INTRODUCTION

How perfectly ordinary someone says looking at the same thing or
I'd like to get to the bottom of that one.
from Martha Ronk, "In a Landscape of Having to Repeat"[1]

W HEN SECOND–CENTURY CHRISTIANS PENNED THEIR THOUGHTS, THEY
usually wrote from cities crowded with monumental buildings whose
erection was funded by emperors and elites. These Christian apologists were
concerned with themes of justice, power, culture, and ethnicity; they wrote
about how the world around them blurred the lines between human and divine,
and how it defined piety and proper religious behavior. In the streets, Christians
and their neighbors were jostled amid a growing population of statues that
depicted the wealthy and powerful as gods, or nearly so. Christians among
others crowded into agoras and forums full of architecture that proclaimed the
triumph of the Roman Empire, even as such spaces often retained or repeated
architecture and images from classical Greece and the Hellenistic cities of
Alexander and his successors. Christians among others questioned the truth
and value of these representations.

In this book I bring together literary texts and archaeological remains to
help us to understand how religious discourse emerges not in some abstract
zone, but in lived experiences and practices in the spaces of the world. I read
early Christian writings addressed to the Roman emperors and to the Greeks
in relation to select buildings and images, especially statuary. This juxtaposi-
tion allows me to show how Christians, like their non-Christian neighbors,

[1] Martha Clare Ronk, *In a Landscape of Having to Repeat* (Richmond, CA: Omnidawn, 2004).
    My thanks to the author and to Omnidawn for allowing the use of this quotation.

1

responded to their material world as they negotiated their ethnic, religious, and cultural identities in the Roman Empire. Second-century Christians engaged in diverse struggles over representation. They accused others of using words and images incorrectly; they accused Roman imperial power of misrepresenting its own claims to justice, piety, and even divinity. While Christians were not systematically persecuted in the second century,[2] many Christians wrote about Roman intolerance and commented on the dangers and bravery of proclaiming Christian identity at this time. Christians thus negotiated their place amid the culture wars of the day. These culture wars involved theological debates and had real social, political, and economic effects.

Early Christians "lived and moved and had their being" in the spaces of the Roman Empire. The New Testament Acts of the Apostles puts this Greek philosophical phrase into the mouth of the apostle Paul as he stands on the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17:16–34). In the early second century, Acts crafts a Paul who not only widely travels the spaces of the empire, but also crosses ethnicities and cultures.[3] His Jewish roots mingle with his fluent Greek cultural skills; his Roman citizenship shields his new Christian identity. Paul as hybrid – never singularly Jewish, Greek, or Roman – stands in Athens, the center of Greek culture, under the rule of Rome, preaching the one God of the Jews in what is arguably our first New Testament text to use the term "Christian." Overlooking the ancient agora where Socrates walked, looking down on altars, buildings, and statues, Paul offers a better religious or philosophical way, trying to turn people toward a God who does not dwell in structures made by human hands. This literary moment captures many of the themes of this book: Interactions with the built environment are not neutral, but for some would have provoked struggles over ethnicity and religious identity, ruminations on the deep power and marketability of foreign or ancient cultures in the context of empire, and debates over what is true religiosity.

Like early Christians, we are shaped by the spaces in which we "live and move and have our being." Our responses to the world – ethical, theological, political – are formed not only by our interaction with literature but also, and probably even more, by our interactions with the images and architecture which surround us, by our movements through cities and other spaces. These responses vary, of course, depending upon who we are. There are places where some of us, given the particularities of our bodies, can walk with confidence while others walk with fear, in danger. What is often missing from studies of early Christian literature is this attention to space, architecture, and art – an understanding of the broader material environment in which this

---

[2] See, e.g., Timothy D. Barnes, "Legislation against the Christians," *JRS* 58 (1968) 32–50.
[3] Throughout, my arguments about ethnicity and how ethnic and religious self-definition are inextricable are indebted to Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

literature was written and the varieties of responses that Christians had to
the spaces of empire.[4] Moreover, we do not adequately consider the range of
meanings such spaces may have for various peoples with different privileges of
status, race, and sex.

