

Cambridge University Press

0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca

Edited by Rolando Ferri

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

## 1. OCTAVIA AND ITS GENRE

*Octavia* is the only complete Latin drama of historical subject which has come down to us. The title of the play given by the MSS is simply *Octavia*, but the drama is often referred to in modern secondary literature as *Octavia praetexta*, a practice which should be abandoned.<sup>1</sup>

The title heroine, *Claudia Octavia*, was the daughter of the emperor Claudius and of Valeria Messalina. Born in 40, she became Nero's wife in 53,<sup>2</sup> reportedly after being adopted into an unknown family to avoid rumours of incest within the imperial family. In legends of this period, her name always appears without the patronymic *Claudia*.<sup>3</sup> The name *Octavia*, however, was hardly that of an adoptive *gens*. Rather than a *gentilicium*, it must have been an inherited *cognomen* of the imperial family; like her older sister's name, *Antonia*, it was probably given to stress the link with a previous generation of Julio-Claudian women.

The play dramatizes the events of three days in June 62 (a chronological fiction: see next section), culminating in Nero's divorce from Octavia, his subsequent marriage to Poppaea, and, lastly, Octavia's deportation to Pandateria.

<sup>1</sup> The normal way of quoting dramatic titles is, e.g., *Accius (in) Bruto* or *Aeneadis*. Titles in the form (proper noun) + *tragoedia*, *comoedia*, *fabula*, in either order, are found: cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.65 *Sophocles poeta in fabula Triptolemo* (other instances of this appositive use in titles are given in *TLL* vi.1, s.v. *fabula*, 33.67–9; 34.3–6, also with a genitive); Don. *GL* Keil iv 375.24–5 *sunt . . . sono masculina, intellectu feminina, ut Eunuchus comoedia, Orestes tragoedia*. On the forms of Latin comic and tragic titles in the ancient sources, mainly grammatical, cf. Jocelyn, *Ennius*, 58–63.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brassloff in *RE* 111.2 (1899), s.v. Claudius, 428, coll. 2893–98; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1110.

<sup>3</sup> In inscriptions and coin legends, her name seems to appear simply as *Octavia* (so, for instance, in *Acta fratrum Arualium*, Henzen (Berlin, 1874), 67.16; 71.41; 77.26). There are only three exceptions, one inscription (*IGRR* 4.969) and two coin legends (cf. *Roman Provincial Coinage* (London, 1992), 1033 (Crete); 2341 (Methymna)).

Cambridge University Press  
 0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca  
 Edited by Rolando Ferri  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

Very little is known of *fabulae praetextae*, or *praetextatae*, the historical ‘dramas in purple-bordered toga’ performed under the Republic.<sup>4</sup> They may have been anything from simple historical pageants, celebrating a triumph, to full-scale dramatizations of significant historical episodes along the lines of Greek tragedy. Ancient critics did not recognize significant differences between *praetextae* and *cothurnatae*, dramas in Greek dress dealing with mythological characters. At any rate, the influence of Greek tragedy, alongside that of Seneca, is very important in *Octavia*, and, as far as can be seen, more significant than that of early Roman drama.<sup>5</sup>

In Republican *praetextae* the celebration of important military and political events, and even of eminent aristocratic individuals, seems to have been prominent.<sup>6</sup> The genre remained productive in the first century of the Empire, but topicality and the reference to contemporary events is unlikely to have been so direct as in early *praetextae*. To judge from some of the extant titles, celebration of Republican heroism played a central part (Maternus wrote a *Cato* and a *Domitius*; Pomponius Secundus an *Aeneas*), sometimes in an anti-imperial key. This element may partly account for the progressive disappearance of *praetextae* from the stage.<sup>7</sup> Political caution, a propensity for themes increasingly irrelevant to popular audiences at large, and a long-term process of ‘gentrification’ of literature at Rome<sup>8</sup> made *praetextae* more

<sup>4</sup> On *praetextae* in general cf. R. Helm, *praetexta*, in *RE* 22.2 (1954), 1569–75; for an exhaustive collection of the *testimonia* cf. Klotz, 358.

