CHAPTER I

Introduction
Greece and the Augustan age

This is a book about the relationship between Roman moral discourse and
the cultural comportment of provincial Greeks. It argues that, during the
transition at Rome from republic to monarchy (late first century BC and
early first century AD), a deep-seated and, under Augustus, quasi-official
concern to shore up Roman *mores* was communicated to the Greeks. This
had the effect of reshaping local cultural profiles, most markedly in the
cities and sanctuaries of Greece itself, which are the focus of this book.
At the provincial end, crucial agency in this process was provided by the
local notables. This elite stratum openly collaborated with Roman power
in the east. Its members played a cornerstone role in the political soci-
ety of the early imperial era, signalled by their possession of the *civitas*
in increasing numbers from the triumviral age on. Their mounting expo-
sure to cultural 'Roman-ness' gave rise to new forms of identity which
make the blanket term 'Greek' too reductive as a cultural denomina-
tor, despite Greek remaining their first language. The view taken here of
Greek ethnicity is avowedly non-essentialist: 'things have no essence, no
"core"'.[1]

A decisive role in what was, in effect, a process of Greek acculturation
to Roman values is attributed here to two Roman emperors: firstly Augus-
tus, founder of the Roman imperial system, whose rule – it is argued –
constructed an 'official' Roman narrative of Hellenism based on an ideo-
logical favouring of 'old' Greece and the traditions of Athens and Sparta;
and, secondly, Hadrian, who powerfully reinforced this narrative in the
course of his cultural politics on an unprecedented scale in the Greek east.

Recent scholarship suggests improved ways of understanding the com-
plex dialogue between 'Roman-ness' and 'Greekness' in the period under
study. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill proposes a 'cardiac' model of the cultural
role of Rome at this time. In the first centuries BC and AD the imperial

[1] Malkin 2001: 1.

I

capital is the pumping heart of the Mediterranean, its cultural voracity sucking in the ideas and goods of Hellenism from the east, and transforming them 'by oxygenation into "Roman" blood' which is then diffused both westwards *and* eastwards. Thus Rome becomes a force for 'hellenisation', which was also, in this context, a mode of 'Romanisation'. Wallace-Hadrill illustrates this model primarily through material culture, e.g. the Athenian imitations of Roman lamps. The model is taken a step further here, where it is proposed to see, in effect, a 're-hellenising' under Roman influence of Hellenism itself, or rather, of aspects of the forms of Greek cultural expression controlled by the stratum of eastern provincial notables, including Greek civic identity.[2]

On one level it is argued that relations of power explain the capacity of this 'Roman' Hellenism to reorder the cultural behaviour of people who in origin were non-Roman. However, the approach taken here is in contrast with current scholarship which emphasises, on the contrary, the distance between Roman power and the culture of the Greek elites in the period under study.[3] A force underpinning normative Roman attitudes to Hellenism sufficiently compelling as to reorientate the cultural behaviour of provincial Greek notables needs to be identified.

Recent scholarly work on Roman morality emphasises that Roman moral discourse was 'concerned overwhelmingly with the behaviour of the upper classes'.[4] This is a crucial point for this book which is focused on the social stratum in the provinces most closely identified, politically and culturally, with the Roman elite. Central too is the Foucauldian emphasis in recent scholarship on the cultural construction of gender as a linchpin in Roman self-definition and on sexual dominance as a defining quality of Roman manliness.[5] These approaches stress the problem posed to elite Roman manhood by the Roman feminisation of Greece and Greeks.

In choosing to negotiate the delicate balance between Greek and Roman, sophistication and vigour, in terms of the supposedly straightforward distinction between 'male' and 'female', Romans exposed the problematic nature of their conceptions of gender. It might seem easy to identify Romans as characteristically masculine. Yet to identify Greeks and Greek culture as feminine was to compromise too much of Roman culture and society. (Edwards 1993: 96)

---

[2] Wallace-Hadrill 2008: esp. chs. 1 and 4. Cardiac model: 27, 361 (quotation). As will become clear, the writings of Andrew Wallace-Hadrill have done much to shape the ideas and arguments of this book.

[3] E.g. Swain 1996.   [4] Edwards 1993: 24.

[5] For a nuancing of this view in the case of the ambiguous category of boyfriends of Roman emperors, where 'there *is* power in being passive', see Vout 2007 (p. 21 for the quotation).

