in the later Republic, as in Cicero, *Verrines*: it was also the location of the mythical rape of Persephone, hence Demeter, and of the working of the shield of Achilles by Hephaestus, Homer, Iliad 18.478. 'Golden' Demeter, ibid. 5.500."

[472] Lib., *Orat. 11.21* translations here and elsewhere are from Norman (2000).

[473] Lib. *Orat. 11.44-50.* Io was a priestess of Hera who, unfortunately, became an object of desire for Zeus. Hera, to punish her and Zeus, turned Io into a cow and tormented her by sending a horse fly to make her wander the world. Ianchus sent his men then went to search for her, but they enjoyed Antioch so much that they decided to stay and not return to their homeland.

[474] This is also connecting the city to Demeter if this is the same Triptolemus featured in the Eleusinian mysteries.

Triptolemus left after founding the city, opening the way to Casus from Crete, to rule the city. He would marry the daughter of the king of Cyprus, therefore connecting his people, the Argives, and the Cypriots. Libanius noted that some Heraclidae, driven out by Eurystheus, settled in the city. By re-telling these mythic pasts, Libanius insisted on the Greek ancestry of the city. He said:

> "Note then that the best and noblest from all these sources flowed together here, as though to a place divinely appointed to receive men worthy of admiration. These roots united their several virtues in us alone —the ancient lineage of the Argives, the law-abiding nature of the Cretans, the royal ancestry of Cyprus, and the divine descent from Heracles."[475]

He goes on to connect Antioch's history with the Persian Wars (499-449 BCE), which did not involve battles but rather cultural interaction that resulted in King Cambyses erecting a temple to Apollo in the city. Unlike Athens and Corinth, which rendered "irreligious" battles of the gods, Antioch did not depict divine warfare, making them "darlings of the gods."[476] Of his Antiochian ancestors, he said that they "behaving justly towards each other, gained their livelihood from the soil and bestowed upon the gods their proper due; in all happiness they inhabited a Greek city in the midst of heathendom."[477]

In the fourth century BCE, the city became a part of the Seleucid Empire after Alexander (r.336-323 BCE). Under Seleucus I Nicator, the city was officially named after his father, Antiochus. Unlike the other Hellenistic kings who took "pride in the destruction of existing towns" Seleucus, according to Libanius, founded cities. The king wanted Antioch "to be a source of other cities, in such numbers that wayfarers were served by cities, not inns."[478] Throughout the Hellenistic period, Libanius said that Antioch was 'the citadel of their [the Macedonians and

---

[475] Lib. *Orat. 11.57*
[476] Lib. *Orat. 11.67*
[477] Lib. *Orat. 11.68*
[478] Lib. *Orat. 11.100-101*

Seleucids] empire, and in all good fortune they dwelt here and adorned her with works from all over the world."[479] Ultimately, Antioch was bloodlessly annexed into the Roman empire by Pompey in 64 BCE, when "the city perceived the divine will and accepted the change without disturbance."[480] Rather than being ruled by the Romans, Libanius said the change in government was more like a "change of family, for the crop of blessings was the same as before."[481]

Shane Bjornlie claims the oration "provides an example for how citizens of urban communities contributed to the manufacture of the city as a genuinely unique idea" while downplaying the city's relationship to the Roman emperor.[482] In the third and fourth centuries, while the Romans were at war with the Persians, Antioch was established as a base for the emperor.[483] Under Constantine, a new office, the Count of the East, was established and placed in Antioch to oversee military operations in the eastern provinces. During Libanius' lifetime, the emperors frequented the city since it became the closest hub to the eastern border. This would lead to the emperor developing relationships among the elites of Antioch. Libanius highlighted how the emperor would have relationships with council members, as well as the governors.[484]

---

[479] Lib. *Orat. 11.129*

[480] Lib. *Orat. 11.129*: Full quote: "However, when by the will of heaven, their empire fell and the world was girt with the golden chain of Rome, so to speak, the city quickly perceived the divine will and accepted the change without disturbance. Even if she had opposed it, it was destined that she should be their subject, and so she acceded to them peacefully, and made the future free from bitterness, providing no excuse for rancour"

[481] Lib. *Orat. 11.130*: "So then, in return for this complaisance, she enjoyed such forethought on the part of our superiors that it seemed that the change of government was merely a change of family, for the crop of blessings was the same as before. It was as if there was no difference between the founders of the city, and those who had come to control it, and as if the Romans possessed something they had originally built, and preserved the kindly relationship towards something of their own creation. They guarded its existing fame, and adding their own customs they retained it in its position as the metropolis of Asia." Keep in mind this is an oration, meant to highlight positive aspects of the city, rather than any negatives. This certainly affects Libanius' narrative of Antioch's history.

[482] Bjornlie (2023), 186-187

[483] Lib. *Orat. 11.177;* Antioch was captured by the Persian king Shapur between 256-260 under Valerian.

[484] Lib. *Orat. 11.147*

They would be so impressed by their wisdom that he would grant them provincial appointments.[485]

Libanius claimed that Antioch became the emperor's favorite city and that he would care for it in his absence "as if it were his own birthplace: he has sworn to return here, too, and he relieves his absences with his dispatches. He piles warfare upon warfare without rest; after his labours in the West, he is eager to view the East, and after his labours in the East, he is eager to view our city. So he never proceeded elsewhere, save as the exigencies of war demanded. In very truth he spent here the happiest days of his life, reclining in the arms of his beloved, so to speak."[486]

Emperor Julian (r. 361-363) had a fraught relationship with the Antiochenes.[487] Julian angrily wrote a work called the *Misopogon* (Beard-Hater), addressed to the people of Antioch between 361-362 CE after they made fun of his appearance when he was there to perform a sacrifice to Jupiter on Mt. Casius.[488] In it, he called the Antiochians out for making fun of his facial hair, saying:

> "Now as for praising myself, though I should be very glad to do so, I have no reason for that; but for criticising myself I have countless reasons, and first I will begin with my face. For though nature did not make this any too handsome or well-favoured or give it the bloom of youth, I myself out of sheer perversity and ill-temper have added to it this long beard of mine, to punish it, as it would seem, for this very crime of not being handsome by nature. For the same reason I put up with the lice that scamper about in it as though it were a thicket for wild beasts."[489]

---

[485] Ibid.

[486] Lib. *Orat. 11.180*

[487] Amm. Marc. XXII.14.1-6; Julian *Misopgon.*

[488] Amm. Marc. XXII.14.1-6

[489] "τὸ γὰρ εἰς ἑαυτὸν γράφειν εἴτε ἐπαίνους εἴτε ψόγους εἴργει νόμος οὐδείς. ἐπαινεῖν μὲν δὴ καὶ σφόδρα ἐθέλων ἐμαυτὸν οὐκ ἔχω, ψέγειν δὲ μυρία, καὶ πρῶτον ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου. τούτῳ γὰρ οἶμαι φύσει γεγονότι μὴ λίαν καλῷ μηδ᾽ εὐπρεπεῖ μηδ᾽ ὡραίῳ ὑπὸ δυστροπίας καὶ δυσκολίας αὐτὸς προστέθεικα τὸν βαθὺν τουτονὶC πώγωνα, δίκας αὐτὸ πραττόμενος, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐδενὸς μὲν ἄλλου, τοῦ δὲ μὴ φύσει γενέσθαι καλόν" Julian. *Misopogon.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913

Julian was a known pagan and had attempted to revive paganism in the empire, which was becoming increasingly Christian. He criticized the Antiochians for not embracing their paganism enough and called them out for being weak and feminine by saying they were clean-shaven.[490] The Antiochenes, however, were not upset about his facial hair, which was secondary to their ire at Julian's attempt to regulate prices.[491] When the senate (*curia*) at Antioch outwardly opposed the order, which revealed their comfort in speaking out against the emperor, Julian composed this invective against them.

In this way, the city, both officially and unofficially, was a center of imperial presence. Libanius made clear that the Antiochenes transitioned seamlessly into the Roman way of life, and they continued to perform civic duties and be a capital for oratorical training. Through Libanius' orations, Antioch appears to be deeply rooted in a Hellenic past while embracing its role under Roman leadership without any conflict. This was in line with Antioch's past, which had always honored people from different cities and cultures. In this way, Antioch was a city that constantly adapted without sacrificing their identity, which, by the fourth century CE, was both Greek and Roman.

---

[490] "For I myself furnish you with an excuse for it by wearing my chin as goats do, when I might, I suppose, make it smooth and bare as handsome youths wear theirs, and all women, who are endowed by nature with loveliness. But you, since even in your old age you emulate your own sons and daughters by your soft and delicate way of living, or perhaps by your effeminate dispositions, carefully make your chins smooth, and your manhood you barely reveal and slightly indicate by your foreheads, not by your jaws as I do"; "δίδωμι γὰρ αὐτὸς τὴν αἰτίαν ὥσπερ οἱ τράγοι τὸ γένειον ἔχων, ἐξὸν οἶμαι λεῖον αὐτὸ ποιεῖν καὶ ψιλόν, ὁποῖον οἱ καλοὶ τῶν παίδων ἔχουσιν ἅπασαί τε αἱ γυναῖκες, αἷς φύσει πρόσεστι τὸ ἐράσμιον. ὑμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ ζηλοῦντες τοὺς ὑμῶν αὐτῶν υἱέας καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑπὸ ἁβρότητος βίου καὶ ἴσως ἁπαλότητος τρόπου λεῖον ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζεσθε, τὸν ἄνδρα ὑποφαίνοντες καὶ παραδεικνύντες διὰ τοῦ μετώπουΒ καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν γνάθων." Julian. *Misopogon.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913

[491] Amm. Marc. XXII.1: Inter praecipua tamen et seria illud agere superfluum videbatur, quod, nulla probabili ratione suscepta, popularitatis amore, vilitati studebat venalium rerum, quae non numquam secus quam convenit ordinata, inopiam gignere solet et famem.

Conclusion

Cities in the ancient Mediterranean were frequently subjected to change. Often, it would be an environmental crisis, war, or money that forced change, and in the third century CE, this was more apparent than ever. The Romans historically had a complex and fraught relationship with the concept of Hellenic culture, as well as with the Greek people themselves. The two cultures, however, had centuries worth of shared history prior to the reign of August (r. 27 BCE-14 CE), to such an extent that when the Romans were conquering Greece, discussions arose about how to handle the situation.

When Augustus constructed his *Pax Romana*, the Greeks and their homelands were included in that vision. In many ways, the Greek East had always been part of the Roman Empire in a manner unlike other provinces and peoples. In the second century CE, Roman emperors sought to directly influence civic activities and behavior. The emperor Trajan sought balance when governing Pontus and Bithynia by encouraging Pliny to insert himself where it concerned the mismanagement of money and potential corruption but otherwise encouraged him to keep the peace. Hadrian encouraged Greek cities to revive Hellenic festivals and celebrations. By the mid-third century, Greek cities and provinces were in economic decline and trying to keep their borders safe. Under Diocletian, cities and provinces were governed by Romans, expected to follow Roman law, and had more access to the Roman government than ever before.

At the same time, Romans in power, whether that be an emperor, governor, or soldier, were diversifying and coming from outside of Rome. No longer were the Romans in power the senatorial elite. *Equites* could be born from a variety of different backgrounds and provinces. This change in rulership, which was initiated during the early stages of the empire under the princeps, opened up the office, allowing governors to have limited power and a sense of loyalty to the emperor. This gave a new class of people a greater stake in the Roman state, and this increased as citizenship expanded. Free people of the empire were steadily gaining more opportunity to play a larger role in the Roman state, whether by military or administrative office holding. This was especially true for men in the Greek-speaking east who had always had a certain advantage in the Roman world, and men in Illyricum and Pannonia.

When Constantine founded Constantinople, formerly Byzantium, he wanted to officially merge the civic structure of a Roman city, modeled from Rome itself, with the geographic locus in the Greek east. It could be because as a solider, Constantine's cultural upbringing was more "Roman" in that he grew up in the army, spoke Latin, and his peers set a similar standard. He created a senate at Constantinople to balance out the Roman governing body and generate a new senatorial order in the east. Constantinople was a city of both Greeks and Romans, who were one in the same.

Almost as a contrast, Antioch had a long and complex history within the empire. It was a Greek city and formerly part of the Seleucid Empire, but it became part of the Roman province of Syria in the first century BCE under Caesar. By the time of Ammianus Marcellinus, Antioch had become a major Roman city in the east and was often the recipient of the emperor and an important center of Christianity. That Ammianus would take on such a traditional Roman narrative in his histories is no surprise, as his life was characterized mainly by being a soldier, but as a "Greek" from Syria, his life and work show the new dynamic of being a Roman in the Greek east in the fourth century.[492]

---

[492] Woods, David and M.P. Hanaghan, editors. (2022). *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill. doi: 10.1163/9789004525351

When Greek authors praise or speak of their cities or other cities in the east, they tie in the Hellenic history by retelling the mythic foundations and their connections to historic Greek events (such as the Persian Wars). These histories reveal complex relationships with other cultures: relationships, which, varied significantly among each city and shaped the image of the city differently. Chaniotis said that Hellenic identities easily coexisted with regional "barbarian" identities, as is the case with Aphrodisias.[493] He claims, for Aphrodisias, identity and past "was displayed through the use of mythical themes" that reflected its relationship to others, which was "to Rome as an ally, to other Greek cities as a peer, or to Karian cities as their *metropolis*."[494] This flexible identity, which demonstrates the resilience of the city's inhabitants, also applied to Antioch, a city with a complex history of rulership.

Bjornlie notes there is a rich body of scholarship dedicated to urban centers and societies in late antiquity, and claims much of this scholarship highlights the "tension between the particularity of individual late antique cities, on the one hand, and the relative uniformity of social, political, and religious structures consistent throughout the late antique urban experience of the Roman Empire, on the other."[495] Additionally, he claims:

> "The history of the Roman Empire, at its most essential, is a history of the Roman state acquiring these loci of very unique identities (cities) and knitting the participation of their elites into the fabric of a larger project: the Roman Empire."[496]

Over time, the trajectory is clear. Throughout the third century CE, the Roman administration changed, and those changes rippled throughout the empire and affected all of her citizens. These changes impacted civic life in the Greek cities in ways they had not experienced before. Under the reign of Diocletian, the government of Roman cities was being standardized. New offices were created to implement those changes further, pulling more people of equestrian rank into Roman offices. Both emperors Diocletian and Constantine created new civic offices, which opened doors for Greek people, and changed the civic landscape when they established capitals in the east.

---

[493] Chaniotis (2016), 93
[494] Ibid.
[495] Bjornlie (2023), 186-187
[496] Bjornlie (2023), 189

Kaldellis highlights that Constantinople was very much a Roman city rather than a Christian city, which did not yet exist.[497] I argue that, despite its geographical location and Greek population, the city reflected Western Roman tradition more than it did a typical Greek city. This was intentional on Constantine's part, who drew on mythic relationships to Troy and the foundation of Rome. The foundation of this city, and what it became, is evidence of the answer to the question I ask throughout this dissertation, which is: How did the Greek east change under Roman rule, and how did Roman rule affect Greek identity? Emperor Constantine was able to physically unite the Greek people with the Roman world by placing a Roman city at the heart of their geographic territory. In doing so, he was able to engage the Greek people, who had been slowly acclimating and integrating into Roman society, into his vision of New Rome.

As civic life in the Greek cities evolved, it became increasingly important to emphasize areas of Hellenic culture that the people could influence, such as education. Just as the political relationship between the Greek and Roman worlds had endured for centuries, so too had the Romans' admiration and respect for the educational institutions in Greek cities. In the first two and a half centuries of the Roman Empire, *paideia*, or the Greek system of education for young men, thrived and was patronized by Roman elites and emperors. Through education, the Hellenic identity and tradition could survive and be passed on to future generations. Even this cultural arena, however, would change in the fourth century.

---

[497] Kaldellis (2021), 14

Chapter Three: Law and Administration

"He [Constantine] enacted many laws, some good and equitable, but most of them superfluous, and some severe." -Eutropius, *Abridgement of Roman History*, book X.8[498]

Introduction

Eutropius was born in the early fourth century, around the time when Emperor Constantine was engaging in his final battle against rival Licinius in 324 CE. This meant that Eutropius lived in the empire built not only by Constantine, who drastically reshaped the Roman world, but also that of Emperor Diocletian. This chapter aims to examine how changes, particularly legal changes, introduced by Diocletian and Constantine in the late third and early fourth centuries impacted imperial culture in the Greek East. I examine how both emperors used Roman law as a guiding force to stabilize the empire and its inhabitants. I argue that the legal reforms and projects had a profound impact on the Romans in the east in unprecedented ways. In the third and fourth centuries, Romans in the Greek-speaking cities and provinces became increasingly aligned with the Roman state. Second, I argue that the changes were not spontaneously born from the tetrarchic emperors. Instead, I demonstrate how their policies were connected to those enacted by prior Roman emperors and aligned with a broader Roman ethos regarding the Roman state.

---

[498] The full quote: "Multas leges rogavit, quasdam ex bono et aequo, plerasque superfluas nonnullas severas, primusque urbem nominis sui ad tantum fastigium evehere molitus est, ut Romae aemulam faceret." Eutr., X.8.

Romans “subscribed to the existence of the ideal constitution or system of laws (*nomoi*) which, if observed, should guarantee order and justice.”[499] Jill Harries observed that:

> “Late Roman society must be viewed in terms of a multiplicity of relationships, in which the law was used as a tool of enforcement, an expression of power, or a pawn in the endless games played out between emperor and citizen, centre and periphery, rich and poor.”[500]

In this chapter I show how Diocletian, and later Constantine, pull from and understand the Roman legal tradition. I want to highlight the intentionality of the emperors, and claim they attempted to unite the Roman people by codifying law and making it the sole practice for citizens. As in other chapters, it is clear that changes either formally established or enacted during the tetrarchic period were not entirely innovative. In fact, the tetrarchs were frequently inspired by policies created by Augustus and Hadrian. Second, without the Antonine Edict, any attempt to homogenize Roman law in a way that impacted a majority of the people living within it would have been impossible. Lastly, by addressing legal concerns, Diocletian and Constantine were acting in the role of the emperor as envisioned by Augustus himself. In this way, both emperors upheld traditional Roman values.

Law and Empire

---

[499] Harries, Jill. (1999). *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 8.
[500] Harries (1999), 8

Prior to the second century BCE, there is little source evidence of Roman legislation. The main known source was that of the Twelve Tables, described by Livy, and dated around 451 BCE.[501] David Ibbetson notes that while the Twelve Tables were considered a *lex*, "it would be a mistake to see the XII Tables as a code in the modern sense of being a complete statement of legal rules; its provisions are far too piecemeal to allow for any such conclusion."[502] During the time of the Republic, there were two legislative bodies, the *comitia centuriata* and the *comitia tributa*, who could approve or deny proposals put forth by the magistrates and senators.[503] Ibbetson suggests that legislation brought before the assemblies were usually "one-off determinations—to make war or peace, for example, or to allow a triumph or impose a fine," and were not detailed complex matters.[504] Instead, the legal process was based on the *legis actiones*, which were "a highly ritualized set of oral formulae within which any legal claim had to be framed."[505] The College of Pontiffs, a religious body, reflected the system developed by the jurists most closely. The College of Pontiffs contained the institutional knowledge and information needed to resolve cases, and individual Pontiffs would give *responsa* to questions brought to them by individuals, which would provide the foundation for the *responsa* given in the second century CE.[506]

The Roman legal system underwent a significant transformation from the latter half of the second century BCE to the third century CE. The two significant developments, according to

---

[501] Livy 3.34.

[502] Ibbetson, D. (2015). Sources of Law from the Republic to the Dominate. In D. Johnston (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law* (pp. 25–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 26; See also: Raymond Westbrook, F. Rachel Magdalene, & Bruce Wells. (2009). *Law From the Tigris to the Tiber : The Writings of Raymond Westbrook*. Eisenbrauns.

[503] Ibbetson (2015), 27

[504] Ibid.

[505] Ibid.

[506] Ibid, 28

Ibbetson, were the development of the formulary system which was “a remedial framework which gave sharper definition to the basis of claims” and an established class of jurists “who applied a more sophisticated type of reasoning to the law than had previously been the case.”[507] Christine Lehne-Gstreinthaler defines jurists as those “who identified as such, who were called jurists, to whom considerable legal knowledge was attributed, and who had left *responsa*.”[508] In reality, the jurists did so much more. They could draft legal agreements, act as legal advisors and businessmen, and accountants. Jurists, according to Lehne-Gstreinthaler, could be employed by any man engaged in upholding any legal arrangement, and were the men who held the institutional knowledge for Roman law. As a body, they were responsible for crafting and storing legal documents, which could be used as evidence and background for court cases. In doing so, they laid the foundation for a legal framework in the Roman court systems.

In his *De Oratore*, Cicero, a first century BCE Roman statesman and lawyer, claimed that men who were considered legal experts would be “an expert in the statutes, and in the customary law observed by individuals as members of the community, and who is qualified to advise, direct the course of a lawsuit, and safeguard a client.”[509] Jurists in the empire engaging with Cicero interpreted some of Cicero’s writing as being that of a jurist. Their engagement with his legacy demonstrates a connection to a Republican politician and their understanding of Roman legal tradition.

---

[507] Ibid., 28

[508] Lehne-Gstreinthaler, Christine. (2016). Jurists in the Shadows’: The Everyday Business of the Jurists of Cicero’s Time. *Cicero’s Law: Rethinking Roman Law of the Late Republic*. Edinburgh, 88

[509] Cicero, *De Oratore*. 1.212. Translation from: Cicero. *On the Orator: Books 1-2.* Translated by E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 348. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942. Original text: Sin autem quaereretur, quisnam iurisconsultus vere nominaretur; eum dicerem, qui legum, et consuetudinis eius, qua privati in civitate uterentur, et ad respondendum, et ad agendum, et ad cavendum, peritus esset

When Augustus became the sole ruler of the Roman state, he claimed to have brought "law (*iura*) and statutes (*leges*)" back to the Roman people.[510] In his *Res Gestae*, published in 14 BCE, he explained how he did exactly that. First, he established himself as the sole supervisor of laws (*lex*) and customs (*mos*), in accordance with Roman tradition, and assumed a tribunicial role for the remainder of his life.[511] Then he claimed that: "Legibus novis me auctore latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi."[512] Second, he took on the role of Pontifex Maximus in 12 BCE, formalizing himself as the head of both state and religion.[513] In doing so, he defined two distinct areas of Roman life and culture that the emperor would oversee, and allowed him to issue edicts.[514]

According to Werner Eck, Augustus "involved himself in the daily, and the private, lives of the citizens as no one ever had before in Roman history. These [Roman] citizens no longer even had full control over decisions about their own personal values" because Augustus sought to "preserve moral values" which included interfering in laws of marriage and childbearing.[515]

---

[510] Eck, Werner. (2008). Augustus. *Lives of the Caesars,* edited by Anthony A. Barrett. Blackwell, 19. See coin 1998,0401.1 in the British Museum, found in Turkey, which says "LEGES ET IVRA P R RESTITVIT" which means "He has restored to the populus romani their laws and rights/statues,": https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1995-0401-1

[511] *Res Gestae 6*: Tuberone senatu populoque Romano consentientibus ut curator legum et morum summa potestate solus crearer, nullum magistratum contra morem maiorum delatum recepi; and 10: quoad viverem, tribunicia potestas mihi esset, per legem sanctum est.

[512] *Res Gestae 8:* **"**By new laws passed on my proposal I brought back into use many exemplary practices of our ancestors which were disappearing in our time, and in many ways I myself transmitted exemplary practices to posterity for their imitation," translation from *Res Gestae*. 1967. P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore: Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Oxford University Press.

[513] *Res Gestae* 10: Pontifex maximus ne fierem in vivi conlegae mei locum, populo id sacerdotium deferente mihi quod pater meus habuerat, recusavi. Quod sacerdotium aliquod post annos, eo mortuo qui civilis motus occasione occupaverat, cuncta ex Italia ad comitia mea confluente multitudine, quanta Romae nunquam fertur ante id tempus fuisse, recepi, P. Sulpicio C. Valgio consulibus.

[514] Sirks, A. J. B. (2015). Public Law. In D. Johnston (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law* (pp. 332–352). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 333

[515] Eck (2008), 24; see also Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2019). "Singles, Sex and Status in the Augustan Marriage Legislation." *The single life in the Roman and later Roman world*. Cambridge University Press

Evans Grubbs establishes that Augustan marriage legislation can be broken down into three laws: *lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* (Julian Law on the Marrying of the Social Orders), the *lex Papia et Poppaea*, which was technically written by consuls M. Papius Mutilus and Q. Poppaeus Secundus and "reinforced the first law and mitigated certain provisions" of the *lex Julia*, and the *lex Julia de coercendis adulteriis* (Julian law on repressing adultery).[516] The laws declared that men (between the ages of 25-60) and women (between 20-50 years of age) should be married and have children. Widows had to remarry; those unmarried and without children could not receive inheritances or legacies from those who were not closely related to them, and those who were married but childless would only partially receive their spouses' property.[517] Simultaneously, the laws rewarded those married couples with children.[518] Evans Grubbs notes that these laws were not necessarily well received by the Roman people during their 300 year life, and yet, they continued to remain.[519] She claims that while the laws did not necessarily impact a larger population of Roman citizens below the elite, the laws did seem to reinforce "imperial ideology (and imperial coffers)."[520]

Second Century Emperors and Law

Emperor Trajan (r. 98-117) officially made the imperial administration into a civil service, rather than a domestic one.[521] Prior to Trajan, the administration focused on personal management of the emperor's domestic household, but after his reign, the administration would focus on the administration of the empire. Even though emperors could choose their domestic staff and therefore had oversight for who would be in positions of power around them, they made these positions official government offices. According to Pliny the Younger, Trajan wanted to adhere to the law, even though it was not expected of him. Pliny said that "no one had intended these laws to apply to the Emperor, Caesar, but you were unwilling for your privileges to extend beyond our own."[522] Pliny admitted to hearing the phrase "the prince is above the law" but "the law is above the prince," and was impressed that Trajan "bows to the same restrictions as any other consul" and his awareness that due to his position, no one should be more concerned about keeping his oath to the people and the Roman state than Trajan.[523]

---

[516] Evans Grubbs (2019), 105-106.

[517] Ibid, 107.

[518] Ibid, 109.

[519] Ibid, 110-118. See too: Cass. Dio.56.2-9 and 50.16.220.3; Tacitus, Annals. 2.85 and 3.28.

[520] Ibid, 118

[521] Sirks, A. J. B. (2015), 338

The Roman legal system significantly shifted to reflect the *auctoritas* of the emperor under the reign of Emperor Hadrian (r. 117-138), who, unlike Trajan, fully assumed his ultimate authority as a lawgiver. It became clear that while the emperor valued the law and wanted to maintain a system of order aligned with Roman tradition, his role was now entwined with the institution, and his word was that of law. The *Institutes* of Gaius were a manual on Roman law published in the mid-second century CE, under the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). In it, Gaius made clear that Hadrian assumed a position of utmost authority.[524] Not only that, but the emperor could also make the law in the form of rescripts. According to Michael Peachin:

> "By the early third century, the great jurist Ulpian flatly stated that whatever the emperor wanted would have the force of law (D. 1.4.1 pr.). Both Ulpian and

---

[522] Pliny the Younger. *Panegyricus,* to Trajan, 475 from: Pliny the Younger, *Letters, Volume II: Books 8-10. Panegyricus.* Translated by Betty Radice. Loeb Classical Library 59. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969

[523] Ibid: Quod ego nunc primum audio, nunc primum disco; non est princeps super leges sed leges super principem idemque Caesari consuli quod ceteris non licet. Iurat in leges attendentibus dis (nam cui magis quam Caesari attendant?), iurat observantibus his quibus idem iurandum est, non ignarus alioqui nemini religiosius quod iuraverit custodiendum, quam cuius maxime interest non peierari.

[524] Gaius. *Institutes*, 1.7: Responsa prudentium sunt sententiae et opiniones eorum, quibus permissum est iura condere. Quorum omnium si in unum sententiae concurrunt, id, quod ita sentiunt, legis vicem optinet; si vero dissentiunt, iudici licet quam velit sententiam sequi; idque rescripto divi Hadriani significatur.

> Cassius Dio were furthermore of the opinion that the emperor stood above the law."[525]

Dio recorded Hadrian as a judge:

> "He transacted with the aid of the senate all the important and most urgent business and he held court with the assistance of the foremost men, now in the palace, now in the Forum or the Pantheon or various other places, always being seated on a tribunal, so that whatever was done was made public. Sometimes he would join the consuls when they were trying cases and he showed them honour at the horse-races."[526]

Whether Greek-speaking cities adopted the Roman legal framework varied significantly among the cities and peoples. Kantor notes that many of our sources come from inscriptions, and until about the second century CE, citizens of certain cities typically chose to use their own court systems, even if they were not currently residing in the city. [527] The legal jurisdictions were subject to the particular status of the *poleis*, whether they were free or not.[528] Citizens of free cities often had more flexibility in using their own court systems.

Indeed, like Augustus, who claimed tribunician power, inscriptions from Hadrian also indicate his tribunician power. In a rescript to the Aphrodisians written in Greek and preserved as an inscription, Hadrian posted his response to a question about jurisdiction over an Aphrodisian citizen. Hadrian responded:

---

[525] Peachin, M. (2006). Rome the Superpower: 96-235 CE. In *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, D.S. Potter (Ed.); *Dig.* 1.3.31; Cass. Dio. 53.18.1

[526] Cass. Dio. LXIX.7.1: Ἔπραττε δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου πάντα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα, καὶ ἐδίκαζε μετὰ τῶν πρώτων τοτὲ μὲν ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ τοτὲ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῷ τε Πανθείῳ καὶ ἄλλοθι πολλαχόθι, ἀπὸ βήματος, ὥστε δημοσιεύεσθαι τὰ γιγνόμενα." Translation from Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VIII: Books 61-70.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 176. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925

[527] Kantor, Georgy. (2015). "Greek Law under the Romans." *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*. Oxford, 9 (of the PDF). See the case of Aphrodisians in which Karian citizens "were protected from summons to Roman courts, even when outside their city," can be attested to in IAph2007, no. 8.100. In Chios, even Roman residents were subjected to the Chian laws (RDGE 70, II.17-18).

[528] See the prior chapter on cities for more discussion on city status.

> “The imperator Caesar, son of divine Trajan Parthicus, grandson of divine Nerva, Trajan Hadrian Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the third time, consul for the third time (A.D. 119), greets the magistrates, the council, and the people of the Aphrodisians. Having received your decree and heard from your ambassadors about the financial [cases I concede to you that if a Greek] who is a citizen of Aphrodisias either by birth or by adoption into the citizen body [is prosecuted by a] Greek who is a citizen of Aphrodisias the trial is to be heard under your [laws and at Aphrodisias], but if, on the contrary, a Greek [from another city (is prosecuted by a Greek Aphrodisian) the trial is to be held under] Roman law and in the province; those, however, who are [in debt to the city or stand surety for such a debt] or in short have a financial involvement with your public [treasury] are to undergo [trial in Aphrodisias]. Since you crown me with a crown [of gold? weighing? pounds], you should know that I have declined it because I do not wish your city to be burdened as far as I am concerned. Farewell.”[529]

The inscription detailed the situations in which a person would be tried under either Aphrodisian or Roman legal systems. On the one hand, this indicates situations where cities would have autonomy, especially regarding public funds or money owed to them. On the other hand, it explains that when a case was between an Aphrodisian and a Greek citizen of another poleis, or a

---

[529] Translation from J. Reynolds: Reynolds, JRA (2000), nos 1-4, whence *SEG* 50 2000.1096. Comments by D. Campanile, ZPE 135 (2001) 136-138, whence *SEG* 51 2001.1491: [Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ Παρθι]κ̣οῦ ὑὸς, θεοῦ Νέρουα υἱωνὸς, Τραιανὸς] [Ἁδριανὸς Σεβαστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστ]ο̣ς δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ τρίτον ὕπατος τὸ γ´] [Ἀφροδεισιέων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ βο]υλῇ̣ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ̣ *v.* χαίρειν *vac.* καὶ τῷ ψηφισ –] [ματι ὑμῶν ἐντυχὼν καὶ τῶν ὑμετέρων πρ]ε̣σβέων ἀκούσας περὶ τῶν χρηματικῶν δι] [κων , [συγχωρῶ ὑμεῖν εἰ μὲν Ἕλλην, Ἀφρο]δεισιεὺς φύσει ἢ τῶν παρ´ὑμεῖν πολει-] [?τευομένων] τι] [ἐγκαλεῖται ὑφ'Ἑ]λ̣ληνος Ἀφροδεισιέως κατὰ τοὺς ὑμετέρους] [?νόμους καὶ παρ'ὑμῶν ?καθί]σ̣τάσθαι τὰς δίκας εἰ δὲ τοὐναντίον Ἕλλην πα-] [ρ '[ἄλλης πόλεως, κατὰ Ῥωμ]αίων νόμους καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ̣ *v.* τοὺς μέντοι] [χρεώστας τῆς πόλεως ἠβεβαι]ω̣τὰς ἢ ὅλως συνβεβληκότας τῷ̣ δημοσίῳ̣ ὑ-] [μῶν , [παρ' ὑμεῖν τὴν δίκην ὑ]πέχειν *vv.* ἐπεὶ δὲ στεφανοῦτε με στεφάνῳ̣] [χρυσῷ̣? ἀπὸ ··?λίτρ]ῶν ἴστε ὅτι πα̣ρ̣ητησάμην αὐτὸν μὴ βουλόμενος] [ἐπιβαρεῖσθαι ὑμετέρα]ν πόλιν ἐμοῦ γε ἕνεκα *v.* εὐτυχεῖτε *stop* ἐπὶ Κλαυδίας Παυλεινῆς.]

