In Livy, Cn. Manlius Volso, cos. 189 B.C., is able to use the example of Tarentum as part of an argument from eugenics designed to convince his troops that the Celts who had migrated to Galatia are nothing to fear: *Tarentinis quid ex Spartana dura illa et horrida disciplina mansit?* ('What has remained to the Tarentines of that hard and rugged Spartan discipline?') (38.17.12). Tarentum, among other *exempla*, proves Volso's maxim that 'whatever grows in its own proper place is sounder (*generosius*); transplanted to soil alien to it, its nature changes and it deteriorates (*degenerat*) towards that in which it is nourished.'

Once again the sentiments resonate with the Regulus Ode. In Horace's poem, too, Tarentum, a town that has lost its essence, is an object lesson in the consequences of not maintaining links with the past.[11] The last two words of 3.5, *Lacedaemonium Tarentum*, encode a peremptory admonition to the reading Roman which encapsulates the stark moral of this Roman Ode: show respect for the past, maintain the Roman way—or go the way of Tarentum.

Brasenose College, Oxford LLEWELYN MORGAN
llewelyn.morgan@bnc.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi030

WHY DIDN'T CONSTANTIUS II EAT FRUIT?

At the end of his obituary notice on the death of the emperor Constantius II, Ammianus Marcellinus follows his usual practice in presenting first the virtues of the emperor, and then his vices. Among the former, Ammianus includes the following: *Quod autem nec os tersisse umquam vel nares in publico nec spuisse nec transtulisse in partem alterutram vultum aliquando est visus, nec pomorum quoad vixerat, gustaverit, ut dicta saepius praetermitto* (21.16.7).[1] Ammianus had, indeed, previously described Constantius' self-control in refraining from spitting, wiping his nose, or moving his head in public, in his elaborate portrayal of the emperor's *adventus* into Rome in 357 (16.10). The avoidance of these three activities had also been enjoined upon Persian grandees by Xenophon's fictionalized Cyrus long before, but Cyrus appears to have been utterly unconcerned about his associates' consumption of fruit.[2] Frakes has argued that Ammianus' formulaic use of the word *dicta* suggests that the historian discussed the emperor's curious abstention from fruit in an

[11] Comparable to Tarentum is Croton, another eighth-century Greek colony on the Golfo di Taranto, also proverbially in decline (Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 2.1.1; Livy 23.30.6). F. I. Zeitlin, 'Romanus Petronius: a study of the Troiae Halosis and the Bellum Civile', *Latomus* 30 (1971), 56–82, at 67–73, considers Petronius' Croton, *urbem antiquissimam et aliquando Italiae primam* which is now given over entirely to *captatio* (*Sat.* 116). For Zeitlin it is, like Horace's Tarentum according to my argument, a city bearing comparison with Rome, but whether as a type or anti-type is in each case rather up to the Romans. The most notoriously hedonistic southern Italian city of all, Sybaris, also stood on this stretch of coast, and also receives a narrative of decline from Strabo (6.1.13), although this original foundation no longer stood in Horace's day.

[1] 'That no one ever saw him wipe his mouth or nose in public, or spit, or turn his face in either direction, or that so long as he lived he never tasted fruit, I leave unmentioned, since it has often been related' (trans. J. C. Rolfe).

[2] Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.41; M. P. Charlesworth, 'Imperial deportment: two texts and some questions', *JRS* 37 (1947), 34–8; J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), 231–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

earlier, now lost, portion of the work.[3] Why and how did Ammianus discuss this phenomenon in that lost section?

Scholarly attention to this question has been lacking. The Dutch commentators on the passage provide some suggestions, but their note is inadequate.[4] They begin with the bald claim that 'This is not a token of some allergy or a curious piece of religiously coloured abstinence.' They then claim that excessive fruit consumption was a sign of gluttony, offering two citations from the *Historia Augusta* in support. Finally, they add that it is 'also quite possible that Constantius' abstinence from fruit has a medical background', arguing that the medical literature presents the eating of fruit as 'somewhat risky' and noting that Nero's musical career required him to abstain from eating apples (Suet. *Ner.* 20.1). Let us examine these contentions.

In the endless catalogues of gluttony found in the *Historia Augusta*, fruit plays a vanishingly small role. In general, fruit serves to suggest luxury and excess in Roman dining only when grouped with many other foods (*HA Clod. Alb.* 11.2) or when emphasis is placed on the eating of fresh fruit out of season (*HA Gall.* 16.2). Fruit plays little part in Trimalchio's feast, and orchard fruits receive very little attention in the cookbook ascribed to Apicius, which is dominated by recipes for meat, poultry, and vegetables flavoured with spices. Thus, moderate fruit consumption would not serve well as a proxy for moderate eating in general, and complete abstention from fruit would be a most unusual way of demonstrating a lack of gluttony.