It is the aim of this book to show that Augustus, in the sense of his whole regime, along with its helpers and enablers, responded to this dilemma by signalling, within an existing Roman debate about Hellenism, a more virile Greece compatible with the philhellenism which was now too deeply embedded at Rome for its eradication to be either feasible or desirable. The conceptual tool for achieving this end was the distinction which Romans already made between 'good' and 'bad' Greeks. The place of this distinction in the attitudes to Greeks found in Roman literature has been summed up as follows:

Where a significant contrast [between Greeks and Asiatics] is intended, the distinction is not between Greek and non-Greek, but between *different varieties* [my italics] of Greek, and its precise form depends on the writer's purpose. It may be used to depreciate the Asiatics by suggesting that they possess undesirable characteristics in greater measure than other Greeks; conversely, it may be used to exalt the Greeks of old Greece and to represent them *as more truly Greek* [my italics]. When the distinction is ignored, it is usually, no doubt, for the purpose of tarring all Greek-speaking peoples with the same brush, but occasionally the object is to attribute to them all the merits more commonly reserved to the old Greeks and in particular the Athenians. (Petrochilos 1974: 20–1)

As this summary suggests, the distinction in question was anything but hard and fast: slippage into a general condemnation of Greekness remained an option for Romans until well into the second century AD.[6] What is apparent too is that the expression of a cultural alignment on the part of Greek-speakers in the eastern provinces with any given *Roman* attitude to Hellenism is not straightforward to identify, since both provincial and (in this particular respect) Roman elites were operating within the same broad cultural field (Hellenism, that is). This is a methodological difficulty which can be overcome, this book believes, by paying sufficient attention to historical and social context. An example, encountered in Chapter 3, is the highlighting of the battle of Salamis in Athenian civic culture at a time when Actium was being persistently compared with Salamis by the Augustan regime. On the other hand, Plutarch claims that manipulation of the memories of the Persian Wars by local politicians could stoke up popular patriotism to dangerous levels.[7] Not only elite Romans, but elite

---

[6] Note Juv. 3.58ff.; 8.112ff.; 10.173; 11.100; SHA *vit. Avid. Cass.* 5.10, a letter to Marcus from his praetorian prefect describing legionaries in Syria who had lost their discipline as *Graecanici milites*. The elder Pliny, who perhaps captures the mood of Flavian Rome, is replete with anti-Hellenism: 3.16.122; 5.1.4; 8.34.81; 15.5.19 (*Graeci vitiorum omnium genitores*); 19.26.86; 28.29.112; 29.7.1; 37.11.31. In Hadrian's youth the charge of *Graeculus* still had force: SHA *Hadr.* 1.5.

[7] Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 814e.

Greeks, walked a tightrope when deploying cultural traditions which could mean different things to different people. As will be seen, under the principate civil unrest, even rebellion, remained an occasional threat to the pax Romana in Greece.

the augustan 'moral revolution'

Augustus tried to bind together a fragile Roman world not only by military force but by common values, values derived from Roman tradition and consciously stamped with Romanness. (Wallace-Hadrill 1993: 97)

Central to the argument of this book is the scholarly acceptance in recent years that in the Augustan 'restoration' of the Roman state the moral and the political were inextricably entwined. The Romans believed that morality (*mos* or *mores*) was one of their supreme defining qualities as a people. The other was *virtus*, (in its traditional sense) martial excellence, the two being totally interdependent in Roman moral thought. The Romans had only one explanation for the cataclysmic upheaval that was the collapse of the Republic: the ethical one of corrupt *mores* among the Roman upper class.[8] Wallace-Hadrill has characterised the collapse of the old system and its replacement with a new political dispensation – the Augustan principate – as a *mutatio morum* or 'cultural revolution', where 'culture' is defined as 'the sum total of practices and beliefs that differentiate one people from another'. This idea of a 'wholesale shift in the Roman value system' is cardinal in any assessment of the reform programme of Augustus and the intensity of the ideological atmosphere in which it was carried out.[9] What underlay this revolution, it has been argued, was nothing less than the depoliticisation of Roman citizenship with the advent of the imperial monarchy:

The transformation of citizenship from a reciprocal bundle of rights and obligations to a form of social dignity is basic for Roman cultural identity. Citizenship is no longer expressed through actions (voting, fighting) but through symbols: it becomes urgent to define culturally what "being Roman" is about when it is reduced to a socio-legal status. (Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 452)

The cultural definition of Roman-ness constructed by Augustus was powerfully focused on *mores* and powerfully reactive to recent Roman debates about moral decline. Here I accept that there existed such a thing as

---

[8] Wallace-Hadrill 1997: 9.
[9] Quotations: ibid., transposing the expression found in Cic. *Leg*. 3.31. Galinsky 1996: 9 prefers 'evolution' to 'revolution'. Wallace-Hadrill 1989: 160; 2008: 453–4.