Roman, then it should be tried via Roman laws (*Ῥωμαίων νόμους*). The inscription includes two other letters from Hadrian, which are responses to questions about taxes and the use of public funds. In both cases, Hadrian sided with the Aphrodisians, agreeing to waive the tax on iron and nails because of the city's status and privileges, and second, Hadrian allowed them to reallocate funding intended initially to pay a high priestess, who was apparently no longer able to fulfill the role, to build an aqueduct.[530] This is a case where Hadrian, having direct contact with the city, permitted the Aphrodisians to govern themselves and move forward with their desired plans. They, of course, officially needed Hadrian's permission and favor to be relayed to the Roman procurators (Claudius Agrippinus and Pompeius Severus, respectively) before acting.

Hadrian's involvement in the legal system and desire to interact with his citizens personally were distinct shifts in the legal system. He was asserting imperial control over a system that had not been as centralized and was in the hands of multiple officials, as well as a governing body, and was subject to discussion among the emperor and his people. Cassius Dio, reflecting on Hadrian's reign, noted people faulted his "meddlesomeness" but, overall, he "balanced and atoned for these defects by his careful oversight, his prudence, his munificence and his skill."[531] It would seem that because his reign was marked by peace and progress, his ambition to step into powers technically granted to him, but not shown by prior emperors, was seen as a good thing. Now, there was an avenue by which all the power was placed in the emperor, and whosoever he decided was fit to have authority.

---

[530] Ibid. Lines 13-41. See Chapter Two: Cities in which Pliny sends a letter to Trajan about using public funds in Pontus and Bithynia.

[531] Cass. Dio. LXIX.5.1: Ἠιτιῶντο μὲν δὴ ταῦτά τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἀκριβὲς τό τε περίεργον καὶ τὸ πολύπραγμον· ἐθεράπευε δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνελάμβανε τῇ τε ἄλλῃ ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ καὶ δεξιότητι.

One way an emperor would make his word known is through an imperial edict. An emperor would sometimes issue an edict that applied throughout the entire empire. These edicts, either written on papyrus or inscribed, would be posted in a public space meant for public viewing. They would be sent to provincial governors to be posted within their provinces, thereby spreading throughout the empire. According to Roger Rees, provincial governors could even add their own text when appropriate. These edicts were intended to display imperial power, and it cannot be assumed that everyone in the empire could read them, but the law would still apply to them.[532] Edicts were written in either Greek or Latin, depending on the location where they were posted. According to Ulpian, illiteracy was no excuse for not abiding by an edict if the edict was set so that "the notice [is] in writing, clearly visible and easily read, in the open, for example, in front of the shop or the place of business, not hidden away but on display."[533] Ulpian stated that if edicts are properly displayed, it can be assumed that the wider literate audience read them or the edict had been read aloud. Therefore, anyone would be aware of the edict because they likely heard mention of it.

In 212 CE, emperor Caracalla (r.198-217 CE) issued a famous edict to extend Roman citizenship to all free men and women in the empire. Author Cassius Dio stated he extended this offer not only to honor them (the people to whom this would apply) in word (*logos*), which was second to the fact (*ergon*), but had sought to increase the empire's revenue through taxation, "as aliens (*xenoi*) did not have to pay most of these taxes."[534] The true rationale behind the edict can only be speculated, but it is worth noting the context from which the edict emerged. Alex Imrie considers a new approach of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and analyzes the edict as "an important political initiative, combining practical and propagandistic values at a crucial point in Caracalla's fledgling sole reign."[535] Each chapter of the monograph explores the potential motivations for publishing the edict and granting such a broad scope of citizenship. Caracalla not only opened up Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the empire but also required that they pray to the Roman gods. The edict stated that the emperor was acting so that he "might please the immortal gods" and that by increasing the citizen population, he could "bring them to the [unknown] of the gods."[536]

---

[532] Rees, Roger. (2013). *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh, 31

[533] D.14.3.11: Proscribere palam sic accipimus claris litteris, unde de plano recte legi possit, ante tabernam scilicet vel ante eum locum in quo negotiatio exercetur, non in loco remoto, sed in evidenti. litteris utrum graecis an latinis? puto secundum loci condicionem, ne quis causari possit ignorantiam litterarum. certe si quis dicat ignorasse se litteras vel non observasse quod propositum erat, cum multi legerent cumque palam esset propositum, non audietur. Translation from: Watson, A. (1998). Book Fourteen. In *The Digest of Justinian, Volume 1* (REV-Revised, pp. 415–435). University of Pennsylvania Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhn70.24

Regardless of the original intention, the question remains whether this edict consequently universalized the Roman legal system throughout the empire. Judith Evans Grubbs asserts that the practice of Roman law in the provinces significantly increased after 212 CE.[537] Caroline Humfress, likewise, argues the link between the edict and state imposition.[538] She argues that while the edict did not force any citizen to abide by Roman law exclusively, it should be thought of in the words of Peter Garnsey as "[a]n enabling mechanism, offering access to the judicial procedures and remedies of the society at different levels."[539] Garnsey relates this political decision to that of the aftermath of the Social Wars that took place during the Republic in the first century BCE. Prior to that, Roman citizenship was exclusive in Rome and a few exceptional foreigners, which imposed a political strain as the Roman state began to expand outside of the city itself. Tensions arose when there were more Roman citizens outside of the city who were not capable of participating in civic life. To combat this, after the Social Wars, "all free inhabitants of Italy south of the Po became Roman citizens" for better or worse.[540] Garnsey notes that citizenship was highly selective and tended to favor those "who were prepared to back the Roman imperialist enterprise and were well placed to do so, geographically and socially."[541]

---

[534] Cass. Dio LXXVIII.9.5. Translation from Earnest Cary and Herbert Foster. "τάς τε διαδοχὰς καὶ τὰς 5ἀτελείας τὰς ἐπὶ τούτοις τὰς δεδομένας τοῖς πάνυ προσήκουσι τῶν τελευτώντων καταλύσας (οὗ ἕνεκα καὶ Ῥωμαίους πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτοῦ, λόγῳ μὲν τιμῶν, ἔργῳ δὲ ὅπως πλείω αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου προσίῃ[4] διὰ τὸ τοὺς ξένους τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν μὴ συντελεῖν, ἀπέδειξεν)." See more below on how this edict impacted the people of the empire. See below for further discussion of the edict.

[535] Imrie, A. (2018). *The Antonine Constitution: An edict for the Caracallan Empire*. Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004368231, 7

[536] There is a word that is illegible on the papyrus. Translation from Ari Bryen: Bryen, Ari Z. 2016. "Reading the Citizenship Papyrus (P.Giss. 40)," *Citizenship and Empire in Europe 200-1900: The Antonine Constitution after 1800 years.* Edited by Clifford Ando. Franz Steiner Verlag: Stuttgart, 32

[537] Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2011). "Promoting pietas through Roman Law." *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, edited by Beryl Rawson. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 379

[538] Humfress, C. (2014). Laws' Empire: Roman Universalism and Legal Practice. In C. Rapp & H. A. Drake (Eds.), *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity* (pp. 81–108). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 87

By the third century CE, however, the functionality of citizenship had changed. Garnsey claims:

> "With the transition from republican government to monarchy more than two centuries earlier, Roman politics, progressively reduced to the level of administration and public service, became the preserve of the very few men who were advanced into the Roman senate and into equestrian posts by the emperor with the assistance of his close associates. Citizenship under the Principate was a qualification for promotion into the higher orders, but a very basic one, necessary but not in itself sufficient. Conversely, aliens who lacked such higher ambitions and were satisfied to be socially prominent and politically active in their own patriae did not need Roman citizenship, and frequently are found without it, especially in the Greek East. The value and prestige of citizenship varied according to the size and social-catchment area of the citizen group in any particular place. Citizenship was not necessarily a mark of high social status. It was, or could be, a reward for select members of local elites, in particular,

---

[539] Ibid, 88; Garnsey, Peter. (2004). Roman Citizenship and Roman Law in the Late Empire. *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire*. Oxford

[540] Garnsey (2004), 136. Garnsey refers to the win as a "pyrrhic defeat" since Roman citizenship was not particularly sought out at the time. In fact, it meant that people would need to give up their other civic citizenships to hold the Roman one.

[541] Ibid, 137

> councillors and magistrates, but it was also bestowed (with certain restrictions) on slaves at manumission, and on auxiliary soldiers on discharge."[542]

He notes that citizenship was always a juridical status, granting access to Roman private law. The preference for using Roman law developed gradually in the provinces over time, even before 212 CE. The edict expedited that preference by clearing the hurdle of imperial citizenship. Opening the floodgates did not immediately trigger a surge of legal cases, but by the late third century CE, Romans in the provinces, especially those in the east, were increasingly aware of their status and legal advantages. This is evident in the legal reforms implemented by the emperors of the tetrarchy.

This affected those in the Greek east in two ways. First, Roman citizenship differed from the concept of Greek citizenship, which had historically been a privilege granted by birth and, occasionally, a gift bestowed by the assembly on select individuals.[543] According to Maria Youni, Greek citizenship "functioned predominantly in the public sphere," unlike Roman citizenship which provided access to Roman private law. Second, Greek legal language had an "open texture" that did not require any specific terminology to have a contract or agreement.[544] For a valid agreement, each party had to state their intent and want, and make sure they were not breaking any laws where the contract was established.[545] In short, the laws varied from *polis* to

---

[542] Ibid, 138

[543] Youni, Maria S. (2010). Transforming Greek practice into Roman Law: Manumissions in Roman Macedonia. The Legal History Review 78 (2010), 311-340: Brill, 313

[544] Youni (2010), 312

[545] Youni (2010), 312-313: Demosthenes 46 *Against Stephanus* 2, 14; Hypereides 3 *Against Athenogenes*, 17 (ὅπως ἄν τις βούληται); Youni provides the numerous Greek examples in which this principle is reflected on 312, footnote 2: According to the principle 'whatever one man agrees with another is binding' (ὅσα ἂν ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ ὁμολογήσῃ κύρια εἶναι): Hypereides 3 *Against Athenogenes*, 13; Demosthenes 47 *Against Euergus and Mnesibulus*, 77; cf. Isocrates 18 *Against Callimachus*, 24–25; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1375b 8–10. According to a variant of this principle, 'whatever one man voluntarily agrees with another is binding' (ὅσα ἂν τις ἑκὼν ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ ὁμολογήσῃ κύρια εἶναι): Demosthenes 56 *Against Dionysodorus*, 2; Plato, *Symposion* 196c 1–2 (ἑκὼν ἑκόντι); cf. Demosthenes 48

polis, whereas Roman law was relevant throughout the empire to any Roman citizen. Roman law guided its citizens and had restrictions on marriage, property, inheritance, status, and liberty, which meant that many people in the provinces had to now adapt to the Roman system which affected their daily lives.

Under the Tetrarchy: A New Order

During his reign, Diocletian sought to systematically address the problems that had arisen in the third century. He achieved this by reforming the way provinces were run, as well as attempting to curb inflation.[546] In addition to the smaller provinces governed by a *praeses*, Diocletian added to the organization of the empire by collecting these smaller provinces into dioceses, each of which would be overseen by a *vicarius*.[547] Christian author Lactantius claimed that by doing so "many governors and even more bureaucratic burdens were loaded onto individual regions," but it was likely that Diocletian had intended to create a more effective way to manage provinces and collect taxes.[548]

Against Olympiodorus, 54; Plato, *Crito* 52d 9–e3; id. *Laws* XI, 920d 2–3. Presence of witnesses: Demosthenes 42 *Against Phaenippus*, 12; Deinarchos 3 *Against Philocles*, 4. On the condition that the terms of the contract are not prohibited by any law or decree: Plato, *Laws* XI, 920d 1–3; cf. Demosthenes 44, *Against Leochares*, 7; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1375b 10–11

[546] Here I am referring to Diocletian's Price Edict issued in 301 CE, which I discuss below.

[547] Dillon, 52. The earliest known position dates to 298. Rees, Roger. 2013. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press*, 25

[548] Lactant., *De mort. pers.* 7.4. translated by Creed: "Et ut omnia terrore complerentur, provinciae quoque in frusta concisae, multi praesides et multa officia singulis regionibus." Dillon, John Noël. (2012). *The Justice of Constantine: Law, Communication, and Control*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. See chapters 1 & 2 for the changes in the empire under Diocletian and hypotheses about his motivations. Much of my analysis aligns with Dillon's who examines the changes under Diocletian and Constantine and compares the reign of the two, who share similarities in their administrative ambitions. Likewise, Evans Grubbs (1995) mentions the similarities between Diocletian's legislation and Constantine's.

The new administrative and military structure for the tetrarchy could be understood as a largely bureaucratic move, but the criticism of fourth-century Christian author Lactantius, suggested that this was noticed by Romans all over the empire. His account must be taken with some healthy skepticism. Lactantius was from North Africa and was a professor of rhetoric there but joined Diocletian's court as the Professor of Latin Rhetoric sometime before 303 CE.[549] He later joined Constantine's court around 314 CE. As a Christian who lived through the persecutions, his works are highly critical of Diocletian but are an essential source since he was an eyewitness to the emperors of the tetrarchy. Lactantius, who called Diocletian "an author of crimes and a deviser of evil," described the tetrarchy as follows:

> "He [Diocletian] ruined everything and could not even keep his hands from God. In his greed and anxiety he turned the world upside down. He appointed three men to share his rule, dividing the world into four parts and multiplying the armies, since each of the four strove to have a far larger number of troops than previous emperors had had when they were governing the state alone. The number of recipients began to exceed the number of contributors by so much that, with farmers' resources exhausted by the enormous size of the requisitions, fields became deserted and cultivated land was turned into forest. To ensure that terror was universal, provinces too were cut into fragments; many governors and even more officials were imposed on regions, almost on individual cities, and to these were added numerous accountants, controllers, and prefects' deputies."[550]

---

[549] Digeser, E. D. (2019). "Lactantius." In P. L. Reynolds (Ed.), *Great Christian Jurists and Legal Collections in the First Millennium* (pp. 239–251). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 239. Note this is before Diocletian issued persecution edicts against Christians.

[550] "Hic orbem terrae simul et avaritia et timiditate subvertit. Tres enim participes regni sui fecit in quattuor partes orbe diviso et multiplicatis exercitibus, cum singuli eorum longe maiorem numerum militum habere contenderent, quam priores principes habuerant, cum soli rem publicam gererent. Adeo maior esse coeperat numerus accipientium quam dantium, ut enormitate indictionum consumptis viribus colonorum desererentur agri et culturae verterentur in silvam. Et ut omnia terrore complerentur, provinciae quoque in frusta concisae; multi praesides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac paene iam civitatibus incubare, item rationales multi et magistri et vicarii praefectorum." Lactant., *De mort. pers*. 7.4

Whereas most governors of the past had held senatorial rank, Diocletian appointed those in the equestrian rank to the position. Although the shift in standards is not mentioned by Lactantius, he does add that the new employees "were very rarely civil; they engaged only in repeated condemnations and confiscations, and in exacting endless resources" more frequently.[551]

From the view of Lactantius, whose bias against Diocletian cannot be ignored, the restructuring of the empire and the creation of many new government positions was a harbinger of chaos. Similar to the third century Greek author Herodian, Lactantius' view is that of an educated elite who was not a direct beneficiary of Diocletian's reforms. For many Romans, however, the new government provided easier access to the courts since Diocletian had almost doubled the number of Roman provinces.[552] Governors were responsible for the jurisdiction of their province, often hearing civil disputes and criminal cases. Dillon highlights the fact that under the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, Caracalla "opened access to the courts for almost all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, new citizens as well as old."[553] Although there is no way to ascertain the true motivations behind Diocletian's reorganization of the empire, it did make the legal system accessible to more people and spread the workload from one governor over many people to more governors responsible for a smaller group of people. Hermogenian, Diocletian's advisor and jurist, even became a praetorian prefect in the western court of Maximian.[554]

Once the empire achieved a level of stability through securing the borders, it was possible to revive its morale. For Diocletian, this meant returning to Roman civil law and codifying his rescripts. The codification was a display of the virtue of the empire, and the rescripts were a showcase of how Diocletian expected his people to use Roman law for their own personal cases. The rescript system had been around since the time of the Republic. Under the Republic, however, requests brought by petitioners were "addressed orally or in writing to jurists, who acquired prestige by displaying learning and wisdom in the answers, *responsa*, which they gave."[555] Under Augustus, authority shifted, and the emperor became responsible for these answers. Diocletian, acted very much like the empire's first emperor, and modeled himself from it.

---

[551] Lactant., *De mort. pers.,* 7.4 Trans J.L creed. Latin: "quibus omnibus civiles actus admodum rari, sed condemnationes tantum et proscriptiones frequentes, exactiones rerum innumerabilium non dicam crebrae, sed perpetuae, et in exactionibus iniuriae non ferendae."
[552] Rees (2013), 25
[553] Dillon (2012), 53
[554] Connolly, Serena. (2010), 39

Rescripts were responses from the emperor to petitioners that had reached out seeking either legal advice or a favor through submission of a *libellus*. As Honoré reminds us that the "rescripts were not legislative" and do not have executive force but rather tell the petitioner what the law is on their situation.[556] While it was unlikely that emperors wrote their own rescripts and instead chose a delegated lawyer to represent their authority, rescripts reveal an interaction between him and his subjects, especially in the east.[557]

According to Tony Honoré: "At least from Tiberius onwards the emperor granted what came to be called rescripts on points of law and so, in effect, set up a free legal advice service as a part of the administration."[558] These rescripts acted as channels to understand how to use laws already in existence to make an argument in court, or to argue a case before a governor or a judge but they were notably not legislative, that is, they stated and interpreted the law but did not enact the law themselves.

---

[555] Honoré, Tony. (1979). 'Imperial' Rescripts A.D. 193-305: Authorship and Authenticity. *The Journal of Roman Studies vol*. 69, 52. See also, Evans Grubbs (2011) where she states that rescripts are "replies by the emperor to inquiries from officials and to petitions from ordinary subjects. Rescripts from the second-century and early third-century emperors have been preserved in the *Digest* in the writings of jurists (legal experts) who either summarized the gist of the rescript or quoted it verbatim… *the Code of Justinian*, preserves about 2,500 rescripts of emperors from Hadrian to Diocletian, with the vast majority of those preserved coming from the third century, especially the reign of Diocletian (284-305)," 378. See also Corcoran (1996), 48-49

[556] Honoré, Tony. (1979). "'Imperial' Rescripts A.D. 193-305: Authorship and Authenticity" *The Journal of Roman Studies vol. 69*, 52

[557] "Certainly, the emperor had to write *scripsi* or *rescripsi* at the end of a petition." Honoré (1979), 54

[558] Honoré, Tony. (1979), 52

Diocletian's jurist, Hermogenian, spearheaded compiling the *Codex Hermogenianus*, which was named after him and modeled on the *Codex Gregorianus*.[559] The *Codex Gregorianus* contained imperial constitutions from emperor Hadrian through Diocletian and was compiled by an unknown jurist, potentially someone named Gregorianus or Gregorius who held the position of imperial secretary for *libelli* (petitions).[560] The latter was a collection of responses to petitioners from 293-294. Both codices mostly contained private rescripts. The rescripts show how far the legal system extended and how it was accessible to the Roman people and not simply a system for the elites.[561]

Petitioners could be anyone, including women, freed people, and even slaves.[562] Connolly believes that petitions originated from petitioners located near the lower Danube, including the provinces of Pannonia Inferior, Moesia Superior and Inferior, and from Bithynia and Pontus.[563] Unfortunately, there are few rescripts from the western court of Maximian, which limits our knowledge of the involvement of Roman citizens in the west.[564] What can be ascertained, however, is their frequency in the east, where we do have more evidence. Due to the increased number of provinces, however, there were more imperial courts so that petitioners would not have to travel far to approach the courts of Diocletian, Galerius, Maximian, or Constantius.

---

[559] *Codex Gregorianus* contained rescripts from both the eastern and western halves of the empire from 196-291. Serena Connolly. Chapter 2: The Rescript System. *Lives Behind the Laws*, 39. According to Connolly, the Codex Hermogenianus was "named after Hermogenian, *magister a libellis* to Diocletian, followed the model of the CG [Codex Gregorianus], comprising responses from ad 293-294 composed by the eastern imperial petitions department, headed by Hermogenian," 39

[560] Corcoran (1996), 29. See Honoré (1994)

[561] I am not denying any inherent bias here. There are a few other factors to question when saying if the law was "accessible." For example, literacy rates, finances, and ability to travel would have played a role in the ability to interact with the law. See Connolly (2010)

[562] According to Connolly (2010) "petitioners were more likely free than servile. Petitioners kept as slaves could petition only on one topic and could face severe limitations on their opportunities to petition," p. 68. See also Connolly's table of "Recipients of Rescripts Preserved in the COD. IUST. and Other Collections," on p.72 which illustrates who the petitioners may have been. Evans Grubbs (2011) notes: "Whereas most rescripts found in the *Digest* were sent to officials inquiring about particular cases, the majority of the rescripts in the *Code of Justinian* were addressed to ordinary men and women throughout the empire, including freed people, soldiers and even slaves," p.378. See more on petitioners in Corcoran (1996), chapter 5.

Although only a small fraction of rescripts survive, they show the many ways in which Romans were using this legal institution. The original petitions no longer exist, but it is still possible to understand the general concerns raised by the replies from the emperors. The petitioners would send requests about trade and business but "most of the rescripts concern inheritance, tutelage, slavery, possession, and debt."[565]

These issues were local and specific and were questions that people needed answers to for leading their daily lives. They could even include more personal matters, such as name changes and disputes over status. For example, from fragments of rescripts found in the *Codex Justinianus,* it is confirmed that the rights of freedmen were preserved, allowing them to maintain their status within the empire. A petitioner, presumably asking for clarity about a relative who was free-born, captured in the Palmyrene Empire in 260-272, and resold as a slave even after the Romans reclaimed the territory. Emperors Diocletian and Maximian respond to Agrippa, saying:

---

[563] "Sirmium was one of the imperial residences of Diocletian, located in the province of Pannonia Inferior, and an administrative hub." Connolly (2010), 63.
[564] Corcoran (1996), 78; See also works from Honoré.
[565] Connolly (2010), 90

> "Since you say that your free-born relative was in effect made captive by the rule of the Palmyrene faction and was sold, the provincial governor will take care that he is restored to his free-born status."[566]

The rescript, posted in 293, ensured that free-born Roman citizens were treated rightfully and were able to maintain their status. In another petition from Crescens, the emperors uphold their diligence to ensure that free-born citizens were not sold into slavery. The case concerns a person who had free-born status that was being contested, despite more than one governor confirming the truth of the status. The emperors, seemingly disgusted, responded by saying that "it is very wicked to defame the status of free-born persons."[567] They insisted that if this person faced any further scrutiny, they should approach their provincial governor to handle the accusation and make the accuser desist.[568]

The responses show the emperor's legal philosophies, which were in line with those of emperors from prior centuries. Hermogenian even would include references to older Roman laws, which, as Connolly states, confirms that legal experts often used rescripts to argue cases on behalf of petitioners.[569] As Evans Grubbs highlights, rescripts in the second and third centuries could even be concerned with family law.[570] She claims that through rescripts "Roman emperors set forth expectations of *pietas*, informing petitioners of their responsibilities and reproaching those who had not acted in accordance with Roman family values."[571] She notes, however, that typically "imperial law did not approve of family members acting against each other in court."[572]

---

[566] *Cod. Iust.* 7.14.4: Cum cognatum tuum ingenuum, factum palmyrene factionis dominatione velut captivum, distractum esse dicas, praeses provinciae ingenuitatis suae reddi eum efficiet. * diocl. et maxim. aa. et cc. agrippae. * <a 293 s. iiii id. ian. aa. conss.>. English translation from: Bruce Frier, ed. *The Codex of Justinian: A New Annotated Translation, with a parallel Latin and Greek Text Based on a Translation by Justice Fred H. Blume.* Vols. 1-3. (2016). Cambridge.

[567] *Cod. Iust.* 7.14.5: Defamari statum ingenuorum seu errore seu malignitate quorundam periniquum est, praesertim cum adfirmes diu praesidem unum atque alterum interpellatum a te vocitasse diversam partem, ut contradictionem faceret, si defensionibus suis confideret. * diocl. et maxim. aa. et cc. crescenti. * <a 293 d. prid. non. april. aa. conss.>

[568] See too, *Cod. Iust.* 7.14.9 where the status of freeborn woman who was the daughter of a freedwoman was being contested. The emperors told her to go before a provincial governor to establish her freedom, which, if her mother was a freedwoman when she was born, should be granted to her.

[569] Connolly (2010), 91

[570] Evans Grubbs (2011)

In this way, the rescripts were a tool by which Roman emperors could spread and enforce Roman law to citizens living in the provinces (in this case in the eastern provinces) and make sure that Roman law, and Roman values, would take the place of older local laws. Again, by this point, most of the petitioners were Roman citizens and despite being from provincial areas that had in the past been allowed to keep a certain level of legal autonomy, were now expected to follow standard Roman law.

Evans Grubbs notes, as well, that this process was not always easy and sometimes petitioners in the provinces had to change from older local practices where it concerned the family. In the early third century, she gives an example of Papinian, who advised provincial governors to follow Roman law regarding a mother serving as guardian to her child (which was not recognized in Roman law).[573] By the end of the fourth century, however, the law had changed under Theodosius to allow such practices in certain cases.[574] Other times, local practices that conflicted with Roman law were rejected. In her article, Evans Grubbs notes that the rejection of the petitioners by Diocletian and his co-rulers "reflect the same championing of traditional Roman ways and morality as found in other pronouncements of Diocletian's reign, including a long edict against close-kin marriages which repeatedly invoked Roman law and stressed the emperor’s own *pietas*.”[575] I argue that this was one of the many ways in which Diocletian sought to use the law to enforce the change of cultural norms, in this case in the eastern provinces, to Roman ones. In a separate article, Evans Grubbs notes that, regarding close-kin marriages, “Roman officials before 212 penalized Roman citizens whose unions were considered incestuous under Roman law, but they allowed provincials who did not have Roman citizenship to follow their local marriage practices.”[576]

---

[571] Evans Grubbs (2011), 378
[572] Evans Grubbs (2011), 381
[573] Evans Grubbs (2011), 388
[574] In this case, she is referring to *Cod. Iust.* 5.35.2 (*Cod. Theod.* 3.17.4) where women, who were widows, were able to serve as guardians.

Caroline Humfress argues that by the late third century, “Greco-Roman cities in the East had lost whatever autonomy they had previously possessed as lawgivers.”[577] Menander Rhetor, a third-century CE Greek author from Laodicea in Asia Minor, who was well-known for his commentary on famous fourth-century BCE Athenian orator Demosthenes, wrote a work on how to compose orations and speeches, most likely during the reign of Diocletian.[578] He mentioned in his chapter on “How to Praise Cities for Activities” that when praising a city that an orator would “consider whether the city establishes precise rules for customs and legal issues such as inheritance and all other areas of the law,” but this point was no longer relevant because “we are subject to the universal laws of the Romans.”[579] Garnsey argues that this is a rhetorical exaggeration.[580] I argue it is likely both an exaggeration and an honest reflection of his current state of government. Menander noticed that cities retain their customs (*ēthē*), despite not having their laws (*nomoi*). This is a third-century CE shift in the Greek east, which had historically been allowed to continue using local laws, but this was either no longer the preference of the inhabitants, or the local laws did not address their new imperial demands, so Roman law stood as the most relevant form of practice.

---

[575] Evans Grubbs (2005), 391 and Evans Grubbs (2018), 360

[576] Evans Grubbs (2018) 322

[577] Humfress, C. (2014), 82

[578] Menander Rhetor, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Menander Rhetor. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ars Rhetorica.* Edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 539. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019, 1. Race then goes on to say: “Although Greek cities in the third century were securely under Roman rule, the culture of the speeches remains distinctly Hellenic.” See more on Menander Rhetor in Chapter 3: Education.

[579] Menander Rhetor. *Treatise* 1.16.22: ἐν μὲν τοῖς κοινοῖς εἰ τὰ νόμιμα καὶ περὶ ὧν οἱ νόμοι τίθεται ἀκριβῶς ἡ πόλις, κλῆρον ἐπικλήρων, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα μέρη νόμων· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος διὰ τὸ τοῖς κοινοῖς χρῆσθαι τῶν Ῥωμαίων νόμοις ἄχρηστον. Translation from: Menander Rhetor, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Menander Rhetor. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ars Rhetorica.* Edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 539. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019

[580] Garnsey (2004), 148

It was also a tool to regulate other issues, such as the economy. In 301 CE, the tetrarchs, Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius and Galerius posted an edict to curb inflation by putting a maximum price on goods. The edict, posted throughout the empire, showed a united front among the tetrarchs who sought to make life more affordable for soldiers (and the people). A copy of this edict was found in Aphrodisias in Caria, written in Latin.[581] In the edict's preamble, the emperors spoke on their responsibilities as emperors to the Roman people. The emperors stated:

> "Public virtue and Roman dignity and majesty will it that fortune of our state be organized in good faith and elegantly adorned—second to the immortal gods, it is right to give thanks to the state as we remember wars we have fought successfully, at a time when the world is in tranquility, placed in the lap of deepest calm with the benefits of a peace which was earned with much sweat. Therefore, we who by the kind favour of the gods have crushed the burning havoc caused in the past by barbarian nations by slaughtering those people themselves, have protected the peace established for all time with the necessary [defences] of justice."[582]

---

[581] There were many copies of the edict posted throughout the empire, in Greek or Latin, but many are in fragments. For example, Crawford and Reynolds published a transcription and translation of the edict found in Aezani: Crawford, M. H., & Reynolds, J. (1975). The Publication of the Prices Edict: A New Inscription from Aezani. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *65*, 160–163. https://doi.org/10.2307/370069. The edict found in Aphrodisias appears to be the most cohesive version of the edict. A new publication from Michael Crawford attempts to reconstruct the entire edict by comparing it to fragments found from other sites. See: Crawford, Michael. (2023). *Diocletian's Edict of Maximum Prices at the Civiasilica in Aphrodisias*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verglag

[582] Rees, Rogers. (2004). "Documents." *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh, 139-140; Transcription from Erim, K. T., & Reynolds, J. (1970). The Copy of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices From Aphrodisias in Caria. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *60*, 120–141. https://doi.org/10.2307/299418: [licet tranquillo orbi]s sta[tu et in gremio altissimae quietis locato etiam pacis bonis] [propterquam sudore la]rgo lab[oratum est disponi fideliter adque ornari decenter hone] [stum publicum et Roma]na dig[nitas maiestasque desiderant ut nos qui benigno fauore] [numinum aestuantes de] praeteri[to rapinas gentium barbararum ipsarum nationum clade] [conpressimus in aeter]nium fund[atam quietem debilis iustitiae munimentis saepiamus.]

