

Bogdan Burliga

"Gemma Augustea" and the roman stoicism

Studia Elbląskie 14, 401-427

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

GEMMA AUGUSTEA AND THE ROMAN STOICISM

Słowa kluczowe: stoicyzm rzymski, kamea, ideologia, imperializm rzymski, filozofia

Key words: Roman Stoicism, cameo, ideology, the Roman imperialism, philosophy

Schlüsselworte: der römische Stoizismus, die Kamee, die Ideologie, der römische Imperialismus, die Philosophie

I. THESIS

The beautiful *Gemma Augustea*, an alluring cameo cut from Arabian onyx (now in Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna: no. AS IX, A 79)¹, always called the attention of the historians of the art². Recently the small masterpiece is usually reprinted in almost all handbooks of Roman history, not to mention the studies particularly devoted to the Roman art³. But not only modern scholars admire the gem: among many others, already Rubens⁴ himself made from it a drawing which is now prese-

* Bogdan Burliga is Lecturer in Greek, University of Gdańsk.

¹ Its height is 19 cm, while width 23cm. According to some scholars it is sardonyx, which then was usual material, see G.M.A. Richter, *A Handbook of Greek Art*, London – New York 1969⁶, pp. 252–253. It was believed that its engraver (stone-cutter) was Dioscurides (or someone from his workshop), of whom mentions Pliny in his *Historia naturalis*, 38. 7 and Suetonius in the *Divus Augustus*, 50; also cf. W.-R. Meow, *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*, Berlin 1987, p. 11. On the onyx and sardonyx and their physical qualities see the recent, detailed commentary of A. Ryś, *Orfeusza 'Kerygmata'. Sokratesa i Dionizjusza 'O kamieniach'*, Poznań 2012, p. 64, note 54.

² See A. Fürtwangler, *Die antiken Gemmen I*, Berlin 1900, plate 56; II, pp. 257–258; cf. G.M.A. Richter, *Catalogue of Engraved Gems. Greek, Etruscan and Roman II. Engraved Gems of the Romans* [A Supplement to the History of Roman Art], London, 1971, p. 101, no 501. A bibliography of modern works in P. Zazoff, *Die antiken Gemmen*, München, 1983, p. 319.

³ A recent overview of the Hellenistic and Roman cameos is in C. Wagner and J. Boardman, *A Collection of Classical and Eastern Intaglios, Rings and Cameos* [The Beazley Archive], Oxford 2003, nos. 622–651.

⁴ Cf. Richter, *Engraved Gems*, p. 101, nos. 501.

rved in the museum of Lübeck⁵. Engraved probably on the occasion of the victories Tiberius (the future Emperor, AD 14–37) won over the barbarian tribes in Pannonia (on the cameo he is identified as the figure on the left, jumping from the chariot, see below)⁶, the *gemma* provides a perfect manifestation of the Augustan imperial ideology⁷, ideology of the new times, rhetorically called by the great poet *magnus saeculorum ordo*⁸ – a renowned political order established by Octavian August (Tiberius' stepfather) after the victorious ending of the war with Antony and Cleopatra and the annexation of Egypt⁹. *Magnus saeculorum ordo* meant above all peace, the symbolic closing of 'the gates of war' (*belli portae*), to cite Vergil's suggestive phrase (*Aen.* 7. 607; cf. Suetonius, *Div. Iul.* 22). No wonder, in sum, that the cameo is often reminded on this occasion and (what understandable) belongs now to the most recognizable items of the Augustan Principate and imperial era – along such other great monuments as the *Ara Pacis Augustae*¹⁰, the patriotic 'Roman' odes of Horace from the Book III¹¹, Vergil's *opus maximum*, the *Aeneid*¹², universal history of Pompeius

⁵ See H. Käbler, *Alberti Rubeni dissertatio de Gemma Augustea* [Monumenta Artis Romanae 9], Berlin 1968.

⁶ Some think, however, that the occasion of its commissioning was a famous annihilation of the three imperial legions under Varus in Teutoburg forest, AD 9 (a famous *clades Variana*); cf. O. Rossbach, s. v. *Gemmen*, [in:] *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* [RE] VII. 1, hrsg. G. Wissowa und W. Kroll, Stuttgart 1910, cols. 1097f.

⁷ On the ideological dimension of the archaeological data see I. Morris, *Archaeology & Ancient Greek History*, [in:] S.M. Burstein, N. Demand, I. Morris and L. Tritle, *Current Issues and the Study of Ancient History* [Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians 7] Claremont, CA 2002, pp. 53–54; see also P. Stewart, *The Social History of Roman Art*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 1–3.

⁸ The famous, 'prophetic' term is that from Vergil's fourth eclogue, verse 5: *magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo* (ed. F.A. Hirszel, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford 1900 [OCT]). Generally on the idea of empire cf. A. Pagan, *Empire*, [in:] *The Classical Tradition*, eds. A. Grafton, G.W. Most and S. Settis, Cambridge Mass. – London 2010, p. 310.

⁹ Cf. K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretative Introduction*, Princeton 1996, pp. 120–121; also his new study: *Augustus. Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, Cambridge 2012, p. 132. A classic analysis remains P. Zanker's highly acclaimed study *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor 1990, pp. 232f. and fig. 182.

¹⁰ Compare M. Jacynowska, *Religie świata rzymskiego*, Warszawa 1990, pp. 119–120; see C. Wells, *Cesarstwo rzymskie*, Polish ed.; tr. T. Duliński, Warszawa 2004, p. 103, and M. Cary and H.H. Scullard, *Dzieje Rzymu II*, Polish ed.; tr. J. Schwakopf, Warszawa 1992, p. 66. Generally R.J.A. Wilson, *Roman Art and Architecture*, [in:] *The Oxford History of Classical the World*, eds. J. Boardman, J. Griffin and O. Murray, Oxford 1986, pp. 771f.

¹¹ Cf. R.G.M. Nisbet, *Horace's Epodes and History*, [in:] *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, eds. T. Woodman & D. West, Cambridge 1984, p. 9. Naturally, not only in the Roman odes expressed Horace his admiration for Augustus and his regime: *Carmen Saeculare* is even more telling; cf. O. Jurwicz, *Kwintus Horacjusz Flakkus, Dzieła wszystkie I*, Wrocław 1986, pp. 14–15 and St. Staryła, *Wstęp*, [in:] *Horacy, Dwadzieścia dwie ody*, transl. A. Ważyk, Wrocław 1991, pp. xxx–xxxiii.

¹² See K. Galinsky, *Vergil's Aeneid and Ovid's Metamorphoses as World Literature*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, ed. K. Galinsky, Cambridge 2005, p. 341. Recently E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture. From Plautus to Macrobius*, Baltimore, MD 2013², pp. 80f.

Trogus¹³, the huge *Geography* of Strabo¹⁴, *Antiquitates Romanae* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or Livy's monumental *Ab urbe condita*¹⁵. To this list one ought to add – last but not least – the *Monumentum Ancyranum*¹⁶, that boastful catalogue of the Augustus's conquests and by the same a terrifying testimony of the Roman pride (and arrogance – according to some historians; cf. Suetonius, *Div. Iul.* 20–21)¹⁷. The later vast encyclopedia of Pliny also may be understood as a continuation of Augustan era, the same Roman effort to describe and 'close' the inhabited world in a text¹⁸.

