Introduction

In September, 2011, a multinational contingent of scholars gathered at the Australian National University in Canberra, Australia, for a conference in honour of Professor Erich Gruen. The present volume bears the same title as the conference itself – an admittedly insufficient attempt to capture the sheer diversity of Erich's scholarly interests and expertise over a long and illustrious career. Invited speakers included Erich's direct scholarly progeny (his students as well as students of his students) and many scholars whose work bears the indelible mark of his enormous influence in the field of ancient world studies over the course of almost a half-century.

The present volume contains twelve of the seventeen papers delivered over the three-day period of the conference. Unfortunately conference proceedings cannot capture the spirit of camaraderie, and especially the lively and inspiring discussions that followed each paper, in which Erich, in typical Gruen fashion, asked the first and most incisive questions, forcing speakers to dig deeper and think more carefully about their cherished hypotheses and guiding assumptions. Erich also bore criticisms of his own work with his usual good grace and generosity of spirit.

The papers herein are organised thematically around Erich Gruen's diverse scholarly interests. The first two papers, including Gruen's own contribution, treat aspects of his most recent scholarly preoccupation – ethnic identity in the ancient world (see, for example, E.S. Gruen, *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*, and E.S. Gruen [ed.], *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, both published in 2011). Erich's paper builds on the insights of these works, challenging the recent trend in ancient world scholarship (represented best by Benjamin Isaac's brilliant *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* [2004]) that regards ancient Greek and Roman attitudes towards the Other as 'racist' (or at least 'proto-racist') in the modern sense. Gruen persuasively argues that apparently racist comments by Roman authors cherry-picked by modern scholars from their rhetorical and satirical contexts tell us less about Roman attitudes towards the Other than the overwhelming evidence for Roman tolerance of Others, as manifested in a founding narrative that stressed – and celebrated, to the point of outright invention – Rome's polyglot origins and the incorporation of enormous numbers of ex-slaves of diverse origins into the Roman citizen body. Gruen emphasises, as he has done since the early 1990s (see his *Studies in Greek*

Antichthon 47 (2013) i-vi

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Culture and Roman Policy [1990] and *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* [1992]), that the supremely self-confident Romans of the middle and late Republic, with the conquest of the larger Mediterranean world under their belts, simply lacked the incentive to vilify Others, who represented no threat, military or cultural, to Roman self-esteem. The Romans could afford to embrace diversity.

Meg Miller's essay continues the theme of ethnic identity, but shifts the focus to Asia Minor, on the western fringes of the Persian empire in the fourth century BCE. On the basis of newly discovered archaeological material, Miller argues that several Anatolian peoples within the Persian empire (Lydians, Phrygians, Lycians and Carians), and, somewhat more surprisingly, Ionian Greeks outside the empire voluntarily adopted elements of Persian dress while at the same time retaining markers – sartorial and otherwise – of their distinct native cultures. This simultaneous identification with and distancing from the culture of the hegemon in terms of dress – or to use Miller's brilliant neologism, 'sartorial bilingualism' – may be paralleled in other syncretic cultural phenomena, such as the assimilation of the Graeco-Roman pantheon into indigenous religious systems and the adoption of classicising artistic motifs and techniques in the Roman West.

The five essays which follow build on Erich Gruen's core contributions to the study of the Roman Republican politics and society, most notably 1968's *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts, 149 – 78 B.C.* and 1974's ground-breaking *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Ian Betts and Bruce Marshall challenge the view put forward in the former book that the *lex Calpurnia* of 149 BC was promulgated by the senate largely in response to what it saw as a challenge to its authority in the area of foreign policy by Roman tribunes, who in recent years had stirred up the populace against abusive governors. According to Betts and Marshall, the senate had, in fact, tried to punish corrupt governors 'in house' for 25 years or more – long before the egregious conduct of Sulpicius Galba (cos. 150), which Gruen regarded as the catalyst for the *lex* of 149. The second half of the paper deals with the vexed question of whether foreigners with no standing in Roman law could lay evidence against corrupt governors under the *lex*. They conclude that it was not until the so-called 'Epigraphic Law' of 122 that such privileges were granted to *peregrini* and that the passage of the largely ineffectual and impractical *lex Calpurnia* was a token gesture designed to mollify and re-assure aggrieved provincials of the Roman senate's ongoing *fides* towards them.

The paper by Lea Beness and Tom Hillard also takes as its starting point Gruen's *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts*, focusing in particular on that standard tool of Roman court orators – political invective. In an intriguing and innovative essay, Beness and Hillard argue that Gaius Gracchus' well known defence of his mother against the attacks of one of his political enemies (Sen. *Dial.* 12.16.6; Plut. *CG* 4.3-4) refers quite specifically to a birth defect suffered by Cornelia hinted at in other sources (Plin. *NH*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7.69; Solin. 1.67): fused genitalia or genital atresia. Although the problem was eventually resolved (perhaps delaying Cornelia's procreativity by many years after her marriage to Ti. Sempronius Gracchus the Elder), and a super-abundance of offspring (twelve children in all) followed, the rumours of Gracchus' and Cornelia's ill-omened union persisted – and indeed reached new heights after the crisis of 133 which witnessed the murder of their eldest son.