Medical treatises provide some information about the nature of fruit and its role in proper diets. Fruit is not portrayed, however, as a particularly dangerous or problematic food. In a single passage in Celsus it is suggested that some believe that eating fruit in autumn might be unhealthy, but Celsus argues that problems arise only when fruit is eaten to the exclusion of other foods (1.3.38). This has a parallel in a discussion in Galen about a man who claims that eating harsh pears and apples causes diarrhoea (Gal. *De Al. Fac.* 2.22 = Kühn 598—601). Galen demonstrates that a properly ordered diet eliminates the problem. Despite these rare references to problems with fruit, there appears to be no particular malady which Constantius would have suffered that would have demanded complete abstinence.

It is not entirely impossible that Constantius was allergic to fruit; such allergies exist, but they are rare.[5] It is unclear why such an allergy would be public knowledge, or in what context Ammianus would have mentioned it. Unlike Nero, Constantius had no musical career that would require a restricted diet; rather, the emperor's forays into culture consisted of oratory and versification (Amm. Marc. 21.16.4).

Although the Dutch commentators on the Ammianus passage dismiss religion peremptorily, religion provides a well-recognized motive for abstention from various foods, as opposed to mere moderation in their consumption.[6] Earlier in the obituary Ammianus had praised Constantius' moderation in eating and his sexual restraint,

[3] R. M. Frakes, 'Ammianus Marcellinus XXI.16.7: A Re-examination', *Hermes* 122 (1994), 253–6.

[4] J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, and H.C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI* (Groningen, 1991), ad loc.

[5] Food allergy is much rarer than commonly believed. Studies have found that only 3 per cent of infants (who are more likely to have allergies than adults) have persistent adverse reactions to any foods: J. E. Perkin, *Food Allergies and Adverse Reactions* (Gainesville, 1990), 1, with nn. 3 and 4. According to Frederic Speer, 'Food allergy: the 10 most common offenders', *American Family Physician* 13 (1972), 112, fruit, including 'plum, cherry, apricot, cranberry, blueberry, and fig', is classified among the foods least likely to act as an allergen.

[6] For example, F. J. Simoons, *Eat not this Flesh: Food Avoidances in the Old World* (Madison, 1961); V. E. Grimm, *From Feasting to Fasting, the Evolution of a Sin: Attitudes*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both typical forms of Christian renunciation that Ammianus had recast to avoid mention of Christianity (21.16.5—6).[7] One might likewise expect Ammianus to obfuscate any Christian origins of Constantius' dietary restrictions.

Evidence for fruit abstention among Christians is lacking, however. Among extreme ascetics of the sort chronicled by Theodoret in his *Religious History*, for example, monks first avoided meat and wine (in accordance with Romans 14 : 21) and then at a more advanced stage rejected cooked food in any form. Thus the monk Abraham rejected bread, pulses, cooked vegetables, and even water, subsisting on lettuce and other raw vegetables, but nevertheless adding fruit to his diet when it was in season (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* 17.6). Clearly Constantius could not have sought to surpass a renunciant of this calibre.

Jerome's treatise *Against Jovinian* provides further support for the inclusion of fruit in a balanced Christian ascetic diet. In seeking to defend asceticism, Jerome provides a wide-ranging ethnographical and historical survey of food avoidances in antiquity. He repeatedly contrasts the luxurious eating of meat and other delicacies with the simplicity of vegetables and fruits (*adv. Iovinian.* 2.11, 2.13, 2.14) and argues that even after the Fall, Adam continued to abstain from meat-eating, and merely added vegetables to the fruit that was already found in his paradisiacal diet (2.15).

There was, however, another contemporary religion in which fruit-eating was problematic: Manichaeism. In his *Confessions* (3.10.18), Augustine mocks the Manichaean belief that the particles of light are bound up in a piece of fruit, and that the sap of the fig tree represents the weeping of the tree at its fruit being plucked (cf. August. *En. Ps.* 140.12). In fact, fruit, vegetables, and grains were all forbidden to be plucked or harvested by the Manichaean Elect, because Mani had preached that harvesting was injurious to the suffering, captive divinity.[8] A stress on fruit in particular may have arisen among critics of Manichaeism both because Manichees believed that 'bright colour, pleasant odour, and sweet taste' were special marks of life in plant foods (August. *De. Mor. Man.* 15.39) and because Christian–Manichee disputation often focused on the nature of evil and the validity of the Hebrew Bible, which directed attention to the Fall and the eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge.[9] Augustine frequently mocks his Manichaean opponents for abstaining from fruit.[10]

Constantius II was no Manichee, but an Arian, and the Arian doctrine of the relationship between the Father and Son was in fact even further from that of the

to Food in Late Antiquity (London, 1996); T. M. Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis, 1998).