But these connections and parallels between the works of art and literature in the Augustan period are well known to be recalled here again¹⁹. Most of the modern experts take into consideration ideological and propaganda dimension of the Augustan literature²⁰. Instead, in the following a few remarks will be devoted to another phenomenon connected with this masterpiece of the ancient art of carving in stone: the so-called Roman Stoicism²¹. A basis for suggesting such a connection results from the conviction that the gem is helpful in Stoic interpretation of Rome's world-wide role that definitely became an established fact with Augustan regime²². In the case of the gem such direct link between the fact of its engraving and the Romans' familiarity with Stoic ideas is of course the allegorical female figure. It is identified

¹³ Cf. J.E. S a n d y s, *A History of Classical Scholarship* I, Cambridge 1903, p. 272; see K. M o r a w s k i, *Zarys literatury rzymskiej*, Kraków 1922, pp. 219–221.

¹⁴ See H.L. J o n e s, *Introduction*, [in:] *The Geography of Strabo* I, Cambridge Mass. – London 1989, pp. xix–xx.

¹⁵ Cf. M. B r o Ź e k, *Historia literatury łacińskiej w starożytności. Zarys*, Wrocław 1976², pp. 320–322; cf. recently M. L o v a n o, *Writers on War. Part II. Rome*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, eds. B. Campbell and L.A. Tritle, Oxford 2013, pp. 82f.

¹⁶ Cf. C. N i c o l e t, *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Empire*, Ann Arbor 1991, pp. 15f.

¹⁷ It contains the so called *Res gestae divii Augusti*, written by Augustus himself. Remarkably, in the §13 he says of *parta victoriis pax*; cf. E.S. G r u e n, *The Imperial Policy of Augustus*, [in:] *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, eds. K. Raaflaub and M. Toher, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1993, pp. 411–412; see. M. S o m m e r, *The Roman Empire 27 BC – AD 474*, [in:] *The Great Empires of the Ancient World*, ed. T. Harrison, London 2009, pp. 203–204.

¹⁸ Cf. A. R i g g s b y, *Guides to the Wor(l)d*, [in:] *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, eds. J. König and T. Whitmarsh, Cambridge 2007, pp. 88f. See n. 106 (below) on the Roman interest in producing the maps of the empire.

¹⁹ E. S i m o n, *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitenwende*, München 1986, pp. 156–161.

²⁰ Cf. St. S t a b r y ł a, *Wergiliusz. Świat poetycki*, Wrocław 1987², pp. 20–24.; R.D. W i l l i a m s, *The Aeneid and Its Literary Background*, [in:] *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II. Latin Literature*, eds. E.J. Kenney and W.V. Clausen, Cambridge 1983, pp. 339f.; recently J. F a r r e l l, *The Augustan Period: 40 BC – AD 14*, [in:] *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. S. Harrison, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2005, p. 45f.

²¹ See generally Ch. G i l l, *The School in the Roman Imperial Period*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. B. Inwood, Cambridge 2003, pp. 33f.

²² On this process, see E.S. G r u e n, *The Expansion of Empire under Augustus*, [in:] *The Cambridge Ancient History X. The Augustan Empire, 43 B. C. – A.D. 69*, eds. A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, E. Champlin and A. Lintott, Cambridge 1996², pp. 147f.

as the goddess *Oecumene*²³ who adorns the Emperor Augustus with a crown²⁴. What do I attempt below is to look at the ‘philosophical’, so to speak, program the *gemma* certainly contains and to situate its ‘message’ in a broader intellectual context. This context – despite the expulsion in 155 BC (on Cato the Elder’s behalf) of the group of Greek philosophers under Carneades²⁵ – was essentially provided by Stoic doctrines, popularized in the *urbs aeterna* in the circles of the Roman aristocrats by two Greek giants, Panaetius of Rhodes²⁶ and his disciple, Posidonius of Apamea (cf. Strabo, 14. 655)²⁷.

In this paper I shall try to put forward and develop the following argument: the scene engraved on the *gemma* is a decisive proof in maintaining that during the reign of Augustus the Romans not only began to employ an old Hellenistic idea of ‘a world-state’²⁸ to describe their ‘newly’ established political order but that they saw the existence of their own empire in the terms of all-embracing, say, quasi-natural reality. On this view the political Roman order has been transformed into the conception of a natural *oecumene*, often having ontological meaning of a natural state of things, something which is obvious, that’s, firmly established, stable, fixed, and which cannot be changed²⁹ – ‘natural’, in sum. Accordingly, the claim will also be

²³ On the representations of this personification in Hellenistic art see A. C h a n, s. v. *Oikumene*, [in:] *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* [LIMC] VII. 1. Zurich 1994, pp. 31–33. The fundamental study still remains the article of F. G i s i n g e r, *Oikumene*, [in:] RE 17. 2, Stuttgart 1937, cols. 2123–2174.

²⁴ Cf. the layout of the book by G. C r e s c i M a r r o n e, *Ecumene Augustea. Una politica per il commenso*, Roma 1993; see M. H a m m o n d, *City-State and World State in Greek and Roman Political Theory until Augustus*, Cambridge Mass. 1951, p. 3. According to the other interpretation the goddess crowing Augustus is Victory: see E. W i p s z y c k a, *Cywilizacja starożytna*, Warszawa 1998, p. 80.

²⁵ See A.A. L o n g, *Roman Philosophy*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, ed. D. Sedley, Cambridge 2003, p. 186; cf. D. S e d l e y, *Philosophy*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, eds. A. Barchiesi and W. Scheidel, Oxford 2010, p. 701.

²⁶ On the personality of Panaetius the literature is vast; see, for example, recent treatments of Ch. G i l l, *Panaetius on the Virtue of Being Yourself*, [in:] *Images and Ideologies. Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, eds. A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long and A. Stewart, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1993, pp. 330f; also A.A. L o n g, *Hellenistic Philosophy. Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1986², pp. 211–215; cf. esp. J.M. R i s t, *Stoic Philosophy*, Cambridge 1969, pp. 173f. Now a fundamental remains P.A. B r u n t’s *Panaetius in De Officiis*, [in:] *Studies in Stoicism*, Oxford 2013, pp. 180f. (Brunt’s collected Stoic papers edited by M. Griffith and A. Samuels); see also A. M o m i g l i a n o, *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenism*, Cambridge 1971, pp. 22f.

²⁷ See L. E d e l s t e i n and I.G. K i d d, *Posidonius I. The Fragments*, Cambridge 1972. Cf. M. P o h l e n z, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, Göttingen 1992²; also A.D. N o c k, *Posidonius*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 49 (1959), pp. 1–2; cf. a fine essay of M. G r i f f i n, *Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome*, [in:] *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, eds. M. Griffin and J. Barnes, Oxford 1997, pp. 4f.

²⁸ See W.W. T a r n and G.T. G r i f f i t h, *Cywilizacja hellenistyczna*, Polish ed.; tr. C. K u n d e r e w i c z, Warszawa 1957, pp. 519f; especially M. S c h o f i e l d, *The Stoic Idea of City*, Chicago 1991, pp. 141f.; also idem, *Saving the City. Philosopher-Kings and Other Classical Paradigms*, London – New York 1999, pp. 46f.