In this book I tell a story of Christians in the second century at three levels.
Beginning with the broadest spaces of the empire, I focus in the first chapters
on Christian contributions to a rhetoric about the shape and space of the
world. Among others who were writing in Greek, and in the midst of Roman
imperial rhetoric of mapping that was manifest in word and image, Christians
said something about the geography of the world and Roman power over it.
In the next chapters, I shift to the cityscape, turning to certain key cities of
the empire and sites within them that elucidate early Christian debates about
justice, power, religion, and culture. I turn in the final chapters to individual
bodies and statues, body doubles – life-sized and oversized – that deliberately
blur boundaries: Do they depict humans or gods?

CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS AND THE SECOND–CENTURY BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Five Christian texts written in the second century in Greek are the focus of
this book: the Acts of the Apostles, Justin's *Apologies*, Athenagoras's *Embassy*,
Tatian's *To the Greeks*, and Clement of Alexandria's *Exhortation*. Among the
most discussed and earliest Christian "apologies," these texts raise key issues
of Christian identity in relation to Greek and Roman culture. Apologies have
often been interpreted as marginal texts opposing Romans, Greeks, Jews, and
other "heretical" Christians. Alternatively, they have been read as keys to the
earliest Christian theological debates. In both instances, such texts are read as
separate from the surrounding culture. Yet early Christian apologetic literature
is not in any simple sense distinct from or in opposition to contemporaneous
"pagan" culture, an insight that Werner Jaeger among others developed years
ago, but which is too often forgotten.[5] I understand these early Christian
apologists to be full participants in the cultural, ethnic, philosophical, religious,
and political struggles of their time.

The second century was a time when there was an explosion of writing by
the first Christian apologists, some of whom expressed concern about rising

---

[4] See, however, Robin Jensen, *Face to Face: Portraits of the Divine in Early Christianity* (Minneapo-
lis: Fortress, 2005) chaps. 1–2; Yaron Z. Eliav, "Roman Statues, Rabbis, and Graeco-Roman
Culture," in Yaron Z. Eliav and Anita Norich, eds., *Jewish Literatures and Cultures: Context
and Intertext* (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008) 99–115.

[5] Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge: Belknap, 1961); Charly
Clerc, *Les théories relatives au cultes des images chez les auteurs grecs du IIme siècle après J.-C.*
(Paris: Fontemoing, 1915), whose collection of sources I unfortunately discovered only after
having searched through the ancient literature myself.

persecution. Scholars have a penchant for pithy definitions of the second
century. Edward Gibbon described it as "the period in the history of the
world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and
prosperous," sustained by the so-called good emperors.[6] (They were, of course,
not so good, and the empire not so happy, if you happened to be a Jew or
a Christian, among others.) E. R. Dodds, in his 1963 Wiles lectures, instead
characterized the second century as an "age of anxiety," interested as he was in
"religious experience in the Jamesian sense": that is, religion as found in the
heart of the individual person of the second century. He painted the inhabitants
of the Roman Empire as concerned about barbarian incursions and sweaty with
hopes and fears for the immortality of the individual soul.[7] While I am less
inclined to make sweeping statements about a historical epoch, I argue in this
book that we do not find in the second century so much an age of anxiety, as we
find "a landscape of having to repeat," to borrow poet Martha Ronk's phrase.