The emperors insisted on curbing greed within the empire so that the Roman people would thrive again. They claim the edict came in response to the people, who sought their help to restore public well-being. Their solution was to set a ceiling for prices, rather than enforce fixed prices, which would have been ineffective. Anyone found in violation would be subjected to capital punishment, since high prices had caused such a problem during a time of peace and refused to improve the well-being of the state and its people. The emperors conclude their preamble by assuring their subjects that they are acting in accordance with their Roman forefathers and not imposing an unprecedentedly severe punishment, saying:

> "Therefore, since it is established that in the practice of passing laws even our ancestors suppressed insolence by prescribing a penalty to be feared—because it is unusual for a policy improving the human condition to be embraced of its own accord and as a guide, a most just fear is always found to govern responsibilities—it has been decided that if anyone works against this statute, for their boldness they will be subject to capital punishment. Let nobody consider this ruling harsh, as there is an immediate means of avoiding danger—by observing moderation. And he is subject to the same punishment who, in his desire to buy, conspires with the seller's greed against the statute."[583]

Their desire to remind the Roman people that it is the duty of the emperors to maintain the health of the state by passing laws that ensure its people do not cause the state to fall into chaos. The preamble reflected on the barbarian invasions that had occurred throughout the empire, causing pillaging, disruptions, and violence. The Romans contrasted with the barbarians, and they needed to maintain order and treat each other well. Second, this preamble highlighted how the emperors of the tetrarchy brought peace from both civil war and invasion and wanted to keep that peace. Third, the edict praised the gods, whom all Romans should thank for this new era of peace. Lastly, the edict highlighted how far the emperors were willing to go to maintain this peace.

---

[583] Rees, Rogers. (2004). "Documents." *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh, 142: Translation from Reynolds (1970): [Etenim si ea quibus null]o sibi f [ine proposito ardet auaritia desaeviens quae sine] [respectu generis hu]mnani no[n annis modo uel mensibus aut diebus sed] [paene horis ipsisque mo]mnentis ad [incrementa sui et augmenta festinat aliqua] [continentiae ratio fr]enaret [uel si fortunae communes aequo animo perpeti] IO [possent hanc debacha]ndi licen[tiam qua pessime in dies eiusmodi sorte lacerantur] [dissimulandi forsita]mn adque r[eticendi relictus locus uideretur cum detestandam in] [manitatem condicionem]que mise[randam communis animorum patientia temperaret

Persecution of Christians- bringing destruction through the law

Laws were the guiding force for daily life and social order. Before Constantine, emperors used the law to punish Christians, or rather, used the law to regulate religion and religious practices. In the eyes of the emperors in the second through early fourth (this ends by 311 CE) centuries, "Christians' refusal to worship the gods… threatened the hard-earned peace bestowed by those gods."[584]

Coins from the third century CE depict Diocletian and Maximian referring to themselves as Jupiter and Hercules, associating themselves with epithets such as "Conservator," "Propagator," "Tutator," and "Ultor."[585] Both tetrarchs pray to the Roman gods for victory at a time when the eastern frontiers fought against the Persians and Sarmatians.[586] For the emperors, the favor of the gods meant not only victory over foreign threats, but also the safety and preservation of the empire. In a rescript to Julianus, proconsul of Africa in 302, the tetrarchs wanted to eradicate the threat of the Manichaeans in North Africa. Manichaeans followed the Parthian prophet, Mani, who preached a cosmic struggle between light and dark, or good and evil. His teachings were reminiscent of Platonic philosophy, as well as Gnostic, Christian, Persian, and Jewish beliefs, but were not inclusive of the pagan Roman gods. In the rescript, the tetrarchs stated:

---

[584] Gaddis, Michael. (2015). *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 31.

[585] Harries, J. (2012). *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The New Empire*. Edinburgh University Press, 83

[586] Harries (2012), 83

> "In their foresight, the immortal gods have deigned to insist that the principles of virtue and truth be acknowledged and confirmed by the counsel and thoughts of many good, great and wise men. It is wrong to oppose or resist these principles; and no new belief should criticize the religion of old. It is highly criminal to discuss doctrines established and defined by our ancestors, which still have their acknowledged place and role."[587]

The Manichaean leaders would be punished by fire and burned alive, along with their books. Followers of the religion would receive capital punishment, and have their property seized by the state. If any one of rank was found guilty, therefore not able to be punished by death, they would be sent to the mines or quarry and have their estates confiscated. The severity of the punishment reflected the emperors' care for the Roman state and its people, which to them, was being poisoned by this new false religion.

According to Jill Harries, the "empire's safety depended on the right religion" and in order to do this the "wrong" religion had to be abolished.[588] Kaldellis explains that for the Romans, religion was not only about ritual, but was "a framework for maintaining the social order and expressing Roman virtues such as patriotism, honesty, reverence, purity, and piety. The Romans boasted that they were the most religious people, by which they certainly meant that they were also the most moral and decent."[589] This is clear from the surviving edicts and was certainly true when emperors faced the emergence of Christianity, in that they felt as if Romans were rebelling against the state directly.

---

[587] Translation from Rees (1998). Documents, Manichaean rescript. Collation of the Laws of Moses and Rome 15.3. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh, 174

[588] Harries (2012), 84

[589] Kaldellis (2021), 65: Full quote: "The Romans had their own *religio*, of which they were proud. It had distinctive traditions, rites, priestly orders, lore, and skills, and its public purpose was to ensure good relations between the gods and the Roman people. As the res publica was constituted politically, its government had jurisdiction over religious

In the third century, emperor Decius (r. 249-251) carried out empire-wide persecutions, specifically targeted towards people who would not venerate the pagan gods.[590] The edict, posted in 249 CE, required that people show a *libellus* to confirm their sacrifice, and if they refused the edict allowed for torture and in some cases execution of anyone who would not comply.[591] This was the strictest policy any Roman emperor had taken against Christianity, and was followed by another persecution from emperor Valerian in 257-259 CE. Geoffrey de Ste. Croix notes that prior to the mid-third century, Christian persecutions came "from below" but after the mid-third century "persecution comes from above, from the government, and is initiated by imperial edict, with little or no sign of persecuting zeal among the mass of pagans."[592] Diocletian, following mid-third century emperors, carried out persecutions against Christians with his Caesar Galerius in the East in 303 CE.[593] I agree with Ste. Croix that emperors of the mid-third century to the early fourth century saw the organization of Christianity as a threat to Roman government and religion, which were entwined.[594] In a time of crisis, the emperors sought to rid the empire of impiety against the pagan gods, who were, obviously, upset.

---

practices, whether to authorize, forbid, or require them, with an eye to the public good. The political leadership regulated the calendar and could forbid all Romans from engaging in certain religious acts, for example human sacrifice, castration, forms of astrology, and specific foreign cults, which were periodically expelled from Rome. There were also obligations, chiefly to participate in ceremonies that invoked the gods in times of peril. Participation in such events was sometimes required of all Roman citizens by law. This was not a religion of 'mere' ritual, as it is sometimes represented, but a framework for maintaining."

[590] Wolfram Kinzig. (2021). *Christian Persecution in Antiquity*. Baylor University Press, chapter 6; De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (2006). *Christian persecution, martyrdom, and orthodoxy*. Oxford University Press (original published in 1963).

[591] Ibid.

[592] De Ste. Crois (2006), 137

[593] Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, were also emperors who carried out persecutions prior to the third century, but those were localized persecutions and were applied to a smaller grouping of people.

[594] Ibid, 138

According to Lactantius, the hatred against Christians had become personal when Galerius' pious [pagan] mother was dining alongside the Christians in her family, who would fast and pray rather than take part, rather than sacrifice to the pagan gods.[595] It infuriated her, and she wanted to spread this hatred to her son, Galerius, who, in turn, would also infect Diocletian. On the day of a festival celebrating the god Terminus it was decided to destroy the Christians. At a church in Nicomedia, Diocletian's former capital, "the prefect, together with chief commanders, tribunes, and officers of the treasury" stormed the gates, pillaged the church and burned Holy Scriptures.[596] Diocletian and Galerius watched nearby as the church was dismantled and leveled to the ground. The next day Christians faced legal issues when "an edict was published, depriving the Christians of all honours and dignities; ordaining also that, without any distinction of rank or degree, they should be subjected to tortures, and that every suit at law should be received against them" while at the same time, they were unable to defend themselves against "questions of wrong, adultery or theft; and finally, that they should neither be capable of freedom," nor have any voice.[597]

Ironically, Galerius became the first to legally allow for Christian worship in 311 CE, when he issued the Edict of Toleration, allegedly on his deathbed. According to Lactantius the edict was as follows:

> "Among all the other arrangements which we are always making for the advantage and benefit of the state, we had earlier sought to set everything right in accordance with the ancient laws and public discipline of the Romans and to

---

[595] Lactant. *de mort. pers.* XI

[596] Lactant. *de mort. pers*. XII

[597] Lactant. *de mort. pers.* XII: Postridie prosopositum est edictum quo cavebatur, ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subiecti essent, ex quocumque ordine aut gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio valeret, ipsi non de iniuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatis agere possent, libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent.

> ensure that the Christians too, who had abandoned the way of life of their ancestors, should return to a sound frame of mind; for in some way such self-will had come upon these same Christian, such folly had taken hold of them, that they no longer followed those usages of the ancients which their own ancestors perhaps had first instituted, but, simply following their own judgement and pleasure, they were making up for themselves the laws which they were to observe and were gathering various groups of people together… Consequently, in accordance with this indulgence of ours, it will be their duty to pray to their god for our safety and for that of the state and themselves, so that from every side the state may be kept unharmed and they may be able to live free of care in their own homes."[598]

This edict, pronounced by Augustus Galerius in Nicomedia, did not allow him to be saved from a terrible death. Lactantius tells us that after a few days of issuing the edict, the "limbs throughout his body now disintegrating, he was consumed by dreadful wasting."[599] He was inflicted with a "God-sent punishment" that began "with his very flesh and extending to his mind. A general inflammation arose in the middle of his bodily private parts, then a deeply fistulous ulcer; these spread incurable to his intestines, from which an unspeakable number of maggots bred and a stench of death arose."[600] In his pain and suffering, he reflected on his crimes against Christians, and after confessing to God, issued an edit of toleration.[601]

It is vital to note, that in the edict Galerius is not simply allowing Christians to practice their religion (in their homes) but also demanding that they pray for the welfare of the Roman state. Constantius, who was Augustus in the west (305-306), was notably lax on the Christians in the empire. According to Eusebius, Constantius had "alone, following a course of conduct different from that pursued by his colleagues, entered into the friendship of the Supreme God."[602] Like Lactantius, Eusebius viewed Constantius, the father of the "Blessed Emperor," as a proto-Christian and said that, although he was not Christian himself, he was kinder towards the Christian population than his co-emperors and led a pious life. Eusebius, who was bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, was a prolific Christian author.[603]

---

[598] Lactant. *de mort. pers*, XXXVI
[599] Lactant. *de mort. pers*, XXXVI
[600] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* LVII.
[601] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* LVII. Compare to the account given by Lactantius given above.

After Maxentius and Maximin Daia teamed up together, Licinius and Constantine allied to overthrow them. Licinius married Constantine's half-sister, Flavia Julia Constantia, to further cement their union. Constantine would head west to take Rome back from Maxentius, while Maximin Daia and Licinius fought over territory in the east, particularly in Bithynia.

In October 312 CE Constantine led his army to Rome to overthrow Maxentius (r. 306-312), who had taken power in Rome, despite not being recognized by any members of the tetrarchy. Like Constantine, Maxentius had not been in line for the tetrarchy, but he was the son of Maximian and the son-in-law of Galerius. Maxentius had defeated *Augustus* Severus in Rome, who had been appointed by Galerius to replace Constantius, with the support of his father, but later fell out with his father Maximian. According to Lactantius, Constantine had been "advised in a dream to mark the heavenly sign of God on the shields of soldiers and then engage in battle."[604] The next day his army put the Chi Rho (XP), the first two letters of Christ's name, on their shields and approached the enemy. Meanwhile, Maxentius was in the city celebrating the anniversary of his prior victory when he could hear the people "shouting with one voice 'Constantine cannot be conquered.'"[605] Maxentius, alarmed, rode into battle that was being brutally carried out by both sides. Ultimately, Constantine emerged as the victor and was happily embraced by the Roman people and senate. At least, that is what Lactantius recorded.

---

[602] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* XIII. See also Barnes, T.D. (1973). Lactantius and Constantine. *Journal of Roman Studies vol. 63*. 29-46.

[603] He wrote a comprehensive *History of the Church, Life of Constantine, Preparation for the Gospel,* and *Demonstration of the Gospel.*

[604] Lactant. *de mort. pers.* 44.5; See Lenski, N. (2005). The Reign of Constantine. In N. Lenski (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (pp. 59–90). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71: "Rather he had a dream ordering him to emblaze on the shields of his soldiers with a sign remarkably like the one he had seen in 310, the primary difference being that it had changed into a monogram of the letters chi and rho, the first two letters of Christ's name in Greek. Such monograms, like the vota symbols of his earlier interpretation, were common in the period, but Constantine's decision or perhaps revelation that the sign stood for Christ was up to that point unique."

In his account, Eusebius records that Constantine had been considering to which god to pray to be victorious over Maxentius. In his sleep "Christ of God appeared to him with the sign [the Chi Rho] which had appeared to him in the sky, and urged him to make himself a copy of the sign which had appeared in the sky, and to use this as protection against the attacks of the enemy."[606] After his victory Constantine "decided personally to apply himself to the divinely inspired writings. Taking the priests of God as his advisors, he also deemed it right to honour the God who had appeared to him with all due rites."[607] Throughout his reign, Constantine sought to make life easier than it had been for Christians. Christian authors saw him as the champion of Christianity, and the one who carried the victory for Christianity over paganism. Though he was not the first to end persecutions, or even to put out an edict of toleration for Christians, he did overturn old laws that had prevented Christians from living like their pagan counterparts.

Meanwhile, Licinius, who had been Augustus since 308 CE, ruled the eastern empire along with Maximin Daia, a fanatical anti-Christian. According to Eusebius, Maximin was ruthless in carrying out his anti-Christian agenda and stressed to provincial governors that they were responsible for obeying the order.[608] Maximin had been complicit in anti-Christian edicts and the persecutions until about 312 CE, when other emperors were increasingly tolerant of Christianity. Stephen Mitchell describes the trajectory of Maximin's slow tolerance policies towards Christians and details his motivations.[609] Maximin claimed that his insistence on removing Christians from cities within his jurisdiction was a response to requests from the cities themselves. He claimed that the people of Nicomedia and Antioch had asked explicitly that Christians be removed from the city. Mitchell, following the accounts of Eusebius and Lactantius, claims that Maximin, as the supreme authority in his territory, had manipulated his subjects into requesting such an action. The requests, which came in the form of petitions, may have been from pagan individuals speaking on behalf of their city, rather than the *koinon*, or assembly, speaking as the official voice of the city. Maximin, who was touring around Asia, would stop at cities such as Nicomedia and Antioch and personally oversee the persecution of certain Christians.[610] Mitchell notes an inscription found in either Colbasa or Codrula in Pisidia, in which Constantine and Licinius were, according to Mitchell, likely coped from a rescript of Maximin in which Maximin appeared to have gone back on his declaration to continue to persecute Christians, but would continue to allow the removal of Christians from the city.[611] This was likely to stall or prevent Licinius from marching against him, which Licinius would do in 313 CE.[612] In the end, Licinius would be victorious, and become the sole ruler in the east.[613]

---

[605] Lactant. *De mort. pers.* 44.6

[606] Euseb. *Vit. Const*. XXIX.

[607] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* XXXII.

---

[608] Mitchell, Stephen. (1988). "Maximinus and the Christians in A.D. 312: A New Latin Inscription." The Journal of Roman Studies 78 (1988): 105–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/301453, 116; Accounts of Maximin's brutality can be found in Eusebius, *Martyrs of Palestine.*

[609] Mitchell (1988)

[610] Mitchell (1988), 118-119

[611] Mitchell (1988), 108. Translation from Mitchell: "And may those who, after being freed from those blind and wandering by-ways, have returned to a right and goodly frame of mind, rejoice most of all, and, as though preserved from a sudden tempest or snatched from a grave illness, let them henceforward feel a more pleasant enjoyment of life. But as for those who have persisted in the abominable cult, let them be separated, just as you ask, far from your city and territory, and be removed, whereby, in accord with the praiseworthy zeal of your petition, your city, separated from the stain of every impiety, may respond, as it has been accustomed, to the sacred rites of the immortal gods with the worship which is owed to them."

Matters of religion were always a vital component in Roman law. Even Roman jurist Ulpian, whose works Diocletian's jurists Gregorian and Hermogenian had consulted heavily when constructing imperial legislation, understood "legislation concerning divine worship constitutes part of the foundation and identity of the polity."[614] Religion, to Ulpian and his successors, fell into the category of public law because it shaped the identity of the Roman polity.[615] Lactantius, equally recognized the importance of religion and divine worship in the Roman world, especially concerning the laws.

As a professor of rhetoric, Lactantius would have received extensive legal training, and that is evident in his body of work. His *Divine Institutes* are essentially a legal defense of Christianity.[616] When Diocletian began his crusade against Christianity, Lactantius consulted both Plato and Cicero on how Christianity fit into the Roman state. In particular, he sought to understand how it worked within the legal system.[617] Even in the works of Ulpian, Roman law in some ways reflects a religion and guides the subjects of the law to a certain morality. Christianity followed divine law of God (*divina ius*), and he connected piety to "cult" (*religio*) and the law of fellow man (*aequitas*) which reflected Cicero's idealization of natural law.[618]

---

[612] Lactant. *De mort. pers.* 37.3042; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 9.10.1-2

[613] For a fuller description of the account please refer back to Chapter One: Armies

[614] Digeser, "Religion, Law and the Roman Polity: The Era of the Great Persecution," p.70

[615] *Dig*.1.1.1.2 and Justinian's Institutes 1.1.1; Digeser, 70

[616] *Lactantius: Div. inst*. Translated by Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey (2003). Liverpool University Press.

[617] Digeser, E. D. (2019). "Lactantius." In P. L. Reynolds (Ed.), *Great Christian Jurists and Legal Collections in the First Millennium* (pp. 239–251).

[618] Cicero, *De Partitione Oratoria* 129-131: Quod dividitur in duas partes primas, naturam atque legem, et utriusque generis vis in divinum et humanum ius est distributa, quorum aequitatis est unum, alterum religionis. Aequitatis autem vis est duplex, cuius altera directa et veri et iusti et ut dicitur aequi et boni ratione defenditur, altera ad vicissitudinem referendae gratiae pertinet, quod in beneficio gratia, in iniuria ultio nominatur. Atque haec communia sunt naturae atque legis, sed propria legis et ea quae scripta sunt et ea quae sine litteris aut gentium iure aut maiorum

Constantine, Christianity, and his Empire

After the death of both Maxentius in the west and Daia in the east, the empire was ruled by two Augusti: Licinius and Constantine, who both appointed their sons as Caesares. Under Constantine's rule, Christianity was reshaping the religious practices of Romans, and Constantine, as a supporter of Christianity himself, established legislation that allowed Christians a place within the empire. Licinius had enacted the "Edict of Milan" alongside Constantine in 313 CE but later became Constantine's rival in the east. According to Eusebius, Licinius,

> "Issued a law decreeing that the bishops should never communicate actively with each other at all, that none of them be permitted to visit his neighbour's church, and that no synods, councils, or discussions of common interest be held."[619]

This put bishops in a position in which they had to either violate the statutes of the Church or be subjected to imperial punishment. Second, Licinius banished Christians and confiscated their property while Constantine "saw fit to receive the servants of God within the imperial court."[620] Again, one must consider the prejudice Eusebius had against emperors who were anti-Christian,

---

more retinentur. Scriptorum autem privatum aliud est, publicum aliud: publicum lex, senatusconsultum, foedus, privatum tabulae, pactum conventum, stipulatio. Quae autem scripta non sunt, ea aut consuetudine aut conventis hominum et quasi consensu obtinentur, atque etiam hoc in primis, ut nostros mores legesque tueamur quodammodo naturali iure praescriptum est. Et quoniam breviter aperti fontes sunt quasi quidam aequitatis, meditata nobis ad hoc causarum genus esse debebunt ea quae dicenda erunt in orationibus de natura, de legibus, de more maiorum, de propulsanda iniuria, de ulciscenda, de omni parte iuris. Si imprudenter aut necessitate aut casu quippiam fecerit quod non concederetur eis qui sua sponte et voluntate fecissent, ad eius facti deprecationem ignoscendi petenda venia est quae sumetur ex plerisque locis aequitatis. Expositum est ut potui brevissime de omni controversiarum genere—nisi praeterea tu quid requiris.

[619] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* LI.

[620] Euseb. *Vit. Const*. LII.

or rather anyone who contested the sole authority of Constantine himself, but it does show the contrast between emperors at the time. Romans were reliant on the mercy of their emperors and subjected to different laws and edicts depending on their emperor's views. In this case, bishops of the church depended on these laws to perform their daily tasks as well as hold property. According to Eusebius, Licinius enacted anti-Christian laws even beyond the clergy and went as far as barring those who would not sacrifice to the pagan gods from military service.[621] This was the same rationale that had prompted the persecutions. When Constantine defeated Licinius in 324 and became the sole inheritor of the empire it meant legal freedom for Christians, and freedom to participate in Roman life once again.[622]

Fourth Century Roman Morality and Tradition

This, however, was not the only shift in the law. Both Diocletian and Constantine had ambitions to make the empire more traditional and adapted family laws to shape Roman family values. Constantine, however, proved himself to be a “hands-on emperor” when it came to imperial legislation. Similar to emperors before him, such as Hadrian, it is not inconceivable that “he had control over what his edicts said and approved their wording” even if he did not write them himself.[623] After he defeated Licinius in the east, Constantine enacted a law in Nicomedia aimed at those who abused their offices under Licinius.[624] In the law, asking informants to come forward, he says: "Thus may the highest divinity [*summa divinitas*] always be favourable towards me and preserve me in safety as I wish, while the state [*res publica*] is most happy and prosperous."[625] Constantine linked himself to the *summa divinitas* as well as the state and equated the favor of the god to his safety and prosperity of the Roman state. This was not unlike emperors before him and is a continuation of the idea that the favor of the gods/god was linked to the state.[626] Second, Constantine used his position as emperor to promote the image of Licinius as a tyrant while drawing himself as a savior. He codified this language into his legislation.

---

[621] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* LIV.

[622] This is, of course, only if you follow the correct form of orthodoxy and are not a heretic.

[623] Evans Grubbs (1995), 49

[624] *Cod.Theod.* 9.1.4: Idem a. ad universos provinciales. si quis est cuiuscumque loci ordinis dignitatis, qui se in quemcumque iudicum comitum amicorum vel palatinorum meorum aliquid veraciter et manifeste probare posse confidit, quod non integre adque iuste gessisse videatur, intrepidus et securus accedat, interpellet me: ipse audiam omnia, ipse cognoscam et si fuerit comprobatum, ipse me vindicabo. dicat, securus et bene sibi conscius dicat: si probaverit, ut dixi, ipse me vindicabo de eo, qui me usque ad hoc tempus simulata integritate deceperit, illum autem,

According to Evans Grubbs: "Like Diocletian, Constantine recognized the need to restate and revive many of the principles of the classical Roman law, but he also enacted new laws in accordance with the changing times."[627] Diocletian had ambitions to revert to traditional law that mirrored the philosophy of the early empire while Constantine took this a step further. The Roman family had been at the heart of the Augustan marriage laws, and so it is no surprise that Diocletian also sought to publish laws that would ensure that Roman families upheld the values of the larger Roman society. Diocletian used rescripts to remind petitioning Romans of what was legally acceptable in the empire, and if he sought to overturn older laws, he would issue an edict. In an exemplary example of explosive language, Diocletian's (and Maximian's) concern for the *pudor*, or modesty, of the Roman people can be seen in an *epistola* concerning adultery, stating:

> "We have such concern for modesty that We remove the ambiguities of former law and, having abolished utterly all limitations besides that of five years and the exception of pimping that may be alleged against a husband, as well as the limitation that affects a bride after the dissolution of her marriage and before her

---

qui hoc prodiderit et comprobaverit, et dignitatibus et rebus augebo. ita mihi summa divinitas semper propitia sit et me incolumem praestet, ut cupio, felicissima et florente re publica. proposita xv kal. octob. nicomediae paulino et iuliano conss. (325 sept. 17); Harries (1999), 145

[625] Translation taken from Harries (1999), 145. *Cod.Theod*. 9.1.4

[626] See above discussion about the Edict of Caracalla.

[627] Evans Grubbs (1995), 43

> denunciation, We decree that the reliability of the allegation must be ascertained. For it is outrageous that the tricks of cunning law should prevent vengeance on behalf of modesty."[628]

This letter serves as an example of how Diocletian and his co-emperor Maximian employed the law to enforce a code of conduct that they deemed acceptable. Diocletian used the law to set a standard for the morality of the subjects of the empire, and his inspiration for that morality was the *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis*, an Augustan law created in during the principate period. In this case, contemporary ideologies on morality superseded past precedents. For this reason, Diocletian not only made laws about the family but also issued edicts to ensure the piety of the Roman people.

Evans Grubbs highlights that while only one edict from Diocletian's family laws survive, "there are several hundred rescripts relevant to marriage, *patria potestas*, and other family matters in the *Codex Iustinianus*" that are published under the names of all four tetrarchs but "almost all rescripts in the Code emanated from Diocletian's chancery in the east."[629] Laws that were relevant during Diocletian's reign but became obsolete by the reign of Justinian, were not not copied into his Codex, so the evidence is fragmentary.[630] In the laws that were copied, however, it is clear the tetrarchs sought to avoid disruptions to traditional Roman marriages, and the social order, in accordance with the law.

---

[628] *Cod.Iust.* 9.9.27. "[impp. diocletianvs et maximianvs aa. et cc. concordio praesidia nvmidiae. Ita nobis pudor cordi est, ut removeamus prisci iuris ambages et constituamus in adulterii quaestione abolitis de medio ceteris praescriptionibus praeter quinquennii temporis et lenocinii quod marito obicitur exceptionem, illam etiam, quae post solutum prius matrimonium ante denuntiationem nuptae competit, fidem criminis nosci. Indignum est enim, ut ultionem pudoris praestigiae versuti iuris excludant. pp. k. ivn. tvsco et anvllino cons." Translation is taken from Dillon, who calls the edict an epistola edict, 79. Also consult Corcoran (1996) and Evans Grubbs (2018), 407-14

[629] Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2018) "Diocletian's Private Law: the Family." In Diocleziano: la frontiera giuridica dell'impero, ed. Salvatore Puliatti and Werner Eck. Pavia University Press: CEDANT (Centro di studi e ricerche di Diritti Antichi), pp. 345-424, 345.

[630] Evans Grubbs (2018), 348; Diocletian also issued a law on incest. See *Cod. Just.* 5.4.17 for an excerpt of the edict.

In their rescripts, the emperors clarified questions about rank, incest, and marriage, saying:

> "Since you declare that you were not born of a senatorial father, but that through mairrage with a senator you acquired the status of a women from the senatorial order (*clarissima femina*), senatorial status (*claritas*), which was achieved by you thanks to your husband, has been set aside if, having subsequently chosen a husband of the second rank (equestrian), you have been reduced to the level of your previous social rank."[631]

The law upheld that rank (and citizenship) followed that of the man who she was currently married to, unless she was unmarried and under the *potestas* of her father.[632] Since Paulina was not born into a senatorial rank and married a man of equestrian rank, she assumed her husband's status.

Another rescript, posted in 295 in Damascus, upheld ancient Roman incest laws (*ius antiquum*) by stating that it is illegal for a man to marry immediate family members, including: daughter, granddaughter, great granddaughter, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, aunt, nieces, granddaughters, stepdaughter, stepmother, daughter-in-law, mother-in-law, and anyone else included the ancient laws.[633] In the edict, the emperors of the tetrarchy insisted that this law be upheld, and the Roman people continue to act appropriately so that "even the immortal gods themselves will be favorable and gentle to the Roman name, as they have always been, if they have seen that all people living under our rule lead a wholly pious and religious and peaceful and chaste life in all respects."[634] The emperors expand even further, and explained why it is vital that the Roman people join in legal and legitimate marriages, saying:

---

[631] *Cod. Iust.* 5.4.10: Cum te non ex senatore patre procreatam ob matrimonium cum senatore contractum clarissimae feminae nomen adeptam dicas, claritas, quae beneficio mariti tibi parata est, si secundi ordinis virum postea sortita es redacta ad prioris dignitatis statum, deposita est. * diocl. et maxim. aa. paulinae. *

[632] Older laws referenced by Gaius and Ulpian frequently referenced Roman citizenship, but by the late third century, more people with the empire had Roman citizenship, and therefore the issue of status was likely more of a question. This is not to say there were not laws regarding marrying non-Romans, but regarding laws focused on people within the empire, the imperial demographic had changed.

[633] *Cod. Iust.* 5.4.17: Nemini liceat contrahere matrimonium cum filia nepte pronepte, itemque matre avia proavia et ex latere amita ac matertera, sorore sororis filia et ex ea nepte, praeterea fratris filia et ex ea nepte, itemque ex

> "In this matter we have decided that this also should be provided for as much as possible: when marriages have been joined in a religious and legitimate way according to the discipline of the ancient law, that, with religion having been safeguarded, there begin to be deliberation as much for the honorableness of those who pursue the joining of marriages, as also for those who are born thereafter as a result, and that even posterity itself be purified by the honorableness of being born. For it has especially pleased our sense of duty (*pietas*), that the sacred names of kinship maintain among one's own loved ones the dutiful (*pia*) and religious affection (*caritas*) owed to blood relationship. For it is wicked to believe those things, which it is agreed have been committed by very many in the past, when in the promiscuous manner of cattle or wild beasts they have rushed into illicit marriages at the instigation of accursed lust, without any respect for modesty or sense of duty (*pietas*)."[635]

The emperors established that it was an act of sacrilege to commit an incestual marriage, and worst of all, children born from these marriages were tainted. These acts reflected on all of the Roman people, and stained the piety of the populus. Therefore, this crime was not only committed between people but it was one committed against the Roman race.

Constantine's laws on the family, likewise, sought to strengthen familial lines and focused on the virtue of women, penalizing adultery and divorce. In modern scholarship, Constantine has been accused of showing his preference for Christianity through his own

---

adfinibus privigna noverca nuru socru ceterisque, quae iure antiquo prohibentur: a quibus cunctos volumus abstinere. * diocl. et maxim. aa. et cc. * <a 295 d. k. mai. damasco tusco et anullino conss.> See also Gaius, *Institutes* I.59-64.

[634] *Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum Collatio* VI.4.1. Translation from Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2002). Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood. Taylor & Francis Group.

[635] *Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum Collatio* VI.4.2. Translation from Evans Grubbs (2002).

litigation of Roman marriage and family, rather than being charged with attempting to recreate an empire of the "good old days."[636] Evans Grubbs asserts that, instead, Constantine's laws on sexual morality reflected an attempt to revive older Roman mores, which happened to reflect Christian values simultaneously.

In a law posted in 319, Constantine confirmed valid Roman marriages between free people and slaves. Like his predecessors, he insisted that marrying a slave woman was illegal.[637] This same policy was recorded by Gaius in his *Institutes*, where he stated that it was prohibited to marry someone of slave status. Constantine went as far as punishing anyone who knowingly committed this crime by working in the mines.[638] The law applied to *curiales*, or decurions, who attempted to (illegally) marry women with slave status.

A Need for Education and a New Ruling Class

Due to the increased focus on imperial administration and Roman law, as well as the growing acceptance of Christianity, the traditional value of *paideia* declined, and elite Romans sought alternative ways to express their status. Students of wealthy families sought to pursue careers in the government, the church, or to go to law school. This was a shift from the earlier centuries of the empire when Romans encouraged Greek cities to have schools that fostered sophists and encouraged students to learn the intricacies of the classical Greek language through the readings of ancient texts. Formal law schools developed under the emperor Augustus, and before that in the time of the Republic, men would learn from jurists in their own time, presumably after receiving *paideia*.[639] The first known law schools were in Rome and were mentioned by the second-century senator Pliny the Younger.[640]

---

[636] Evans Grubbs (1995), 55.