[7] Various views on the hotly contested subject of Ammianus' treatment of Christianity include Alan Cameron and Averil Cameron, 'Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire', *CQ* 14 (1964), 316–28; T. G. Elliott, *Ammianus Marcellinus and Fourth Century History* (Sarasota, 1983); E. D. Hunt, 'Christians and Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus', *CQ* 35 (1985), 186–200; V. Neri, *Ammiano e il cristianesimo* (Bologna, 1985); J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), 435–51; E. D. Hunt, 'Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus revisited', *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993), 108–13; T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca, NY, 1998), 79–94.

[8] S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey* (Manchester, 1985), 20; J. BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual* (Baltimore, 2000), 76–82.

[9] For example, August. *C. Fort.* 22; R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995), 70–108.

[10] For example, August. *De Mor. Man.* 16.47, 16.58; *C. Faust.* 6.4, 6.8, and cf. *De Mor. Man.* 16.39, 16.43; *C. Faust.* 5.10, 6.6; *De Nat. Bon. C. Man.* 44, 47.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Manichees than was the doctrine of Nicene orthodoxy. Indeed, Lyman has argued that Arianism arose in reaction to Manichaean doctrine.[11] The manifest unfairness, however, of an orthodox Christian accusing an Arian of being a Manichee provided no barrier to such accusations actually taking place.[12] Thus, in Athanasius' many treatises written in opposition to Arians, he repeatedly associates Arianism and Manichaeism[13] and suggests that Arianism logically leads to Manichaeism.[14] He also several times highlights the fact that the imperial official Sebastian, whom he charges with violence against the orthodox, was a Manichee.[15] We might suspect, therefore, that more ephemeral polemics written against the emperor's Arianism would likewise have associated him with Manichaeism, and with the more extravagant practices, such as fruit abstinence, associated with that sect.

Ammianus' brief discussion of Athanasius (15.7) fails entirely to do justice to the conflict between the bishop and Constantius.[16] Some argue that the historian's neglect and distortion of Christianity arise from the perceived impropriety of treating Christianity fully in classicizing history; others place more weight on Ammianus' own malice and prejudice against the religion. Neither view, however, precludes the historian's familiarity with the works of Athanasius and other Nicene opponents of Constantius. Valerio Neri, for example, argues that Ammianus' complaint that Constantius corrupted Christianity, a *religio absoluta et simplex*, with *anilis superstitio*, was derived from pro-Nicene rhetoric.[17] In the west, Manichaeism was considered a variant form of Christianity by proponents as well as detractors, and thus, for example, an anti-Christian Platonist like Alexander of Lycopolis has equal disdain for Manichaeism.[18] A traditionalist like Ammianus would likewise conflate and despise both, and Woods has recently argued that Ammianus had done just that earlier in his work by portraying Strategius Musonianus' involvement in the Arian council of Antioch as an investigation into 'Manichaeism'.[19] In a discussion of Ammianus' hatred of Constantius, Seager notes, 'That the pagan historian should employ Christian lies to blacken a Christian emperor is a pleasing irony.'[20] At 21.6.7, and in the original lost discussion it presupposes, Ammianus seems again, from ignorance or guile or a combination of the two, to have employed Christian polemic for his pagan purposes.

New College of Florida DAVID ROHRBACHER
rohrbacher@ncf.edu
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi031

[11] R. Lyman, 'Arians and Manichees on Christ', *JTS* 40 (1989), 493–503.
[12] R. Van Dam, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Berkeley, 1985), 78–87.
[13] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 66; *Or. C. Ar.* 1.2, 1.53, 2.39, 2.40, 2.41, 2.43, 3.50; *De Syn.* 13, 33; *Ep. Ad Adelph.* 2; cf. Ps.-Athan. *Or. C. Ar.* 4.23.
[14] Athan. *Or. C. Ar.* 1.8, 1.23, 3.35.
[15] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 59, 73; *Ap. De Fug.* 6; cf. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.28.
[16] T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 166–7.
[17] V. Neri, 'Ammianus' definition of Christianity as absoluta et simplex religio', in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, and H.C. Teitler (edd.), *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Amsterdam, 1992), 59–65.
[18] P. W. van der Horst and J. Mansfeld, *An Alexandrian Platonist Against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise 'Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus'* (Leiden, 1974).
[19] D. Woods, 'Strategius and the "Manichaeans"', *CQ* 51 (2001), 255–64.
[20] R. Seager, review of T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality, BMCR* 1999.04.13.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi031 Published online by Cambridge University Press