Kathryn Welch and Hannah Mitchell revisit the issue (discussed by Gruen in 1998) of whether Alexander the Great was a major aspirational influence on Julius Caesar, and especially on Pompey the Great. In contrast to Gruen, who argued that the Romans (and in particular these two men) were too supremely self-confident as masters of the world to need Alexander as a model, Welch and Mitchell argue that, paradoxical as it might seem (given the strong ideological aversion to monarchy in Roman popular culture – to say nothing of the deeply ambiguous posthumous reputation of Alexander himself), Caesar and Pompey both cultivated associations with the Macedonian king in their rivalry against each other. The authors stake out a middle ground here between earlier scholarship (for example, D. Michel's 1967 study, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius*), which overstated the mania for *imitatio Alexandri* in the late Republic and early Empire, and the studied agnosticism on the issue of Gruen, Peter Green and D.J. Martin. In their call for a return to a balanced picture, Welch and Mitchell engage in some *imitatio* of their own, specifically of Erich Gruen himself, whose recent work on ethnic identity, as was seen earlier, attempts to inject some balance into recent debates over purported ancient Greek and Roman racism.

Martin Stone's paper attempts to grapple with one of the perennial mysteries of the late Republican *fasti*: when did M. Licinius Crassus (cos. 70) hold his praetorship? In *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Gruen argued tentatively for 73, a view that has become canonical. Stone, however, argues that for a man of Crassus' stature not to have achieved the praetorship 'in his own year', that is, (most likely) in 75, would have raised some eyebrows and at least called for comment by historians, among others Plutarch in his *Life of Crassus*. Stone's careful argumentation is a model of case-building from circumstantial (though clearly suggestive) evidence. As Gruen himself has done repeatedly, Stone squeezes every last drop of information from the spotty record and reminds us how scholarly received opinion can ossify into established fact until someone with a lifetime of scholarly insight and intellectual courage is willing to set the accretion of opinion aside and start all over again from scratch.

Tom Stevenson's contribution is a response to Gruen's chapter in the *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (2005), where it is argued that Augustus, who wanted to avoid giving the impression that he was building a political dynasty based around his own family, avoided public pronouncements about (political) succession for as long as he could. In yet another call

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for balance and a restoration of the centre in this volume, Stevenson argues that there can be little doubt that for decades Augustus was engaged in a conscious effort to ensure that one of his own blood would succeed him, not simply in the conventional aristocratic sense of appointing the next *paterfamilias* and all that entailed, but more importantly in a political sense, that is, someone who could inherit his enormous authority in the Roman state (which was often assimilated to the *domus Augusta* itself). Despite the ideological opposition to monarchy in Roman popular culture, the perpetuation of political stability that Augustus' personal authority ensured was so desirable to most Romans that they probably welcomed state succession planning more than they feared it. Through his fierce concentration on the primogeniture of men of Julian blood, his anomalous focus on endogamous marriages within the imperial family itself and the distribution of political and military responsibilities and powers to the men of his immediate family, Augustus demonstrated his determination to establish a ruling dynasty for the Julian house.

The following two papers by Sarah Pearce and James McLaren shift the focus to another area of Gruen's scholarly interest, the Jews of antiquity and their engagement with the Graeco-Roman world (see E.S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* [1998] and *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* [2002]). Pearce, an expert on Philo of Alexandria, takes up the challenge of the former book in a paper focused on where Philo stood on the subject of Jewish intermarriage with non-Jews. Like Gruen, Pearce sees Jewish intellectuals like Philo operating in a cosmopolitan, Hellenising milieu, engaging with the Greek philosophical and cultural legacy and using it to build up Jewish self-esteem and communal identity in a solidly Graeco-Roman world. So Philo's discussion of the ban on intermarriage substitutes terms and concepts borrowed from Plato's epistemology for the rougher and readier discourse of the Pentateuch and Torah (so the Platonic 'unlearning' replaces the Pentateuch's 'whoring after', and so on). Although Philo's preoccupation with intermarriage can tell us little about the actual situation on the ground in cosmopolitan Alexandria in the first century AD, what it does show is a Jewish intellectual harnessing the power of the Greek philosophical traditions for the purpose of strengthening a diasporic Jewish community and its spiritual heritage.