²⁹ See P.R. H a r d i e, *Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986. I fully agree with Llewelyn Morgan when stating that in Vergil agriculture became ‘a metaphor for Rome’ (*Creativity Out of Chaos: Poetry between the Death of Caesar and the Death of Virgil*, [in:] *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A New Perspective*, ed. O. Taplin, Oxford 2000, p. 367: Morgan cites

proposed that this ‘new’ political order, the ‘project’ called *imperium Romanum*³⁰, provided one of the vital bases for further Greek and Latin philosophical (but not only philosophical) literature. The stability and durability of the Roman imperial power in relatively peaceful circumstances (the first two centuries AD), extended over so many nations and tribes, simply became for the next generations of the Greek and Roman *litterati* a basis or a framework in their discussions concerning general, universal themes about what is natural and what necessary in human life. It was just the working of the empire that defined also the subject-matter of ethical themes in philosophy: the place of man in the world and his goals of life, or destiny. In such way, as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has observed, Roman culture became ‘epistemological system’³¹. The most evident case remains here the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180) and his *Meditations*, a thoroughly Stoic work, whose ‘earthly’-*hic et nunc* context is the Roman rule over the world. In Marcus’ conception the empire constitutes man’s earthly ‘post’ that no individual or organized group (regardless of his/her social status) can change or overthrow – conversely, as a rational being every man must follow and fulfill his duties at this place where he was put by his own destiny³². In other words, it was the Roman Empire that provided a stimulus not so much for the popularity of the so called ‘Roman’ Stoicism (what is obvious), but rather that further existence and development of the Stoic doctrines was possible within political realities that were the result of the Roman domination over the rest of the world. So, a firm ground for vitality of Stoicism in the Roman era was thus the *civitas Romanorum* itself, not the old Greek notion of a ‘world-wide’ state³³. Looking from such a point of view a word of warning must be added: in the interpretation proposed above the Roman Stoicism should not be further considered as mere ‘philosophy’ but perceived in more general (sociological) terms – as ‘ideology’³⁴. This last interpretation pervades a thoughtful paper written in 1985 by B.D. Shaw³⁵. In this sense the Roman Stoicism should rather be regarded as a phenomenon not so much confined to a ‘school’ (with its physical features as, for example, a separate building with a group of attendants) but a broadly dispersed set of ideas, deeply per-

Georg. 2. 136–176). It may be even maintained that not only idealized agriculture but ‘nature’ as such became a metaphor for the Roman rule.

³⁰ To remind a highly idealistic picture of the Roman empire by E. Gibbon, *Zmierzch cesarstwa rzymskiego I*, Polish ed.; tr. S. Kryński, Warszawa 1995, pp. 17–55.

³¹ *Mutatas Formas: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge* [in:] *Cambr. Comp. Age of Augustus*, p. 80.

³² See the observations of P.A. Brunt in his outstanding, *Stoicism and the Principate*, Proceedings of the British School at Rome [PBSR] 30 (1975), pp. 7–35.

³³ There is fine analysis in the book of the acknowledged Polish authority, Professor Anna Świerkówna, *Hellenika. Wizerunek epoki od Aleksandra do Augusta*, Warszawa 1974, pp. 17–33 and 381–389.

³⁴ This point is stressed out by Paul Veyne in his brilliant study *Cesarstwo rzymskie*, [in:] *Historia życia prywatnego I. Od Cesarstwa Rzymskiego do roku tysięcznego*, red. P. Veyne, Polish ed.; tr. K. Arustowicz, Warszawa 2005², pp. 238–239.

³⁵ *The Divine Economy: Stoicism as Ideology*, *Latomus* 44 (1985), pp. 16–54; see T. Habinek, *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton 1998, p. 147–148.

vading Roman way of thinking³⁶. One of the examples of such approach toward the old Stoic doctrine was ‘an appropriation’ of the Hellenistic term ἡ οἰκουμένη³⁷. The Romans borrowed it and prompted their own conception of the empire, understood as their *orbis terrarum*. By doing so they just changed Old Stoa’s understanding of the term ‘the inhabited world’³⁸.

³⁶ By stating this I do not mean that Stoic philosophy affected directly the Roman art of government and that it had a clear influence on the actual line of politics in the Roman Empire. It simply could not work so, because the Greek Stoics themselves were never interested in practical or administrative side of government, even if some of them were attendants at Hellenistic courts or friends of the kings, Roman emperors or men in power. But some of the adherents of Stoic doctrine at Rome might have seen their public service as fulfilling Stoic duties. So is the case of Marcus Aurelius, see Ch. Gill, *Stoic Writers of the Imperial Era*, [in:] *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, eds. Ch. Rowe and M. Schofield, Cambridge 2000, p. 611 (cf. R. B. Rutherford, *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. A Study*, Oxford 1991, pp. 59f.; and L. de Blois, *The Relations of Politics and Philosophy under Marcus Aurelius*, [in:] *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*, ed. M. van Ackeren, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2012, p. 178). Also Arrian of Nicomedia, a famous disciple of the Stoic Epictetus, saw, as it seems, his long military service in the Roman army along these lines; see generally P. Garnsey and R. Saller, *The Roman Empire, 30 BC – 284 AD*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1987, p. 179.

³⁷ It should be reminded here that the term οἰκουμένη was used by the Christian thinkers, although in a different sense: so is in the letter to the Ephesians, 4. 3; cf. the more traditional meaning in Matthew 24.14. But leaving aside the quotations in New Testament, there is also a controversy as to the historicity of Augustus’ decree to enrollment of the inhabitants of the Roman *orbis terrarum*. The famous information is found in Luke, 2,1 (Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξήλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην). If true, it would be a clear indication of the imperial efforts to financial unification of the *orbis terrarum*. R.K. Sherk does not include it to his anthology of the imperial documents from the Augustan Principate (*The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian* [Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 6], Cambridge 1988). Be that as it may, one thing is clear: for Luke πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην undoubtedly means Roman *oikumene*.

³⁸ St. Śnieżewski in his comprehensive book *Salustiusz i historia Rzymu*, Kraków 2003, maintains (p. 76) that ‘Kosmopolityzm, wspierany przez filozofię grecką, stopniowo przekształcał mentalność Rzymian w stronę hellenizmu’. But this statement should be slightly corrected, as the Romans relatively quickly absorbed Greek philosophy. By the term ‘to absorb’ I do not mean that this was a wholly conscious process on the part of the Roman intellectuals. On the contrary, it was the development of the empire itself rather which facilitated the transformation of the Hellenistic notion of ‘inhabited world’. Professor Śnieżewski rightly states (p. 77) that there was a vehement territorial growth during the Roman republic which changed the Roman minds and character. But it is difficult to agree with him that the influence of the Greek philosophical thought at the end of the republic resulted in a moral crisis in the Augustan Principate, especially if one seeks the most explicit mark of such a crisis in cosmopolitanism. The crisis was the result of the Sallustian *avaritia* and *libido dominandi*. In the Augustan era cosmopolitanism was no real danger yet, as it was the idea of the world empire itself (Virgilian *imperium sine fine* from the *Aeneid*, 1. 279) which removed all potential tensions: it was possible due to the enormous extending of Roman power. To put it differently, one might say that the Roman empire was a conglomerate of different cultures, sub-cultures, cults and religions (including, of course, from some time, Christianity). But all that immense structure was under an administrative umbrella of the mighty personality of Roman emperor, a web of the governmental apparatus and watchful eyes of the Roman officials.