<sup>5</sup> The genre of *Octavia* has often been discussed, especially as regards its kinship to the Republican *praetextae*: for a survey of the relevant bibliography cf. Schmidt (1985), 1425; Manuwald (2001), 95, n. 86. A recent monographic issue of *Symbolae Osloenses* hosts a debate on *praetextae* in the imperial age: cf. *SO* 73 (2002), 5–105; see also *infra*, 61–2.

<sup>6</sup> On the occasions for performance of Republican *praetextae* and on subsequent restagings of some of them cf. H. I. Flower, *CQ* n.s. 45 (1995), 175.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of the staging–recitation debate specifically with reference to *praetextae* cf. the *SO* issue cited in n. 5, *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> See *infra*, chapter 5, n. 137.

Cambridge University Press  
 0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca  
 Edited by Rolando Ferri  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

## THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF OCTAVIA

suitable for recitation in the auditoria of a few aristocratic patrons than for onstage performance before large theatre audiences.

### 2. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF OCTAVIA

The narrative of Tacitus concerning Octavia in *Ann.* 14.59–64, which is the most complete account of the events covered by the *praetexta*, is compressed and elliptical, and reconstruction of the incidents leading to Octavia's divorce and subsequent execution is accordingly difficult.

According to Tacitus, Nero finally resolved to get rid of Octavia and to marry Poppaea after disposing of Sulla and Plautus (14.59 *posito metu nuptias Poppaeae . . . maturare parat Octauiamque coniugem amoliri*). After a first attempt to suborn a charge of adultery failed, the reason adduced to justify divorce was Octavia's inability to produce an heir (14.60 *exturbat Octauiam, sterilem dictitans; exim Poppaeae coniungitur*). Octavia was at first not removed from Rome, receiving Burrus' house and Plautus' estate in compensation. Tacitus does not relate any specific charge to account for her subsequent banishment to Campania (*mouetur . . . primo ciuilis discidium specie . . . mox in Campaniam pulsa est*): perhaps none was on record, if the princess had been whisked away unobtrusively. There was at first discontent among the Roman people at the treatment meted out to Octavia; then rejoicing, as if Nero had given in and recalled her (text uncertain). Under pressure from Poppaea, Nero decided to eliminate Octavia. A plot was set up against her, and Anicetus, fleet commander at Misenum, was bribed into confessing to adultery with her. Deportation to Pandateria and, shortly afterwards, execution ended the story.

The account of the same events given by Suetonius (*Nero*, 35.2) is even more summary: (*Octauiam*) *dimisit ut sterilem, sed improbane diuortium populo . . . etiam relegauit, denique occidit sub crimine adulteriorum*. Suetonius omits the temporary banishment to Campania, as do Dio's epitomizers (*Hist. Rom.* 62.13.1 Boiss.; but the story

Cambridge University Press

0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca

Edited by Rolando Ferri

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

may have been just as succinct in Dio himself). Suetonius (*Nero*, 35.3) also states that eleven days elapsed between Octavia's divorce and Poppaea's marriage (*Poppaeam duodecimo die post diuortium Octaviae in matrimonium acceptam*). The chronology of the events in the play is compressed for reasons of dramatic effectiveness. In fact, while in *Oct.* 437 Nero orders the elimination of Plautus and Sulla on the day preceding the marriage, we deduce from Tacitus that Nero set about the divorce only after receiving confirmation of the two opponents' deaths: as many as thirty days probably elapsed after Nero issued the order and before news of its execution reached him.<sup>9</sup> In the play, on the other hand, the divorce takes place on the same day as the marriage (666).