Augustan 'ideology', which, like Roman imperial ideology in general, did not arise from relations of class dominance and subjection in an anachronistically modern Marxist sense, but was constructed through 'intersubjective relations' between the participating groups on a basis of shared core values.[10] I accept here too the proposition that ideology informed all Augustus' reforms, not just the overtly political ones. Regarding the climate in the capital in which these reforms were carried out, it is Wallace-Hadrill, once more, who has pointed to the force of the word *scelus*, 'a word which carries some but not all of the implications of the Christian "sin"', used by Horace to characterise the immorality of the late republican elite. He goes on to argue that there were Messianic undertones to Augustan ideas which may well have owed something to Roman awareness by this date of Judaism. On this view, many Romans believed that a saviour was needed to absolve them of sin.[11]

The idea, explored in recent scholarship, that Augustus sought to reassert traditional gender roles as part of a larger programme of Roman moral recuperation is also key to the arguments of this book. Roman authors, it has been claimed, saw lapses in female chastity as a symptom of the general disorder of the late republic.[12] N. Shumate has fruitfully compared this kind of gendered ideological stance with modern discourses of national regeneration. These likewise form their 'backbone' on 'the idealization of the national past and the implication of issues of gender and sexuality in that process'. Horace's 'Roman' odes, the ones (3.2, 3.5, 3.6) with an overtly political content which, on the face of it, serves to support and elaborate on Augustan moves to restore Roman morality, can be read as promoting an ideal of pristine masculinity (*virtus* in the traditional, martial, sense) and as offering the reader 'a generic bad woman [as] the primary barometer of social and moral decline'.[13]

Arguably the Roman audience for complex poetry was relatively small and select. Augustan culture also confronted a mass audience with its ideas by means of the visual arts (see further, below). Recent scholarship has detected a 'gendered discourse' in the monuments of Augustan Rome.[14] Singled out as a short case study here is a theme in Augustan public art which illustrates – so it is argued below – the stark tone of this 'gendered discourse'. Massed sculptural representations of 'sinful' women in the city's key public spaces are a marked feature of the Augustan rebuilding of

[10] Ando 2000: esp. 222–3. Note also Zanker 1988: 101; Galinsky 1996: 8 and 81 (denying an 'ideology' in the modern sense). Milnor 2005: 50 n. 7.
[11] Wallace-Hadrill 2004: esp. 174–6.   [12] Edwards 1993: 42–7.   [13] Shumate 2006: 69, 75.
[14] Kellum 2003; Milnor 2005.

Rome. The earliest of these groups formed part of a portico in the new sanctuary of Palatine Apollo which Octavian dedicated in 28 BC. The statues in question have been characterised as a 'disturbing yet surprisingly prominent element in the decorative scheme'.[15] They depicted the 'crowd' (*turba*) of the Danaids, fifty sister–wives of Greek legend who committed the crime of killing their cousin–husbands on their wedding night. The inclusion on the Palatine of the instigating figure of their father Danaus, his sword drawn, makes clear that the iconographic emphasis – rarely in ancient depictions of the myth – was on the crime itself.[16]

This group can be compared with the Caryatids – repeated architectural supports in the form of young women – which decorated both the so-called 'Pantheon' of Agrippa in the Campus Martius and the Forum of Augustus, showcases of the regime, dedicated respectively in 25 BC and 12 BC. Here the art-historical reconstruction is more serpentine. In the case of the Forum, fragments have survived in the form of female figures copying the 'maiden' statues supporting the north porch of a building on the Athenian Acropolis, the Erechtheum. These Forum figures are known to have originally numbered over fifty, arranged high up as decoration for the attic storey. The effect on the viewer at ground level, it has been suggested, would have been 'overwhelming'.[17] The term 'Caryatids' is applied in ancient literature to the Pantheon figures only, our sole source, the elder Pliny, adding that they were commissioned from an Athenian sculptor, one Diogenes. It has been argued that survivors from these Pantheon Caryatids should be recognised in another four replicas of the Erechtheum maiden-figures found in Hadrian's villa at Tibur. On the view of Pieter Broucke, these figures were salvaged from the Pantheon during this building's Hadrianic reconstruction. They confirm, if Broucke is right, that Diogenes modelled the Caryatids of the original Pantheon on the Erechtheum of his native Athens.