II. THE FIGURES LOCKED UP IN THE STONE

Now, time is to return to the Vienna cameo itself. What is known of its earliest history? Why was it commissioned at all? As usually in the case of the majority of ancient works of art – too many questions, even more doubts, and almost no secure data. But in this case ‘almost’ makes some difference. The most difficult problem here is the identification of the figures.

It is usually believed that the gem has been cut either at the end of the reign of Augustus, or in the first years of Tiberius’ rule – either way, this does not affect the present argument. A direct impulse was to have been Tiberius’ victorious campaigns in Pannonia (now Dalmatia) and Illyricum (A.D. 9)³⁹. We don’t know when but is certain that it was brought to Constantinople (perhaps by Constantine the Great): this is inferred from the fact that after the capture of Byzantium by the Crusaders in 1204 the priceless stone from the Augustan times was taken by an unknown French knight to Toulouse⁴⁰. It is also nowadays a well known fact that the gem was listed in the inventory of the treasury belonging to the church of Saint Sernin in this city; the inventory is dated on the year 1246. In 1533 its owner became the king François I of France (1515–1547). Then the gem disappears to have been bought in 1619 by the Austrian Emperor Rudolph II. It was the Habsburg Vienna that became a final place for safekeeping this small but invaluable witness of the glory of the civilization that irretrievably has been gone.

The onyx cameo contains of two layers⁴¹. The lower register presents a shocking scene of the deplorable treatment of Roman enemies (Celts or Germans probably), subjugated by the triumphant victors⁴²; the occasion is the erecting of the trophy (the symbol of victory)⁴³. There are on the left two figures representing the captives; the one makes a gesture of resignation; the second is chained and observes the action. On the right the soldiers brutally pull at the hair two captives: a bearded man and a standing woman. The motif of how the Romans pictured their military triumphs – being a more prosaic and grim side of the working of the *imperium Romanum* – over various enemies is a particularly fascinating topic but it cannot be explored here⁴⁴. As the eminent expert in ancient art put it, what is especially striking here

³⁹ Suetonius *Tiberius*, 16–17.

⁴⁰ Its history is, of course, much more complicated. One might say as if it was a realization of the rule reserved for the books: *habent sua fata lapides*, see E. Zwi erlein-Diehl, *Antike Gemmen und ihre Nachleben*, Berlin – New York 2007, pp. 243–244.

⁴¹ See the detailed analysis of J. Pollini, *The Gemma Augustea: Ideology, Rhetorical Imagery, and the Creation of a Dynastic Narrative*, [in:] *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, ed. P.J. Holliday, New York 1993, pp. 258–298; cf. A. Kamm, *The Romans. An Introduction*, Milton Park – New York 1995, pp. 137–138.

⁴² Cf. J. Rufus Fears, *The Ideology of Victory at Rome*, [in:] *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* [ANRW] II. 17. 2, hrsg. W. Haase, Berlin – New York 1981, p. 810; see R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order. Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*, Cambridge Mass. 1966; also P. Zanker, *Roman Art*, Los Angeles 2000, pp. 164f.

⁴³ See B. Campbell, *The Roman Empire*, [in:] *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds. Asia, the Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, eds. K. Raaflaub & N. Rosenstein, Cambridge Mass. – London 1999, pp. 219–220.

⁴⁴ See e. g. J. Elsner, *Roman Eyes. Visuality & Subjectivity in Roman Art & Text*, Princeton 2007, pp. 3f.

is ‘the total segregation of victor from the defeated’⁴⁵. With regard to the *gemma*, however, it is worth observing that while lower part remain a graphic illustration of what the Roman imperialism was in practice⁴⁶, for the purposes of the present article far more interesting is the scene engraved on top of the gem – a spiritual, religious, and ideological commentary on the brutal act presented in the low part of the stone⁴⁷.

Now, the figures which can be tentatively identified by the art historians are as follows: the man sitting on the throne is Augustus himself⁴⁸. At his feet an eagle is showed, symbolizing Jupiter. Augustus is crowned by a veiled woman who is identified now as personification of the *Oikumene*. On the right there are Neptunus (or: Ocean) and sitting Italia (alternatively: Gaia; cf. n. 62, below), with the horn of bounty; the last is also accompanied by children. Near Augustus, on the left, the goddess of Rome is seated; she holds a spear and wears helmet. The chariot is driven by the goddess Victoria. A man descending from the vehicle is probably Augustus’ stepson, Tiberius. There is a controversy as to who is the figure between Rome and Tiberius. Some saw in it the prematurely died Drusus, Livia’s son; others think in turn of Drusus’ son, the valiant Germanicus, brother of the future emperor Claudius.

The whole picture is exceptionally powerful as it shows two sibling sides of the same social and political phenomenon: Rome’s unsurpassed power in her heyday, Roman imperialism in action⁴⁹. The commission and appearance of the gem may be interpreted as an illustration of the process Sir Ronald Syme has called ‘the or-

⁴⁵ T. H ö l s c h e r, *The Language of Images in the Roman Art* (English tr. from German by A. Snodgrass and A. Künzl-Snodgrass), Cambridge 2004, p. 41; cf. his excellent paper *Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory and Cultural Symbolism*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003), pp. 1–17. See also D.G. K y l e, *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*, London – New York 1998, p. 53; recently P. de S o u z a, *War, Slavery, and Empire in Roman Imperial Iconography*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies [BICS]* 54 (2011), pp. 31f.

⁴⁶ Again, the scholarly literature is vast, to begin with the works of the French historian Maurice Holleaux; see W.V. H a r r i s, *War and Imperialism in the Republican Rome, 327–70 B.C.*, Oxford 1979; recently E. R a w s o n, *Roman Imperialism*, [in:] *Oxf. Hist. Cl. World* (as in note 10, above); also J. R i c h, *Fear, Greed and Glory: The Causes of Roman War-Making in the Middle Republic*, [in:] *War and Society in the Roman World*, eds. J. Rich and G. Shipley, London – New York 1993, pp. 39f.; see A.M. E c k s t e i n, *Conceptualizing Roman Imperial Expansion under the Republic: An Introduction*, [in:] *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, eds. N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2006, pp. 567f.

⁴⁷ Cf. E.S. G r u e n, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1984, pp. 274f.

⁴⁸ The so called Grand Camée de France, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, is similar to the *gemma Augustea* in its propaganda, but not identical: it pictures Augustus’ family and his descents. But the lowest, third register of the sardonix cameo is also ‘peopled’ by the barbarian captives (cf. F.S. K l e i n e r, *A History of Roman Art*, Boston 2010, pp. 107–108, fig. 7–8). It should be perhaps stressed out here that representing the figures seated served to underline their status and dignity, cf. G. D a v i e s, *On Being Seated: Gender and Body Language in Hellenistic and Roman Art*, [in:] *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, ed. D. Cairns, Swansea 2005, p. 216f.