Clearly, succession was a crucial concern for Nero, and peace and stability required a legitimate heir. If Octavia was really incapable of producing one, divorce was inevitable, and Nero, legally, did not need a pretext. Divorce in similar circumstances was a prerogative of all husbands in Rome.<sup>10</sup> Yet a divorced princess of royal birth, alive and in distress, was too great a temptation for anyone aiming at removing Nero. This point is made explicit by Poppaea in Tac. *Ann.* 14.61, for the benefit of readers not fully alive to the level of violence and political calculation involved in the whole affair: Nero conceivably did not need to be reminded. It has been argued persuasively that the demonstration in favour of Octavia was much more threatening than suggested by our sources and that indeed there were grounds for Nero to fear a general insurrection, masterminded by the Claudian faction.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Plautus was in exile in Asia Minor, and the average time of a journey from Rome can be calculated as between ten and fifteen days (cf. L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton, 1971, 281–99).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford, 1991), 436–8. *exturbat*, in *Ann.* 14.60, is a *t.t.* for divorce; the expulsion from the husband's house was one of the sanctions of separation. Domitian probably divorced his wife under circumstances similar to Octavia's case in 84: evidence and secondary literature in Griffin, *CAH*<sup>2</sup> xi (2000), 61, n. 294.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. E. Meise, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie* (München, 1969), 173.

Cambridge University Press  
 0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca  
 Edited by Rolando Ferri  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

## THE DATE OF THE PLAY

The charges of adultery subsequently set up against Octavia appear, in this light, as a natural course of events in the context of the ruthless dynastic infighting of Julio-Claudian Rome.<sup>12</sup> If the elimination of Octavia was part of a long-term scheme, divorce was equally necessary as a preliminary step, because charges of adultery could not be brought against a married woman: a husband had to divorce his wife first, then formally accuse her.<sup>13</sup> Under the Julian law, the punishment for adultery was relegation to the islands; in Octavia's case, there was the aggravation that the crime could be presented as a conspiracy against the life of the emperor.<sup>14</sup>

The extant sources are clearly biased against Nero, and fail to give an objective analysis of the political stakes involved in the affair. While Octavia may well have been an innocent victim, the account of her story given by the tragedian is entirely in keeping with, indeed dependent on, the fiercely anti-Neronian stance taken by the historiographical *vulgata*, a fact which has a considerable bearing on the question of the date of the work.

### 3. THE DATE OF THE PLAY

#### The case for an early dating

Few scholars at present grant serious consideration to the thesis that Seneca himself wrote *Octavia*, perhaps as an attack on Nero. Even leaving aside all questions of language and style (see *infra*, p. 31), the prophecies of 618 ff. speak in favour of a date later than

<sup>12</sup> Very probably, Claudius' marriage to Agrippina had been eminently political, a pacificatory move aiming at reuniting the two feuding branches of the royal house. The choice of Nero as his successor was probably made in this spirit, as an attempt to ensure the allegiance of the army to the descendants of Germanicus and Augustus.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* 286: in Ulpian's words, 'as long as a marriage lasts, a woman cannot be accused of adultery'. After the divorce, the husband could set up the suit within sixty days.

<sup>14</sup> In general, an adultery in the emperor's household was a graver matter: cf. Woodman-Martin ad Tac. *Ann.* 3.24.3 (Cambridge, 1996).

## INTRODUCTION

68.<sup>15</sup> Giancotti's argument<sup>16</sup> that 'astrologers had prophesied to Nero the end in his life-time' fails to see that the story is a blatant fabrication *post eventum*. What astrologer would have gone and told Nero that he would die an outlaw and a fugitive?

A case has been made more recently for relatively early composition. P. Kragelund<sup>17</sup> has proposed that the play was written to celebrate Galba's triumph in 68.<sup>18</sup> Kragelund's main argument