The point of this brief art-historical digression is to establish that Romans of the early principate would have viewed all these figures as what they called 'Caryatids'. It is precisely under Augustus that this term first appears in Latin literature along with a Roman aetiology for which there is no precedent in earlier Roman *or* Greek tradition. The text is the *De Architectura*

---

[15] So Milnor 2005: 51.
[16] So Kellum 2003: 279. Other recent discussions include Sauron 1994: 502–3; Gurval 1995: 123–36; Milnor 2005: 51–2, 64–5. Divergent art-historical views of the possible appearance of the Danaids: Balensiefen 1995 (herm-type females wearing the peplos, an identification accepted, e.g., by Stewart 2004: 145); *LIMC* 5.1 (1990) 588 (a seated female carved in the round).
[17] Sauron 1994: 121 n. 195.

of Vitruvius, published in the first half of the twenties BC. This work is
addressed to the new princeps, but its prefaces 'go far beyond ritual obei-
sance to the regime'. It clearly aligns itself with Augustan ideology, and does
so in an ambitious way, as 'a labour to save the world'.[18] This alignment is
detectable in the Vitruvian aetiology of the Caryatids.[19] Vitruvius explicitly
states: ' . . . . if anyone erects marble statues of robed women, which are
called Caryatids, on his building [. . .] this is how he will explain them
to enquirers'. He then shows how the figures represented the humiliated
women of Greek Caryae, a Laconian town on the Spartan periphery, who
were forced to bear their heavy loads, while dressed in all their womanly
finery, in perpetual atonement for their community's treachery to the Greek
cause during the Persian Wars. The Persian Wars context has a decidedly
Augustan ring (see Chapter 3). This Vitruvian version turns the Caryatids
themselves into distinctly Augustan figures by identifying them as married
women (*matronae*) and clothing them in the *stola*, a Roman female garment
frequently depicted in early imperial art and symbolic of 'female virtue and
modesty'.[20] The peculiar fit with different Augustan strands raises the pos-
sibility that this aetiology – as others have already suggested – was created
by Vitruvius himself, or rather reworked by him, to suit the moral cli-
mate of Rome in the twenties BC, when Augustus was already planning
his programme of social and moral legislation.[21] Vitruvius, if so, could be
seen as another member of the 'class of cultural brokers and image makers'
associated in modern research with the phenomenon of invented national
tradition.[22] The apparent absence of a strong aetiology for the Erechtheum
figures in their original Athenian context – the Erechtheum accounts sim-
ply call them *korai*, maidens – would have reduced the likelihood of a
challenge to the authority of this transformed meaning.

   As with other visual manifestations of Augustan ideas, scholars continue
to debate the symbolism of these representations. Political and cultural
allegories have been read into both Danaid and Caryatid groups: in the case

18 See Wallace-Hadrill 2008: ch. 4 ('Vitruvius: building Roman identity'); 148, 149 (quotations).
19 On this point: Gros 1989.
20 See Zanker 1988: 162–6 with fig. 131; Sebesta 2001: 48–9.
21 Vitruvian invention: Schneider 1986: 105 with n. 688, where Schneider argues for the basic historicity
    of the episode.
22 Vitr. 1.1.5; Plin. *HN* 36.11. Agrippa's so-called Pantheon, perhaps originally a temple of Mars and
    a memorial to the donor's land victories: A. Ziolkowski, *LTUR* 4 (1999), 54–6. Forum Augustum:
    V. Kockel, *LTUR* 2 (1995), 289–95 (with bibliography). Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 99 (probable first
    attempt by Octavian at social legislation before 27 BC). Broucke 1999 (Tivoli copies) with Lesk
    2005: 262–80. Recent interpretations include: Wesenberg 1984a–b, followed by Rowland and Howe
    1999; Sauron 1994: 120–1; Schäfer 1998: 105; Milnor 2005: 110–15. 'Cultural brokers': Shumate 2006:
    76–7.