⁴⁹ ‘imperialism’ understood as potentiality to exercise power and possibility to impose one’s own will, according to the etymology of the word; on the definition see K.A. R a f l a u b, *Born to be Wolves? Origins of Roman Imperialism*, [in:] *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Graeco – Roman History, 360 – 146 B.C.*, in *Honor of E. Badian*, eds. R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris, Norman OK – London 1996, pp. 274–276.

ganization of opinion'⁵⁰, one of the signs of Roman triumphal rituals⁵¹. Visuality was here certainly the gem-graver's main mean of persuasion⁵²: realism, brutality, and – at the same time – allegorical and symbolic manner in presenting the majesty of the *princeps*⁵³, make the two registers an unity. The ideological message of the cameo is beyond any dispute but by this word⁵⁴, however, one should understand also moral implications both scenes carry with. This moral dimension is at odds with modern sensibility, no doubts, but nevertheless it lies at the heart of the Roman understanding of what glory, pride and public morality were – in sum⁵⁵. Leaving aside the scale of the project there is no essential difference between the ideology of the cameo scenes and, say, the meaning of the narrative the two later, famous, monumental Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius contain. When looking at the cameo a strong impression arises that we are still dealing with the same type of mentality. It is the mentality of the conquerors who were deeply convicted that although cruel their dealing is they are nevertheless morally better – a somewhat sinister idea in the ear of the modern reader but quite familiar for ancient observers⁵⁶. Additionally, a perfect comment on the two scenes on the gem would be the words Calgacus, one of the commanders of the Britons, expresses in Tacitus' *Agricola*, ch. 30. The realistic picture how the sons of she-wolf ruled the inhabited world is in this famous passage shockingly disillusioned and sounds as 'modern'⁵⁷:

⁵⁰ R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1960, pp. 459f.

⁵¹ On which see M. Beard, *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge Mass. – London 2007, pp. 143–186.

⁵² Cf. J.D. Crossan, *Roman Imperial Theology*, [in:] *In the Shadow of Empire*, ed. R.A. Horsley, Louisville 2008, pp. 67f. On this process in general perceptive analysis of P. Veyne, *Cesarstwo grecko-rzymskie*, Polish ed.; tr. P. Domański, Kęty 207, pp. 377f.

⁵³ See J.J. Pollitt, *The Art of Rome c. 753 B.C. – A.D. 337. Sources and Documents*, Cambridge 1983, p. 116f.; cf. the vocabulary of *Res gestae*, 3. 1 – 2: 'I undertook many civil and foreign wars by land and sea throughout the world, and as victor I spared the lives of all citizens who asked for mercy. 2 When foreign peoples could safely be pardoned I preferred to preserve rather than to exterminate them'; 4. 1: 'I celebrated two ovations and three curule triumphs and I was twenty-one times saluted as *imperator*' (transl.: P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divii Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, Oxford 1983, p. 19); cf. R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, p. 447.

⁵⁴ Cf. R. MacMullen, *The Roman Empire*, [in:] *Ancient History: Recent Works and New Directions*, ed. C.G. Thomas, Claremont Calif. 1997, p. 85. This is not to say, of course, that the gem was destined to be viewed by so many onlookers as possible: we do not know how often was it showed and to whom. It was certainly known to the emperor's family, but who else was admitted to look at it, must remain unknown. Yet an intrinsically embedded ideological message in it is obvious. This reminds of the importance of the images in Augustus' (and later) 'new' world at all, see G. Woolf, *Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996), p. 28.

⁵⁵ Cf. G. Woolf, *An Imperial People*, [in:] *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the Roman World*, ed. G. Woolf, Cambridge 2003, pp. 70f.

⁵⁶ See, for example, the description of the sacking Corinth in 164 BC (cf. M.M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, Cambridge 2006², no 100, pp. 195–196). P.A. Brunt, *Laus imperii*, [in:] *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, eds. P.D.A. Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge 1978, pp. 160–161 reminds that the Romans considered their empire as just.

⁵⁷ Cf. H. Heubner, *Kommentar zu Agricola des Tacitus*, Göttingen 1984, pp. 88f. In the same vein speaks the king Mithridates in Justin, *Epit.* 38. 6. 7–8.

infestiores Romani, quorum superbiam frustra per obsequium ac modestiam effugeris. raptores orbis, postquam cuncta vastantibus defuere terrae, iam et mare scrutantur: si locuples hostis est, avari, si jjauper, ambitiosi, quos non Oriens, non Occidens satiaverit: soli omnium opes atque inopiam pari adfectu concupiscunt. auferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium, atque ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant ('these more deadly Romans, whose arrogance you shun in vain by obedience and self-restraint. Harriers of the world, now that earth fails their all-devastating hands, they probe even the sea: if their enemy have wealth, they have greed; if he be poor, they are ambitious; East nor West has glutted them; alone of mankind they behold with the same passion of concupiscence waste alike and want. To plunder, butcher, steal, these things they misname empire: they make a desolation and they call it peace'; ed. and trans. M. Hutton, Loeb)⁵⁸.

The presence of Rome and Victory in the company of Augustus as proudly represented on the cameo, is well understandable⁵⁹. It may be explained by the fact that the two abstract deities belonged to the traditional Roman pantheon⁶⁰. But what about the personification of the inhabited world?⁶¹ In what follows I shall argue that it is the figure of this goddess on the gem which represents a true novelty in Augustus' ideological programme. Its role played in the narrative makes the boastful message engraved on the cameo not only something new but revolutionary, in fact. It is not the traditional Roman deities as Neptunus (or: Oceanus), Rome or Victory but *Oikumene* which determines the exceptional character of the scene engraved on the stone⁶². For, its presence really means something much more important: a new stage in the ideological development of the Roman state⁶³, when the name of

⁵⁸ P. V e y n e, „*Humanitas*”: *Rzymianie i nie-Rzymianie*, [in:] *Człowiek Rzymu*, ed. A. Giardina. Polish ed.; tr. P. Bravo, Warszawa 2000, p. 442, rightly points out that it is by no means a Roman mark of empathy or a confession of guilt, not to say of any expression of remorse. Rather, the speech is the historian's own reconstruction of the way in which enemies perceived Roman rule, but cited by Tacitus in order to show barbarian lack of understanding the Roman values that lay behind the politics of conquests. On the conception of the Roman *humanitas* see also E. P a n o f s k y, *Meaning in the Visual Arts. Essays in and on Art History*, Garden City, NY 1955, pp. 1–2.

⁵⁹ It reminds something like an act *apotheosis*, on which in the Roman times see I. Gradel, *3.d. Heroisierung und Apotheose. B. Roman Apotheosis*, [in:] *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum [ThesCRA]*, ed. J.Ch. Balty et al., Los Angeles 2004, pp. 189f. On the abstract deities on coins cf. J. O n i a n s, *Classical Art and the Culture of Greeks and Romans*, New Haven – London 1999, p. 200.

⁶⁰ Cf. K. G a l i n s k y, *Continuity and Change: Religion in the Augustan Semi-Century*, [in:] *A Companion to Roman Religion*, ed. J. Rüpke, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2007, pp. 71f.