<sup>15</sup> The attribution to Seneca was questioned as early as Petrarch (*Fam.* 24.5.17) and Salutati (*Ep.* 3.8 Novati, 1.152 *nonne Neronis exitus . . . plane, prout accidit, recitatur? que premoriens Seneca nec uidit nec . . . potuit diuinare*). Petrarch's letter (1348) blames Seneca for leaving a scathing portrayal of his former pupil after pandering to his vicious inclinations; yet from the charge of composing *Octavia* Seneca could be exonerated if the rumour were true that 'another Seneca' had composed this, as some passages of the play seem to suggest (*Octauie . . . locus aliquis hanc suspitionem recipit, Fam.* 24.5.17); cf. R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV* (Florence, 1905–1914), 2.178. Elsewhere, Petrarch expressed some amazement at the words of 'Seneca' in 377 ff., which seemed to him to forecast the future end of the philosopher too truly (cf. Martellotti, *IMU* 15 (1972), 153–4). Salutati's doubts pivoted mainly on 618–31, where Nero's death is foretold, but considerations of style and literary convention also played a part (cf. Martellotti, 161). For views analogous to Salutati's, or influenced by his judgement, in the margins of several MSS cf. Kragelund (1982), 72–3; Tarrant, *Agam.*, Introd. 37. The author of the marginalia in BL Harl. 2484 (who, however, predates Salutati), for instance, notes at 620–1: *describit mortem Neronis futuram et ex hoc tu potes scire quod Seneca non composuit hoc opus quia Nero necauit Senecam ut dicit Boetius de consolatione et alii*. The question of the authenticity of *Octavia* overlaps with that of the identity of that elusive *Doppelgänger* of Seneca, 'the tragedian', who was believed (since late antiquity: cf. Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 9.230–4) to be different from the philosopher, probably on account of an equivocal passage in Martial 1.61.7–8, where the 'two Senecas' in question are the rhetor and the philosopher. Older editors discussing the problem conjure up the ghost of Marcus Annaeus Seneca, the supposed son of the philosopher, to whom some ascribe the, in their view, less successful dramas of the corpus. Also of interest is the *Vita Senecae* of Gasparino Barzizza (1411), in L. Panizza, *Traditio* 33 (1977), 297–358, esp. p. 348 for Gasparino's position on the authorship of the tragedies. An extract from Petrus Crinitus' *De poetis Latinis* (1505) is enclosed in Avantius' preface, which seems to give *Octavia* to the 'alter Seneca'. The *Ad lectores* of Farnabius has a useful survey of positions held by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century critics.

<sup>16</sup> Giancotti (1954), 23. <sup>17</sup> Kragelund (1982), *passim*; (1988), 492–508.

<sup>18</sup> Emphasis on the necessity for peace (279–81) and the condemnation of cruelty (982) may well reveal the attitude of a witness to the events of 68–69.

Cambridge University Press

0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca

Edited by Rolando Ferri

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE DATE OF THE PLAY

consists of a supposed parallelism between Galba's 'republican' slogans and the alleged populism of the play.<sup>19</sup> Yet Galba's recognition of the authority of *Senatus populusque* is widely paralleled in early imperial history. Vespasian initially followed very much the same guidelines, and so did Nerva and Trajan.<sup>20</sup> In addition, the lines in which the Chorus summons itself to rebel against the *princeps* display little Republicanism: the rebels only want to restore the Claudian princess to her legitimate share in the government.<sup>21</sup> There is nothing triumphalistic about the play, and the final lament over the fickleness of the *uulgu* (877–7• *o funestus multis populi | dirusque fauor*) seems to dispel any impression that the people could be considered a political body, and could describe Galba's end as aptly as Octavia's. The *praetexta* is remarkably vague and non-committal on all constitutional issues regarding the position of the *princeps*. Nothing can be gleaned from supposed references to constitutional debates. No traces of the so-called Senatorial opposition under Vespasian can be detected. The language in which political issues are discussed applies to situations which range through the whole of the first century. In the words of its first choral ode, *Octavia* proclaims allegiance to the legitimate branch of the Claudians – a harmless proclamation which would in fact fit well with the Flavian emperors' attitude towards Claudius.