The second century is famous for its great proliferation – a repetition –
of imperially sponsored building projects, especially under Hadrian. It is also
a time when many sculptures were produced, especially honorific statues of
civic elites, many of which looked like the imperial family and/or re-presented
forms from classical- and Hellenistic-period Greek sculpture.[8] Metropolitan
centers under the Roman Empire, especially in the first through third centuries
CE, were haunted with a ghostly, cool "other population."[9] Pliny, writing in
the first century, complained about the three thousand bronze statues that
aedile M. Scaurus erected on the *scaenae frons* ("scene building") of a theater
(*Nat. hist.* 36.114). Cassius Dio reported that in early first-century Rome "it
was possible for anyone who wanted freely to display themselves in public in
a painting or bronze or stone" to do so.[10] He literally uses the Greek term
for "mob" (ὄχλος) to talk about how many statues there were – a crowd
that clustered in particularly prominent places within the city and hung off its
architecture. Dio lived at the height of statuary proliferation in the late second
and early third century. Perhaps feeling crowded, he celebrates the sobriety
of the first century, when the emperor Claudius insisted that statues could be

[6] Edward Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (2 vols.; Cincinnati: J. A. James, 1840) 1.39.

[7] E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); quotation is from p. 2. See Judith Perkins, *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Self-Representation in the Early Christian Era* (New York: Routledge, 1995) for a different understanding of this second-century rhetoric.

[8] See discussion and nuance in Paul Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity* (trans. Alan Shapiro; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

[9] See esp. Peter Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 1–8, 118, chap. 4: "The Other Population of Rome."

[10] Cassius Dio 60.25.3; ET Ernest Cary and Herbert Baldwin Foster, *Dio Cassius Roman History* (9 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–27) 7.431; see also Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.558, regarding Herodes Atticus and an excess of statues.

erected in Rome only by decree of the Senate or if someone built or repaired a public work.

The statuary mob of which Dio disapproved was not small or easy to miss, but was characterized by "high technical elaboration and finish," usually in polished marble, and by an "imposing scale . . . well over lifesize."[11] Across the empire, and especially in the Greek East, statues were displayed for many reasons, but they were often commissioned and erected to honor the recipient as a benefactor or prominent person in the city. Their final form, like portrait photography today, said subtly through clothing, stance, and hairstyle something about the person's ethnicity, education, wealth, status, religiosity, family connections, and power. Such statues not only acknowledged benefaction or power but also sought to bind the dedicatee, imperial, elite, or just wealthy, even more closely to a city, encouraging further benefaction. Although Dodd's characterization of the second century as an age of anxiety is not quite right – it is too driven by the issue of individual religious experience, a concern more of the twentieth century than the second – there is something anxiously performative about this time period. We find a massive repetition of statuary as if to reassure the city that the gods and true religion exist, and as if to reassure or to assert that the imperial family is in control. Statuary confirms to the elite that they are in power and suggests to the cities that benefit by them that these elites will continue to be here, offering their wealth for the benefit of the city.

This repetition occurs in a world that valued tradition and antiquity over innovation. A new religion would be labeled a *superstitio*, not something truly religious or pious. There was at this time no "anxiety of influence" in producing writings or images but rather a desire to echo prestigious ancient forms. This "landscape of having to repeat," however, should not be dismissed as derivative and thus debased. Scholars have begun to use terms like "emulation" or "repetition" to avoid the derogatory tone of "copying" or "imitation," which misrepresents why such artworks were reproduced.[12] Such

---

[11] R. R. R. Smith, "Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D.," *JRS* 88 (1998) 63; he puts the usual size at 2.10–2.20 m.

[12] See Miranda Marvin, *The Language of the Muses: The Dialogue between Roman and Greek Sculpture* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2008); Elaine Gadza, "Roman Sculpture and the Ethos of Admiration: Reconsidering Repetition," *HSCP* 97 (1995) 121–56; Richard Gordon, "'The Real and the Imaginary': Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World," *Art History* 2 (1979) 5–34; see also Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984); Miranda Marvin, "Copying in Roman Sculpture: The Replica Series," in Eve D'Ambra, ed., *Roman Art in Context: An Anthology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993) 161–88. See also Elaine Gadza, ed., *The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002) and the work of Ellen Perry, *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and the excellent review essay that treats both: Christopher Hallett, "Emulation *versus* replication: redefining Roman copying," *JRA* 18 (2005) 419–35.