[637] *Cod. Iust.* 5.5.3: Ideoque praecipimus, ne decuriones in gremia potentissimarum domorum libidine servarum ducente confugiant. si enim decurio clam actoribus atque procuratoribus nescientibus alienae fuerit servae coniunctus, et mulierem in metallum trudi per sententiam iudicis iubemus et ipsum decurionem in insulam deportari, omnibus bonis eius civitati, cuius curialis fuerat, mancipandis, si patria potestate fuerit liberatus nullosque habeat liberos vel parentes vel etiam propinquos, qui secundum legum ordinem ad eius successionem vocantur. <a 319 d. k. iul. aquileiae constantino a. v et licinio c. conss.>

[638] And that all of their goods would be confiscated and become property of the state. *Cod. Iust.* 5.5.3.2-3: Quod si actores vel procuratores loci, in quo flagitium admissum est, fuerunt conscii vel compertum facinus promere noluerunt, metallo eos convenit implicari. <a 319 d. k. iul. aquileiae constantino a. v et licinio c. conss.> Si vero dominus hoc fieri permisit vel postea cognitum celavit, si quidem in agro id factum est, fundus cum mancipiis et pecoribus ceterisque rebus. quae cultui rustico sustinentur, fisci viribus vindicetur: si vero in civitate id factum est, dimidiam bonorum omnium partem praecipimus confiscari poenam augentes, quoniam intra domesticos parietes scelus admissum est, quod noluit mox cognitum publicare. <a 319 d. k. iul. aquileiae constantino a. v et licinio c. conss.> Can be found in *Cod. Theod.* 12.1.6: Also discussed by Evans Grubbs (1995), 277-280

By the third and fourth centuries law schools were known to be in Rome and Berytus, and by the late empire "a law degree was required to practice before the higher courts, and this was, in turn, a qualification for positions in the government."[641] Outside of the major law schools, there were smaller locally run law schools where jurists trained to teach students law in their own province or provide a school that required less travel.[642] In this chapter, I have focused heavily on how the legal structure of the empire changed and how expansive it became. The new attention given to legal and rhetorical education was significantly tied to Roman tradition, not necessarily a Hellenic one. When these two systems were Romanized, legal and education, Greek citizens were found themselves more aligned with the Roman state than ever before.

Emperor Augustus had divided the empire into senatorial and imperial provinces, with the senate controlling the former and the emperor responsible for the latter.[643] Men of equestrian rank oversaw the financial affairs of the imperial provinces, and as the empire's territory and citizens grew, so did the number of imperial careers. As Williams states, these careers were obtained by merit, rather than through noble birth.[644] This was especially true by the reign of Constantine.

---

[639] Riggsby, 59
[640] Riggsby, 60-61
[641] Riggsby, 64
[642] See Chapter 4: Education for more on Roman legal education.
[643] Williams, Stephen. (1985). *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*. BT Batsford, Ltd, 103

In the third century, the crisis changed who qualified for certain administrative positions. Emperors sought to strip power from the senatorial class and instead place it in the hands of those they deemed loyal, which often meant military men. Diocletian took power during a time of immense instability, and the institutions established by the Roman government centuries earlier were disrupted. Diocletian followed the example of previous emperors, such as Septimius Severus, and promoted men from lower ranks over those from the senatorial class. Men of equestrian rank held a majority of the higher offices, including governor positions, changing the educational requirements for these positions. His ambitions were not only to revive systems for tax collection and stability but to increase access to law courts. To do so he increased the number of governors, almost doubling them, and employed men who were "legally trained and [an] expert" and who would carry out his agenda properly and efficiently.[645] Diocletian decided that governors should "try all legal cases in person, and no longer delegate: or at least, that they only delegate the lesser cases, and only after they have ruled on questions of law, leaving their deputies merely to decide matters of fact."[646]

---

[644] Williams: "The small number of top jobs continued to be reserved for senators, as always; but below and alongside them grew up a far larger professional civil service—procurators, heads of bureaux and all the middle levels of advisers and functionaries—which favored able men of the equestrian class. At the apex was the unique figure of the Praetorian Prefect, who had gradually become the nearest thing to a Chief Minister. It was this great body of equestrian administrators who effectively ran the successful High Empire of the Flavians and Antonines. This was not just because of their greater professionalism, but primarily because of their far great numbers. Since the equestrian order was entered by property qualifications, not birth, it offered an incomparably greater pool of educated, competent and ambitious men," 103.

[645] Williams, 104.

[646] Williams, 105

In a rescript from Diocletian and Maximian in 294, they describe the role of governors in hearing legal cases, especially where it concerned appointing judges (*iudices pedanei*) for cases they could not try because they had other civic obligations.[647] The emperors insisted that governors had to try cases in which their level of authority (*gravitas*) was required.[648] Importantly, cases concerning freeborn and freedmen status, which governors had historically tried, were required to be decided by the governors so that a valid decision would be made.[649] It is clear that emperors sought to make the duties of offices known so that Roman citizens would be tried appropriately and avoid further lawsuits. Diocletian was not establishing new standards for governors, but rather, reinstating old rules for their positions and duties.

After defeating Licinius, Constantine wanted to centralize the Roman government to secure the eastern provinces. According to Kelly, Constantine promoted participation in the Roman government and made sure Romans knew "the immediate and tangible advantages of a willing participation in the administration of a reunified empire."[650] He, like Diocletian, enacted further reforms to take away responsibilities from the Praetorian Prefects.

---

[647] *Cod. Iust.* 3.3.2: Placet nobis praesides de his causis, in quibus, quod ipsi non possent cognoscere, antehac pedaneos iudices dabant, notionis suae examen adhibere, ita tamen ut , si vel per occupationes publicas vel propter causarum multitudinem omnia huiusmodi negotia non potuerint cognoscere, iudices dandi habeant potestatem. * diocl. et maxim. aa. et cc. dicunt: * <a 294 d. xv k. aug. cc. conss.>; *Cod. Iust.* 3.3.2.1: (quod non ita accipi convenit, ut etiam in his causis, in quibus solebant ex officio suo cognoscere, dandi iudices licentia permissa credatur: quod usque adeo in praesidum cognitione retinendum est, ut eorum iudicia non deminuta videantur): dum tamen de ingenuitate, super qua poterant et ante cognoscere, et de libertinitate praesides ipsi diiudicent. <a 294 d. xv k. aug. cc. conss.>.

[648] *Cod. Iust.* 3.3.2.1: Placet, ut iudicibus, si quos gravitas tua disceptatores dederit, insinues, ut delegata sibi negotia lata sententia determinant.

[649] Ibid: nec in his causis, in quibus pronuntiare debent et possunt, facultatem sibi remittendi patere ad iudicium praesidale cognoscant, maxime cum, et si iudicatio alicui litigatorum parti iniusta videatur, interponendae provocationis potestas a sententia ex omni causa prolata libera litigatoribus tribuatur.

[650] Kelly, Christopher. 2005. "Bureaucracy and Government." *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 184.

Another new office established circa 312 CE, the *magister officiorum*, further "reflected the consolidation in one office of a number of civilian administrative duties."[651] The Praetorian Prefect had various legal responsibilities including that of judge, but Constantine sought to mitigate the power and authority of the prefectures and governors by establishing new offices. He developed two offices, that *of quaestor sacri palatii* and the *magister officium*, to oversee the legal system. Kelley explains that the *quaestor sacri palatii* could draft legislation, responses to petitions, and letters that were addressed to the emperor.[652] The *magister officiorum*, who could share a staff with the quaestor, had a multitude of responsibilities associated with the emperor.~~[653]~~

The new positions and institutions created by Constantine were clearly defined and consolidated so that powerful officials would answer to the emperor himself, and therefore prevent "any rival gaining control of both army and administration."[654] All of which is relevant in the Greek cities of the east, because in this period more than ever they were expected to not only rely on the Roman government, but also to be a part of it.

---

[651] According to Kelly: "The *magister officiorum* represented a significant aggregation and systematization under one senior official of a series of disparate functions. Many of these—particularly the core tasks concerned with petitions, correspondence, and embassies—connect this post with a range of departments responsible since the first century AD for the conduct of these key aspects of imperial administration," 188.

[652] Kelly, 188.

[653] Ibid. "He supervised the sacra scrinia (the three principal imperial secretariats, from which the quaestor also drew his staff), which dealt with a wide range of matters, including petitions, reports, judicial records, the issuing of letters of appointment to various senior civil and military posts, the requests of embassies, and the day-to-day running of the palace. The institution of the magister officiorum represented a significant aggregation and systematization under one senior official of a series of disparate functions. Many of these particularly the core tasks concerned with petitions, correspondence, and embassies– connect this post with a range of departments responsible since the first century ad for the conduct of these key aspects of imperial administration." Kelley likewise notes that: "The magister officiorum may perhaps have been created by Diocletian, but on balance it seems more likely that the position was established– in the separate administrations of both Constantine and Licinius– sometime soon after 312.26 The main palatine secretariats, which had varied in number, title, and duties, are first recorded in 314 in the tripartite division which became standard for the late empire: scrinium memoriae, scrinium epistularum, and scrinium libellorum." Not. Dign. or. 12, oc. 10; see Harries 1988, 159–69

[654] Kelly, 191

Fourth-century sophist and orator Libanius of Antioch uncovers the lives of educated elite Greeks attempting to start careers in the Roman administration.[655] Libanius was so well-connected that he was able to access the emperor Julian, with whom he had frequent correspondence. As a professor of rhetoric, Libanius wrote numerous letters on behalf of his students to introduce them to other influential elites. Bradbury highlights a group of Libanius' letters sent to Berytus to professors of law there. In one letter, Libanius wrote to Domnio on behalf of Hilarinus, a Greek who had already held a career or worked in some way but was now seeking to get legal training. Libanius said:

> "Look, you've even roused Greece to your side, and, in addition to the boys, you've all but persuaded even old men to come on the run to Phoenicia. This Hilarinus previously desired to get something from my course, but was prevented by fortune and is now coming to participate in yours. You really ought to be to him as I myself would have been, had he participated in my daily exercises. I'm talking not about goodwill, which you clearly display at all times, but rather that he learn a lot in not much time. To those who come late to their studies and who endure ribbing, it's appropriate that this be their reward from their teachers: intensive lessons and an enthusiasm that instils speed in their art."[656]

Hilarinus was coming late to the study of law after already attempting a different career (which is unknown). This letter highlights the growing advantages and profitability of studying law compared to other fields. In another letter to Florentius (*magister officiorum* from 355, 359-361 CE), Libanius spoke highly of his friend Parthenius, also from Antioch, who wanted to become a governor.[657] These letters show the connected network between education, law, and the imperial government in the Greek-speaking east. The abundance of these letters speaks how sought out these positions were. Raffaella Cribiore warns that "one should be alert to the marked imbalance between the rancorous denunciations [of students seeking legal or political careers] in his speeches and the resigned acceptance of his correspondence."[658] Libanius' critiques of legal studies reflected his favoritism towards his city of Antioch, of which he wanted to establish as an educational pillar in the empire. When students left to pursue training in Rome, Berytus, or Athens, he was reminded of the fact that his school lacked the educational training necessary to fit the mid-fourth-century job market.[659]

---

[655] For more on Libanius, see the following chapter on education.
[656] Translation from Bradbury (2004), letter B.164, sent 361 CE.

The attention to Roman law or legal professionals was sometimes met with criticism. Fourth-century Greek historian Ammianus Marcellinus spoke extensively about the corruption one could find in lawyers.[660] He broke lawyers down into four rotten classes, and finally claimed:

> "And when the contending parties are stripped of everything, and days, months and years are used up, at last the case, now worn out with age, is introduced, and those brilliant principals come forth, bringing with them other shadows of advocates. And when they have come within the barriers of the court, and the fortunes or safety of someone begins to be discussed, and they ought to work to turn the sword or ruinous loss from an innocent person, the advocates on both sides wrinkling their brows and waving their arms in semblance of the gestures of actors … stand for a long time opposite each other … when … after the semblance of a trial has gone on for three years allege that they are not yet fully

---

[657] There are also letters to the *magister officiorum* Musonius (356-57), whom did not seem to be interested in Libanius, and Anatolius (360-363), who was the *magister libellorum* in Gaul before becoming the MO, to whom Libanius only wrote one letter to (ep.739). See Bradbury, Scott. (2004). B.41

[658] Cribiore, Raffaella. (2007). *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton University Press, 212

[659] Ibid, 205-213

[660] Amm. Marc. *30.4.9–1l, 13–15, 19*

> informed; and after they have obtained a further postponement … they persistently demand the pay for their danger and toil."[661]

Before that, he even accused them of acting as oracles, rather than legal scholars, and criticized their abilities to speak in court.

I want to stress that Roman and Greek culture were not at constant odds with each other. Libanius' frenemy, Anatolius of Berytus, exemplified the intersection of Greek and Roman culture. He was a "model" Roman official who served as Praetorian Prefect of Illyricum from 357 to 360 CE (in Sirmium) and was a strong benefactor to Libanius' students.[662] Anatolius, who considered himself a sophist, had a foot in each arena. What is clear, though, is that almost forty years after Constantine became sole ruler, changes in the lives of elite Greeks were forever altered, as they were now formally a cog in the Roman machine.

Conclusion: Laws in the late Third and Fourth Centuries

Several factors can be considered. First, who used the law, and to whom did it apply? According to Kelly, the government restructuring employed by Constantine strengthened the Roman central administration and was intended to bring in the eastern provinces that had been somewhat removed previously.[663] Unlike other parts of the empire that had to adapt to entirely new infrastructure to appear more Roman, during the principate cities in the Greek east were encouraged to continue Hellenistic traditions while they were under Roman leadership. The Greek cities in the first through third centuries were allowed to remain localized and generally able to govern themselves with autonomy, provided they maintained peace. Second, and most importantly, the Greek language persisted and even became the second language of the empire. Even petitioners who received rescripts would write to the emperor in Greek or Latin, depending on their location within the empire, but would receive responses in Latin.[664] Inscriptions on graves in these cities continued to be in Greek, and even honorific inscriptions to the emperor himself were in Greek.[665] The Greek East was allowed to maintain its own legal traditions and "rarely did the imperial government… actively enforce Roman legal principles over those of native legal systems."[666]

---

[661] Amm. Marc. *30.4.19;* Translation from: *Ammianus Marcellinus, vol. III, trans. John C. Rolfe (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956:* et cum nudatis litigatoribus dies cesserint et menses et anni, tandem obtrita vetustate controversia intromissa, ipsa capita splendoris ingressa alia secum advocatorum simulacra inducunt. cumque intra cancellorum venerint saepta, et agi coeperint alicuius fortunae vel salus, atque laborari debeat, ut ab insonte gladius vel calamitosa detrimenta pellantur, conrugatis hinc inde frontibus brachiisque histrionico gestu formatis, ut contionaria Gracchi fistula post occipitium desit, consistitur altrinsecus diu: tandemque ex praemeditato conludio per eum, qui est in verba fidentior, suave quoddam principium dicendi exeritur, Cluentianae vel pro Ctesiphonte orationum aemula ornamenta promittens: et in eam conclusionem cunctis finem cupientibus desinit, ut nondum se patroni post speciem litis triennium editam causentur instructos, spatioque prorogati temporis impetrato, quasi cum Antaeo vetere conluctati, perseveranter flagitant pulveris periculosi mercedes

[662] Bradbury (2004), 87. See B.56 To Anatolius on his many achievements. In the letter, Libanius heard that Anatolius declined to be prefect of Rome, but was rumored to be chosen as a prefect in the east.

However, in the late third and early fourth centuries, the idealization of emperors to revive and maintain a classical Greek past began to fade. Instead, the emperors of the tetrarchy sought to create order, and one way they did this was by prioritizing Roman law, which would affect all citizens of the empire, including those in the Greek East.[667] This was accomplished through codifying Roman law, and through the new imperial structure of the tetrarchy established by Diocletian, which increased access to the courts and legal systems. Diocletian and Constantine had different methods, but both used the law as a universal way to guide the lives of Romans. Diocletian increased the number of territories, government offices and courts, while also taking away power from the senatorial class. Then he appointed the jurist Hermogenian, *magister a libellis* under Diocletian, who compiled rescripts from the 293-294 CE in the *Codex Hermogenianus*. In 295, Hermogenian moved west to head the *scrinium libellorum*, and later became a praetorian prefect under Maximian.[668] His administrative initiatives alongside the evidence provided by his rescripts show two things: more opportunities in the east for government roles and an increased interest in interacting with Roman law because it had become the standard of government.

---

[663] Kelly (2005), 183

[664] Corcoran (1996), 59

[665] See: Reynolds, J. M. (1987). *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek inscriptions with commentary: Texts from the excavations at Aphrodisias conducted by Kenan T. Erim*. Cambridge Philological Society. All inscriptions found in Aphrodisias, a city in the diocese of Caria. Only one of eleven in the recorded inscriptions for the time between 284-350 CE were recorded in Latin. Of that particular inscription, Reynolds says: "one of the very small number of Latin inscriptions found at Aphrodisias. Although the rarity of such texts at the site makes comparison hazardous, the script is strikingly similar to that used in the Aphrodisias texts of Diocletian's Price and Currency documents," 20.

[666] Evans Grubbs (1995), 41; 15-34.

[667] It should again be noted that emperors themselves did not write the laws, and I do not mean to imply as such. What I do mean to establish is that even though jurists wrote laws, and even responded to petitioners through rescripts, they did so with the confidence of the emperor that they would act in his, and the empire's, best interests.

Constantine, likewise, with ambitions to return to classical Roman traditions, used law and *epistulae* as his primary focus. He developed two new offices, *quaestor* and *magister officiorum*, to off-load the legal responsibilities of the praetorian prefect, and therefore diluting the power of the prestigious position. With the creation of these new offices and the introduction of a new class, new opportunities emerged for those living in the eastern provinces that could appeal to the wealthy elites residing there.[669]

Under Constantine, the primary religion of the empire began to shift from a pagan one, which had allowed for diversity in worship and cult practice, to a rigid monotheistic one that sought to root out alternative forms of Christianity, such as Arianism. Constantine brought

---

[668] Connolly (2010), 39. Connolly notes that it is not until 305 when Hermogenian was given senatorial honors and held the office of urban prefecture.

[669] Kelley (2005), 198-199

Christianity into the empire by giving (Catholic) Christians and churches the same benefits as pagans and pagan temples.[670]

A second shift focused on Roman legal tradition and its impact on learning Latin. Bilingualism in the empire was not new. Libanius in his autobiography stated that his great-grandfather, who lived in the third century, had been mistaken as coming from Italy because of a speech he so eloquently delivered in Latin.[671] But, Libanius said, "although he was versed in Latin, he originated from nowhere else but here [Antioch]."[672] His great-grandfather served as an exemplar of bilingualism. He was an example of how a native Greek speaker would have mastered the Latin language so well as to deliver it (even if Libanius embellishes in this oration) and even tricked the crowd into thinking he had been from Italy. In his day, Libanius saw a shift in which his students saw the importance of Latin instead of Greek so that they could study law. Although Libanius taught a generation after Constantine, his students reflected a long coming change and shift in educational needs. I argue this happened not only because Latin was the language of the law, which had become a dominant way to control and guide the Roman population, but also because the emperors, whose power often relied on their armies and the benefice of their armies, employed Latin more because it was the language of the armies.[673] Also, there was a major increase in job opportunities within the Roman administration that preferred Latin over Greek.[674]

---

[670] See for example *Cod.Theo.* 16.2.4, in which Catholic Christians can leave property to the church in their wills.
[671] Libanius. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992
[672] Lib. *Autobiography*, 3: "οἴονται δέ τινες τὸν ἐμὸν ἐπίπαππον ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἥκειν ὑπὸ λόγου τινὸς τῇ ἐκείνων γλώττῃ ποιηθέντος ἠπατημένοι. ὁ δὲ ἄρα τὸ μὲν εἶχε ποιεῖν, ἦν δὲ οὐκ ἄλλοθεν."
[673] Armies are addressed in chapter one.
[674] More in Chapter Four: Education

While citizenship was not a new concept, citizenship of a larger state was not a requirement in the Hellenistic world, and individuals often held citizenship in their city.[675] However, it was not uncommon to express identity within a collective as having a set of cultural norms shared by those who were free and participating in some form of their civic government. What made the late third and fourth centuries distinct was the new organization brought to the empire under the tetrarchy. I see a continuity in the way both Diocletian and Constantine used Roman law to mitigate daily disputes involving property, family, and religion. Caroline Humfress argues that while Constantine's contemporaries see his legislation as Christian, his legislative actions harken back to Roman law established prior to Christianity. She states: "What is striking, however, about the three hundred and thirty or so extant (or rather partially extant) laws issued by Constantine between 312 and 337 is not their attempt to implement any legislative programmes of either innovation or conservatism but rather their 'reactive' quality. The drafters of Constantine's laws respond to concrete situations: they clarify, tinker with, elaborate, and occasionally repeal various substantive principles of Roman law already in existence."[676] Rather than viewing the legal developments of Diocletian and Constantine both as different and non-traditional, I agree with Humfress, Corcoran, Evans Grubbs, and others who argue their ambitions emerged from classical principles embedded in Roman law.[677]

Through this new organization and new legal changes, Romans had better access to the law and the emperor himself. Due to the increased activity with the law, and the initiative to make the law more "traditional" and shape it so that it reflected the values of the early empire,

---

[675] See more in Chapter Two: Cities.
[676] Humfress, Caroline. (2005). Civil Law and Social Life *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine. Cambridge*
[677] Corcoran (2000); Evans Grubbs (1995); Humfress (2005)

Romans living in the Greek east were adapting themselves to traditional Roman life. Lastly, when Constantine built his “New Rome” in the eastern city formerly known as Byzantium, he redrew the network of imperial connection. With the foundation of Constantinople, the Constantinopolitan Senate, and the network of wealthy Christians, people in the Greek-speaking east had more access to the emperor and his court than ever before. In turn, this proximity would allow the eastern Romans to fully engage with an empire that was now firmly theirs fully.

Chapter Four: Education

"He would tell the tale of the rhetorical prowess of many another sophist too and of the orations by which they won or lost their disputations, and as a result of all this a longing for Athens began to possess my soul." -Libanius, *Oration* 1.11[678]

Introduction

Around the fifth century BCE, Greek intellectuals began to develop a deeper understanding of philosophy, mathematics, logic, language, and politics. These intellectuals gathered a following of pupils who sought to learn from their methods and further develop their ideas. These intellectuals became known as sophists, from the Greek term *sophos* or *sophistês,* which both originate from the word *sophia* (meaning wisdom). They would form their schools of thought around a particular area of specialization. Take, for example, the renowned Athenian philosopher Socrates, Plato's teacher. Socrates established a sort of school, or institute of learning, in which he would take disciples under his guidance and encourage them to think through problems via dialogues with one another.[679] In this way, he became a private teacher, where his students would learn his way of thinking and how to present rhetorical arguments.[680] Unfortunately, Socrates' way of thinking was at odds with Athenian cultural norms. He was seen as a delinquent who taught the Athenian youths to question older cultural precedents, especially those concerning religion. He was condemned to death in 399 BCE by an Athenian court when a student of his used mythological stories as a rationale for abusing his father. Despite being popular among the younger Greek elites, the court found that using a religious example for argumentative evidence and rationale was impious on the part of Socrates.[681]

---

[678] Translation from: Lib. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. Libanius, *Oration* 1.11: οὗτος ὁ Ἰασίων, ἃ παρ᾽ ἀνδρῶν πρεσβυτέρων Ἀθηνῶν τε πέρι καὶ τῶν αὐτόθι δρωμένων ἐδέδεκτο, καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ὡς εἰπεῖν πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐμυθολόγει Καλλινίκους τέ τινας καὶ Τληπολέμους ἑτέρων τε οὐκ ὀλίγων σοφιστῶν διηγούμενος σθένος λόγους τε οἷς ἀλλήλων ἐκράτησάν τε καὶ ἐκρατήθησαν, ὑφ᾽ ὧν τις ἐπιθυμία τοῦ χωρίου κατελάμβανέ μοι τὴν ψυχήν.

[679] Sansone, D. (2017). *Ancient Greek civilization*. Wiley-Blackwell, 255-258

[680] Unlike other sophists, who required payment from their students, Socrates did not accept money as payment since he felt he did not know enough and did not consider himself the wisest. Plato stated in his *Apology*, which is from the perspective of Socrates, that Socrates criticized other sophists who go "to each and every city and persuade the young, who can associate with any of their fellow citizens they like without charge, to leave the company of those people, join them and pay money and be happy to do so." *Apology,* 18-22. Translation taken from: Plato. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo.* Edited and translated by Christopher Emlyn-Jones, William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

The seed, however, was planted and took root quickly. This system was highly developed in Athens, attracting both Athenian and non-Athenian citizens to flock to the city to learn from certain teachers. David Sansone suggests that because sophists taught their students how to craft well-thought-out arguments a democratic system would suit them best.[682] Therefore, the demand for well-spoken citizens was highly prized in Athens, where citizens could use their rhetorical abilities to negotiate positions of power. Throughout the centuries, the practice continued in Greek cities, as traveling from city to city was part of the sophist's job.

I have spoken briefly about *paideia* in the prior chapter, but only where it concerned athletic training in the *gymnasia*, the benefaction of schools, and teaching positions as official offices in the Roman government. That discussion, however, overlooks the historical significance of the educational training of *paideia* and its cultural importance in the Hellenistic world. *Paideia* was not only about learning how to read and write, but it also described the training one would receive to be part of the larger community. It included physical and educational training, but for some elite individuals, it included advanced rhetorical training. This advanced oratorical and literary training opened doors for networking among influential elites in both Hellenistic and Roman cities.

---

[681] Sansone (2017), 259-261. Plato, for example, was among the young elite who found a mentor in Socrates.

[682] Sansone (2017), 261-263

This poses the question of what was being taught to private citizens while in school, and how it bound generations of citizens in the Greek and Roman worlds. Likewise, it raises the follow-up question of how *paideia* and intellectual culture, built upon Hellenic identity, adapted once Greek cities were officially under Roman rule. I will discuss educational practices and their historical significance but will primarily focus on intellectual culture and the individuals who were active in the scholarly community. Moreover, my study focuses on the sophists, orators, philosophers, and teachers, as well as their respective communities in the third and fourth centuries.

Philostratus of Athens recorded educational practices, intellectual culture, and the educators themselves through the mid-third century in his work *Lives of the Sophists*. According to Graeme Miles and Han Baltussen, the sophists recorded by Philostratus were "glamorous, eloquent, often egotistical, and petty. At best, they are embodiments of the traditions of rhetoric and literature to which they dedicate their intellects, ambassadors from their cities to the emperors, teachers, and performers of an imagined past."[683] Of the works of Philostratus, Miles and Baltussen comment on his apparent need to "assemble and preserve Hellenistic culture" and to articulate what that culture was during his lifetime and what it had been in the past.[684] They affirm that "the nature of Hellenism is that it is primarily a matter of paideia, of education in the language, literature, and thought of the past, and the creative reinterpretation of this inheritance in the present."[685]

---

[683] Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.* Edited and translated by Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2023, 3

[684] Miles and Baltussen (2023), 15

[685] Ibid. See too: Whitmarsh, Tim. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Goldhill, S., ed. (2001). *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge; Borg, B. E., ed. (2004). *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. De Gruyter; Richter, D. S., and W. A. Johnson, eds. (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford

Around the reign of Decius (r. 249-251) until the reign of Constantine (r. 306-337), there was a so-called "dark period" in which few works survive. Due to this, I will primarily examine the periods before and after and hopefully bridge the gaps in between. The survey begins in the mid-second century and stops roughly with the reign of Philip the Arab (244-249 CE), where Philostratus' work*, Lives of the Sophists*, ends. The survey picks up again around the time of Constantine as sole ruler (324 CE), during which Greek intellectuals were living in a different empire. Two significant developments within the empire would significantly alter Greek culture. The first is citizenship, which was expanded in 212 CE, and the second is religion, which shifted from pagan to Christian. I want to demonstrate how both of these would impact the lives of Greek people in these circles and how they would ultimately shape intellectual practices. It is outside the scope of this chapter and dissertation to identify every detail of education during that time, which means I largely exclude educational practices in the Latin-speaking West and the basic educational training that children would receive, and specifically, Christian intellectual circles in Alexandria and Caesarea.[686] Instead, I attempt to analyze higher educational practices in Greek-speaking cities and how they evolved in the third and fourth centuries, to understand the cultural shifts within the historical Greek communities.

The Second Sophistic

---

[686] For works that examine education in the Greek and Roman worlds, see: Morgan, T. (1998). *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*. Cambridge University Press; *Education in Greek and Roman antiquity*. (2001). Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789047400134; *A companion to Roman rhetoric*. (2007). Blackwell; Joyal, M. (2009). *Greek and Roman education: A sourcebook*. Routledge.; *The Oxford handbook of childhood and education in the classical world*. (2013). Oxford University Press. Educational practices specific to the Latin-speaking West: Gwynn, A. (1926). *Roman education from Cicero to Quintilian*. Clarendon Press.

The Second Sophistic is not an understudied movement. Glen Bowersock, Simon Swain, and Tim Whitmarsh have all closely examined the period and its impact on Greek intellectuals living in the Roman Empire.[687] The term "Second Sophistic," however, as both an intellectual category and a reference to a specific period in time, is not as straightforward as one would hope. Philostratus himself claims the Second Sophistic began with Aeschines (389-314 BCE), son of Atrometus "when he was exiled from political activity at Athens and had become acquainted with Caria and Rhodes." According to Swain, periodization "often reflects examination syllabuses rather than real cultural or political boundaries. However, the world of the Greek elite in the Second Sophistic age is distinctive."[688] He argues that the stability provided by the Empire and the patronage of the philhellenic Romans allowed for the expansion of Greek education and sophism throughout the empire during this period. Glen Bowersock, Tim Whitmarsh, and Simon Swain aim to connect Hellenism and Hellenic identity to a broader Roman identity that relied on the continued existence of Hellenic culture.[689] Bowersock has examined the context and literary framework of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*.[690] He asserts that the second sophistic movement developed in response to appease the Romans and their concept of Greek education, *paideia*.[691] These scholars work to understand the rise in Hellenic education and learning, just as Christianity began to spread throughout the Roman world and reshape educational centers. Their work details how a Greek education was intrinsic to Roman elite sophistication and the importance of *paideia* in elite culture.

---

[687] This chapter relies heavily on sources from or about the elite class. Students had to pay their teachers in institutions of higher learning, so sophists and Greek intellectuals of the period usually came from wealthy families by nature. Likewise, due to their familial status and intellectual abilities, they achieved positions of political power and were often connected to the emperor or imperial family. I will discuss identity and cultural movements, but the focus will be primarily on a specific class of individuals. In other chapters, I examine multiple classes of people and how culture outside of elite circles changed during the reign of Diocletian through to the mid-fourth century.

[688] Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and empire: Language, classicism, and power in the Greek world, AD 50-250*. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1

[689] Bowersock, G. W. (1969). *Greek sophists in the Roman Empire*. Clarendon P; Whitmarsh, T. (2005). *The second sophistic*. Oxford University Press, published for the Classical Association.; Swain, S. (1996).

[690] Bowersock, (1969)

[691] Swain (1996); Whitmarsh (2005)

Philostratus defined the Second Sophistic and sought to distinguish it from the "ancient" or “old” (ἀρχαία) tradition. He stated:

> “The Ancient Sophistic proposed philosophical themes and discussed them diffusely and at length. It discussed courage, and it discussed justice, and both heroes and gods, and in what form the cosmos was fashioned. But the sophistic following that one, which we must not call new, for it is ancient, but rather second, depicted poor men and rich and the noble and the tyrants and themes relating to named characters, to which history leads the way.”[692]

Take, for example, Dionysius of Miletus.[693] According to Philostratus, Emperor Hadrian admired Dionysius enough to appoint him as a “satrap” and elevate him to the equestrian rank.[694] Philostratus the Athenian, a sophist himself, exemplified the Second Sophistic. Philostratus, from a long line of Lemnian sophists, was born around 170 CE in Lemnos, which granted him the privilege of Athenian citizenship, and most likely held a senatorial rank. He studied in Athens and Ephesus under Proclus of Naucratis, Hippodromus of Larissa, Damian of Ephesus, and Antipater from Hierapolis, the last of whom was also the instructor for Septimius Severus’s sons and future emperors Geta and Caracalla.[695] In his work, *Lives of the Sophists*, Philostratus constructed a catalog of biographies of sophists from Greek-speaking cities from the reign of

---

[692] Philostr. *VS*. 1.3: Ἡ μὲν δὴ ἀρχαία σοφιστικὴ καὶ τὰ φιλοσοφούμενα ὑποτιθεμένη διῄει αὐτὰ ἀποτάδην καὶ ἐς μῆκος· διελέγετο μὲν γὰρ περὶ ἀνδρείας, διελέγετο δὲ περὶ δικαιότητος, ἡρώων τε πέρι καὶ θεῶν καὶ ὅπη ἀπεσχημάτισται ἡ ἰδέα τοῦ κόσμου. ἡ δὲ μετ᾽ ἐκείνην, ἣν οὐχὶ νέαν, ἀρχαία γάρ, δευτέραν δὲ μᾶλλον προσρητέον, τοὺς πένητας ὑπετυπώσατο καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς ἀριστέας καὶ τοὺς τυράννους καὶ τὰς ἐς ὄνομα ὑποθέσεις, ἐφ᾽ ἃς ἡ ἱστορία ἄγει. Transaltion here and moving forward from Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen (2023).