⁶¹ The lexicon of Liddell, Scott and Jones (*LSJ*) names an example of personified *Oikumene* in Phrygia, IIIrd century AD (in: *Revue archéologique* 1987).

⁶² To a great degree *Oikumene* may be compared with another Roman abstract deity, a famous *Tellus*, a personification of 'Mother', or 'Earth', eventually 'Peace'; cf. P. Stewart, *Roman Art* [Greece & Rome New Surveys in Classics 34], Oxford 2004, pp. 42 – 44, fig. 13.

⁶³ See J.P. A r n a s s o n, *The Roman Phenomenon: State, Empire, and Civilization*, [in:] *The Roman Empire in Context. Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, eds. J.P. Arnasson and K.A. Raaflaub, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2011, pp. 353f., who says of Augustan period as 'a decisive civilizational change'.

Rome began to mean *cosmopolis*⁶⁴. It is as if looking at the onyx layer one should understand that – irrespective of his/her own individual political preferences – from that time the world became Roman. Augustus’ prophetic desire, as recorded later, became thus reality: in Suetonius’ biography (*Div. Aug.* 28) he hopes that the state he had constructed will go on, unchanged and unshaken after his death. In this hope he was quite right.

III. OIKOYMENH TRANSFORMED: THE HELLENISTIC CONCEPT VS. ROMAN *ORBIS TERRARUM*

It is not wholly clear why did the precepts given by the thinkers from ἡ στοὰ ἢ ποικίλη (‘The Painted Porch’) win such a wide acceptance among the Roman upper classes⁶⁵. Why this sect entirely, instead of the Sceptics or Epicureans (although it was Epicurus’ philosophy which left perhaps the most beautiful mark in the Latin literature – Lucretius’ masterpiece)? Naturally, scholars dealing with this intriguing problem noted it long ago but they rarely attempted at giving a satisfactory explanation. It was just taken for granted. Perhaps no one can offer an adequate answer. One only may feel to be convinced by the statement Professor Nussbaum has expressed in her chapter on the connection between ancient philosophy and literature: ‘The ideas of Stoicism were broadly disseminated at Rome in the first century BC and the first two centuries AD, and entered deeply into the ways poets had of seeing the world, much in the way that the ideas of Christianity did in other eras’ (cf. B.D. Shaw, note 35, above)⁶⁶.

The leading German authority in ancient Stoicism, Max Pohlenz (*Die Stoa*, p. 257, see note 27, above) typically explained this fact by the Roman pragmatism. He wrote:

‘In raschen Siegeszuge hatte sich die Stoa eine führende Stellung im Geistesleben des Ostens errungen. Naturgemäß griff sie im zweiten Jahrhundert auch auf die aufstrebende Macht des Westens hinüber. Hier stieß sie allerdings auf ein kernfestes, selbstbewußtes Volkstum, das nicht daran dachte, eigene Art fremden Einfluß zu opfern. Trotzdem gelang es ihr auch hier, gerade auf die maßgebende Schicht

⁶⁴ See the title of the book edited by Catherine Edwards and Greg Woolf, containing several thoughtful essays: *Rome the Cosmopolis*, Cambridge 2003, with the first chapter (by Edward and Woolf) ahead: *Cosmopolis: Rome a World City*, pp. 1–20. I think that there is another important testimony to this process: the description of the Aeneas’ shield in the *Aeneid*, 8. 585–731. Essentially the idea was borrowed from the Homeric *Iliad*, 18. 478–608, but it is clear that in Vergil’s version the cosmos depicted on Vulcan’s masterpiece is Roman world; see P.R. H a r d i e, *Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Shield of Achilles*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985), p. 28; cf. S. M o r t o n B r a u n d, *Virgil and the Cosmos: Religions and Philosophical Ideas*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. Ch. Martindale, Cambridge 1997, p. 220.

⁶⁵ So S. A h b e l-R a p p e, *Philosophy in the Roman Empire*, [in:] *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, ed. D.S. Potter, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2006, p. 524; there is a fine analysis in R.B. Rutherford, *Meditations*, pp. 59–80.

⁶⁶ M.C. N u s s b a u m, *Philosophy and Literature*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, ed. D. Sedley, Cambridge 2003, p. 238.

bestimmend einzuwirken. Die Römer waren ihrem eigentlichen Wesen nach ganz unphilosophisch, ausschließlich den praktischen Aufgaben des realen Lebens zugewandt. Bei ihnen herrschte nicht das Wissen, sondern die Wille. Spekulatives Denken und die hellenische Freude an der theoria, an der Schau und Erkenntnis um ihrer selbst willen, was ihnen fremd. Sie eigneten sich die empirisch gegebenen Dinge auch geistig an, aber nur, um sie zu nützen, nicht um sie in ihrem innersten Sein zu verstehen. Die Problematik des letzten Warum und Woher kümmerte sie nicht’.

Pohlenz’s judgement was accepted in full by Reale (in his fourth volume of *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, Lublin 1999, p. 95; vol. III, p. 329; vol. IV, pp. 95f.). The Romans were eclectics⁶⁷, we often read, a people acquainted to make a free choice between the various doctrines taught in the Greek philosophical schools and then popularized in Rome. Moreover, almost everyone agrees that the Stoic philosophy was ‘holistic’ in its character (A.A. Long’s term⁶⁸). This means that ‘Stoicism and Epicureanism were “philosophies of life” very directly and single-mindedly. That was their novelty’⁶⁹. In result, some general advices how to live and act won favor of the pragmatically oriented Romans⁷⁰. Nowadays the term ‘Roman Stoicism’ is an universally accepted; it is also widely used in modern books on the history of the ancient thought. For the convenience’s sake, the historians of ancient philosophy write of the third phase of Stoicism – just the Roman one. This is the case of Giovanni Reale and his well known series on ancient philosophy⁷¹. But not only of his: other experts agree too (see D. Sedley, see n. 101, below). It is not my intention here to deny the legitimacy of such claims. The phenomenon of the popularity of Greek Stoicism in Rome is a doubtless fact, although hardly to be explained in a simple way⁷². The reason for this in that in its Roman form it essentially differed from what modern students of the ancient Greek thought are accustomed to imagine of. The difference lies in its ‘Roman’ meaninglessness, or, to be more precise, in the lack of a systematized, formal body of thought. Why?

It is true that the philosophical still schools existed during the Roman period, the teachers and masters gave their lectures too (Epictetus’ school in Nicopolis would be the most evident example)⁷³. But the Romans, people of desperately practical mind (cf. Laelius in Ciceronian *De republica*), were – it is thought – deprived of the love of-, and interest in speculative thinking as such. If *some* of the representatives of the Roman elite adopted in the second century BC *selected* items of the old Stoic doctrine, they did so for practical reasons, without entering subtle theoretical assumptions

⁶⁷ So rightly N. Davies, *Europa. Rozprawa historyka z historia*, Polish ed.; tr. E. Tabakowska, Kraków 1999, p. 192.

⁶⁸ *The Philosophical Life: Introduction*, [in:] *Images and Ideologies*, p. 300.

⁶⁹ A. Long, *Philosophical Life*, p. 301.