evaluative terms arose especially under the influence of eighteenth-century scholar Johann Winckelmann's hierarchical periodization of ancient art, in which the last stage was one of devolved imitation.[13] Roman-period sculptors are often characterized as hacks, copying Greek masterpieces mechanistically, missing the spirit of Greece that breathed life into the original statues and cloaked them in beauty. Such a critique consciously or unconsciously echoes Walter Benjamin's analysis of the loss of "authenticity" and the "aura" of an image in an age of mechanical reproduction.[14]

The Roman period was not a time of blind imitation or copying. These objects had their own context and "authenticity," to use Benjamin's term, even if there was repetition of literary and imagistic themes from classical and Hellenistic Greek culture. Yet because of this landscape of repetition, the second century was also a time of crises of *mimēsis* or representation, crises that had to do with ethnicity, *paideia* (the term for "culture" or "education" in Greek), and piety. How is identity adjudicated? How can one know if someone is Greek? Philosophical? Roman? Barbarian? Cultured? Who is really pious, and who denies the gods, and can the person who denies the gods do so precisely because s/he is pious? Who has the right to give a name, and based upon what criteria? Is a given image a god or a human? An elite or an emperor? How should one respond to the expansion and evolution of imperial cult, in which the imperial family was honored or even worshipped as gods or demi-gods, or at least as similar to the gods? This crisis over representation was visually evident through statuary and other images; for writers like Justin or Athenagoras, it was also manifest in a justice system more interested in names than deeds, and in emperors who claimed to be philosophical and pious but whose actions demonstrated something else entirely.

The second century is also the time when the term "Christian" first appears in our literary evidence – when some Christians come to name themselves as something distinct from Judaism – and when we have the first writings penned by Christians educated in elite Greek learning and culture, who are or want to be in conversation with their educated non-Christian peers. My argument that Christian writers argue about religion *alongside* "pagan" writers is not particularly controversial. Yet, in the study of Christian apologists, the traditional divisions of pagan-Jew-Christian have obscured possible alliances between those of high status who engaged in a culture war about the value of Greek *paideia* in the high Roman Empire. These divisions have obscured the possibility that Christian "apologists" do not define Christianity against

---

[13] Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity* (trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave; Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006) 232–38.

[14] Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in an Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in Hannah Arendt, ed., *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (trans. Harry Zohn; New York: Schocken, 1969) 217–51.

paganism or Judaism as much as they define Christianity against certain *kinds* of other ethnic and religious practices, practices they usually attribute to the "many" or the crowd, on the one hand, and to the imperial family, on the other. One contribution of my book is to show these Christian voices within a controversy on the nature of true religion, as both the "tolerance" and the religious influences of Roman imperial cult blanketed the Mediterranean basin like strange snow. Christian "apologists" thus engage large, cross-cultic and cross-ethnic conversations about the nature of true religion and right ritual, defining themselves alongside educated "pagans" as part of a thin stratum of cultured elites who can see the folly of the low religious practices of the poor and the very, very rich.[15] Christians participate in the world, including its material aspects, in complex ways, sometimes assimilating, sometimes resisting, sometimes engaged in "colonial mimicry." They use available arguments and debates to carve out a space where Christians, too, are cultural and political critics in and of the Roman world.

BRINGING TOGETHER LITERATURE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

All historical work is an imaginative enterprise, but many analyses are constricted by their over-reliance on literary sources. As I worked with the literature of second-century apologetic Christian texts, puzzling at the confluence I found in them of concerns about justice, piety, culture and ethnicity, and the blurring between human and divine, moments of clarity came when I pictured my teaching and research trips to the cities of the Greek East. In Olympia one can still see remains of the Fountain of Herodes Atticus and Regilla at the edge of the city's *altis* or sacred grove. This second-century family, famed for its wealth that rivaled the emperors and the oratorical and cultural skills of Herodes Atticus, imposed itself into the ancient cityscape. Nearby stood Pheidias's famous sculpture of Zeus, many altars to gods and statues of athletes, and other markers of classical-period Panhellenism – the glory days of Greece. Ancient visitors could stand at the fountain's cool waters, looking up at statues of the wealthy family of Regilla and Herodes, on one level, the imperial family on another, both levels punctuated by statues of Jupiter/Zeus. Surely this, like the Christian texts of focus in this book, is a form of "address" both to the emperors and to Greeks, one that directly treats the topics of piety and Greek culture under Rome.