[693] Philostr. *VS* 1.59-63

[694] Ibid. I.61. A satrap is a procurator.

[695] Philostr. *VS* 2.66: “He was appointed as the teacher of Severus’ children and we used to call him “teacher of gods” when we praised his lecturing”; διδάσκαλος μὲν γὰρ τῶν Σεουήρου παίδων ἐνομίσθη καὶ θεῶν διδάσκαλον ἐκαλοῦμεν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐπαίνοις τῆς ἀκροάσεως

Nero (54-68 CE) through to his own time which was during the reign of Philip the Arab (244-249 CE). Some of the lives he recorded were his own teachers. For him, the term "sophist" was primarily used to "denote a species of epideictic oratory rather than a historical period.”[696] However, for modern historians, the term "Sophist" has been used to describe not only a period within the scope of Philostratus’ work but also a movement in Greek education under the Roman Empire.[697]

Philostratus’ work on the *Lives* shows the deep network of sophists spread throughout Greek-speaking cities in the East. He himself was even connected with the imperial family through Julia Domna. She was known for surrounding herself with talented sophists and astrologers of the time, and Philostratus may have even accompanied her and the emperor Septimius Severus (r. 193-211 CE) to Britain.[698] According to Bowersock, “Philostratus belonged to the circle of the Syrian empress, Julia Domna, he may well have been introduced to it by Antipater himself. From early in the third century, in all probability, Philostratus mingled with the luminaries of the empress and traveled with them in the great lady's entourage."[699] Philostratus himself mentioned the empress in his account of Philiscus the Thessalian. He stated:

---

[696] Johnson, William A., and Daniel S. Richter. (2017). 'Periodicity and Scope,' in Daniel S. Richter, and William A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, Oxford, 4

[697] Johnson, William A., and Daniel S. Richter (2017): Johnson and Richter discuss the inconsistencies and ambiguities in defining Philostratus' concepts of sophist and sophism, as well as the problems with periodization for the so-called movement. The question also arises whether there was a Latin movement, as Philostratus only covers those living in Greek-speaking cities and Greek education.

[698] Jones (2005) claims Philostratus was among the circle of sophists who joined themselves with Julia Domna and became close with the imperial household. Jones, Christopher P. (2005). Philostratus. *Apollonius of Tyana, Volume I: Life of Apollonius of Tyana, Books 1-4.* Edited and translated by Christopher P. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 16. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2.

[699] Bowersock (1969), 5

“He [Philiscus] insinuated himself into the group of geometers and philosophers around Julia, and obtained from her, with the emperor’s consent, the chair at Athens.”[700]

Philostratus' own life offers insight into the connections between intellectuals, educators, and the ruling class, as they often shared similar characteristics. This overlap is especially evident throughout the second sophistic movement, as sophists were closely connected to the emperor, and the political pursuits of those who could complete their education at these centers for higher learning were also clearly visible. Many people Philostratus discussed achieved a political career.

The Cultural Movement in Education during the Second Sophistic

As Swain and Bowersock show, elite Greeks were able to express their cultural identity through these educational centers.[701] The movement showcased a boom in the Greek language and revisited classical philosophy from Athens in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. The scholarship on the movement primarily focuses on elite Greek men who had the economic means to pursue higher education. Swain defines his scope by examining the "male Greek elite, that is, the restricted group in control of the economy, culture, and government whose activities and beliefs are reasonably well known to us, and [on] the world of Old Greece and Asia Minor."[702]

---

[700] Philostr. *VS 622. Philiscus the Thessalian*: “ἐστάλη ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ὡς τὰ ἑαυτοῦ θησόμενος, καὶ προσρυεὶς τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἰουλίαν γεωμέτραις τε καὶ φιλοσόφοις εὕρετο παρ᾽ αὐτῆς διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν Ἀθήνῃσι θρόνον.”

[701] Swain and Bowersock are not the only scholars to contribute to this, but I use them primarily because they include sophists in the later second and early third centuries. See: Goldhill, S. (2001) for more context on the first through mid-second centuries.

[702] Swain (1996), 1

The Second Sophistic was characterized by the study of the Greek language, which included the study of classical Attic language and rhetoric.[703] Moreover, the “Asianic” practices referred by Philostratus, were in direct contrast to those who used Athenian, or Attic, linguistic styles. According to Lawrence Kim, the “Asianic” style can be “described in predominantly pejorative terms and associated with word-play, musical rhythms, repetitive sound effects, parallelism, and balanced clauses; on the other hand, an ‘Attic’ style, self-consciously set against ‘Asianic,’ that hearken back to the prose of the fifth- and fourth-century Athenian writers.”[704] When an orator used the Attic style, it signaled “membership in a ‘cultured’ elite distinguished form the ‘ignorant’ masses.”[705]

Swain utilizes the Greek novels to discuss a cultural identity 'under Rome.' His work ponders whether this movement was 'playing up to' Roman philhellenism, to which he responds affirmatively, in some cases. In other ways, he argues, this movement rejected Latin influence over Greek.[706] The sophists of the second sophistic often avoided “terms transcribed or translated from or calqued based on Latin words and phrases."[707]

The existence of Latin in higher education, for example, in the form of chairs of Latin in Rome and Greek-speaking cities (such as Athens or Antioch), and the fact that Latin was the language of both the army and the Roman administration, including law, would dilute the influence of the Greek language.[708] Outside of language, studying Greek literature allowed sophists to recall a political history from the Greek world and find connections to their cultural past before Roman domination. Of identity, Swain comments:

---

[703] According to Swain (1996) “Atticism looked to an ideal of correct Greek within an already widely polarized language situation with clearly established differences between educated elite and non-educated Greek. The value of studying it lies in the fact that it is a disclosure of social and political events quite as much as an expression of literary tastes,” 7

[704] Kim, Lawrence. (2019)., 'Atticism and Asianism', in Daniel S. Richter, and William A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, Oxford Handbooks (2017; online edn, Oxford Academic, 6 Nov. 2017)

[705] Lawrence (2017), 46

[706] Swain (1996), 40

[707] Ibid.

> "Greeks identified with Rome politically because Rome encouraged them and needed them (or their friends or colleagues), because there were solid benefits to be gained from Roman citizenship and because they appreciated the benevolent regime of the Antonines. But cognitively and spiritually, none of this means the Greeks did not remain Greeks, whereas there is an enormous amount of evidence to prove that they did."[709]

This was undoubtedly true of second-century philhellene emperors Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, who were educated by and admired by Greek philosophers in Athens.[710] Hadrian frequented Greek cities, and carried out building projects to restore the cities of ancient Greece. He founded the Library of Hadrian in Athens, put up an Arch east of the Acropolis of Athens and restored the Temple of Olympian Zeus which had a colossus statue of him in the temple.[711] Importantly, Hadrian fashioned himself in the likeness of a Greek philosopher by depicting himself with a full beard.[712] Similarly, Marcus Aurelius (r. 161-180), who was initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries at Eleusis, frequently traveled to Athens and other Greek cities to interact with sophists. Like Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius adopted the look of a philosopher by sporting a long beard and somber expression.[713] Marcus Aurelius even attended lectures of the philosopher Sextus, saying: “it is a good thing for one growing old still to be learning. So I am going to Sextus the philosopher, to learn from him, what I do not yet know.”[714]

---

[708] Swain (1996) 41-42. I am not suggesting that Greeks thought they could altogether avoid linguistic overlap. I agree with Swain's suggestion that the Greeks probably knew Latin better than we think and that it could have been avoided in spoken, day-to-day life. I primarily speak in the realm of higher education.

[709] Swain (1996), 88

[710] See Philostr., *VS* 557 where a Lucius said to Marcus Aurelius, who was on his way to attend a lecture by the philosopher Sextus, "O Zeus, the king of the Romans grows old but he hangs a tablet around his neck and goes to school, while my king, Alexander, died at thirty two."; "ὦ Ζεῦ," ἔφη, "ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς γηράσκων ἤδη δέλτον ἐξαψάμενος ἐς διδασκάλου φοιτᾷ, ὁ δὲ ἐμὸς βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἀπέθανεν."

[711] The statue no longer survives, but the base with the scription survives. *Agora XVII 261*: [Αὐτ[οκράτορα Καίσαρα]Τρ[αιανὸν Ἀδριανὸν]Σ̣ε[βαστὸν Ὀλύμπιον]ΤΟ[- - -]ΤΟ[- - -]. .[- - -]

[712] See the bust of Hadrian found in the Vatican Museum, Rome. Item number 531. Found in: Amelung: Catalogue of the Vatican Museum I (1903), 566, no.362, pl. 59; Walston: Catalogue of Casts in the Museum of Classical Archaeology (1889), 116, no.614

In the late second and third centuries CE, Athens thrived with teachers of philosophy and rhetoric. Athens had a long-standing reputation as a hub of *paideia*, and many Western, Latin-speaking Romans flocked to it. Athens, however, was not the only important city. Each city had its school that taught pupils the basics of language and grammar. However, if a student were financially able, he could move to a larger city known for schools of higher learning. Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Smyrna gained popularity in the second and third centuries. The growth of these institutions enabled more educators, increased competition among schools, and a broader range of educational practices. Sophists and philosophers were often given names referring to their city or island of origin. This practice may hold less importance overall, but it was frequently meant to signify a particular philosopher and their hometown, especially when two sophists shared the same name. Although most students mentioned by Philostratus left their hometowns for larger cities to study, their place of origin continued to matter throughout their lives.

When talented sophists won the favor of Roman citizenship or senatorial titles from the emperor, they still had a cultural and financial obligation to their city. Greek cities had a cultural tradition of *euergetism*, and competition among cities. Once a city granted higher status and chair positions, a sophist could receive a substantial financial reward.[715] For example, the imperial chair position at Athens earned about "40,000 sesterces, equaled the income derived, at a return of six percent, from property worth more than 650,000 sesterces: well above the equestrian census."[716]

---

[713] See the bust of Marcus Aurelius in the Musée Saint-Raymond, accession number RA 61 b, 30108.

[714] Philostr., *VS* 557: “βαδίζοι καὶ ἐφ’ ὅ τι, καὶ ὁ Μᾶρκος, “καλὸν,” ἔφη, “καὶ γηράσκοντι τὸ μανθάνειν· εἶμι δὴ πρὸς Σέξτον τὸν φιλόσοφον μαθησόμενος, ἃ οὔπω οἶδα.”

[715] See Chapter Two: Cities on for more explanation of *euregtism* and *polis* competition.

Notable second-century Greek Romans Herodes Atticus and Aelius Aristides, a pupil of Herodes, wrote under the emperors Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius. Herodes Atticus was the progenitor of the revival of Atticism and was highly adored by Philostratus. Both Herodes and Aelius Aristides enjoyed a strong connection to Rome.

Herodes Atticus was a famous Athenian Roman living in the second century CE. He fully integrated himself into Roman life by taking a patrician Roman wife and becoming the first Greek consul in 146 CE. As Maud Gleason states, "Herodes Atticus was one of a kind."[717] He simultaneously funded building projects in his city and was a teacher. He is an example of a person capable of maintaining both a Greek identity as an Athenian and holding a Roman office; however, generally in the second century, Roman and Greek identities were not fused, and Herodes used the two at will.[718] Herodes was quite controversial during his life and found himself at odds with orators in Rome. He, allegedly, commanded his freedman Alcimedon to kick his wife, Appia Annia Regilla, while she was eight months pregnant. The act killed her and the child.[719] He was tried in Rome but was found innocent. He represented himself in the trial, and rather than defend the action, he spoke on his own ancestry.[720] Philostratus explained that his obvious grief and claim that he did not order her death allowed him to walk free of the charge.[721] This, however, was not the only time Herodes found himself in a Roman court.[722] Herodes had ample wealth, alongside his philosophical and oratorical prowess, which undoubtedly allowed him certain privileges in the Roman world. Hadrian allowed him to select candidates for teaching positions in Athens, which was a significant display of power. Hadrian, taking an active role in education, would also appoint teachers, as was the case with Theodotus.[723]

---

[716] Flinterman, Jaap-Jan. 2008. Sophists and Emperors: A Reconnaissance of Sophistic Attitude *Paideia: the World of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Barbara E. Borg. Berlin: De Gruyter, 365-366. See: Avotins, I. (1975). *The Holders of the Chairs of Rhetoric at Athens. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, *79*, pp. 313–324. https://doi.org/10.2307/311142 for more information on the Imperial Chair of Rhetoric at Athens. Although the date is uncertain, Philostratus mentions Lollianus as the first chairholder, potentially under Hadrian. Marcus Aurelius then established a second chair. According to Avontins, there were nine sophists mentioned by Philostratus who held the position, 315.

[717] Gleason (2010), 133

[718] Gleason (2010), 128

[719] Philostr. *VS*, 556-557.

Ultimately, Herodes Atticus' Roman identity would prevail among the others. In his will, he stipulated that each citizen in the Athenian demos should receive a hundred drachmae annually. This was in direct violation of Roman law, which required that property of Roman citizens must be given exclusively to other Roman citizens. As a result, Athenians were only given a one-time payment of 500 drachmae.[724]

Aelius Aristides studied under Herodes Atticus in Athens, and later in Pergamum under Aristocles. While in Smyrna during an earthquake, he and emperor Marcus Aurelius crossed paths. Philostratus detailed the interaction in which Aelius Aristides had waited a few days to meet the emperor.[725] When Marcus Aurelius asked why it took so long for them to meet, Aelius

---

[720] ibid
[721] ibid
[722] See Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. (2017), 239-240.
[723] Philostratus, *VS* 668
[724] Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. (2017); Gaius, *Institutes* 2.285; Philostr. *VS* 547
[725] Philostr. *VS* 582: Οἰκιστὴν δὲ καλεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἀριστείδην τῆς Σμύρνης οὐκ ἀλαζὼν ἔπαινος, ἀλλὰ δικαιότατός τε καὶ ἀληθέστατος· τὴν γὰρ πόλιν ταύτην ἀφανισθεῖσαν ὑπὸ σεισμῶν τε καὶ χασμάτων οὕτω τι ὠλοφύρατο πρὸς τὸν Μᾶρκον, ὡς τῇ μὲν ἄλλῃ μονῳδίᾳ θαμὰ ἐπιστενάξαι τὸν βασιλέα, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ "ζέφυροι ἐρήμην καταπνέουσι" καὶ δάκρυα τῷ βιβλίῳ ἐπιστάξαι ξυνοικίαν τε τῇ πόλει ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Ἀριστείδου ἐνδοσίμων νεῦσαι. ἐτύγχανε δὲ καὶ ξυγγεγονὼς ἤδη τῷ Μάρκῳ ὁ Ἀριστείδης ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ· ὡς γὰρ τοῦ Ἐφεσίου Δαμιανοῦ ἤκουον, ἐπεδήμει μὲν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἤδη τῇ Σμύρνῃ τρίτην ἡμέραν, τὸν δὲ Ἀριστείδην οὔπω γιγνώσκων ἤρετο τοὺς Κυντιλίους, μὴ ἐν τῷ τῶν ἀσπαζομένων ὁμίλῳ παρεωραμένος αὐτῷ ὁ ἀνὴρ εἴη, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἔφασαν ἑωρακέναι αὐτόν, οὐ γὰρ ἂν παρεῖναι τὸ μὴ οὐ ξυστῆσαι, καὶ ἀφίκοντο τῆς ὑστεραίας τὸν Ἀριστείδην ἄμφω δορυφοροῦντες. προσειπὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ, "διὰ τί σε," ἔφη, "βραδέως εἴδομεν;" καὶ ὁ Ἀριστείδης, "θεώρημα," ἔφη, "ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἠσχόλει, γνώμη δὲ θεωροῦσά τι μὴ ἀποκρεμαννύσθω οὗ ζητεῖ."

Aristides replied: “ Emperor, a subject that I was contemplating kept me busy, and when the mind is absorbed in contemplation it should not be dislodged from what it seeks.”[726] The emperor delighted in this response, and requested to hear Aelius speak. The speech was so good that the emperor rebuilt the city.[727]

Aelius Aristides had a close connection to the Roman state. He was a Roman citizen, as indicated by the base of a statue.[728] He, like Herodes Atticus, wrote in the Attic style. In 167 CE he wrote an oration for the *Panathenae*, which was an Athenian festival for the goddess Athena in which Athenians and non-Athenians would celebrate at the Acropolis, commissioned by Herodes himself. In the oration, Aelius Aristides, praises the city of Athens and tells an entire history of her glory.[729] He positions Athens as the founding Hellenic city, and the leader of Hellenic culture. The oration establishes Athens as an educational hub when he speaks about the divine patronage of the city (referred to as religious matters (*δ’ ἴσως περὶ τῶν θείων πρῶτον)*). The goddess Athena gave the city wisdom (σοφίᾳ), and because of that gift, she:

> “Drew the attention of all men everywhere to the city, desiring to lay down in her universal principles and patterns, like people providing for children’s educations, so that, just as in general things go well for learners if their teachers are the highest quality, so human beings too should emerge perfected in the virtue appropriate to them from following the proper models, and should have by divine benefaction not only the seeds of wheat and barley, but also the seeds of justice and all the rest of a settled civic existence.”[730]

---

[726] Ibid. See above for full passage.

[727] Ibid.

[728] Oudot, Estelle. (2017). Aelius Aristides. *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford; Puech (2002) Orateurs et Sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’epoque imperial. *Textes et traditions 4*, Paris, Vrin. 140–145.

[729] Aelius Aristides. *Oration 1.4*: Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ αὐτό γε τοῦτό ἐστιν καὶ τὸ μόνον πεποιηκός μοι τὸν λόγον, ὅτι οὕτω πολλοῖς καὶ μεγάλοις τῆς πόλεως ὑπερεχούσης, καὶ τόπον οὐδένα τοῖς βουλομένοις εὐφημεῖν ἀργὸν παρεικυίας, οὐδείς πω μέχρι τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἅπαντα καθῆκεν ἑαυτὸν οὐδ’ ἐθάρρησεν. ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν τοὺς ἄνω χρόνους ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν ᾄδουσι καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κοινὰ τῇ πόλει, καὶ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τοῦ παρείκοντος. Translation from: Aelius Aristides. *Orations, Volume I.* Edited and translated by Michael Trapp. Loeb Classical Library 533. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017

[730] Translation from: Aelius Aristides. *Orations, Volume I.* Edited and translated by Michael Trapp. Loeb Classical Library 533. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.Aelius Aristides, Orations 1.45: οὐ μόνον δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς

He went so far as to write an oration to Rome, comparing it to Athens as a sister city.[731] This likely supports Swain's point about catering to Roman philhellenes, but it also bridged a political connection between Greek intellectuals and the Roman world. J. H. Oliver argues that the work "has so many reminiscences of Plato's style and Platonic passages" that Aelius Aristides used Plato's *Laws*, *Timaeus*, and the *Critias* to describe the Roman state within a cosmological framework.[732] He compares Rome to prior empires, such as the Greek kingdoms, the Persian Empire, and the Macedonian Empire, concluding with the Roman Empire, within which men were finally set free. It is essential to note that the genre of this oration is panegyric, and therefore presents the Roman state in a highly positive light. As Menander describes in his work on how to praise cities, if a city is ruled in mixed government forms, "say that it has taken the best features of them all, a claim made by Plato in the Laws."[733]

Sophists and the State

πόλεως θεοὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἤρισαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧν ἤρισαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐν τῇδε τῇ πόλει τὰς κρίσεις ἐποιήσαντο, πανταχόθεν πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπιστρέφοντες πρὸς τὴν πόλιν καὶ πάντων ἀρχὰς καὶ δείγματα βουλόμενοι καταθέσθαι παρ' αὐτῇ, καθάπερ οἱ τοὺς παῖδας προδιδάσκοντες, ἵν' ὥσπερ πανταχοῦ τῶν ἄκρων προδιδαξάντων καλῶς ἔχει τοῖς ζηλοῦσιν, οὕτω κἀκεῖνοι τέλειοι τὴν γιγνομένην ἀρετὴν ἀποβαῖεν, οἷς χρῆν ἑπόμενοι, καὶ μὴ μόνον τῶν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν εἴη τὰ σπέρματα αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἁπάσης διαίτης τε καὶ πολιτείας ἐκ θεῶν αὐτοῖς εἴη τὰ σπέρματα.

[731] Oliver, J. H. (1953). The Ruling Power: A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, *43*(4), 871–1003. https://doi.org/10.2307/1005702

[732] Oliver (1953), 878

[733] Menandor Rhetor, 1.6.3: εἰ δὲ μικτήν, ὅτι ἐξ ἁπασῶν εἴληφε τὰ κάλλιστα. τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Πλάτων περὶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς πολιτείας ἐν τοῖς Νόμοις εἴρηκεν καὶ Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῷ Ῥωμαϊκῷ.

Sophists of the Second Sophistic have a reputation for not being as politically polemical as classical authors, such as Plato or Gorgias, and instead seem to praise the Roman state and the emperors largely.[734] Teachers, sophists, and rhetoricians in the second century were involved in Roman politics, and before the edict of Caracalla in 212 CE, they were not guaranteed Roman citizenship. Often, it was necessary to win citizenship, and they required the favor of Roman elites or the emperor to secure positions of power. Many held office, and in the second century, sometimes special offices were granted to teachers.[735] Sophists received special honors from the emperor, "notably in the form of advancement into the equestrian and senatorial orders."[736] In his biography of Philiscus, Philostratus provides insight into the relationship between philosophers, their positions, and the emperor, as exemplified by Philiscus' trial for evading his civic duty.[737] The case was then brought to the emperor, Caracalla (r. 198-217), who heavily chastised the teacher for neglecting his duties.[738] First, he demanded that Philiscus orally defend himself rather than have a speaker represent him. According to Philostratus, Philiscus unsuccessfully defended himself in an act similar to a modern-day filibuster, which only further provoked the emperor. Once the emperor had had enough, he shouted out: "His hair shows what sort of man he is, his voice, what sort of orator!"[739] When Philiscus attempted to claim that due to his position as chair of rhetoric at Athens, he was not required to carry out his public services, the emperor was outraged. Caracalla asserted: “Neither you nor any other teacher is exempt! Never would I, for the sake of a few miserable speeches, rob the cities of men who ought to perform public services.”[740]

---

[734] Gorgias was a fifth century BCE Attic Greek rhetorician and philosopher from Sicily.

[735] Especially the office of *ab epistulis Graecis*, in which office holders would write responses to petitioners on behalf of the emperor. See: Celer who was appointed under emperor Hadrian, Alexander of Seleucia was appointed under Marcus Aurelius; Hadrian of Tyre, who was appointed *ab epistulis Graecis* by Commodus (Philostratus, VS. 2.42); See too Quirinus of Nicomedia who was appointed as the *advocatus fisci*, which was held by an equestrian and established by Hadrian. Although it is unclear, I wonder if Quirinus was raised to equestrian rank by Caracalla, since Philostratus claimed that he was not from a distinguished family.

[736] Bowersock (1969), 30; See the case of Heliodorus who was raised to equestrian rank under Caracalla Philostr. *VS* 2.91

[737] Philostr. *VS 622. Philiscus the Thessalian*. “The Heordaean Macedonians had summoned Philiscus to perform public services in their city, as was their right in the case of all who on the mother's side were Heordaeans, and since he did not undertake them, they referred the matter to the courts." "Ἑορδαῖοι Μακεδόνες ἀνειπόντες ἐς τὰς οἰκείας λειτουργίας τὸν Φιλίσκον, ὡς δὴ ὑπάρχον αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀπὸ μητέρων, ὡς δὲ οὐκ ὑπεδέξατο[1] ἐφίεσαν.”

[738] Ibid. Antoninus Caracalla. Philostratus referred to the emperor as Antoninus, the son of the philosophic Julia: Ἀντωνῖνος δὲ ἦν ὁ τῆς φιλοσόφου παῖς Ἰουλίας.

Following the Emperor Caracalla's Edict in 212 CE, which granted Roman citizenship to all subjects of the Empire, educators would have all been Roman citizens. However, even before that, distinguished teachers, such as Herodes Atticus in the second century CE, held Roman citizenship. It was not uncommon by the third century for sophists to have already gained Roman citizenship, which allowed the families of sophists to achieve higher Roman statuses.

However, the emperors’ attitude towards sophists and educational institutions appears to be varied. Like Philiscus, Antipater the Syrian received the wrath of Caracalla. As mentioned above, Antipater was the teacher of Caracalla and Geta and was a part of Julia Domna’s circle of philosophers. Due to his excellence in rhetoric, he was able to gain political offices as well. He was appointed secretary *ab epistulis Graecis* under Emperor Severus and later rose to the rank of consul, eventually becoming the governor of Bithynia under both Severus and Caracalla.[741] However, he showed himself too bold when he wrote in a letter to Caracalla after the death of

---

[739] Ibid. ὡς δὲ οὐ πρὸς τὰ ἐρωτώμενα αἱ ἀποκρίσεις ἐγένοντο Φιλίσκου “τὸν μὲν ἄνδρα” ἔφη “δείκνυσιν ἡ κόμη, τὸν δὲ ῥήτορα ἡ φωνή,” καὶ μετὰ πολλὰς τοιαύτας ἐπικοπὰς ἐπήγαγεν ἑαυτὸν τοῖς Ἑορδαίοις.

[740] Ibid. “οὔτε σὺ” εἶπεν “ἀτελὴς οὔτε ἄλλος οὐδεὶς τῶν παιδευόντων· οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε διὰ μικρὰ καὶ δύστηνα λογάρια τὰς πόλεις ἀφελοίμην τῶν λειτουργησόντων.”. Philostratus did mention, however, that after this incident, Caracalla did indeed allow an exception of public duties for Philostratus of Lemnos. Second, there was a precedent for granting immunity to teachers. According to Bowersock (1969), Vespasian and Hadrian both granted immunity to teachers, as seen by an inscription from Pergamum and a law from the *Digest* (*Dig.* 50.4.18.30), 32

[741] The exact dates of his appointments are unknown. According to Philostratus: " When he was promoted to consular rank, he governed the people of Bithynia, but when he turned out to be too ready with the sword he was relieved of the office." Ὑπάτοις δὲ ἐγγραφεὶς ἦρξε μὲν τοῦ τῶν Βιθυνῶν ἔθνους, δόξας δὲ ἑτοιμότερον χρῆσθαι τῷ ξίφει τὴν ἀρχὴν παρελύθη.” Philostr. *VS 607*

Geta that Caracalla “had one eye instead of two, and one hand, and that those whom he had taught to take up arms for one another, he now heard had taken them up against one another.”[742] After this accusation, Antipater was stripped of his title. Like other sophists of the era, Antipater was in close correspondence with the imperial family, and in this case, too close.

Sophists who were close to the emperor could even negotiate favors on behalf of others.[743] Philostratus mentioned that one of his teachers, Damianus of Ephesos, was an important benefactor of his city, Ephesos. Damianus came from an illustrious family, and according to Philostratus, those descended from him “were all honored with seats in the Senate and were objects of astonishment for their fine reputation and their disdain for money.”[744] Despite this disdain, Damianus was financially well-off. Due to his wealth and perhaps his family and obligation to the city, Damianus donated money to the state and funded building projects there. Philostratus mentioned that he funded a temple to Artemis, which he dedicated to his wife; he planted trees “that bear fruit and give shade,” and even made harbors.[745] In many ways, Damianus acted as a benefactor in his city, which included building projects, city maintenance, and senatorial status, as well as occasionally funding other scholars, such as

---

[742] ὡς τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἐπιβουλεύοι, γράφει πρὸς τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἐπιστολὴν μονῳδίαν ἐπέχουσαν καὶ θρῆνον, ὡς εἷς μὲν αὐτῷ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐκ δυοῖν, χεὶρ δὲ μία, καὶ οὓς ἐπαίδευσεν ὅπλα ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων αἴρεσθαι, τούτους ἀκούοι κατ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἠρμένους,” Philostr. *VS 608*

[743] This was not a new aspect of Roman culture and patronage, but I want to illustrate that sophists became these political agents through these Roman cultural norms. It is an almost unofficial way in which Greeks could engage with imperial government and politics.

[744] Philostratus, *VS,* 606. *Damianus of Ephesos*. Δαμιανῷ τοίνυν ἐλλογιμώτατον μὲν καὶ τὸ ἄνω γένος καὶ πλείστου ἄξιον τῇ Ἐφέσῳ, εὐδοκιμώτατοι δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ φύντες, ξυγκλήτου γὰρ βουλῆς ἀξιοῦνται πάντες ἐπ᾽ εὐδοξίᾳ θαυμαζόμενοι καὶ ὑπεροψίᾳ χρημάτων

[745] Philostr. *VS 606. Damianus of Ephesos*. αὐτός τε πλούτῳ ποικίλῳ καὶ πολυπρεπεῖ κατεσκευασμένος ἐπήρκει μὲν καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις τῶν Ἐφεσίων, πλεῖστα δὲ ὠφέλει τὸ κοινὸν, χρήματά τε ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ τὰ ὑποδεδωκότα τῶν δημοσίων ἔργων ἀνακτώμενος. ξυνῆψε δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ κατατείνας ἐς αὐτὸ τὴν διὰ τῶν Μαγνητικῶν κάθοδον· ἔστι δὲ αὕτη στοὰ ἐπὶ ἓξ στάδια λίθου πᾶσα, νοῦς δὲ τοῦ οἰκοδομήματος μὴ ἀπεῖναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοὺς θεραπεύσοντας,[39] ὁπότε ὕοι. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τοὔργον ἀπὸ πολλῶν χρημάτων ἀποτελεσθὲν ἐπέγραψεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γυναικός, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἑστιατήριον αὐτὸς ἀνέθηκε μεγέθει τε ἐξάρας ὑπὲρ πάνθ᾽ ὁμοῦ τὰ παρ᾽ ἑτέροις καὶ λόγου κρείττω περιβαλὼν κόσμον·; πρῶτον μὲν ἡ γῆ πᾶσα, ὁπόσην ἐκέκτητο, ἐκπεφυτευμένη δένδρεσι καρπίμοις τε καὶ εὐσκίοις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ καὶ νῆσοι χειροποίητοι καὶ λιμένων προχώσεις βεβαιοῦσαι τοὺς ὅρμους καταιρούσαις τε καὶ ἀφιείσαις ὁλκάσιν

Hadrian of Tyre or Aelius Aristides, to deliver speeches on behalf of the city. Philostratus' work concludes around 237 CE, and he dedicates it to Antonius Gordian III, the emperor at the time. The dedication further suggests the connection between academics and government officials.

In the mid-third century, as explained in prior chapters, imperial instability and the invasion of Gothic tribes impacted Roman society. In particular, the crises that took place during the period left us with few sources to report what happened accurately. Through fragmentary and fourth-century sources, however, there is some evidence to suggest that philosophical education continued. A new philosophy, known as Neoplatonism, was founded by Plotinus (204/5-270 CE), an Egyptian philosopher. Neoplatonism was a philosophy developed by Plotinus, which believed in a higher being beyond human understanding that created the universe and all things. Plotinus' life was recorded by his student, Porphyry of Tyre, in his work *On the Life of Plotinus and the Order of his Books*.[746] Plotinus was rather sickly and detested having a physical body, but found peace in the works of Plato. He went to study philosophy in Alexandria but found it unfulfilling. Instead, he worked under a lesser-known philosopher, Ammonius. There, he found his true teacher and stayed with him until he went to fight the Persians alongside Emperor Gordian III (r. 238-244).

Upon Gordian's death, Plotinus fled to Antioch and eventually settled in Rome under emperor Philip (r. 244-249). Porphyry detailed that he went to study under Plotinus when he was thirty years of age, and Plotinus was about fifty-nine. While it seemed that Plotinus had not written anything in the twenty years he was at Rome, Porphyry discovered twenty-one treatises, which he recorded in his account. Plotinus would eventually write fifty-four in total, the "power" of which "varies according to the period in which he wrote them, in early life, in his prime, or his illness."[747] His lectures revolved around the material in the treatises, focusing on ancient philosophic ideas and morality.