T. D. Barnes<sup>22</sup> has also argued for a very early date (Galba's reign), maintaining that the author of *Octavia* was familiar with the political events of 62 at first hand. He claims to recognize in

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Oct.* 676–82 *ubi Romani uis est populi . . . ?*

<sup>20</sup> Legends with *Libertas* were coined under several rulers (Octavian *VINDEX LIBERTATIS*: *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup>, 79, 476; Claudius (?): *LIBERTAS AVGVSTI*: *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup>, 128, 97; Vespasian: *LIBERTAS PVBLICA*, *LIBERTAS RESTITVTA*: *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 271, 69; 272, 80; Nerva: *LIBERTAS AB IMP. NERVA RESTITVTA* (*CIL* VI.472); for Trajan cf. P. L. Strack, *Untersuchungen* 1.176–7. For other revivals of *Libertas* and related ideas in post-Neronian coinage of various date cf. Kragelund (1998), 152 n. 2.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Oct.* 789–90 *reddere penates Claudiaae diui parant | torosque fratris, debitam partem imperi*.

<sup>22</sup> *MH* 39 (1982), 215–17.

Cambridge University Press

0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca

Edited by Rolando Ferri

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

the play a sympathetic attitude towards Messalina which would reveal a somewhat different approach to the history of the Julio-Claudians, one which precedes the establishment of the official historical *vulgata*.<sup>23</sup> Yet the only sympathetic remarks made about Messalina in the play are uttered by her daughter,<sup>24</sup> and no pre-vulgata tradition need be presupposed behind them. They are simply adapted to the point of view of a bereaved daughter. On the other hand, Nero's references to Messalina already attest the diffusion of the tradition depicting her as driven by an insatiable lust.<sup>25</sup>

Barnes also drew attention to the play's failure to mention Otho as Poppaea's husband at *Oct.* 731, which is taken as an argument in favour of a Galban dating. Under Galba, Otho was an influential figure, and caution would have recommended passing over in silence his past acquaintance with the Neronian court. After the fall of Nero, however, there were two competing versions in circulation of Otho's relations with Poppaea. One, attested in Suetonius, Plutarch, Cassius Dio and Tacitus, and commonly claimed for Pliny's historical work, represented Otho's marriage to Poppaea as a fiction contrived by Nero to cover his encounters with Poppaea while still officially married to Octavia.<sup>26</sup> But no such sham-marriage is mentioned in the later version represented by Tac. *Ann.* 13.45, wherein Nero came to know of Poppaea only through Otho's incautious praise of her beauty. The divergence between the two conflicting versions followed by Tacitus in his two successive works has been tentatively explained by the hypothesis that, while working on the *Annales*,

<sup>23</sup> A view shared by Meise (1969), 175.

<sup>24</sup> *Oct.* 259–60 *furor miserae dura genetricis meae, | quae nupta demens nupsit . . . ;* 266–7 *cecidit infelix parens | heu nostra ferro.*

<sup>25</sup> 536 *incesta genetrix detrahit generi fidem.* On doubts raised against Claudius' paternity on account of the notorious conduct of Messalina cf. Juv. *Sat.* 6.115–32, 10.329–45; Suet. *Nero* 7 (*Nero*) *Britannicum . . . ut subditiuum apud patrem arguere conatus est.*

<sup>26</sup> Suet. *Otho* 3 *Poppaeam Sabinam . . . nuptiarum specie recepit*; Plut. *Galba* 19.2; Cass. Dio *Hist. Rom.* 61.11.2; Tac. *Hist.* 1.13 *Poppaeam Sabinam, principale scortum, ut apud conscium libidinum deposuerat* (sc. *Nero*) *donec Octaviam uxorem amoliretur.*



#### THE DATE OF THE PLAY

Tacitus finally had the opportunity to consult Cluvius's history, probably published in the intervening time.<sup>27</sup> If the author of *Octavia* was following the same source as Suetonius, Plutarch and the *Historiae*, there is no compelling reason why Otho should have been mentioned as Poppaea's husband.