Moving across the Aegean to Aphrodisias in modern-day Turkey, the visitor enters the narrow space of the Sebasteion, two long porticoes that end in a

[15] On the topic of religious tolerance in the Roman Empire, see Clifford Ando, *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008) 43–58 and chaps. 5–6 on the rite of *evocatio*.

temple dedicated to the goddess Aphrodite, to the "emperor gods," and to the city itself: an eastern city wedding itself in its myth, cult, and politics to Rome. Relief sculptures in fine marble on each of the porticoes depict personifications of the nations (*ethnē*) of the world as well as the emperors in heroic poses, conquering and pious, gathering this world to themselves. The architecture and art of this jewel of a building complex render violence divinely supported, maps the ethnicities of the world as belonging to Rome, and suggests that Roman power is pious and inevitable, blowing across the Mediterranean like a force of nature.

The study of art, architecture, and early Christianity should encompass not only catacomb paintings or the first churches, but also the earliest Christian responses to the built environments of the Roman Empire. A central argument of my book is that Christian apologists' *literary* texts can be best understood alongside *archaeological* remains from the spaces of the Roman world, and particularly the cityscapes of the second century. Disciplinary boundaries, however, have impoverished the study of early Christianity *and* the study of classics, ancient history, and art and archaeology: We have not been able to recognize how themes such as power, justice, piety, and culture are part of far-ranging ancient conversations that are manifest not only in literature but also in archaeological remains. We are like the blindfolded people in the fable who surround and touch the elephant, each characterizing the object of his or her interest according to limited knowledge. The elephant's side is a wall, the leg is a tree, the trunk is a snake, the tusk a spear, the ear a fan, the swinging tail a rope.

Because Christian texts are often sequestered from "classics," historians of early Christianity have too rarely recognized that "our" authors participate, for instance, in the so-called Second Sophistic, a cultural surge of interest in ancient Greek philosophy, rhetoric, images, and *paideia*, which extends roughly from the first to the third centuries CE. Moreover, specialists in literary texts have too rarely recognized that the themes of the so-called Second Sophistic and its resistors were not restricted to the power of oratory and words; such themes are also found in the built environment – "citations" of classical architecture and motifs, archaizing forms of worship supported by building renovations, representations of the diversity of *ethnē* (nations or ethnicities) and how they fit into the high valuation of Greek *paideia* and Roman power.[16] Not all cities of the Greek East "said" the same thing; not all literary texts of the so-called Second Sophistic were the same. Yet themes thread through this period, and Christians participate in the common debate.

---

[16] Susan Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) esp. chap. 2; Tonio Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art* (trans. A. Snodgrass and A. Künzl-Snodgrass; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Similarly, Roman historians and art historians have not recognized the extent to which Christians conversing about images and representations were not engaged in knee-jerk rejections of iconography – an old scholarly prejudice – but thoughtful investigations of the powerful effects of iconography on those who moved about the empire. This book takes seriously what second-century Christians, among others, took seriously, even if they wrote satirically: that statues of theomorphic humans and anthropomorphic gods were significant theological statements. The theological stakes of such objects are expressed clearly in the North African writer Tertullian's insistence that Christian sculptors who "make" gods become priests to them, and their salvation becomes a fat, gilded sacrifice to the gods (*De idol.* 6). There is good reason in antiquity and today to take seriously the topic of the image of god(s), because it raises larger questions about what it means to be human, how the real or statuary human body stands in danger of becoming a commodity, who is considered worthy to be a god or in the image of god(s).