---

[746] Plotinus. *Ennead, Volume I: Porphyry on the Life of Plotinus. Ennead I.* Translated by A. H. Armstrong. Loeb Classical Library 440. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969. Translations will be from this edition. See also Brisson, Luc. (2014). Plotinus' Style and Argument. *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Routledge, 126–128.

Porphyry claimed Plotinus mastered classical Greek philosophy, saying:

> “Plotinus, it would seem, has expounded the principles of Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy more clearly than anyone before him. The works of Numenius and Cronius and Moderatus and Thrasyllus come nowhere near the accuracy of Plotinus’s treatises on the same subjects.”

His classes were open and focused on explaining doctrines based on his teachers and expressing dogmatic ideas, but he did not focus on oratorical training. Luc Brisson notes that Plotinus was most likely a Latin speaker, given his difficulties with the Greek language, and borrowed from both Attic and Ionic dialects to reflect the dialogue style of his work, but made most use of koine.[748] Brisson claims that his language is highly reflective of that of other intellectuals in Rome during the first through third centuries CE. As a result, he received criticism from his fellow Greek intellectuals.[749]

The account shows how educators influenced the city around them. Anyone could attend Plotinus’ classes, and he had a wide array of students.[750] Porphyry claimed that even senators would attend Plotinus’ lectures, and one, Rogatianus, went as far as to renounce his rank and leave public life to commit himself to the life of a philosopher.[751] Plotinus became a guardian for elite men and women who " on the approach of death, brought him their children, both boys and girls, and entrusted them to him along with all their property, considering that he would be a holy and god-like guardian."[752] Dutifully, Plotinus would take on the task. Porphyry claimed he would:

---

[747] *Porphyry, On the Life of Plotinus. 6.30:* Ὥσπερ δὲ ἐγράφη, τὰ μὲν κατὰ πρώτην ἡλικίαν, τὰ δὲ ἀκμάζοντος, τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος καταπονουμένου

[748] Brisson (2014), 131. See too, *Life of Plotinus* 18.5-10, where Porphyry discussed how Plotinus delivered his lectures.

[749] Brisson (2014), 131. *Life of Plotinus*, 17.16-24, where he is accused of plagiarism.

[750] Ibid. 1.13-14

> "He patiently attended to the accounts of their property when their trustees submitted them, and took care that they should be accurate; he used to say that as long as they did not take to philosophy their properties and incomes must be kept safe and untouched for them. Yet, though he shielded so many from the worries and cares of ordinary life, he never, while awake, relaxed his intent concentration upon the intellect."[753]

As an intellectual leader, Plotinus assumed various social roles beyond teaching and was close to Emperor Gallienus (r. 253-268) and his wife.[754] His life reveals the importance of the intellectual community and Roman social life, particularly showing how interconnected they were. His genius and philosophical ideas were further clarified and popularized through his student, Porphyry.

Fourth-century Greek author Eunapius provides a biography of Porphyry.[755] Porphyry lived from approximately 234 to 305 and wrote numerous works on philosophy, as well as a biography of Plotinus.[756] Eunapius claimed to have received a "liberal education" and studied under Longinus in Athens.[757] Porphyry mastered both rhetoric and grammar while continuing his studies in philosophy. Eventually, however, he was lured into studying at Rome, where he would take his speeches to the forum. There he lived out his days during the reigns of Gallienus (r. 253-268), Claudius (268-270), Aurelian (r. 270-275), Tacitus (r. 275-276), and Probus (276-282).[758] Porphyry wrote an extensive treatise, *Against the Christians*, which does not survive in its entirety, but was likely composed during the reigns of Diocletian and Maximin Daia.[759]

---

[751] Ibid, 7.30-47.

[752] Ibid. 9.6-10: Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀποθνῄσκειν μέλλοντες τῶν εὐγενεστάτων φέροντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα, ἄρρενάς τε ὁμοῦ καὶ θηλείας, ἐκείνῳ παρεδίδοσαν μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης οὐσίας ὡς ἱερῷ τινι καὶ θείῳ φύλακι.

[753] Ibid: Ἠνείχετο δὲ καὶ τοὺς λογισμούς, ἀναφερόντων τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις παραμενόντων, καὶ τῆς ἀκριβείας ἐπεμελεῖτο λέγων, ἕως ἂν μὴ φιλοσοφῶσιν, ἔχειν αὐτοὺς δεῖν τὰς κτήσεις καὶ τὰς προσόδους ἀνεπάφους τε καὶ σῳζομένας. Καὶ ὅμως τοσούτοις ἐπαρκῶν τὰς εἰς τὸν βίον φροντίδας τε καὶ ἐπιμελείας τὴν πρὸς τὸν νοῦν τάσιν οὐδέποτ᾽ ἂν ἐγρηγορότως ἐχάλασεν.

[754] Gallienus ruled jointly with Valerian from 253 to 260, but was the sole ruler from 260 to 268.

[755] More on Eunpaius below.

[756] I do not explain the philosophical debates here, nor do I summarize the works of Porphyry. The two works I mention can be found here: *Porphyre: La Vie de Plotin*, 2 vols., Luc Brisson et al. (eds.), Paris: Vrin, 1982–1992. (Greek text, French translations, commentary and several studies of particular subjects); *Porphyry Against the*

Iamblicus, from Coele in Syria, and “who was both of illustrious ancestry and son of refined and prosperous parents,” would follow in his footsteps.[760] Iamblichus followed Neoplatonic philosophy and became a student of Porphyry. He would go on to open his own school in Apamae, Syria, to which many students of philosophy flocked to be his pupils.

Eunapius also referred to the historian whose works are now lost or fragmentary, Dexippus, who lived contemporaneously with Porphyry. Although Porphyry had moved to Rome to teach, Dexippus lived in Athens and even defended the city against Herulian invasions in the 270s.[761] Dexippus was from a distinguished Athenian family deeply intertwined with the intellectual and civic life of Athens. His father was an *ephebe* during Commodus's reign, and his grandfather, P. Herennius, probably had Roman citizenship. Fergus Millar explained that historiography in the second and third centuries followed three patterns: “scholarly rewriting of

---

Christians (Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition, 1), translated with notes by Robert M. Berchman, Leiden: Brill, 2005

[757] Eunap. *Life of Porphyry of Tyre*. Miles and Han Baltussen, introduction for: Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.* Edited and translated by Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2023

[758] Timeframe being 252-282 CE: τοὺς δὲ χρόνους ἐς Γαλλίηνόν τε καὶ Κλαύδιον ἀκμάζειν συνέβαινεν, Τάκιτόν τε καὶ Αὐρηλιανὸν καὶ Πρόβον

[759] Berchman, R. (2005). *Porphyry against the Christians*. Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789047415725, 3; Barnes, T.D. (1973). Porphyry Against the Christians: Date and Attribution of Fragments. Journal of Theological Studes (XXIV(2), 424-442. https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/XXIV.2.424

[760] Eunapius, *Life of Iamblicus*. 5.2. Translation from Miles and Baltussen.

[761] Eunap., *Life of Porphyry of Tyre*. See: Millar, (1969) for contextualization of Dexippus.

periods of the classical, and sometimes the Hellenistic, past; massive compilations of Roman history up to the present; and a remarkably flourishing historiography of the most recent past, chiefly related to the reigns of emperors, or, more specifically, to the wars fought by them."[762] This genre, unlike that of rhetorical practice, seemed to embrace both Greek and Roman tradition and past. Millar insisted that when the Herulians invaded Athens, the city was in a period of stability, and the Athenian families were thriving in intellectual circles.[763] What Millar established through his study of Dexippus was that life in Athens was thriving and not every prominent family chose to be a part of the Roman government at the time. Millar concluded:

> "The rise of provincial and local families into the Roman aristocracy is of course one of the great themes of imperial history. Athens provides examples of a different phenomenon, the maintenance over generations, sometimes over centuries, of a prominent position in the intellectual and political life of the city by families whose members could easily have sought Roman office, but who did not choose to do so. There was a real sense in which Athens remained a capital, not a provincial city; and this fact can hardly have failed to affect the standpoint from which a prominent Athenian wrote history."[764]

This is vital to understand because, as Millar suggested, these intellectuals followed Emperor Diocletian to the court of Nicomedia after Athens was attacked. The stability and, I assume, the change that occurred around the rise of Diocletian and the establishment of the tetrarchy led to migration to other Greek cities.

---

[762] Millar, F. (1969), 269-270
[763] Ibid, 276
[764] Ibid, 283

Education under the Tetrarchy: Diocletian to Constantine

There was no drastic change in educational practices in institutions of higher learning immediately following Diocletian's rise to power. Due to the new locations of the imperial capitals, however, philosophers would have moved to ideal spots for attention. Fergus Millar suggests that, based on Eunapius' account, some philosophers from Athens in the late third century would have moved from Athens to join the court of Diocletian in Nicomedia.[765]

Menander Rhetor, a writer of treatises on rhetoric, is a key source for the period. Potentially from in Laodicea, he wrote his work during the reign of Diocletian.[766] His work detailed how to compose rhetorical works, in particular, describing their formula. He broke down rhetoric into three types: "speeches in law courts concerning public or private matters; those delivered in assemblies or councils; and thirdly, epideictic speeches which are called encomiastic or vituperative."[767] His evaluation, critical analysis, and deep understanding of the field show his obvious competency in the field. He wrote commentaries on Demosthenes, which, according to Malcolm Heath, were born from lectures given to advanced students in Alexandria Troas.[768] While not much is known about Menander personally, what his treatises show is a close connection to the Greek practices in oratory, especially that of Demosthenes. He continued to use these works with his students and used it as the ideological framework for composing orations and speeches.

---

[765] Millar (1969), 18

[766] This is deduced by William H. Race in the introduction of: *Menander Rhetor. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ars Rhetorica.* Edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 539. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019, 6

[767] Menander Rhetor, *Treatise* 1.1; translation from Race (2019), 21

[768] Heath, M. (2004). *Menander: A rhetor in context.* Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 217

Eunapius also spoke of a man named Sopater. Sopater, a student of Iamblicus, was a skilled orator and became the leading Neoplatonist after Iamblicus' death. He sought to work in the court of Constantine the Great, despite being pagan. Accordingly, "he attained to such a level of wisdom and competence that the emperor was captivated by him and publicly made him a council member, giving him a seat at his right hand, a thing unbelievable to hear and see." [769] His position further instigated "envy against a court that had recently turned to the study of philosophy."[770] He met an unfortunate end when he became the victim of a plot by the praetorian prefect Ablabius. Eunapius explained the drama, saying that Emperor Constantine enjoyed gathering the people in the theater, allowing them to get drunk, and taking in the praises they would give him. When the city was facing a famine, the drunken people of Constantinople no longer wanted to applaud the emperor. It was then that someone accused Sopater of halting the winds that allowed shipments of grain to be delivered into the city by magic. Constantine, easily swayed by the accusation, ordered Sopater's death by decapitation.[771] Eunapius, prone to gossip, suspected that the others in Constantine's court had not wanted the court to have pagan philosophers.[772]

---

[769] Eunap. *Life of Porphyry of Tyre*, 6.8 "καὶ ἐς τοσοῦτόν γε ἐξίκετο σοφίας καὶ δυνάμεως, ὡς ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς ἑαλώκει τε ὑπ᾽ αὐτῷ καὶ δημοσίᾳ σύνεδρον εἶχεν, εἰς τὸν δεξιὸν καθίζων τόπον, ὃ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἰδεῖν ἄπιστον"
[770] Ibid. "οἱ δὲ παραδυναστεύοντες ῥηγνύμενοι τῷ φθόνῳ πρὸς βασιλείαν ἄρτι φιλοσοφεῖν μεταμανθάνουσαν"
[771] Ibid. 6.10-18.
[772] Ibid. 6.8-9.

Diocletian's administrative reforms led to an increased need for education in Latin, rhetoric, and legal training. Following closely in importance was Christianity, which had a significant impact on classical educational institutions and their teachings. Together, these elements contributed to a cultural transformation among the educated elite, ultimately changing the Hellenic identity. Christian intellectuals, however, existed contemporaneously with the reign of the tetrarchs.

Christian Intellectuals during the Tetrarchy

Jennifer Nimmo Smith reminds us that schools would not be segregated based on religion.[773] Both pagan and Christian children would attend the same schools where they would be taught their letters by using the names of pagan gods and heroes, and study pagan literature (such as Homer and Hesiod). Students would receive basic education in rhetorical training by reading authors such as Demosthenes, but some would go on to more developed programs in Antioch, Athens, or Alexandria. It was through this upbringing that Christian authors would craft their understanding of Christian doctrine.

Throughout the works of Porphyry and Eunapius, there are mentions of Christian students, but these are sparse. Porphyry even wrote a treatise, *Against the Christians*, which Emperor Constantine attempted to ban. Both Lactantius and Eusebius chronicled the period of the tetrarchy and lived during the reign of its rulers. In Lactantius' *Divine Institutes*, he directed his defense of Christianity to the educated elite, seeking to construct the new religion within a philosophical framework. He connected wisdom (*sapientia*) and religion (*religio*), but also undermined philosophers. He opens his work by direct attack:

---

[773] Smith, Jennifer Nimmo. (2001). Introduction. *A Christian's Guide to Greek Culture: Pseudo-Nonnius.,* xvii

> "In the days when men of outstanding ability made a serious commitment to learning, they dropped every activity both public and private and devoted all the effort they could spend on it to the search for truth. They thought it far more glorious to investigate and understand the essence of things human and divine than to concentrate on piling up wealth and accumulating honours. Those are fragile and earthly aims, and concern only the physical self, and so they cannot make anyone a more honest or a more just person. 3 These men certainly deserved their acquaintance with truth: their desire to know it was so strong that they wanted to put it before all else; 4 some abandoned all they had and renounced every pleasure, as is agreed, in order to strip themselves bare and follow virtue pure and simple. The very word virtue and the power of it had so much weight with them that in their judgment it contained in itself the prize of the supreme good."[774]

In the next passage he asserted that they, the philosophers, do not succeed and wasted their time because they did not accept the Christian god. Philosophers, according to Lactantius, were in higher regard than orators because they taught how to live and to live well by a sense of virtue, but that can be achieved by Christianity. Book three of his work is entirely dedicated to the conversation of truth, rhetoric, and philosophy. In fact, he suggested that philosophers were not required to tell the truth, despite their oratorical skills.[775] Because of this, he stated, there is no reason to "hold them in high esteem."[776] He explained further that while Philosophy is the pursuit of wisdom, “anyone in pursuit of wisdom is obviously not wise yet; he studies to become capable of wisdom,” and asserts that it is not a requirement that these men are wise. Although, for Lactantius, unless they learn through Christian doctrine, they were not wise anyway.

---

[774] Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 1.1.1; translation from Lactantius. (2004). *Divine Institutes*. Translated by Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey. Liverpool

[775] Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 3.1.13.

[776] Ibid.

His account volleys between recognizing what philosophy is as a study, the usefulness of it, and ultimately concluding that no philosopher or orator was beholden to virtue because they were not living virtuously. In doing so, Lactantius cast a shadow over the field and further deepened the divide between philosophers and Christians. His rhetorical training, however, enabled him to convey the word of God to the Romans in an eloquent manner.

Eusebius wrote two major works *Ecclesiastical History*, and a panegyric of the *Life of Constantine* in the early fourth century.[777] Eusebius was from Caesarea Maritima in Palestine, and lived through the persecutions of Diocletian like Lactantius. Eusebius’s work and life show his commitment to a Christian world, and his *Ecclesiastical History* was the first work in the historical genre to represent Christianity in this way, further foregrounding his commitment to Christianity. He attempted to elucidate Christian doctrine by presenting biblical scholarship on biblical manuscripts and giving a formal introduction to the Christian faith.[778] Unlike Lactantius, who actively engaged with Hellenic tradition at the time, Eusebius was more concerned with developing Christian intellectual life, which would thrive under Constantine.

Education from the reign of Constantine through Julian

---

[777] This is not to suggest these are his only works, of which there were many. Hollerich, M. J. (2021). *Making Christian History: Eusebius of Caesarea and His Readers* (1st ed., Vol. 11). University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1npx3nfMore below.

[778] Eusebius, *General Elementary Introduction, Proof of the Gospel, and the Preparation for the Gospel.*

Recent scholarship has brought to light a potential third sophistic movement about which Libanius and Eunapius wrote.[779] In the fourth century, the study and practice of rhetoric transformed, necessitating its adaptation to both the classic pagan educational framework and the emerging Christian intellectual context, as well as to the new demands of the empire. This meant that professors of rhetoric had students who wanted to pursue careers outside of the traditional career path in the Greek-speaking east.

Many Romans who were able to receive a higher education were of the elite class. Perhaps unlike in prior centuries, when philosophers in the east were primarily interested in traditional Greek education, men in the fourth-century Greek east were interested not only in rhetorical training but also in legal training. This made Latin more critical since the legal language of the empire was Latin. Athens continued to be an exemplary school of philosophy, as shown by Edward Watts's work on fourth-century Athens and Alexandria.[780] As was true during the Second Sophistic, "*paideia* was acquired through an expensive and time-consuming process of education that not only taught literature but also allowed men of culture to master a code of socially acceptable behavior."[781] This learned behavior and connection through educational institutions bound scholars and created a network. The network became increasingly vital as teachers and other students secured government positions and positions of power, as exemplified by Libanius. With the support of an elite already well-established within this network, one could achieve a higher office.

---

[779] Szabat, Elizbieta. (2015). "Late Antiquity and the Transmission of Educational Ideals and Methods," *A companion to Ancient Education*. "Scholars have long held the opinion that rhetoric never recovered after the 3rd century crisis, thus remaining an indolent and uncreative shadow of what it was at its peak during the Second Sophistic. Recent studies, however, have rehabilitated late rhetoric to a large extenet. Many scholars have come to identify it as the 'third sophists,' emphasizing not only late ancient rhetoric's continuity, but also its vitality and technical innovations," 253; Pernot, L., & Higgins, W. E. (2005). Conclusion: The Heritage of Greco-Roman Rhetoric. In *Rhetoric in Antiquity* (pp. 202–214). Catholic University of America Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt284x1w.11

[780] Watts, E. J. (2006). *City and school in late antique Athens and Alexandria*. University of California Press.

[781] Watts (2006), 4

In the fourth century, the works of Eunapius and Libanius uncover the deep network of the educated Hellenic elite. Eunapius, who wrote his own *Lives of the Philosophers*, sought to continue on the work of second-century author Philostratu*s*. Eunapius was born in Sardis in 346, during the reign of Constantius (r. 337-361), and wrote his work in the late fourth century. He attended school at Athens for five years before returning to Sardis to teach.[782] Eunapius focused entirely on the eastern Greek-speaking philosophers and sophists, ignoring those from the western cities. Eunapius even writes about Libanius, the teacher from Antioch. Although he lived a generation later than the period of the tetrarchy, he did discuss philosophers who lived before him, as mentioned above. He included mostly pagan sophists, except for his Christian teacher Prohaeresius.[783] Eunapius, considering his bias or potential lack of knowledge, rarely mentions men in the mid- to late-fourth century who take up public office. Unlike the third century, in which Philostratus and their citizens often described teachers as being patrons to the city, philosophers of this age seem to be closer to the emperor's court to perform orations as well as receive favor from the emperors.

To contrast the work of Eunapius, the orations, letters, and autobiography of Libanius of Antioch can be examined to illustrate the vast personal and professional network of academics in the mid-to-late fourth century. Libanius was born in Antioch and received his education in Athens, which he detested. In his autobiography, he lamented upon arrival:

> “I was in Athens—in the hands of people I wanted none of; and the day after, I was in the hands of yet other people, and these I wanted none of, either. I was unable even to catch a glimpse of the teacher from whom I had come to learn, for I was cooped up in a cell about as big as a barrel—such is the reception they give students

---

[782] Miles and Han Baltussen, introduction for: Philostratus, Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists. Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.* Edited and translated by Graeme Miles, Han Baltussen. Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2023

[783] Eunap. *VS* 10.85

> on their arrival. My teacher had lost me and I him, so we began to set up a hullabaloo from our separate stations."[784]

Libanius had lost himself within a rowdy crowd of students when he attempted to work with Epiphanies. Upon arrival, he was taken by students of Diophantus (Epiphanies' rival), and forced to enroll under him instead. The students had taken over the area and were trying to hastily commit to working under their preferred professor by forming overwhelming crowds. He was then swiftly committed to learning under Diophantus and attended his lectures. Of the experience, Libanius observed:

> "I began to realize that I was present at nothing out of the ordinary, for the guidance of students had been monopolized by people who were little better than students themselves. So my attitude was held to be derogatory towards Athens and I was held guilty of not respecting my professors. It was with difficulty, therefore, that I allayed their anger, telling them that I was listening in respectful silence, for vocal demonstrations had been made impossible because of my illness."[785]

Libanius goes on to describe the intensity of the situation. He claimed that the fighting between schools had become serious, and students would engage in physical altercations, throwing stones at each other on behalf of their teacher; thereby raising the teacher's prestige.[786] Refusing to take part in any of this madness, Libanius kept to himself and studied hard. When three teachers were under threat of being fired due to the severity of the students' rioting, Libanius was potentially in line to become the chair of rhetoric in Athens. Eventually, however, the governor decided to keep the three teachers, and Libanius felt this caused tension between himself and the teachers. Luckily, he was given an excuse to leave when he was called to Constantinople. While in Constantinople, he was persuaded by Nicocles the Spartan, later to become a teacher under emperor Constantius II (r.337-361), to stay in the city and teach.[787] Once again, Libanius found himself in an unwanted situation, and at the heart of the conflict between other professors. He claimed:

---

[784] Lib., *Orat.* 1.16; Translation from Norman.

[785] Lib., *Orat.* 1.17

[786] Lib., *Orat.* 1.19; "From my boyhood, gentlemen, I had heard tales of the fighting between the schools which took place in the heart of Athens: I had heard of the cudgels, the knives and stones they used and of the wounds they inflicted, of the resultant court actions, the pleas of the defence and the verdicts upon the guilty, and of all those deeds of derring-do which students perform to raise the prestige of their teachers. I used to think them noble in their hardihood and no less justified than those who took up arms for their country: I used to pray heaven that it should be my lot too to distinguish myself so, to go hot-foot to the Peiraeus or Sunium or other ports to kidnap students at their landing, and then go off hot-foot once more to Corinth to stand trial for the kidnapping, give a string of parties, run through all that I had, and then look to someone to make me a loan." Translation from Norman

> "So both the professors were full of chagrin, one because he had never enjoyed any success at all, the other because he had lost it, for the first had never even had the chance of pre-eminence and the second had been ejected from it. As I have said, they were full of chagrin, and they proceeded to heap abuse upon me, calling me a greedy, insatiate, restless disturber of the peace and other such insulting names. Yet it was through no deed of violence of mine that their students were deserting them; the inducement was something different."[788]

Then, he would be the victim of a supposedly jealous Christian professor, Bemarchius. According to Libanius, Bemarchius incited a riot against him because he [Bemarchius] did not have students, and Libanius was doing well in a speech competition against him.[789] Libanius would leave the city after this and take up teaching in Nicomedia. Of Nicomedia he says:

> "The city of Nicomedeia was by now visited with such inspired frenzy for it [Libanius' teachings] that I gave school lessons even in the swimming baths and this seemed nothing out of the ordinary to the average person. In this way the whole

---

[787] Lib., *Orat.* 1.35-38 for his experience in Constantinople. Nicocles was also the teacher of emperor Julian between 339-344 CE. In 363 Julian sent him as an envoy to Constantinople calm down the city after riots. "Nicocles," Jones, A.H.M., J.R. Martindale and J. Morris. (1971b). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, 630

[788] Lib. *Orat.* 1.38.

[789] This is Libanius' account, and even Libanius suggested that he may not be the best person to speak on his time in Constantinople since he was so upset by the entire experience (*Oration* 1.37: καὶ ἔδει μὲν ἕτερον τὸν ταῦτα διηγούμενον εἶναι, περὶ ἑτέρου γὰρ ἂν ἕτερος ἀποκεκαλυμμένως διῄει).

> city had become my lecture room, as it were, and those who had learnt my prologues turned their backs upon other people’s compositions, continually reciting mine everywhere.”[790]

After finding himself tied up in academic conflict and competition in three different cities, Libanius became disillusioned with the state of education in the east. He would later hold the chair of rhetoric at his beloved city of Antioch and was a private tutor in Constantinople for a brief time. Libanius’ personal experience reveals the chaos unfolding around the educational centers and how competitive the process became. It appears that students were constantly competing to be pupils of certain teachers. Because educators relied on students to pay for their services and enhance their popularity, they became highly competitive with one another. This created an intellectual culture resembling an ouroboros of competition and aggression; students were battling among themselves to learn from the popular teachers, while teachers fought among themselves to be the most sought after by students.

Raffaella Cribiore has done extensive research on Libanius.[791] Her work shows the sophist’s attention to his students, his city of Antioch, and his dedication to pedagogy. She highlights how Antioch became a center for rhetorical teaching, potentially superseding Athens. Libanius' letter to Florentius revealed the depth of these connections. He requested that Florentius recommend Miccalus, who was a friend of Libanius' friend,

---

[790] Lib. *Orat.* 1.55: περὶ ἥν οὕτω τὴν ἔνθεον ἐμεμήνει μανίαν ἡ Νικομήδους πόλις, ὥστε ἤδη με κἀν ταῖς θερμαῖς κολυμβήθραις τἀν τῷ διδασκαλείῳ ποιεῖν καὶ μηδὲ ταῦτα ἔξω τοῦ νόμου τοῖς ἰδιώταις εἶναι δοκεῖν. οὕτως ἡμῖν ἅπασα ἡ πόλις καθειστήκει μουσεῖον· οἵ γε καὶ τοὺς προλόγους παραλαμβάνοντες, τἄλλα ἐκβάλλοντες ᾄσματα, ᾄδοντες πανταχοῦ διετέλουν.

[791] Cribiore, Raffaella. (2009). *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; (2013). *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the fourth century*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press

Olympius. Libanius asked that Florentius not only try to get him an office, but also to help him get married and continue his line in Antioch. Such a request again highlights the network within which the educated elite utilized their institutional connections to secure government office and establish interpersonal connections within those networks. It also showed the influence they could have in building a family line.[792] Indeed, Miccalus would go on to be a governor of Thrace (362 CE), and an archonship in Macedonia.[793]

The Church Fathers and *Paideia*

The Cappadocian fathers, Basil the Great, his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus, were from the elite class and received their education in their hometowns and at the school in Athens. Both Libanius and Gregory account for their time in Athens and their perception of the city. Ironically, Libanius dislikes Athens, as is attested above, whereas Gregory finds the city admirable and a hub of intellectual wealth and history.

Basil was a student of Libanius while in Constantinople, and all three were classically trained students who were familiar with the concept of *paideia*.[794] Because the church fathers introduced Greek pedagogical practices to their congregations and applied the same methodology they had learned from their higher educational training to teach Christian principles, I argue that the practice of Greek education was introduced to a new class of people. No longer was higher education exclusive to those who could afford to attend school; instead, anyone who attended a Christian church would be introduced to these practices. *Paideia* had traditionally been a means for Greek speakers to maintain their cultural identity among the learned elite. In the mid-to-late fourth century, it was transmitted to a larger population. According to Elzbieta Szabat: "The Greek ideal of *paideia* was the foundation of Christian culture."[795]

---

[792] Libanius. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume II: Letters 51-193.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 479. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. Letter 53

[793] See “Miccalus,” in Jones, A.H.M., J.R. Martindale and J. Morris. (1971b). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, 602, for his governorship (used synonymously with archonship) in 362.

[794] Rousseau, P. (1998). *Basil of Caesarea.* Retrieved from https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.emory.edu/2027/heb08380.0001.001, 61

There was significant overlap between the work of a rhetor and that of a bishop or church father leading a congregation or sermon. In a response to Stagirius the Sophist, Gregory of Nyssa, compared the role of a sophist and a bishop by saying: "Who among the bishops has imposed a tax on his words?" Who has made his disciples pay fees? But this is what sophists plume themselves on, putting up their own wisdom as merchandise just as the harvesters of honey do with their honey-combs."[796] Here, Gregory suggested the most significant difference between the two is that one charges for their wisdom and teaching, and the other does not. He also reveals his classical training when he references Plato and Homer.

Gregory Nazianzus utilized his rhetorical training when addressing a diverse audience. Ray Van Dam stated that his sermons, or really orations, became so intellectually developed that "later Byzantine commentators were in fact so impressed that they mined these sermons for examples of the most erudite techniques of formal logic; the polymath Michael Psellus thought that only Gregory could compare to the old classical orators."[797] The Cappadocian fathers knew to use their training in oration to captivate their crowd, who may or may not have been a part of the educated elite. Nonetheless, this practice universally attracted and captivated an audience. In later centuries, Christian intellectuals in the east continued to see the brilliance of these sermons and how they were influenced by pagan rhetorical practice.

---

[795] Szabat, (2015). See also Cameron, Averil. (1991). *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. University of California Press and Brown, Peter. (1992). *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. University of Wisconsin Press

[796] Gregory of Nyssa, Letter 27 response to Stagirius: Silvas, Anna M. (2007). *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters : Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Vol. 00083). Brill.

[797] Van Dam, R. (2003). Listening to the Audience: The Six Days of Creation. In *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (pp. 105–131). University of Pennsylvania Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhjnf.14, 107

Upon emperor Julian’s (r. 361-363) ascension to the throne, Scott Bradbury claims that the Hellenes, in this case referring to pagans, were “jubilant” because the new emperor “quickly made it clear that henceforth imperial favour would be extended to Hellenes, men of traditional education and culture with proper reverence for the old gods.”[798] Julian brought conflict to the schools when he banned Christian teachers from teaching 'pagan' works, impeding them from using traditional tools for rhetorical studies, philosophy, and philology. In his letter, known as the "Rescript on Christian Teachers," Julian chastised those Christians who continued to teach the works of classical authors such as Homer, Hesiod, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Lysias for reaping the benefits of pagan culture and taking for granted the pagan elements embedded in these works. His letter said:

> “But I give them this choice; either not to teach what they do not think admirable, or, if they wish to teach, let them first really persuade their pupils that neither Homer nor Hesiod nor any of these writers whom they expound and have declared to be guilty of impiety, folly and error regarding the gods, is such as they declare. For since they make a livelihood and receive pay from the works of those writers, they thereby confess that they are most shamefully greedy of gain, and that, for the sake of a few drachmae, they would put up with anything."[799]

---

[798] Bradbury, Scott. (2004). *Selected Letters of Libanius: From the Age of Constantius and Julian.* Liverpool, 9

[799] Julian, “Rescript on Chirstian Teachers.” Translation from Loeb: Julian. *Letters. Epigrams. Against the Galilaeans. Fragments.* Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library 157. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923 “δίδωμι δὲ αἵρεσιν μὴ διδάσκειν ἃ μὴ νομίζουσι σπουδαῖα, βουλομένους δὲ διδάσκειν ἔργῳ πρῶτον[5] πείθειν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὡς οὔτε Ὅμηρος οὔτε Ἡσίοδος οὔτε τούτων τις, οὓς ἐξηγοῦνται καὶ ὧν κατεγνωκότες εἰσὶν ἀσέβειαν ἄνοιάν τε καὶ πλάνην εἰς τοὺς θεούς, τοιοῦτός ἐστιν. ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἐξ ὧν ἐκεῖνοι γεγράφασι παρατρέφονται μισθαρνοῦντες, εἶναι ὁμολογοῦσιν αἰσχροκερδέστατοι καὶ δραχμῶν ὀλίγων ἕνεκα πάντα ὑπομένειν. ” Cod.Theo, XIII.3.5; Cod.Justin, X.53.7.; the second law was revoked by Jovian (r. 363-364)

Even Libanius, a strong supporter of Julian, thought this was somewhat extreme. According to Cribiore this was not only a religious or educational act, but an act in which the emperor showed the role he "would play in the selection of educators, [which] until then exclusively in the hands of municipal magistrates and councilors."[800] A month later, his stance on teachers was recorded in the Theodosian Code where it states: “Masters of studies and teachers must excel first in character, then in eloquence.”[801] He then described the process for approval by saying that while he “cannot be present in all municipalities” all teachers must by “approved by the judgement of the municipal senate and shall obtain the decree of the decurions with the consent and agreement of the best citizens.”[802] Finally, he stated that those requests would go through him “for consideration, in order that such teachers may enter upon their pursuits in the municipalities with a certain higher honor because of our judgement.”[803]

In response to this, Gregory of Nazianzus, questioned the relationship between, language, education, and religion. In his fourth oration he exclaimed: "If speaking Greek belongs to the *religion,* pray show where it is the rule, and amongst what sort of priests (like particular sorts of sacrifices), and in honour of what kind of diction? Since all nations have not the same doctrines, nor any single one the sole possession of them; nor yet the same ceremonial, as it is laid down by your own sacred interpreters and directors of sacrifice.”[804]

---

[800] Cribioré (2013), 230

[801] *Cod.Theod.*XII.3.5: Idem a. magistros studiorum doctoresque excellere oportet moribus primum, deinde facundia. sed quia singulis civitatibus adesse ipse non possum, iubeo, quisque docere vult, non repente nec temere prosiliat ad hoc munus, sed iudicio ordinis probatus decretum curialium mereatur optimorum conspirante consensu. hoc enim decretum ad me tractandum referetur, ut altiore quodam honore nostro iudicio studiis civitatum accedant. dat. xv kal. iul., acc. iiii kal. augustas spoletio mamertino et nevitta conss.