⁷⁰ Cf. F.W. Walbank, *Świat hellenistyczny*, Polish ed.; tr. G. Muszyński, Warszawa 2003, pp. 178–179. This does not mean that the Roman sought solution of all their problems in the Old Stoa: for instance, Cicero’s *Consolatio* was an overview of the various doctrines concerning.

⁷¹ Translated into Polish by E.I. Zieliński; five volumes, Lublin 1994–2002); cf.

⁷² Cf. M. Morford, *The Roman Philosophers. From the Time of Cato the Censor to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*, London – New York 2002, pp. 1–4.

⁷³ P. Hadot, *Czym jest filozofia starożytna?*, Polish ed.; tr. P. Domański, Warszawa 2000, pp. 194–195.

of the Stoic logic or ontology. Here lies the source of troubles in our interpretation: how to seek Stoic traces in Latin literature? When one begins to study the topic of Roman Stoicism, he soon realizes that the advices and precepts of the Old Stoa are dispersed, so to speak: they are ‘embedded’ in historiography, oratory, lyric poetry, epic. Additionally, even if we know of the Roman thinkers who were regarded as Stoics, their real influence on politics is either unknown or doubtful. Such looking for Stoic traces is not facilitated by the fact that Stoic doctrine was in many points similar either to the Epicurean or Sceptic thinking. Of course, Stoic philosophy *must have been* very popular and it may be traced already in the times of Cicero (e.g. in Sallust⁷⁴), winning thus acceptance of many representatives of the Roman elite during the Principate period. This situation was something obvious and natural later, for many generations of the Roman intellectuals and men of letters. But the ‘practical’ interests of the Roman devotees means that it is not easy to state what exactly was that Roman character of Greek Stoicism. The words Sir Samuel Dill wrote long ago may be quoted here: ‘Philosophy in the time of Seneca was a very different thing from the great cosmic systems of Ionia and Magna Graecia, or even from the system of the older Stoicism. Speculative interest had long before his time given way to the study of moral problems with a definite practical aim’⁷⁵. Dill expressed a sentiment which was later the subject of many learned studies but the problem of why the Romans found Stoicism so attractive cannot be explained better than by assuming that to a great degree it was the Roman expansion that provided a new impetus for Stoic thinking. The empire provided a background against which a broad ‘dialogue’ about character (in Greek: *to ethos*) of the Roman people and Roman value system has begun. On the one hand this expansion to the Greek East was the main cause of the arrival of many Greek thinkers to Rome, including the disciples of the Old Stoa: usually as hostages. Then gradually the Roman pupils of those teachers started to interpret republican successes in the light of the Stoic views, often seeing the Roman drive and domination in the terms of an inevitable event or mission: the successes were interpreted according the new philosophy about human destiny. Such was the opinion of Cicero in his treatise *On Duties* (*De officiis*, 1.35). During this historical process an additional, interesting phenomenon has appeared: the interest in the Roman character and ethics, both by the Greeks and Romans themselves, was a response to Roman rule; its aim was to explicate Roman achievements by studying ‘Roman’ character. This case reminds famous Thucydidean passages referring the characteristic of the Athenians before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war: Athenian power and her rule over so many cities of the Aegean was simply explained by their innate character, that’s national *ethos* (Thuc, 1. 68–78). Such reasoning reminds of Heraclitus’ famous statement that *ethos anthropo daimon* (fr. 250 in: G.S. Kirk & J.E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge 1960, p. 213 [= Stobaeus, *Anth.* 4.40.23]). The character

⁷⁴ M.L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages I*, Leiden 1985. She doubts if Sallust was a Stoic, but in a paper in preparation, *Sallust’s mala ambitio* (Cat. 4.2), I shall argue that the historian remained under a strong influence of the Stoic ideas.

⁷⁵ *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, London 1904, p. 289.

of the Romans determined their destiny: it was destiny to be victors, to rule. Cicero wrote in *De officiis*:

maiores nostri Tusculanos, Aequos, Volscos, Sabinos, Hernicos in civitatem etiam acceperunt, at Karthaginem et Numantiam funditus sustulerunt; nollem Corinthum, sed credo aliquid secutos, oportunitatem loci maxime [...]. Et cum iis, quos vi deviceris consulendum est, tum ii, qui armis positis ad imperatorum fidem confugient, quamvis murum aries percusserit, recipiendi ('Our forefathers admitted to full rights of citizenship the Tusculans, Aequians, Volscians, Sabines, and Hernicians, but they razed Carthage and Numantia to the ground. I wish they had not destroyed Corinth; but I believe they had some special reason for what they did – its convenient situation, probably [...]. Not only must we show consideration for those whom we have conquered by force of arms but we must also ensure protection to those who lay down their arms and throw themselves upon the mercy of our generals, even though the battering-ram has hammered at their walls'; transl. W. Miller, Loeb).

A later commentary on this passage would be the famous description of what did Scipio Aemilianus say on the ruins of Carthage in 146 B.C. His words were quoted by the historian Polybius (38.22.1) and Appian (*Punic.* 132). The latter wrote that:

ὁ δὲ Σκιπίων, πόλιν ὀρῶν ἑπτακοσίοις ἔτεσιν ἀνθήσασαν ἀπὸ τοῦ συνοικισμοῦ καὶ γῆς τοσησδε καὶ νήσων καὶ θαλάσσης ἐπάρξασαν ὄπλων τε καὶ νεῶν καὶ ἐλεφάντων καὶ χρημάτων εὐπορήσασαν ἴσα ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις, τόλμη δὲ καὶ προθυμία πολὺ διασχοῦσαν, ἢ γε καὶ ναῦς καὶ ὄπλα πάντα περιηρημένη τρισὶν ὁμῶς ἔτεσιν ἀντέσχε πολέμῳ τοσῶδε καὶ λιμῶ, τότε ἄρδην τελευτῶσαν ἐς πανωλεθρίαν ἐσχάτην, λέγεται μὲν δακρῦσαι καὶ φανερὸς γενέσθαι κλαίων ὑπὲρ πολεμίων, ἐπὶ πολὺ δ' ἔννους ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ γενόμενός τε καὶ συνιδῶν, ὅτι καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη καὶ ἀρχὰς ἀπάσας δεῖ μεταβαλεῖν ὡς περ ἀνθρώπους δαίμονα καὶ τοῦτ' ἔπαθε μὲν Ἴλιον, εὐτυχῆς ποτε πόλις, ἔπαθε δὲ ἡ Ἀσσυρίων καὶ Μήδων καὶ Περσῶν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις ἀρχὴ μεγίστη γενομένη καὶ ἡ μάλιστα ἔναγχος ἐκλάμψασα, ἡ Μακεδόνων, εἰπεῖν, ἐς Πολύβιον τὸν λογοποιὸν ἀποβλέψαντα, εἴτε ἐκῶν, εἴτε προφυγόντος αὐτὸν τοῦδε τοῦ ἔπους: “ἔσσειται ἡμᾶρ, ὅταν ποτ' ὀλόγη Ἴλιος ἱρὴ καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἐνμμελίῳ Πριάμοιο.” Πολυβίου δ' αὐτὸν ἐρομένου σὺν παρρησίᾳ (καὶ γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ καὶ διδάσκαλος), ὅ τι βούλοιο ὁ λόγος, φασὶν οὐ φυλαξάμενον ὀνομάσαι τὴν πατρίδα σαφῶς, ὑπὲρ ἧς ἄρα, ἐς τὰνθρώπεια ἀφορῶν, ἐδεδεῖ.