of the former, a reference to Cleopatra (Danaus was Egyptian by origin), or a generalised allegory for civil war (the Danaids murdered their close kin); in the case of the latter, triumphal symbols of Augustus' subjugation of foreign peoples or – something quite different – the 'embodied concept of traditional religiosity'. There is good reason to think that the 'meaning' of these figures may have been multivalent for their Augustan producers no less than their Augustan viewers: 'gender encodings, even at the most basic level of reading, are not transparent'.[23] I suggest that there has been insufficient attention paid, in recent assessments of intended meanings, to the Augustan gendering of the threat to Roman *mos*. The overriding fact is that these massed figures all denoted female crime or punishment, with a specific focus on the transgressions of married women, as Patrick Marchetti has seen in the case of the Danaids.[24] To create these striking and – in the context of the city of Rome – highly unusual sculptural effects, relying on the iteration of the female figure, it was necessary for Augustan artists to identify, by recycling of existing myths or by invention, aetiologies which implicated large groups of females at a time (fifty Danaids, all the married women of Caryae). Whatever additional signification they may have had for producer or viewer, these representations had the effect of introducing into the heart of imperial Rome an eye-catching, unmissable, sculptural shorthand for 'bad' or 'culpable' wives. It is tempting to relate these and other choices in public sculpture under Augustus to the same castigatory mood which produced, early in the second decade of the reign, legislation to protect Roman marriage and the Roman family. This included the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* in 18 BC, which permitted a Roman father, in certain circumstances, to kill an adulterous daughter with his own hands – to many today, a shocking prescription.[25]

For the project of this book it is essential to demonstrate that Augustan concern for the morality of Roman women was matched by an equal concern for the shoring up of Roman manhood. Recent work has emphasised the great prestige of traditional *virtus* in ancient Roman values. Formed on *vir*, 'man', the word in its traditional sense denoted an ideal manliness which manifested itself in martial excellence. Attention has been drawn

---

[23] Kellum 2003: 276.   [24] Marchetti 2001b: 458 with n. 14.
[25] See Edwards 1993: 37–42 at 38, with earlier literature; Galinsky 1996: 128–40. As Edwards notes, the 'certain circumstances' 'may have been deliberately impractical'. Note too the Augustan taste for sculptural depictions of the slaughter of the children of Niobe: in ivory relief on the doors of the temple of Palatine Apollo, and in free-standing sculptures in the Horti Lamiani, property of L. Aelius Lamia, *cos.* AD 3 and a friend of Augustus (for these see Sauron 1994: 604–5, with an Augustan date for the statuary). Here Stewart 2004: 1148–9 sees a moralising ethos at work of a different sort: 'exempla of human transgression upon the divine realm'.

to a nexus of overlapping idealisations in Roman republican writers asso-
ciating *virtus* in this traditional sense both with *antiquae mores* and with
the greatness of Rome as measured by her military success.[26] It has been
shown too that the inculcation of this core Roman value was a central aim
of the combat training which many ancient writers emphasise as crucial to
Roman military success:

Disciplina militaris both promoted formally rational elements and created a *sens
pratique* in the Roman elite as to how they should command, train, and manage
soldiers, and how they themselves should live in *militia*. (Phang 2008: 36)[27]

Tenets of this Roman military masculinity included active sexual roles,
dietary austerity and generally the avoidance of luxurious behaviour: that
is, morality entered into Roman army discipline too:

If one were to ask the Romans to explain their success in building and maintaining
their empire, it is unquestionable that a large part of the answer would be the
discipline of the army. By this Romans seem to have meant a certain sophistication
of tactics and organization; but *disciplina*, or *askēsis*, also had an important moral
dimension; it is the opposite of decadence and luxury, and it is easily corrupted by
money and peace. (Mattern 1999: 203)