Of course, by reading Christian and non-Christian texts together, and by bringing together both literary and archaeological remains, my own reconstruction of the second century cannot entirely capture the elephant that we, blindfolded by the limits of our sources and methods, touch. All of our historical reconstructions are provisional and partial, all inevitably and happily the best attempts of our imaginative enterprise.

Yet to try to see more fully the second-century Roman world, we must attend not only to literature and material remains together, but also to how we conceptualize space itself. Michel de Certeau, David Harvey, and others have encouraged an analysis of space that would involve "walking in the city" in "wandering lines" rather than attempting to find a panoptic point from which to survey the scene. Such an analysis demands thinking beyond the elites who walked the metropolitan centers of the Roman Empire and taking seriously feminist and postcolonial criticisms, which ask questions about imperial power and its (ab)use of its subjects' bodies. Despite the elite male focus of many of our sources, this book tries to catch a glimpse of those who were less than elite: those, like Paul and even lower in status, who might stand in the center of Athens to offer some critique of culture, cult, and power; those, like the slaves and women we find at our texts' margins, who also might move through civic spaces busy with marble bodies of elites as gods. What would it mean to walk those cities and to travel between cities these roughly two thousand years later, and to resist being seduced by the pedagogical power of monumental architecture, a crowded statuary population, and their persuasive messages about ethnicity, *paideia*, and knowledge?[17]

---

[17] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (trans. Steven Rendall; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); David Harvey, *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Edward Soja, *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (Oxford: Blackwell,

Although many would argue that archaeological finds and material culture offer us hard evidence, rock-hard in fact, empirical and scientific and easier to trust than literary texts, I think otherwise. Architecture makes statements; statues speak, too. Feminist and postcolonial criticisms teach us to ask about the rhetoricity of literary evidence; we can extend this questioning to material remains.[18] What arts of persuasion do they employ and to what ends? How can we imaginatively reconstruct a viewer who sees and resists? A viewer who walks the city not with the knowledge of an elite but with that of a slave who does not own or control his or her own body, who is aware from his or her own experience of bodies of all sorts and their uses?

Asking these kinds of questions can help us to expose that interpretations of of statuary and monumental architecture in the Roman Empire were dynamic and contested. From this period emerged new views of the civic landscape and indeed new mappings of the *oikoumenē*, the "inhabited world." Vitruvius, who addresses his *De architectura* to Augustus, centers the map on Italy and the Roman people and concludes: "Thus the divine intelligence established the state of the Roman People as an outstanding and balanced region – so that it could take command over the earthly orb" (*De arch*. 6.1.11).[19] Yet geographical thinking about the first- and second-century Roman world is not stable; it shifts even within this one text. In the same passage, Vitruvius celebrates the man who is shipwrecked, the universal traveler: "An educated person is the only one who is never a stranger in a foreign land, nor at a loss for friends even when bereft of household and intimates. Rather, he is a citizen in every country (*sed in omni civitate esse civem*)" (6.preface.2).[20] Vitruvius oscillates between two poles. In one, the map of the world centers on Rome; in the other, the map of the world has no center but is traced by the universal traveler. This citizen of everywhere has in hand both *ars* ("skill") and a universal education – and in this period, such education was usually defined as antiquarian Greek *paideia*.[21]

2000); Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); see esp. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith; Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

[18] See esp. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999) and *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007).

[19] ET Vitruvius, *Ten Books on Architecture* (trans. Ingrid D. Rowland; commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 77.

[20] ET Rowland, 75; the Latin is from Vitruvius Pollio, *De Architectura* (ed. F. Krohn; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912).

[21] Vitruvius himself explains this emphasis on art and education in terms of ancient Athenian law (*De arch*. 6.preface.3–4). On the value of Greek education and on the *pepaideumenos theatēs*, or educated viewer, see Simon Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); see also William Hutton, *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the* Periegesis *of Pausanias* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 32–41; Smith, "Cultural Choice and Political Identity," 56–93.