[802] Ibid.

[803] Ibid.

[804] Gregory Nazianzen, *Invective against Emperor Julian*. King, Charles William. (1888). *Julian the Emperor: Containing Gregory Nazianzen’s Two Invectives and Libanius’ Monody with Julians Extant Theosophical Works*. London. For more on the orations: Elm, S. (2010). Gregory of Nazianzus’s Life of Julian revisited (Or. 4 and 5): the art of governance by invective. In S. McGill, C. Sogno, & E. Watts (Eds.), *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians:*

The Use of Latin and Laws

In the prior chapter, I focus on the use of law by the tetrarchs and how they utilized it to impact the daily life of Roman citizens in the Greek-speaking East. There, I discuss jurists, their roles, and their backgrounds. In this chapter, however, I will briefly examine Latin as a literary and rhetorical language in the Greek-speaking East, as well as its impact on Greek culture through the influence of legal schools. The practice of rhetoric was well-understood and respected in the Roman world.

We know that Latin had been taught in the Greek-speaking cities for centuries. Libanius, wrote in his autobiography that his great-grandfather, who lived in the third century, had been mistaken as coming from Italy because of a speech he so eloquently delivered in Latin.[805] But, Libanius said, "although he was versed in Latin, he originated from nowhere else but here [Antioch]."[806] His great-grandfather served as an example of bilingualism in which a native Greek speaker would have mastered the Latin language so well as to deliver it, even if embellished by Libanius in this oration.

In Berytus, or modern Beirut, there was a school famous for its legal training. Law professors, like academic chairs in other cities, were appointed by city council or the government and employed by the state.[807] Linda J. Hall, who primarily focuses on the period from 300 to 600

Later Roman History and Culture, 284–450 CE (pp. 171–182). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. See also Cribioré (2013)

[805] Libanius. *Autobiography and Selected Letters, Volume I: Autobiography. Letters 1-50.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Loeb Classical Library 478. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992

[806] Libanius *Autobiography*, 3: "οἴονται δέ τινες τὸν ἐμὸν ἐπίπαππον ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἥκειν ὑπὸ λόγου τινὸς τῇ ἐκείνων γλώττῃ ποιηθέντος ἠπατημένοι. ὁ δὲ ἄρα τὸ μὲν εἶχε ποιεῖν, ἦν δὲ οὐκ ἄλλοθεν."

[807] Hall, L. J. (2004). *Roman Berytus Beirut in late antiquity*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY Routledge, 36

CE, considers the self-identification of those living in Berytus, or modern-day Beirut. The earlier part of her study shows a meaningful connection to both Greek and Latin education. She claims that Berytus "was known as the 'most Roman city' in the East."[808] She highlights the bilingualism prevalent in the city, noting that Latin inscriptions had existed there longer than in any other Greek-speaking city. Yet, Greek continued to be the language used in all forms of verbal communication, regardless of economic class. She comments on identity:

> "Such a period of immersion in the language and the laws of Rome must have changed not only the students' scholarly knowledge but also their view of who they were as individuals. Berytus became a center for cultural assimilation and changed self-identity. Although many persons in the Greek East referred to themselves as 'Romans,' surely a period of immersion in the language and the laws of Rome intensified this self-concept."[809]

The importance of the legal schools in Berytus is evident through Libanius' letters to the legal professors there. Libanius frequently wrote on behalf of students who sought legal training in Berytus, and used his influence to help them get in with the best professors, as I have mentioned above. Cribiore explained that "rhetoric had landed on the rocks" and even Libanius could see that it was not the most lucrative choice for his pupils.[810] The training fostered in schools provided the professional experience, such as shorthand writing, that made them ideal candidates for government positions.[811] Second, Latin and legal training were inherently connected, since laws were written in Latin. Cribiore suggests that students of law may not have had a refined ability in Latin, but rather, students could get away with a superficial understanding of the language, and that the classes may have even been taught in Greek since that was the first language of the students.[812] This further encouraged students who received an education in the Greek East to pursue careers in law.

---

[808] Hall (2004), 1
[809] Hall (2004), 193
[810] Cribiore (2007), 206
[811] Ibid; This was undoubtedly true prior to Emperor Julian, who ended the preference for shorthand.

Conclusion

Education and intellectual communities were a key component of Greek culture in the Greek-speaking cities from the inception of the Roman Empire. It was a means for the classical Greek literary language to be continued, remembered, and celebrated. It was valued as an exposition of culture and high society in the Roman world. During the Second Sophistic era, many sophists and educational institutions found patrons among the emperors and imperial family, particularly under Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, and Julia Domna. The movement expressed a desire among Greek-speaking Romans, including many philosophers and sophists who held Roman citizenship, to uphold and continue educational and linguistic practices that had been popular in classical and Hellenistic Athens.

Although it is difficult to discern the educational culture from the mid-third century to Diocletian, it is clear that an intellectual network for Greek educators and students continued to exist. Neoplatonism, founded by Plotinus in the mid-3rd century, gained traction in the philosophical schools in the late 3rd century. This would spread from Rome to the Greek cities, such as Athens, Antioch, Apamea, and Alexandria. The ideology would persist into the fourth and fifth centuries CE and become a favored philosophy under Emperor Julian (r. 361-363). The philosophical framework was also applied by Christian thinkers, such as Gregory of Nyssa and Synesius of Cyrene, in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. Intellectuals in the third century further developed the field. They cultivated this form of philosophy, thereby adding to the body of paideia and demonstrating the innovation that continued despite imperial instability.

---

[812] Ibid, 208-10

Like Philostratus, Libanius provides accounts of numerous students from Greek cities who sought careers in politics. He worked with both Christian and pagan students, and his influence reached everywhere from Antioch to Rome. By comparing the lives and letters recorded by each of them, one can see the prevalence of the education network, despite the changes in the elite social class and religion. Letters between Basil the Great and Libanius demonstrate that the strong network of scholars persisted despite religious differences. In a collection of twenty-four letters, Basil and Libanius exchange views on references for students. For instance, in letter 336, Libanius responded to a letter from Basil. Happily, they reminisced about his knowledge of a young Basil when he witnessed Basil "vying with the old men in sobriety (and that too in the famous city [Athens] which teemed with pleasures!), and already possessing a great share of eloquence."[813] He confessed he had thought of Basil and wondered what had become of him and if he had pursued the career of students who often did well in school.[814] Then, however, Libanius found out the Basil had dedicated his life to God: "But when there came persons bearing the tidings that you were traversing ways of life far better than these, and that you were considering how you might become more pleasing to God rather than how you could amass wealth, I congratulated both you and the Cappadocians, you for wishing to be a man of that kind, and them for being able to produce such a citizen."[815] In other letters attributed to them, Libanius and Basil seem to have a falling out, in which Libanius criticized Basil for his lack of regard for the ancient sources, and Basil criticized Libanius for profiting off teaching. However, scholars now believe these letters are forgeries and, therefore, do not accurately portray the relationship between Basil and Libanius.[816]

---

[813] Basil. *Letters, Volume IV: Letters 249-368. On Greek Literature.* Translated by Roy J. Deferrari, M. R. P. McGuire. Loeb Classical Library 270. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934. Letter 336

[814] Τί νῦν ἡμῖν ὁ Βασίλειος δρᾷ, καὶ πρὸς τίνα βίον ὥρμηκεν; ἆρ᾽ ἐν δικαστηρίοις τρέπεται,[2] τοὺς παλαιοὺς ῥήτορας ζηλῶν; ἢ ῥήτορας εὐδαιμόνων πατέρων ἀπεργάζεται παῖδας; ὡς δὲ ἧκόν τινες ἀπαγγέλλοντες ἀμείνω σε πολλῷ τουτωνὶ τῶν ὁδῶν πορεύεσθαι, καὶ σκοπεῖν, ὅπως ἂν γένοιο Θεῷ μᾶλλον φίλος, ἢ συλλέξεις χρυσίον, εὐδαιμόνισά σέ τε καὶ Καππαδόκας, σὲ μὲν τοιοῦτον βουλόμενον εἶναι, ἐκείνους δὲ τοιοῦτον δυναμένους δεικνύναι πολίτην

Basil's younger brother, Gregory of Nyssa, also wrote a letter to Libanius, praising his oratorical abilities.[817] Gregory admitted that his teachers are "Paul and John and the other Apostles and Prophets—if we [Christians] are not too bold to claim the teaching of such men."[818] He said of Libanius that his "wisdom, which those competent to judge say streams down from you and is imparted to all who have some share of eloquence" has been told to Gregory by Basil, his brother and teacher, who was, for a short time, a student of Libanius.[819] At this particular time in history, a person of either religion could co-exist in similar intellectual circles and networks.

Raffaella Cribiore's work on Libanius and Edward Watts' book on schools in Athens and Alexandria show the trajectory and importance of *paideia* in maintaining a Roman identity in the fourth century.[820] Their research is primarily focused on Athens, Antioch, and Alexandria, and the movement of students to these cities (both from eastern and western parts of the empire) offers a perhaps too narrow view of Roman and Greek identity in the Greek East through major educational centers. Stenger's work on how educators, such as the Cappadocian fathers, extended their pedagogical practices beyond higher academia into the lives of those attending church is provocative. Since *paideia* had always been an integral part of Greek culture, this was one way for those who could not receive a higher education to adopt parts of Greek culture that had previously been inaccessible.

---

[815] ὡς δὲ ἧκόν τινες ἀπαγγέλλοντες ἀμείνω σε πολλῷ τουτωνὶ τῶν ὁδῶν πορεύεσθαι, καὶ σκοπεῖν, ὅπως ἂν γένοιο Θεῷ μᾶλλον φίλος, ἢ συλλέξεις χρυσίον, εὐδαιμόνισά σέ τε καὶ Καππαδόκας, σὲ μὲν τοιοῦτον βουλόμενον εἶναι, ἐκείνους δὲ τοιοῦτον δυναμένους δεικνύναι πολίτην

[816] See Cribiore (2007), 100-105 for the discussion on the letters which she believes are authentic. I have only included letter 336 from Basil and Libanius' response, which Cribiore believes are not forgeries.

[817] Gregory of Nyssa, Letter 13 to Libanius: Silvas, Anna M. (2007). *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Vol. 00083). Brill.

[818] Ibid.

[819] Ibid.

[820] Cribioré (2009) and (2013); Watts (2006).

While much of this dissertation focuses on change, this particular chapter highlights a notable absence of it. Greeks were not willing to, or were not capable of, losing such a vital aspect of their culture, particularly in terms of Hellenic education and tradition. Even when sophists would seemingly pander to the Roman emperor, whereas sophists in the fourth century BCE would have been more critical of their state, they managed to keep the field of rhetoric and oration alive and well by gaining the favor of the Roman elite. By the fourth century CE, sophists, now firmly integrated into the Roman state and no longer necessarily beholden to the emperor's will, continued to criticize the government. That much can be seen with how firmly connected the imperial family and educational leaders were. Second, even a dramatic change in religious practice was insufficient to quell the passion for a classical education. Instead, there was backlash against the notion that Christians were unable to continue to teach in these spheres. While significant changes were occurring during this period, people living in Greek cities clung to what made their culture distinct. The lessons taught in these educational institutions were formative for the ideal citizen. Even as the citizen and the state evolved, the virtues put forth by the institution remained. Virtue was deeply ingrained in all three cultures: Roman, Greek, and Christian, making them no longer mutually exclusive categories. In fact, by the fourth century CE, the three seemingly opposed identities were now one.

Conclusion

« Ut miles quondam et Graecus »[821]

This dissertation contributes to the extensive body of scholarship seeking to understand the Roman Empire's 'Third Century Crisis,' Hellenic identity under Roman rule, and the impact of Roman imperial policy in the Greek-speaking east. When I began this project, I felt there was a gap in modern Roman historiography that failed to bridge the third century and the tetrarchy to the reign of Constantine and the empire of his successors.[822] Second, I noticed that scholarship on the fourth century heavily focused on the reign of Constantine and his successors, as well as the rise of Christianity and the Christianization of the empire. Likewise, the scholarship on the third and fourth centuries seemed to imply that the tetrarchic period was a blip in the empire's history, which, thanks to Constantine, did not lead to the people's ruin. Also, scholars of late antiquity, who not only defined the period but also made significant strides in revealing the wealth of culture, progress, and intellect of the era, seemed to detach the Roman state of the fourth and fifth centuries from that of their forebears. While this incredible body of scholarship is vital to our understanding of the Roman Empire, there were clear holes in the imperial narrative, and importantly, the narrative of the Roman people.

Fergus Millar's work *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II* suggested that the empire under Theodosius II (r. 408-450) was administratively and functionally 'Roman' but because of the preferred and dominant use of the Greek language, was also

---

[821] Amm. Marc. XXI.16.9: *ut miles quondam et Graecus.* Translation my own but is straightforward and a well-research statement. See Matthews (1989), chp.XVIII, 452-472. For additional context on Roman education in the third through fourth centuries please refer to Chapter Four: Education

[822] See scholarship that focuses on the third century: Ando (2012) and Harries (2012); Scholarship on the tetrarchy, which seems to almost isolate the period from the prior century and reign of Constantine: Leadbetter (2009) and Rees (2013)

'Greek'.[823] By the fifth century, the eastern and western halves of the empire had been permanently fractured, and the relationship between the two courts was strained. With Constantinople at the metropole, the eastern half proved to be the prevailing and more stable side of the empire as they faced less power interference from the Goths. Millar mostly relies on language to claim an identifiable "Greek Roman Empire" and argues that Greek was being used more frequently for imperial correspondence and religious functions, while Latin continued to be used as the legal language of the empire. Like him, I focused on the language of the administration and its significance, as well as its potential impact on the interest in Hellenistic education. I, however, argue that there are many ways in which the Roman empire had developed a bicultural identity, and that this biculturality was already present by the reign of Theodosius II. By comparing four vital institutions in each chapter and examining them all in one study, it becomes clear that the Greek-Roman Empire, imagined by Millar, took root in the early fourth century.

Furthermore, influenced by scholars who criticized the stigmas surrounding the Eastern Roman Empire and Christianity, I turned to the reign of Constantine. As the founder of Constantinople and catalyst for the development of Christianity in the empire, I wanted to know how his policies made the empire distinct from prior centuries. Judith Evans Grubbs writes extensively on his reign and, in particular, his legal policies. She argues that Constantine recalled policies from Emperor Augustus, and affirms his policies were in line with Roman tradition, rather than Christian ideologies. It was through her work on Constantine that I was introduced to her work on Diocletian. The more I learned about his reign, the more I saw that his vision of the

---

[823] Millar, F. (2006). *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and belief under Theodosius II (408-450)*. University of California Press. International Article Number: 9780520247031

Roman Empire was a continuation of the visions of first- and second-century emperors. Diocletian, after stabilizing the frontiers, made an effort to codify the law and make it more accessible to citizens who may not be familiar with it by using the rescript system. The legal and administrative systems were reorganized, standardized, and further developed to fit the needs of the fourth century empire.

Both Diocletian and Constantine inherited an empire that needed mending. According to Lenski: “As Constantine secured control of an ever-growing share of the empire, his dealings with cities were governed by these same assumptions and circumscribed by the practices of governance that had preceded him.”[824] As soldiers, the emperors of the tetrarchy succeeded in leading armies against external threats of invasion and pleasing their armies. As Romans, they sought to guide their people back to the *Pax Romana* by reviving Roman morals and traditions, as has been shown throughout this dissertation.

When Constantine relocated his capital to the eastern half of the empire, he shifted the center of the Roman world. Anthony Kaldellis states:

> “New Rome was henceforth the focal point of the Roman east, no longer a border between east and west. Thus, instead of emperors traveling around the provinces to secure their loyalty, they brought the cream of the eastern provinces to New Rome. By this point in Roman history, “Rome” was less a physical city than an ideal of political community, and it had expanded to encompass the provinces. Mobility and inclusiveness were values embedded in the earliest layers of Rome’s legend, as its national ancestors had moved from Troy to the banks of the Tiber. The res publica that emerged there was imagined less as a physical place than a community cemented by shared notions of justice and religion. This idea was evoked vividly in times of civil war as each side claimed to represent the true res publica, even if it was not physically in Rome.”[825]

---

[824] Lenski (2016), 92

[825] Kaldellis (2021), 19

A non-Roman (as in not from the city of Rome) elite was already transpiring, and the idea of an eastern capital was not unheard of. Kaldellis reminds us that "the idea of a Roman move to the east was ancient" and dates back to as early as the first century BCE, when Mark Antony relocated to Alexandria.[826] Second, emperors in the second century CE were not of Italian descent and came from Roman provinces. Emperor Trajan was the first from Spain, and this trend continued into the third century. Third, more and more provincials were rising to positions of power, whether through government offices or the army, and eventually, even the emperor himself would be more present in the provinces than in Rome. With them, they brought a court of jurists, senators, soldiers, and mints to spread their message and imperial control wherever they went. This very move was recognized by Herodian, who recorded that a Roman general in Antioch claimed, "Rome is where the emperor is," which was a common sentiment in the eastern provinces and cities during the fourth century.[827] When the emperor relocated, he brought with him centuries of Roman tradition and changed the political landscape.

Intellectuals in the Greek east continued to promote, protect, and adapt *paideia,* which enabled Hellenistic culture to thrive in elite circles. Greeks in the third and fourth centuries developed their own ideas of what it meant to be a part of the Roman polity. Libanius is a perfect example of this. In his letters, he frequently corresponded with fellow philosophers, political figures, and even the emperor himself.

---

[826] ibid

[827] Hdn. 1.6.5: ἐκεῖ τε ἡ Ῥώμη, ὅπου ποτ᾽ ἂν ὁ βασιλεὺς ᾖ. Translation from Herodian. *History of the Empire, Volume I: Books 1-4.* Translated by C. R. Whittaker. Loeb Classical Library 454. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969

While Hellenic training and culture continued to be passed down through educational training, the sense of civic duty declined among the elites. Libanius spoke about members of the Antiochene senate who were accused of abandoning their duties.

> "Moreover, the council has such wisdom and oratorical ability that you would say that it was some company of sophists in their prime demonstrating their technique. So keen is their intellect, so compact their expressions, so inexhaustible is their brow that many hearers flock to the courts, as though they were regular seats of instruction, to hear the arguments presented before the governors, improvisations which are superior to carefully prepared discourses. This ability compels the governors to live up to their name, but not to go beyond it, and play the tyrant. How so? Wherever the council lacks education, though it be ever so wealthy, it is dumb and lies open to outrage by the governors, and must grin and bear it. They who cannot obtain their rights by argument, are obvious targets for wrong-doing, and though they may have the title of councillor, their position is one of slavery. Among us, on the other hand, our mastery in oratory maintains the independence of the council in the fullest sense. It compels those who are set up as administrators of public affairs to live up to the name. If they are men of moderation, it contributes to their search for the highest good, if they are headstrong it restrains their insolence with the compulsion which philosophy supplies, and with its rhetoric, as it were, lulls their temper to rest. The councillors have thus acquired a magic stronger than the governors' power."[828]

Libanius, himself a political figure, teacher, and citizen of Antioch, struggled to perform his own civic duty. In this oration, it is clear that he believed members of the council required oratorical training and intelligence, which referenced his firm loyalty to *paideia* and the training it provided for members of the Greek elite. His account is similar to the picture of the republican Cicero, who viewed the courts as a stage of performance. Libanius emphasized the strengths of the Antiochene elite, particularly the members of the Antiochene Senate (*boule*), whom Libanius praised for their ability to voice their opinions openly to the governor and prevent him from acting tyrannically.[829] In this oration, the Antiochene elites uphold traditional Hellenic customs.

---

[828] Lib. *Orat. 11* 139-140.

[829] Lib. *Orat. 11* 139 and 142

For example, he claimed: "Citizens do not claim to be superior to foreigners, but the state welcomes the virtues of the newcomers as, to be sure, it welcomes those of its own sons."[830] In this way, Libanius asserts, the Antiochenes were like the Athenians, who "granted a share in their own government to newcomers from Pylos, and employed them in the highest offices."[831] This reference also suggested that eastern Romans sought out Antioch as a desirable city to live in. His oration painted the picture of a prosperous city with a virtuous elite who maintained bureaucratic relationships with imperial governors and emperors without sacrificing their own values as a people. While his narrative highlights Antiochenes and their Greek heritage, it also clearly shows the role Greek local councils played in maintaining governance within the Roman imperial system. The speech offers another example of Greek Romans blending Greek cultural traditions with Roman administrative practices.

Greeks living in the eastern Greek territories were deeply entwined with Roman ways of life. Still, they were connected through language and academic training to their Hellenic ancestors. This gradual transition into Roman life and the empire occurred over centuries but was accelerated in the third century by Caracalla and, much later, Diocletian. Both emperors sought to utilize Roman law and jurisdiction to fully integrate Greek cities and people into the Roman Empire, ensuring they were unquestionably Roman. Constantine continued this trend, and despite years of persecution, even found a way to weave Christians and Christianity into the Roman imperial framework after years of opposition.

I will conclude with the example of fourth century historian Ammianus Marcellinus (330-390 c.). His historical work, the *Res Gestae,* merged both Latin and Greek literary traditions.[832]

---

[830] Lib. *Orat. 11* 167

[831] Lib. *Orat. 11* 167. Norman notes that Libanius is referencing Pericles Funeral speech in Thucydides 2.39.

[832] Matthews, John. (2002). *The Roman Empire of Ammianus: with a New Introduction*. Michigan Classical Press

The narrative consisted of thirty-one books, which covered Roman history from the year 69 CE to the Battle of Adrianople in 378 CE. Unfortunately, only the last eighteen books of the series survive, which cover the reign of Constantius II through the death of Valens (r.364-378 CE). Scholars have considered how the work of Ammianus continued the work of Tacitus and Suetonius, whose works end with the reign of Domitian in 96 CE.[833]

His personality occasionally comes through in his work. While his narrative of the time of the tetrarchy no longer exists, one could imagine how he would have described the tetrarchic emperors. He criticized emperors who acted outside of the law or who were particularly ruthless. He was critical of Constantius II, who hiked up tax rates and violently carried out executions and torture against those who committed treason, and claimed his cruelty rivaled that of Caligula, Domitian and Commodus, saying: "For it was in rivalry of the cruelty of those emperors that at the beginning of his reign he destroyed root and branch all who were related to him by blood and race."[834] That being said, it would be difficult to know how Ammianus would have evaluated the tetrarchic emperors who overhauled the government structure and carried out mass persecutions of Christians. In Chapter Three: Roman Law, I wrote extensively on how tetrarchic emperors employed legal arguments as justification for persecution. Even though Ammianus was a pagan and did not seem supportive of Christianity, his distaste for violence on a mass scale likely confirms that he would have disapproved. Yet, Ammianus may have appreciated

---

[833] There are other scholars who have studied the similarities between the authors. See: Blockley, R. C. (1973). "Tacitean Influence upon Ammianus Marcellinus." *Latomus*, *32*(1), 63–78; Wilshire, L. E. 1973. "Did Ammianus Marcellinus Write a Continuation of Tacitus?" *The Classical Journal*, *68*(3), 221–227; Williams, Mary Frances. 1997. Four Mutinies: Tacitus 'Annals' 1.16-30; 1.31-49 and Ammianus Marcellinus 'Res Gestae' 20.4.9-20.5.7; 24.3.1-8." *Phoenix*, vol.51 no.1, 44-74

[834] Amm. Marc. XXI.16.17 and Amm. Marc. XXI.16.8: Caligulae et Domitiani et Commodi immanitatem facile superabat, quorum aemulatus saevitiam inter imperandi exordia, cunctos sanguine et genere se contingentes, stirpitus interemit.

Diocletian's respect for traditional Roman law and the rhetorical prefaces that accompanied his legislation.

When Julian, whom Ammianus greatly admired, forbade Christian teachers from teaching rhetoric or literature, Ammianus accused him of acting inhumanely (*inclemens*) and suggested that the act, which Julian had put into law, should be "buried in silence."[835] Ammianus obviously had a connection and respect for traditional education. Ammianus held Julian in high regard and frequently mentioned his educated upbringing, passion for the pagan religion, and his positive attributes.[836] He recorded that emperor Valens, unlike his brother and co-ruler Valentinian, had an "uncultivated mind, and was trained neither in the art of war nor in liberal studies."[837] While the tetrachic emperors were not necessarily opponents of education, they likely received a humble educational training as soldiers and did not possess the philosophic mind of Julian.

By the time of Ammianus Marcellinus, the imperial policies established by the emperors of the tetrarchy, as well as the presence of Christians in the imperial family and court, had become standard. He briefly mentioned Diocletian as the founder of the *adoratio*, which was a "foreign [Oriental] and royal form of adoration" in which the emperor was showcased as a god and called "dominus."[838] Matthews asserts that the *adoratio* was not only "a symbol of the remoteness of an Oriental despot before his subjects" but that it was "a demarcation, acted out before one's eyes, of those imperial supports entitled to a place in the emperor's presence, and of an order of precedence within their number."[839] Caligula and Domitian also practiced a form of *adoratio*, but it is unmentioned by Ammianus. I argue that there are two reasons for this omission: first, because emperors after Caligula and Domitian did not continue the practice, which was not a formal custom, whereas emperors who succeeded Diocletian upheld it. Alternatively, in the cases of Caligula and Domitian, a stigma was associated with the practice, as both emperors were perceived as deviants whose reigns hurt the Roman people. However, during Ammianus' time, the practice was viewed as commonplace and carried less of a negative connotation. Matthews, too, claims Ammianus' "absence of feeling" towards the custom is worth consideration. [840] Much of Ammianus' work prompts his audience to examine the empire as he knows it, and this is especially true where it concerns his account of the *adoratio*. His matter-of-fact account represented how the empire of the fourth century had changed from prior centuries. The imperial government and Roman society "displayed a taste for the theatrical, for pictorial gesture and pageantry" that contrasted with past Roman societal norms but had been accepted by Romans in the fourth century.[841] Matthews suggests that these new practices were a result of the tetrarchy's expansion of the government and "imperial ceremonial, in such acts of protocol as *adoratio purpurae*, provided a focal point, and a sense of identity, to a new and enlarged governing class, the members of the *imperial militia*."[842] These rituals were inclusive of the newly expanded ranks of privileged Romans, but, simultaneously, isolated the emperor as a figure above everyone else.

---

[835] Amm. Marc. XXII.7: Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos, ritus Christiani cultores

[836] Amm. Marc. XV.7-8 on Julian's education in Greece;

[837] Amm. Marc. XXXI.5: in crudelitatem proclivior, subagrestis ingenii, nec bellicis nec liberalibus studiis eruditus

[838] Oriental in reference to Persian origin. Amm. Marc. XV.18: Diocletianus enim Augustus omnium primus, externo et regio more instituit adorari, cum semper antea ad similitudinem iudicum salutatos principes legerimus. See also Matthews (2002), 244-245. Caligula and Domitian were not the only emperors to be called "dominus." Pliny used the term to address Trajan, but it was the blatant act of declaring oneself as a god alongside a disruptive reign that seem to be the problem.

---

[839] Matthews (2002), 246
[840] Matthews (2002), 246.
[841] Matthews (2002), 247.
[842] Matthews (2002), 249.

Ammianus' characterizations of the emperors, especially his obituaries of the emperors, reflected the literary trends of classical authors who contrasted the virtues and vices of emperors. Gavin Kelly argues that Ammianus further develops his analysis of contemporary emperors by using *exempla* and comparing them to earlier figures in the Roman historical record.[843] Ammianus' adoption of a Latin tradition, his evident admiration for the emperor Julian, and his criticism of the city of Rome and the Romans as it adhered to Roman literary tradition, as well as his probable familial status of *honestior* are worth understanding to determine bicultural identity.[844]

Ammianus, thought to be from an elite family in Syrian Antioch, clearly saw himself as a Roman and, therefore, wrote his history in Latin, the language of the army and Roman bureaucracy. He ended the *Res Gestae* by labeling himself "as a former soldier and Greek."[845] The quote, which opened this conclusion and was mentioned in the "Introduction," has been discussed by modern scholars who want to understand the intention behind the admission.[846] T.D. Barnes notes a few options for the claim: first, that Ammianus could be proud of his identity as a Greek and career as a soldier; or second, he wanted to apologize for his career as a humble soldier rather than a career suitable for an elite Greek (such as a governor or orator).[847] His chosen path contrasts with those of the men seen in Eunapius' *Lives* and Libanius' letters. John Matthews provides a third option, stating:

---

[843] Kelly, Gavin. (2023). Ammianus Marcellinus, Speeches, and Rhetoric. *Rhetoric and Histography in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lieve van Hoof and Maria Conterno. Peeters Publishers

[844] Matthews (2002), 456-468 for the historical tradition from which Ammianus wrote.

[845] Amm. Marc. XXI.16.9: *ut miles quondam et Graecus.* Translation my own but is straightforward and a well-research statement. See Matthews (2002), chp.XVIII, 452-472. For additional context on Roman education in the third through fourth centuries please refer to Chapter Four: Education

[846] Barnes, T. D. (1998). *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Vol. 56). Cornell University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.cttq45g1, 65.

[847] Barnes (1998), 65

> "Perhaps it only seemed natural to him precisely as an expression of his own career, which had been largely conducted in Latin, the language of administration and the army; if 'Graecus' defined the literary character and scale of the history he wrote, 'miles' largely determined the language in which it was written. Considered in relation to his historiographical purpose, Ammianus' choice of language gave him the opportunity to connect Greek and Roman traditions in the manner described in this chapter."[848]

Michael Hanaghan and David Woods suggest that the claim could be a "boast concerning his qualification to write the history," which he was exceptionally qualified to do due to both his personal experience on military campaigns, some of which he recorded, and the education he acquired as a Greek.[849] Kelly and others suggest that his style was a result of his rhetorical training, and another piece of evidence that Ammianus' admission of being a *graecus* was a reference to his educational background.[850] Ammianus integrated both Greek and Latin classical traditions with his own literary training. His style reflects a shift in educational practice while also proving the classical foundation from which elite Romans continued to reference.

Lastly, they argue there was a religious component to the claim, which asserted Ammianus as a pagan, and so "the combination of the terms *miles* and *Graecus* could signal his opposition to those pious Christians who styled themselves *milites Christi* 'soldiers of Christ.'"[851] That Ammianus would adopt such a traditional Roman narrative in his histories is no surprise, as his life was largely characterized by his service as a soldier. He served from 354 to 363 CE under emperors Constantius II and Julian as part of the *militia armata*, the imperial armed service, and accompanied the general Ursicinus, the *magister equitum per Orientem*, on campaigns. When Ursicinus was ordered to Cologne to put down Silvanus, who had risen against Constantius II, he brought with him "some tribunes and ten of the body guard (*protectores domestici*), to assist the exigencies of the state."[852] Ammianus was a part of the *protectores domestici*, and as such witnessed firsthand the violence within the empire, the emperors and imperial leaders, and the Persian wars of his time. In this way, Ammianus Marcellinus differed from classical historical authors, who may have witnessed events in Rome, overseen a province in an administrative capacity, or been close to the emperor, but were not in a position to recount events that took place on the battlefield.

---

[848] Matthews (2002), 468

[849] Hanaghan, Michael and David Woods. (2022). Introduction. *Ammianus Marcellinus from Soldier to Author*. Brill, 1

[850] Kelly (2023); Rance, Philip. (2022). Simplicaitas militaris: Ammianus Marcellinus and sermo castrensis. *Ammianus Marcellinus from Soldier to Author*. Brill, 1

[851] Ibid, 1-2. I am less convinced by this final reasoning.