Barnes's other argument concerns Tigellinus' failure to turn up in a play on Nero's atrocities, which he again ascribes to chronological reasons: Tigellinus was protected by Vinus, and so it would have been dangerous for the author of *Octavia* to blacken him in his play. Tacitus actually only goes so far as to say that Tigellinus was not executed, as many would have wished, owing to Vinus' protection, which is a long way from stating that Tigellinus was still powerful enough to silence and to intimidate his accusers.<sup>28</sup>

#### The subject matter of *Octavia* and the lost histories of the Flavian age

There is nothing in the play incontrovertibly suggesting that the author had witnessed the events himself. We have no means of establishing with absolute precision the date of the tragedy, say, through a fortunate anachronism or a transparent allusion, but consideration of the play's structure strongly suggests that it was composed by someone who worked from written sources. This clarifies the dating in so far as it establishes a *terminus post quem*, that is the publication of the historical books of Pliny, Cluvius and Fabius.

The tradition about Nero must have been to a large extent the creation of the annalists writing in the Flavian age: political

<sup>27</sup> A. Gercke (1896), 197; A. Momigliano *RAL* 8 (1932), 293–300; Syme, *Tacitus* 1.290; G. B. Townend, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 98–120; id. *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48. Fabius Rusticus must have published his work after the year 84 perhaps in response to Pliny's, which had been published posthumously, after 79.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.72; in Plut. *Galba* 17.4 Tigellinus, though publicly disgraced, appears to scorn the public condemnation thanks to Vinus' protection; *Otho* 2.1, however, tells a different story, describing Tigellinus' fears throughout the reign of Galba.

Cambridge University Press

0521823269 - Octavia: A Play Attributed to Seneca

Edited by Rolando Ferri

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

assassinations were committed under Augustus too, even within the imperial family, and Vespasian probably gave his consent to the killing of the six-year-old son of Vitellius after his victory.<sup>29</sup> Yet no one regards these emperors as monsters, owing to a benevolent and idealizing historical tradition. Otho's and Vitellius' efforts to assert themselves as Nero's legitimate successors suggest that the legend of Nero the monster had not gained currency widely by 69. On the contrary, Nero's memory was an important political instrument in the immediate aftermath of Galba's fall. Nero appears still to have been popular in the year of the Four Emperors. Otho was acclaimed by his troops as *Nero Otho* (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.78); he used this name in his *diplomata* (Plut. *Otho*, 3.2; Suet. *Otho*, 7.1;<sup>30</sup> Cass. Dio *Hist. Rom.* 64.6), re-erected the statues of Poppaea and set about enlarging the *Domus aurea*; Vitellius offered propitiatory sacrifices to the shade of Nero (Tac. *Hist.* 2.95; Suet. *Vit.* 11; Eutrop. 7.18).<sup>31</sup> The unfavourable tradition seems to have established itself only with the advent of the Flavian dynasty, presumably following the publication of such influential historical accounts as Pliny the Elder's and Fabius'.<sup>32</sup> We may imagine that in 68–69 much of what happened in the household of the *princeps* was still shrouded in obscurity.

In *Octavia* the tradition associated with Nero's atrocities has already taken its final form: Nero figures there as the matricide, the murderer of Claudius, Britannicus and Octavia, the incendiary of Rome, the defiler of the gods. Since these assassinations appear to have taken place, it was perhaps inevitable that Nero should be portrayed as a monster. The fact remains

<sup>29</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.80.

<sup>30</sup> *Ab infima plebe appellatus Nero, nullum indicium recusantis dedit, immo ut quidam tradiderunt, etiam diplomatibus primisque epistulis suis . . . Neronis cognomen adiecit.*

<sup>31</sup> Cf. B. W. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (London, 1903), 418–19; M. T. Griffin, *Nero. The end of a dynasty* (London, 1984).

<sup>32</sup> Perhaps the earliest attestation of the legend of Nero in the form of a list of Nero's crimes (the murders of Britannicus, Octavia, Agrippina) is found in Jos. *Bell. Iud.* 2.250–1 Niese (II. xiii, 1–2), published around 75. The story is presented as 'well known to all'. On the existence of favourable sources cf. Griffin, *Nero*, 235–7; Jos. *Bell. Iud.* 4.9.2; Paus. 7.17.3; 9.27.4.