James McLaren's piece on the Jews in Flavian Rome puts forward the arresting image of Roman Jews after the suppression of the Jewish revolt being surrounded by the signs of their humiliation, defeat and subjection, like the imagery on the Arch of Titus, depicting the bloody spoils and sacred objects wrenched from the destroyed Temple in Jerusalem. Here McLaren builds on and challenges Gruen's work in *Diaspora*, where it is shown that the Jews were no more or less visible in Rome (and thus apparently felt no more or less threatened) after the Jewish Revolt than before it, and that, at least in terms of the literary evidence, the Romans exhibited no greater hostility to the Jews of Rome after the revolt. McLaren then shifts the focus

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

back from monuments to texts, and in particular Josephus' account of the Jewish War. McLaren, taking his cue from Tessa Rajak, who in recent years has urged a more balanced view of Josephus, persuasively argues that the Jewish writer offered the Jews of Rome a counter-narrative to the monumental narrative created by the Flavian dynasty in the city in order to help them deal with their defeat and their unprecedented visibility, as well as to affirm the Jewish way of life, their faith and traditions, and especially the ongoing power of their god.

The final three essays of the collection deal with the theme of Roman imperialism, a major focus of Gruen's research over the years, but especially in his massive and magisterial *Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (1984). Arthur Eckstein, a student of Gruen's at Berkeley in the 1970s, contributes a paper that builds on the insights of his recent books, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome* (2006) and *Rome Enters the Greek East: from Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-170 BC* (2008). Using modern International Relations (IR) Realist theory to explore Roman imperialism, Eckstein argues that even after 188 BC, when Roman unipolarity had been achieved in the Mediterranean, the Greek states still did not have to dance to Rome's tune, and in fact emerged as far more powerful than they had been before the wars against the Macedonian and Seleucid monarchies. The Romans' top priority in the period 188-167 was the prevention of the emergence of a peer competitor or a coalition of hostile Greek states. Neither of these eventuated, with the result that Rome's involvement in the Greek east was for the most part limited to infrequent and/or ineffective diplomatic interventions, while the Greeks themselves enjoyed an unprecedented period of political stability. The Romans and Greeks could continue to speak to each other on a level of (relative) equality, and Roman control was limited, in modern taxonomy, to a 'sphere of influence' east of the Adriatic.

Peter Edwell's discussion of the upper Euphrates as a frontier between the Parthian and Roman empires is a welcome clarification of exactly where the late Republican/early Imperial eastern frontier was located. Building on John Richardson's recent book, *The Language of Empire* (2008), Edwell argues that the negotiation of the upper Euphrates frontier in this period influenced semantic shifts in the term *imperium* itself. Unlike Richardson, however, Edwell suggests that the meaning of *imperium* in the corporate sense of the power of the Roman people did not originate under Augustus but considerably earlier, in the 50s BC, when the Romans and Parthians began to negotiate (by force and diplomacy) the location and shape of the frontier between their empires. Alongside this development, and for much the same reasons, there also emerged in the same period the concept of the *Imperium Romanum*, the Roman Empire as a territorial unit. Edwell applies his findings to the archaeological record of Dura-Europus on the middle Euphrates to demonstrate that that city was not, contrary to earlier interpretations, a site of Roman-Parthian military competition in the mid-first century BC. On

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Edwell's revised chronology, Dura was probably under Parthian control from the last few decades of the second century BC to the first few decades of the first, after which it was lost to the Parthians and fell under increasing Roman political and economic influence in the decades that followed.

The final paper of the collection belongs to the volume's Guest Editor, himself in turn a student of Eckstein's. Both Gruen's *Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* and the Editor's *Friendship and Empire: Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 BC)* (2011) left neglected the perhaps unresolvable question of when the international friendship (*amicitia*) between Athens and Roman began. The paper included here attempts to establish a plausible date range for this event, placing it within the context of Roman coalition-building during the First Macedonian War, rather than a few decades earlier or around 200 BC, as has usually been argued. A pre-200 date for the establishment of *amicitia* is necessary in order for the dynamics of the Roman-Athenian diplomatic interactions leading up to the outbreak of the Second Macedonian War to make sense. In 200, when the Athenians asked for Roman protection against the aggressions of Philip V, they did so in virtue of having a prior claim on Roman *fides* and *amicitia* extending back to at least 209 or 208.

* * * * * *

The 2011 conference was one of the most personally and professionally fulfilling experiences of my career thus far – a chance to catch up with old friends from Australia and abroad and to meet new ones, as well as a stimulus to further research. Thanks above all are due to our special invited guests, Erich himself, my mentor and PhD supervisor Art Eckstein and, one of the afore-mentioned new friends, Sarah Pearce. Massive logistical support was provided by Bruce Marshall, whose tireless efforts to construct an elegant and balanced program for the conference and keep us all in line and on time carried over to the process of editing and assembling this collection of papers. The administrative staff at the ANU School of Cultural Inquiry were invaluable assistants as well; Jennifer Beattie's formidable organisational skills and Lalitha Foster's artistic vision in particular must be acknowledged. Major funding was provided by the ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences and the Australasian Society for Classical Studies. Finally, I would like to thank all attendees, presenters and session chairs for making the conference such a memorable occasion, and the contributors to this volume for their hard work, punctuality and timely responses to the Guest Editor's impatient requests and persistent inquiries.

The Australian National University PAUL J. BURTON

Paul.Burton@anu.edu.au

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000228 Published online by Cambridge University Press