Recent research emphasises the emasculation of the Roman citizen male
as a significant concern of Roman writers in the late republic. Writing in
the aftermath of Caesar's assassination, Sallust condemned the 'softening'
of Roman troops through their exposure by Sulla to Greek luxury, a theme
taken up in the next generation of Roman historians by Livy (see the next
section). Adulteresses impugned Roman masculinity since they implicitly
exposed husbands as 'not men enough to control their wives'. In a passage
which seems to anticipate the Augustan moral programme, Cicero impli-
cates adultery (by linking *libidines* with the birthrate) in the social disorder
for which his prescription is 'strict legislation' (*severis legibus*).[28] Directly
engaging with Augustan concerns, Horace's third book of *Odes*, published
in 23 BC, has been read as an explicit manifesto for a Roman *virtus* under
threat:

---

[26] Passages cited in this regard include Enn. *Ann*. 156 Skutsch ('The Roman state is built on ancient *mores* and *viri*') and Cic. *Phil*. 4.13: '*virtus* is the badge of the Roman race and breed . . . With this *virtus* your ancestors conquered all Italy first, then razed Carthage, overthrew Numantia, brought the most powerful kings and the most warlike peoples under the sway of this empire.' See Edwards 1993: 20–2; Galinsky 1996: 84; McDonnell 2006: 2–3.

[27] *Sens pratique*, a concept borrowed from Pierre Bourdieu, is defined by Phang 2008: 31 as 'a durable, ingrained disposition of thinking, feeling, and behaving that is characteristic of a given field'.

[28] Sall. *Cat*. 11.5 and Cic. *Pro Marc*. 23 (46–45 BC), noted by Galinsky 1996: 8.

A literal reading of this word ('manliness', or comportment proper to men) is authorized by the comprehensive gender scheme . . . The robust youth (*robustus puer*) of *Odes* 3.2 is enjoined to cultivate his *virtus* by devoting himself to the hardy military life with its open-air existence and constant dangers . . . There he will learn the value of the stripped-down life (*pauperie*) and will, it is implied, develop an aversion to its opposite, *luxuria*, the unmanning force that had been identified as the root of social and national catastrophe in Roman moralistic discourse since the late Republic . . . Archaic warrior values thus appear to be invoked as a proper paradigm, at least in some circumstances, for the contemporary young Roman male to embrace. (Shumate 2006: 69)

The Augustan programme sought to associate itself with a traditional masculinity. On the level of symbols, *virtus* in the traditional military sense was one of the four virtues proclaimed on the golden shield (*clipeus virtutis*) with which the Senate honoured Octavian at the same time as it dubbed him with the title 'Augustus', in 27 BC.[29] As for practical measures, in what sounds like an audible echo of Horace Augustus reorganised the military training of the sons of Roman knights and senators, reflecting in so doing a concern to induct the rising generation in traditional *mos*.[30] Maecenas' speech in Cassius Dio (52.26) specifically implicates masculinity in this project by specifying 'softness' (*malakia*, the Greek equivalent to *mollitia*), along with laziness, both typical elements of female physiology in ancient thought, among the unmanly behaviours which training should remedy. Augustus addressed the military *virtus* of the army rank and file too. According to an admiring Suetonius, he 'imposed the most severe military discipline, including the revival of antique punishments'.[31] As regards the elite male, his moral legislation sought to achieve the arguably impossible by, as it were, legislating for *virtus*. Penalties for husbands who put up with adulterous wives highlighted the preference of the regime not only for good wives but also for 'strong and vigilant' husbands who policed their womenfolk's behaviour as of old.[32]

Augustus addressed morally sapping *luxuria* by the power of *exemplum*, personal example, a communicative strategy to which Romans attributed great force when wielded by their political leaders.[33] Famously he chose to live in a surprisingly modest house for a member of the Roman

---

[29] Galinsky 1996: 82, pointing out that these virtues refer to events preceding 27 BC: '*virtus* in that context is the traditional *militaris virtus*', a point overlooked by McDonnell 2006: 385 in arguing that *virtus* here is the ethical kind, coined on *aretē*. Rightly: Eck 2003: 3, 93; Levick 2007: 18.

[30] *OCD*[3] s.v. *iuvenes* (B. Levick).

[31] Suet. *Aug.* 24. Alston 1998 stresses that Roman soldiers as such, because their subaltern status deprived them of personal freedom, 'did not conform to aristocratic ideals of virility'.

[32] Edwards 1993: 61.   [33] Wallace-Hadrill 1997: 9 citing Cic. *Leg.* 3.31.