This perspective was essential for our understanding of the fourth-century Roman Empire because the emperor traveled extensively throughout the empire and often fought battles against usurpers or foreign enemies himself. His account of the Persian Wars led by Julian shapes his narrative by exemplifying a case of Roman defeat and the demise of an emperor whom Ammianus regarded so highly as a good Roman emperor.[853] Guy Williams likens Ammianus to Xenophon, a Greek fifth-century BCE historian and philosopher who fought in the Persian Wars in his time.[854] Xenophon fought in a failed expedition that sought to place the Persian general Cyrus on the Cyrean throne. Because Cyrus died, the mission could not be fulfilled, but as Williams explains, "Xenophon makes a success out of a failure by focusing not on the death of the expeditionary architect but on the feats of the troops as they withdraw."[855] Ammianus took this as a model for his own work so that the strengths of the Roman troops are at the forefront of the narrative, and Julian maintains his military dignity. By drawing on Xenophon's literary strategy and adapting it to fit his own experience, Ammianus wove together ancient and contemporary narratives, while also showcasing the cyclical history —a well-remembered phenomenon in the Greek world —that existed almost a thousand years prior.

---

[852] Amm. Marc. XV.22. See Emion, Maxime. (2002). Ammianus and the *Dignitas Protectoris*. *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill, 63-67 for the function of the *protectores*.

[853] See Amm. Marc. XVI where Ammianus described Julian by comparing him to previous esteemed emperors, saying: "For some law of a higher life seems to have attended this youth from his noble cradle even to his last breath. For with rapid strides he grew so conspicuous at home and abroad that in his foresight he was esteemed a second Titus, son of Vespasian, in the glorious progress of his wars as very like Trajan, mild as Antoninus Pius, and in searching out the true and perfect reason of things in harmony with Marcus Aurelius, in emulation of whom he moulded his conduct and his character." And Amm. Marc. XXII.8.1 where Ammianus referred to Julian as a *magnus princeps*.

[854] Williams, Guy. (2022). Xenophon and Ammianus: Two Soldier-Historians and Their Persian Expeditions. *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill

[855] Ibid, 380

As a Greek from Syria, his life and work reveal the new dynamic of being a Roman in the Greek East in the fourth century.[856] His self-proclaimed epithet, while difficult to determine his true intention behind the statement, served as one example of the many different roles Greeks had within the empire. Suppose we are to believe that his self-proclaimed Greek identity was linked to his educational background or his ethnicity. In that case, we can assume that for Ammianus, Greekness could be defined by attributes other than language. His life, paired with others such as Libanius and those who were present throughout his epistolary record, reveals the Greek Romans of the fourth century. Likewise, the examples provided throughout this dissertation show that Greeks practiced and engaged with Romanness in a variety of ways. All these examples, however, highlight that third and fourth-century Greeks maintained a Greek cultural identity while simultaneously having a Roman legal and political identity. It is from their testimonies as individuals who valued, understood, and practiced their Hellenic past, while actively participating in their imperial Roman present, that the true Greek Roman Empire was born.

With my prior focus on fifth century Roman society, I did not understand how the Greeks, who were at this point very active in politics, bureaucracy, and culture, were suddenly

---

[856] Woods, David and M.P. Hanaghan, editors. (2022). *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill. doi: 10.1163/9789004525351

Romans. I wanted to understand the slow process by which the Greek east became this essential place for Roman society and how it came to house the new capital. By broadening my scope and examining distinct facets of the Roman world beyond language, I gained a deeper understanding of how the Greeks were able to integrate themselves into this world while maintaining their Hellenistic culture. Unlike Millar, I sought to understand cultural characteristics beyond language. I found that, in a broad sense, the Greeks had a complex and unique relationship with the Roman state. This relationship was sometimes that of oppression and cultural exchange, and at other times a beneficial relationship of patronage and imperial structural support.[857] Through the resilience of individuals deeply connected to their ancestral past and their dedication to honoring that past through available cultural practices, Greeks were able to thrive within the empire. Consequently, Roman Greeks flourished and ultimately became the stewards of the Roman state. This narrative is one of survival, change, and imperial strength. This dissertation has, hopefully, shown that the mid-third to fourth centuries were not merely an age of crisis, but an era of Roman resilience, in which emperors, cities, and communities adapted, endured, and reasserted a distinctly Roman imperial order within a changing world.

---

[857] For example, legal support that was not previously available and military support.

Secondary Sources

Adams, J. N. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge University Press

Alcock, Susan E. "Roman Imperialism in the Greek Landscape." *Journal of Roman archaeology* 2 (1989): 5–34. Web.

Alcock, S. E. (1993). *Graecia capta: The landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge University Press.

Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry, & Jas Elsner, editors. (2001). *Pausanias : Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford University Press.

Alcock, S. E. (2002). *Archaeologies of the Greek past: Landscape, monuments, and memories*. Cambridge University Press.

Alston, R. (1994). Roman military pay from Caesar to Diocletian. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 84, 113–123.

Amon, Herman. (2018). Gallien, Claude le Gothique, Aurélien et le bon empereur dans les *Caesares* d'Aurelius Victor *Interférences* [En ligne], | 2018, mis en ligne le 09 février 2018, consulté le 11 février 2018

Ando, C. (2000). *Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman Empire*. University of California Press

Ando, C. (2007). The army and the urban elite: A competition for power. In P. Erdkamp (Ed.), *A companion to the Roman army* (pp. 123–145). Blackwell Publishing.

Ando, C. (2012). *Imperial Rome AD 193-284: The critical century*. Edinburgh University Press.

Andrade, N. J. (2013). Antiochus IV and the limits of Greekness under the Seleucids (175–63 BCE), in *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (pp. 37–66). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Avotins, I. (1975). *The Holders of the Chairs of Rhetoric at Athens. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, *79*, pp. 313–324

Badian, E. (1958). *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 b.c.).* Oxford

Badian, E. (1972). *Publicans and sinners: Private enterprise in the service of the Roman Republic*. Cornell University Press

Barnes, T.D. (1973). Porphyry Against the Christians: Date and Attribution of Fragments. Journal of Theological Studes (XXIV(2), 424-442. https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/XXIV.2.424

Barnes, T. D. (1998). *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Vol. 56). Cornell University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.cttq45g1

Barnes, T.D. (2010). Maxentius and Diocletian. *Classical Philology, vol. 105, No. 3* (July 2010), pp. 318-322. The University of Chicago Press

Berchman, R. (2005). *Porphyry against the Christians*. Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789047415725

Bernini, Julie. (2024). "Gymnasia and Baths." *Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. Oxford University Press*

Birley, Anthony R. (1997). Hadrian and Greek Senators. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 116, pp.209-245

Birley, Anthony R. (2000). The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus. *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, *49*(2), 230–247. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4436577, 234.

Birley, Anthony R. (2002). *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography*: Vol. Taylor &amp; Francis e-Library ed. Routledge

Bjornlie, S. (2023). Urban Crises and the Contours of the Late Antique Empire through the Lens of Antioch. *Studies in Late Antiquity : A Journal*, *7*(2), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1525/sla.2023.7.2.184

Blockley, R. C. (1973). *Tacitean influence upon Ammianus Marcellinus. Latomus*, 32(1), 63–78.

Bloy, Dylan. (2012). "Roman Patrons of Greek Communities Before the title πάτρων." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. Franz Steiner Verlag, pp.168-201

Boatwright, M. T. (2018). *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Princeton University Press. doi: 10.1515/9780691187211

Borg, B. E., ed. (2004). *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. De Gruyter

Bowen and Garnsey (2003). *Lactantius: Divine institutes*. Liverpool University Press

Bowersock, G. W. (1965). *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford

Bowersock, G. W. (1969). *Greek sophists in the Roman Empire*. Clarendon Press

Bowersock, G. W. (1990). *Hellenism in late antiquity Thomas Spencer Jerome lectures*. University of Michigan Press

Brisson, Luc. (2014). Plotinus' Style and Argument. *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Routledge

Brown, Peter. (1992). *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. University of Wisconsin Press

Bryen, Ari Z. 2016. “Reading the Citizenship Papyrus (P.Giss. 40),” *Citizenship and Empire in Europe 200-1900: The Antonine Constitution after 1800 years*. Edited by Clifford Ando. Franz Steiner Verlag: Stuttgart

Burrell, Barbara. (2009). Reading, Hearing, and Looking at Ephesos. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome.* Oxford: Oxford University Press 69-95

Busine, A., editor. (2015). *Religious Practices and Christianization of the Late Antique City (4th–7th cent.)* Leiden: Boston

Byrne, Sean. (2003). *Roman Citizens of Athens*. Leuven; Dudley, Mass: Peeters

Cameron, Averil. (1991). *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. University of California Press

Cameron, Averil and Stuart Hall. (1999). *Eusebius' Life of Constantine*. Clarendon Press

Cameron, A. (2005). *Procopius and the sixth century*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis

Cameron, A. (2006). *The Byzantines*. Blackwell Pub. International Article Number: 9780631202622

Carbone, Lucia. (2021).“Coinage in the Roman Provinces: Conference Highlights, part 1.” Posted via the American Numismatics Society on their website. URL here: https://numismatics.org/pocketchange/rbw1/

Chaniotis, Angelos. (2016). Memory, Commemoration & Identity in an Ancient City: The Case of Aphrodisias. *Daedalus*, Vol. 145, no. 2 (Spring 2016), pp.88-100

Chin, M. J. H. (2018). OGIS 332 and Civic Authority at Pergamon in the Reign of Attalos III. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, *208*, 121–137. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45147264

Clinton, K. (1989). Hadrian's Contribution to the Renaissance of Eleusis. *Bulletin Supplement (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies)*, *55*, 56–68. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43768503

Connolly, S. (2010). *Lives behind the laws: The world of the Codex Hermogenianus*. Indiana University Press

Corcoran, S. (1996). *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284-324*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Corcoran, S. (2008). *Diocletian. In Lives of the Caesars*, A.A. Barrett (Ed.). https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1002/9781444302950.ch10

Crawford, M. H., & Reynolds, J. (1975). The Publication of the Prices Edict: A New Inscription from Aezani. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *65*, 160–163. https://doi.org/10.2307/370069

(2023). *Diocletian's Edict of Maximum Prices at the Civil Basilica in Aphrodisias*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verglag

Creed, J.L. (1984). *De mortibus persecutorum*. Oxford

Cribiore, Raffaella. (2007). The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch. Princeton University Press

Cribiore, Raffaella. (2009). *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Cribiore, Raffaella. (2013). *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the fourth century*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press

Curran, John. (2000). *Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century*

Davenport, C. (2012). Soldiers and Equestrian Rank in the Third Century AD. *Papers of the British School at Rome*, *80*, 89–123.

De la Bédoyère, G. (2017). “Introduction.” *Praetorian: The rise and fall of Rome's imperial bodyguard*. Yale University Press.

De Martino, F. 1973. *Storia della costituzione romana* II^2. Naples, 364-71

De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (2006). *Christian persecution, martyrdom, and orthodoxy*. Oxford University Press.

Dickenson, Christopher. (2017). *On the Agora*. Brill

Digeser, E. D. (2019). “Lactantius.” In P. L. Reynolds (Ed.), *Great Christian Jurists and Legal Collections in the First Millennium* (pp. 239–251). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Digeser, “Religion, Law and the Roman Polity: The Era of the Great Persecution,”

Dillon, John Noël.(2012). *The Justice of Constantine: Law, Communication, and Control*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Dmitriev, S. (2005). *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Dmitriev, S. (2017). ‘The Status of Greek Cities in Roman Reception and Adaptation’, *Hermes* 145: 195–209.

Drinkwater, J. F. (1987). *The Gallic Empire: Separatism and continuity in the north-western provinces of the Roman Empire, A.D. 260-274*. Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

Dominik, William and Jon Hall, editors.*(2007). A companion to Roman rhetoric*. (2007). Blackwell

Duncan-Jones, R. (1990). *Structure and scale in the Roman economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eck, Werner. (2008). "Augustus." Lives of the Caesars, edited by Anthony A. Barrett. Blackwell

Eilers, Claude. Eilers, Claude. (2002). *The Appearance of Patrons in the Greek East. Roman Patrons of Greek cities.* Oxford

Eilers, Claude. Eilers, Claude. (2003). Pompey's Settlement to the Death of Augustus. *A companion to the Hellenistic world*. Blackwell Pub. Lt. doi: 10.1002/9780470996584, 90.

Elliott, P. (2014). *Legions in crisis: Transformation of the Roman soldier, AD 192-284*. Fonthill Media Limited. International Article Number: 9781781553343

Elton, Hugh. (2006). The Transformation of Government under Diocletian and Constantine. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell

Emion, Maxime. (2002). Ammianus and the *Dignitas Protectoris*. *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill

Erdkamp, Paul.(2007). Introduction. *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell

Erim, K. T., & Reynolds, J. (1970). The Copy of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices from Aphrodisias in Caria. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *60*, 120–141. https://doi.org/10.2307/299418

Evans Grubbs, Judith. (1995). *Law and Family in Late Antiquity: The Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation*. Oxford

Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2002). *Women and the law in the Roman Empire: A sourcebook on marriage, divorce and widowhood*. Routledge.

Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2005). Children and Divorce in Roman Law. *Hoping for Continuity: Childhood, Education, and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. ed. K. Mustakallio, J. Hanska, H-.L. Sainio, and V. Vuolanto (Rome: Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae vol. 33), 33-47

Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2011). Promoting pietas through Roman Law. *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, edited by Beryl Rawson. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Evans Grubbs, Judith. (2018) "Diocletian's Private Law: the Family." In Diocleziano: la frontiera giuridica dell'impero, ed. Salvatore Puliatti and Werner Eck. Pavia University Press: CEDANT (Centro di studi e ricerche di Diritti Antichi), pp. 345-424 (2019). “Singles, Sex and Status in the Augustan Marriage Legislation.” *The single life in the Roman and later Roman world*. Cambridge University Press

Evans Grubbs, Judith and Tim Parkin, editors. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of childhood and education in the classical world*. Oxford University Press

Ferrary, J.-L. 1999. ‘La liberté des cités et ses limites à l’époque républicaine’, *Mediterraneo Antico* 2/1: 69–84

Ferray, J. 2014. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique* (2nd ed.). Rome

Ferrary, J. 2017. *Rome et le monde grec. Choix d’écrits*, 181–94.

Flinterman, Jaap-Jan. 2008. “Sophists and Emperors: A Reconnaissance of Sophistic Attitudes,” *Paideia: the World of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Barbara E. Borg. Berlin: De Gruyter

Frantz, A. (1988). *Late antiquity, A.D. 267-700*. American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Gabrielsen, V., & Paganini, M. C. D. (Eds.). (2023). *Private Associations in the Ancient Greek World: Regulations and the Creation of Group Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gaddis, Michael. (2015). *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*

Galinsky, Karl, editor. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge University Press.

Galinsky, K. (2005). Vergil’s Aeneid and Ovid’s Metamorphoses as World Literature. In K. Galinsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (pp. 340–358). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garnsey, P. (1970). Septimius Severus and the Marriage of Soldiers. *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, *3*, 45–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/25010598

Garnsey, P. (1988). *Famine and food supply in the Graeco-Roman world: Responses to risk and crisis*. Cambridge University Press

Garnsey, P. (2004). “Roman Citizenship and Roman Law in the Late Empire.” *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire*. Oxford

Gilliver, Kate. (2007). “The Augustan Reform and the Structure of the Imperial Army.” *A Companion to the Roman Army.* Edited by Paul Erdkamp. Wiley Blackwell.

Girdvainyte. (2024). Greek and Roman Citizenships. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press

Gleason, Maud. (2006). Greek Cities Under Roman Rule. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell

Gleason, Maud. (2010). Making Space for Bicultural Identity. *Local knowledge and microidentities in the imperial Greek world*. Cambridge University Press

Goldhill, S., ed. (2001). *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge

Graf, F. (2015). *Roman festivals in the Greek East: From the early empire to the Middle Byzantine Era*. Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge

Gruen, E. S. (1990). *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy*. E.J. Brill.

Gruen, E. S. (1992). *Culture and national identity in Republican Rome*. Cornell University Press.

Guilland, R. (1971). Études sur l'Histoire Administrative de l'Empire Byzantin. Le Questeur:: Ὁ ΚΟΙΑΙΣΤΩΡ, QUAESTOR. *Byzantion*, *41*, 78–104

Gwynn, A. (1926). *Roman education from Cicero to Quintilian*. Clarendon Press.

Hall, J. (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity.* Retrieved from https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.emory.edu/2027/heb31904.0001.001

Hall, L. J. (2004). *Roman Berytus Beirut in late antiquity*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY Routledge

Hallmannsecker, Martin and Anna Heller, editors. (2025). *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated

Hanel, Norbert. (2007). Military Camps, *Canabae*, and *Vici*. *The Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell

Harries, Jill. (1988). “The Roman Imperial Quaestor from Constantine to Theodosius II.” *The Journal of Roman Studies, vol 78*, pp. 148-172

Harries, Jill. (1999). *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Harries, Jill. (2012). *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The new empire*. Edinburgh University Press.

Haynes, I. (2013). In *Blood of the provinces: The Roman auxilia and the making of provincial society from Augustus to the Severans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heath, M. (2004). *Menander: A rhetor in context*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated

Heather, Peter and John Matthews. (2004). Chapter One: The Canonical Letter of Gregory Thaumaturgus and the Third Century Invasions. *The Goths in the Fourth Century.* Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool

Hekster, O. (2002). *Commodus: An emperor at the crossroads*. BRILL.

Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. (2017). Favorinus and Herodes Atticus. *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford

Hollerich, M. J. (2021). *Making Christian History: Eusebius of Caesarea and His Readers* (1st ed., Vol. 11). University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1npx3nfMore below.

Honoré, Tony. (1979). “’Imperial’ Rescripts A.D. 193-305: Authorship and Authenticity” *The Journal of Roman Studies vol*. 69

Honoré, Tony. (1986). III. The Making of the Theodosian Code. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Romanistische Abteilung*, *103*(1), 133-222

Honoré, Tony. (1994). *Emperors and Lawyers: with a Paligenesia of Third Century Imperial Rescripts 193-305 AD.* London

Honoré, Tony. (2002). *Ulpian: Pioneer of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Humfress, C. (2005). "Civil Law and Social Life." Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine. Cambridge

Humfress, C. (2014). Laws' Empire: Roman Universalism and Legal Practice. In C. Rapp & H. A. Drake (Eds.), *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity* (pp. 81–108). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ibbetson, D. (2015). Sources of Law from the Republic to the Dominate. In D. Johnston (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law* (pp. 25–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Imrie, Alex. (2018). *The Antonine Constitution: An Edict for the Caracallan Empire. Impact of Empire*, 29. Leiden; Boston

Johnson, William A., and Daniel S. Richter. (2017). 'Periodicity and Scope,' in Daniel S. Richter, and William A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, Oxford

Jones, A.H.M. (1939). '*Civitates liberae et immunes* in the East', in *Anatolian Studies presented to W. H. Buckler*, ed. W. M. Calder and J. Keil, 103–17. Manchester

Jones, A.H.M. (1940). *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*

Jones, A.H.M. (1964). *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*. *Vols. 1-3*. Johns Hopkins University Press

Jones, A.H.M. (1971). *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*

Jones, A.H.M., J.R. Martindale and J. Morris. (1971b). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge

Joyal, M. (2009). *Greek and Roman education: A sourcebook*. Routledge.

Kaldellis, A. (2004). *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, history, and philosophy at the end of antiquity*. University of Pennsylvania Press. doi: 10.9783/9780812202410

Kaldellis, A. (2007). *Hellenism in Byzantium: The transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition*. Cambridge University Press

Kaldellis, A. (2015). *The Byzantine Republic: People and power in New Rome*. Harvard University Press. Unspecified: 40024490335

Kaldellis, A. (2023). *The field armies of the East Roman Empire, 361-630*. Cambridge University Press

Kaldellis, A. and Marion Kruse. (2021). *The New Roman Empire: A History of Byzantium* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197549322.001.0001

Kantor, Georgy. (2015). “Greek Law under the Romans.” *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*. Oxford

Katsari, C. (2003). Organisation of Roman mints during the third century CE: The eastern provinces. *Classics Ireland*, 10, 27–53.

(2011). *The Roman Monetary System: The Eastern Provinces from the First to the Third Century AD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kelly, Christopher. (2005). Bureaucracy and Government. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kelly, Gavin. (2023). Ammianus Marcellinus, Speeches, and Rhetoric. *Rhetoric and Histography in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lieve van Hoof and Maria Conterno. Peeters Publishers

Kim, Lawrence. (2019). Atticism and Asianism. in Daniel S. Richter, and William A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, Oxford Handbooks (2017; online edn, Oxford Academic, 6 Nov. 2017)

Kleiner, D. E. E. (1992). *Roman sculpture*. Yale University Press

König, I. (1974). Die Berufung des Constantius Chlorus und des Galerius zu Caesaren: Gedanken zur Entstehung der ersten Tetrarchie. *Chiron*, 4, 567–576.

Kovács, Péter. (2010). A Phygrian in the Pannonian Army- Some Notes on the Stela SEG 31, 1116. *Anodos, Studies of the Ancient World.* Trnavská univerzita

Kulikowski, M. (2016). *The triumph of empire: The Roman world from Hadrian to Constantine*. Harvard University Press

Kyrtatas, D. J. (2020). Religious Conflict in Roman Nicomedia. In M. J. Kelly & M. Burrows (Eds.), *Urban Interactions: Communication and Competition in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (pp. 147–180). Punctum Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv19cwdm9.8

Leadbetter, B. (2009). *Galerius and the will of Diocletian*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lee, A. D. (2007). *War in late antiquity: A social history*. Blackwell Pub

Lehne-Gstreinthaler, Christine. (2016). Jurists in the Shadows: The Everyday Business of the Jurists of Cicero's Time. Cicero's Law: Rethinking Roman Law of the Late Republic. Edinburgh

Lenski, Noel. (2005). The Reign of Constantine. In N. Lenski (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (pp. 59–90). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lenski, Noel. (2016). Approaching Constantine: The Orcistus Dossier. In *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics* (pp. 87–113). University of Pennsylvania Press

Levick, B. M. (1958). 'Two Pisidian Colonial Families', JRS 48 (1958), 74–8 at 74)

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. (1972). *Antioch: City and imperial administration in the later Roman Empire*. Clarendon Press

Madsen, J. M. (2009). *Eager to be Roman Greek response to Roman rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. Duckworth. doi: 10.5040/9781472540669

Magie, David. (1950). *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*. Hallmannsecker

Martin and Anna Heller. (2025). "Introduction." *The Oxford handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press

Master, J. (2016). *Provincial soldiers and imperial instability in the histories of Tacitus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Matthews, J. (1989). *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. London: Duckworth.

Matthews, J. (2000). *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code*. Yale University Press

Matthews, John. (2002). *The Roman Empire of Ammianus: with a New Introduction*. Michigan Classical Press

Mennen, I. (2011). *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193-284*. Brill. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w76vsp

Merola, Giovanna. (2023). The Legal Status of the Greek *Poleis* in the Roman Empire. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*, Oxford

Millar, Fergus. (1964). *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Millar, Fergus. (1993). *The Roman Near East*. Harvard University Press

Millar, Fergus. (2002). P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions. *Rome, the Greek World, and the East.* University of North Carolina Press

Millar, Fergus. (2006). *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and belief under Theodosius II (408-450)*. University of California Press. International Article Number: 9780520247031

Mitchel. (1983), *Armies and frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia: Proceedings of a colloquium held at University College, Swansea in April 1981*

Mitchell, Stephen. (1988). “Maximinus and the Christians in A.D. 312: A New Latin Inscription.” *The Journal of Roman Studies 78* (1988): 105–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/301453

Mitchell, Stephen. (1995). *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. Clarendon

Mitchell, S. and Greatrex, G. (2023). *A History of the Later Roman Empire, AD 284-700* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ

Mitropoulos, Giorgos. (2022). Politics of the Past: Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in Achaea. *The Province of Achaea in the 2nd Century CE*. Routledge

Morgan, T. (1998). *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*. Cambridge University Press

Noreña, C. F. (2011). *Imperial ideals in the Roman West: Representation, circulation, power*. Cambridge University Press.

Norman, A.F. (2000). *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture, as Observed by Libanius.* Liverpool

Oliver, J. H. (1953). The Ruling Power: A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, *43*(4), 871–1003. https://doi.org/10.2307/1005702

Oliver, G. J. (2007). Citizenship: inscribed honours for individuals in Classical and Hellenistic Athens. In J.-C. Couvenhes & S. Milanezi (Eds.), *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate* (1–). Presses universitaires François-Rabelais. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pufr.2899

Oudot, Estelle. (2017). Aelius Aristides. *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford

Peachin. (2006). Rome the Superpower: 96-235 CE. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Blackwell

Pernot, L., & Higgins, W. E. (2005). Conclusion: The Heritage of Greco-Roman Rhetoric. In *Rhetoric in Antiquity* (pp. 202–214). Catholic University of America Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt284x1w.11

Phang, Sara. (2001). *The Marriage of Roman Soldiers (13 B.C.-A.D. 235).* Brill

Phang, Sara.(2007). “Military Documents, Languages, and Literary.” *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell

Pharr, C. (1952). “Minutes of the Senate.” *Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Princeton, Princeton University Press

Pollard, N. (2000). *Soldiers, cities, and civilians in Roman Syria*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Potter, David. (1990). *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire: A Historical Commentary on the Thirteenth Sibyline Oracle*. Clarendon Press

Potter, David. (2006). The Transformation of the Empire: 235-337 CE. *A Companion to the Roman Empire*

Price, Simon. (1984). *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge University Press

Puech. (2002) Orateurs et Sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’epoque imperial. *Textes et traditions 4*, Paris, Vrin. 140–145.

Rance, Philip. (2022). Simplicaitas militaris: Ammianus Marcellinus and sermo castrensis. *Ammianus Marcellinus from Soldier to Author*. Brill

Rees, R. (1993). Images and image: A re-examination of tetrarchic iconography. *Greece & Rome*, 40(2), 181–200.

Rees, R. (2004). *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh University Press.

Rees, R. (1993). Images and Image: A Re-Examination of Tetrarchic Iconography. *Greece & Rome*, *40*(2), 181–200

Reinmuth, O. W. (1929). *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebia*, University of Nebraska Studies in Language

Reinmuth, O. W. (1948). The Ephebate and Citizenship in Attica. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, *79*, 211–231. https://doi.org/10.2307/283362

Remijsen, S. (2015). Looking at Athletics in the Fourth Century: The Unification of the Spectacle Landscape in East and West. In R. Dijkstra, S. van Poppel, & D. Slootjes (Eds.), *East and West in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century: An End to Unity?* (pp. 121–146). Brill. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w8h14q.12

Reynolds, JRA (2000), nos 1-4, whence *SEG* 50 2000.1096. Comments by D. Campanile, ZPE 135 (2001) 136-138

Reynolds, J. M. (1987). *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek inscriptions with commentary: Texts from the excavations at Aphrodisias conducted by Kenan T. Erim*. Cambridge Philological Society

Richter, D. S., and W. A. Johnson, eds. (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford

Richardson, John. (2016). Provincial Administration. *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Law and Society.* Edited by Paul J. du Plessis. Oxford University Press

Riggsby, A. M. (2010). *Roman law and the legal world of the Romans*. Cambridge University Press.

Romano, D. G. (2003). City Planning, Centuriation, and Land Division in Roman Corinth: Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis & Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis. *Corinth*, *20*, 279–301. https://doi.org/10.2307/4390729

Romeo, I. (2002). The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece. *Classical Philology*, *97*(1), 21–40. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1215544

Rousseau, P. (1998). *Basil of Caesarea.* Retrieved from https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.emory.edu/2027/heb08380.0001.001

Sansone, D. (2017). *Ancient Greek civilization*. Wiley-Blackwell

Seeck, O. (1891). Die Erhebung des Maximianus zu Augustus. In *Commentationes Wolßinianae* (pp. 33–36). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Sheppard, A. R. R. (1984). Homonoia in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire. "*Ancient Society*, *15/17*, 229–252. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44080243

Sherwin-White, A. N. (1973). *The Roman citizenship*. Clarendon Press.

Sherwin-White, A. (1984). *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*. Duckworth

Simon, J. (2011). *The defense of the Roman and eastern frontiers: A reassessment of Roman military strategy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sirks, A. J. B. (2015). Public Law. In D. Johnston (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law* (pp. 332–352). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Smith, R. R. R. (1998). Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, *88*, 56–93

Sommer, Michael. (2018). *Palmryra: A History*. Routledge

Spawforth, A. J. S. (2011). *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Stickler, Timo. (2007). “The Foederati.” *The Companion to the Roman Army*. Wiley Blackwell

Strobel, K. (2007). Strategy and army structure between Septimius Severus and Constantine the Great. In P. Erdkamp (Ed.), *A companion to the Roman army* (pp. 268–291). Blackwell Publishing.

Sutherland, C. H. V. (1967). *The Roman imperial coinage* (Vol. VI). London: Spink & Son Ltd.

Speidel, M. A. (2023). Learning Latin in the Roman Army. *Social Factors in the Latinization of the Roman West*

Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. Oxford

Szabat, Elzbieta. (2015). “Late Antiquity and the Transmission of Educational Ideals and Methods,” *A companion to Ancient Education*

Thorne, James. (2007). Battle, Tactics, and the *Limites* in the West. Companion to the Roman Army. Wiley Blackwell.

Tomlin, R. (2008). A. H. M. Jones and the army of the fourth century. In D. Hunt & J. Drinkwater (Eds.), *A. H. M. Jones and the later Roman empire* (pp. 145–160). Brill.

Too, Yun Lee, editor. *(2001). Education in Greek and Roman antiquity*. (2001). Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789047400134

Westbrook, Raymond and F. Rachel Magdalene, & Bruce Wells. (2009). *Law From the Tigris to the Tiber : The Writings of Raymond Westbrook*. Eisenbrauns.

Van Dam, R. (2003). Listening to the Audience: The Six Days of Creation. In *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (pp. 105–131). University of Pennsylvania Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhjnf.14

Watson, Alaric. (1999). *Aurelian and the Third Century*. Routledge

Watts, E. J. (2006). *City and school in late antique Athens and Alexandria*. University of California Press

Wheeler, E. L. (2007). The army and the limes in the east. In P. Erdkamp (Ed.), *A companion to the Roman army* (pp. 214–233). Blackwell Publishing.

Whitby, M. (2007). Strategy and army structure between Septimius Severus and Constantine the Great. In P. Erdkamp (Ed.), *A companion to the Roman army* (pp. 268–291). Blackwell Publishing.

Whitmarsh, Tim. (2001). Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Whitmarsh, T. (2005). *The second sophistic*. Oxford University Press, published for the Classical Association

Williams, Guy. (2022). Xenophon and Ammianus: Two Soldier-Historians and Their Persian Expeditions. *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill

Williams, M. F. (1997). Four mutinies: Tacitus' *Annals* 1.16-30; 1.31-49 and Ammianus Marcellinus' *Res gestae* 20.4.9-20.5.7; 24.3.1-8. *Phoenix*, 51(1), 44–74.

Williams, Stephen. (1985). *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*. BT Batsford, Ltd

Wilshire, L. E. (1973). Did Ammianus Marcellinus write a continuation of Tacitus? *The Classical Journal*, 68(3), 221–227.

Wolfram Kinzig. (2021). *Christian Persecution in Antiquity*. Baylor University Press

Woods, David and M.P. Hanaghan, editors. (2022). *Ammianus Marcellinus from soldier to author*. Brill. doi: 10.1163/9789004525351

Woolf, G. (1994). Becoming Roman, staying Greek: Culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, *40*(40), 116–143. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500001875

Woolf, G. (2006). *Et tu, Brute?: The murder of Caesar and political assassination*. Profile Books. International Article Number: 9781861977410

Youni, Maria S. (2010). Transforming Greek practice into Roman Law: Manumissions in Roman Macedonia. *The Legal History Review 78* (2010), 311-340: Brill

Zanker, P. (1992). Btirgerliche Selbstdarstellung am Grab im romischen Kaiserreich, in *H. -J. Schalles, H. von Hesberg and P. Zanker, Die rdmische Stadt* in 2.Jahrhundert n.Chr.: Der Funktionswandel des offentliche

Zuiderhoek, A. (2009). Government Centralization in Late Second and Third Century a. d. Asia Minor: A Working Hypothesis. *The Classical World*, *103*(1), 39–51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40599902