For many scholar Scipio's behavior seemed exceptionally strange: how could the Roman victor, they ask, in the hour of his greatest triumph have expressed such pessimistic views, as if he wanted to deny Rome's great political and military achievement, a peak of its political power? Did really Scipio issue such grim thoughts? Or, is the passage only a plausible fabrication of Polybius, the product of his free imagination? We never shall know for sure. However, it would be perhaps safely to assume that Polybius knew something genuine about. If so, the sentiment may be explained by Scipio's acquaintance with some Greek philosophical doctrines (see A. E r s k i n e, *The Hellenistic Stoa. Political Thought and Action*, London 1990,

pp. 213–214). As it is assumed, Scipio's Hellenism was a well known matter and in this case his lamentations sound as if he had read a treatise similar to, let us say, Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*. Apparently, Scipio's comments have Stoic tones.

This section is not aimed at explicating every aspect of the Roman predilection to Stoicism. Its goal was to indicate that what was important for Roman Stoicism may be stressed as follows: it was the Roman *Machtpolitik* which not only facilitated further development of the Stoic sentiments at Rome but that at the same time these territorial purchases were understood and interpreted by the observers and witnesses from this angle. Perhaps one ought think here in more concrete terms: it was a meeting of influential persons that played a decisive role here. The long presence of Polybius in Rome (167–150 BC) became the beginning of this process. His friendship with Panaetius resulted in the introducing this Stoic thinker to the young Roman aristocrat and his friends (including Laelius, known from Cicero's treatise on friendship; cf. E. A s t i n, *Scipio Aemilianus*, Oxford 1967, pp. 294–299). This in turn meant the start of a new intellectual phenomenon: Roman philhellenism. For some conservative Romans, with Cato the Elder ahead, it was a menace to the traditional values, a source of troubles. But looking from modern perspective it contributed to something much more important: the intellectual interpretation of the role and place of the *gens Romana*. In this sense, Stoicism 'justified' Roman expansion, so it may be regarded today as ideology (cf. n. 35, above). With meeting of the Greek Stoics Roman history began to be interpreted in more general, say, metaphysical terms: the empire became something more like a political entity; it had its own destiny and it itself was the Romans' destiny to rule over the world. It even may be said that we are close to the suggestion that Roman power and the right to rule (to have an empire) was seen as the Roman *heimarmene* (fate). These observations appear in the philosophical writings from the end of the republic, to mention especially Cicero's treatises (cf. A.M. E c k s t e i n, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1996, pp. 219–220).

In his *On Divination (De divinatione)* – a treatise written from Stoic perspective (see esp. 1. 118) – Cicero wrote: 'there is a divine force embracing human life' (cf. also *Tusc. disp.* 1.70; see M. Beard, J. North and S. Price, *Religions of Rome II*, Cambridge 1998, p. 352). The sentence is thoroughly Stoic. If we connect it with Cicero's other remarks, where his pride of Roman power evidently appears, or his general thinking about government and the state in the *De republica* and *De legibus* (cf. Colish, *op. cit.* I, p. 92), a clear picture emerges: slowly and inevitably (perhaps) the statesman accepted the vision, in which Rome ruled the world and became something resembling necessity. Concerning this topic, it is a pity that the discussion in the Books II and III of the Ciceronian *De republica* (written in 54 B.C.) has been not preserved. Here Laelius justifies Roman right to rule over the *orbis terrarum* arguing that there are just wars (*De resp.* 3.23.35; cf. *De imp. Cn. Pomp.* 53; *Pro Mur.* 22; *Cat.* 4. 11), led in the defense of one's territory and unjust wars, conducted without precise ends. The Romans, being morally better than others, have of course such right. His adversary, Furius Philus, reminds the view that state justice is impossible and it cannot be reconciled with the drive to maintain power. Laelius agrees (*De resp.* 3.24.36) but if fact he does not refer this case to the Romans. The most compelling argument in claiming that the whole dispute is held in the shadow of Roman power

conceived as a world power, is the end of the treatise – a famous *Somnium Scipionis*, being a tale how good, just citizens and patriots happily exist in the ‘heavens’ and look at earth in the vast space of the Milky Way. In fact, the dialogue of the Roman *nobiles*, although deeply imbued in Greek theories, is the conversation about Rome, still Rome.

Stoic color pervades also the second ‘political’ work of Cicero about Roman state – *De legibus*. Here especially important remains the fact that according to the arguments presented in the Book I the source of law lies in Reason which is given by god and common to all people. The law, argument runs, is something natural but this adjective contains a meaning of something divine, a divine factor. Another important step toward Stoic interpretation of the Roman politics and life are the *Paradoxorum* (44 B.C.), where the politician seeks to defend a few Stoic theses. One of them was that only wise man is free and remains a true citizen: as an example the writer indicates is that while being on exile he was a true Roman citizen. What is also of great weight here is that in order to test the validity of the Stoic paradoxes, the examples of Roman political life are given.

Other treatises of Cicero are not different. The famous dialogue *Hortensius* (45 B.C.) is a defense of philosophy in Rome. Its importance lies in the fact that philosophical contemplation and study of philosophy can bring happiness; it makes a man morally better. Although it is difficult to assert a direct connection between philosophy and Roman politics, of great importance is the fact that it was Roman elite members who discussed such topics. This is the case of the discussion of Stoic views on what constitutes highest good (*honestum*). This theme appears in the Books III and IV of the *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, where Cicero’s mouthpiece of Stoic doctrines is Cato. Evidently Stoic character have many remarks from *Tusculanae disputationes*; perhaps the most evident is that from 3. 82, concerning false impressions. Attractiveness of the Stoic doctrine about gods appears also in the *De natura deorum*, Book II, where Balbus refers the Stoic doctrine of divine care of mankind.

In the treatise *On Duties* (written in the year of the assassination of Caesar; the fragments in Edelstein and Kidd, pp. 56–57) Stoic doctrines reaches their peak. They are discussed with regard to the problem of *honestum* (justice). One of the aspect of being just is *fides*, a duty of defense others (here Roman allies are meant) against those who commit injustice (1. 28–30). Cicero devotes also many remarks to the connection between citizen and state (*res publica*), claiming that a good citizen should help his/her fatherland. Further, he interprets *honestum* as a feature of *magnitudo animi*. Honest man, he argues, should undertake great deeds in politics. But here a restriction appears: to act does not mean to be unjust. One should thus act reasonably, without passions and not randomly. From this observation follows that everyone ought to know his/her own nature and choose a most suitable way of life (*vitae cursus*: 1. 119). The sentiment is Stoic but what is worth noticing is that it is not discussed theoretically but applied to the ideal of Roman citizen who should be just and reasonable.

I have briefly mentioned of several Cicero’s philosophical writings as they seem to be representative and show the growth of the Stoic interpretation of Roman public life and history. This does not mean that it was Stoic thinking alone which totally

dominated in Romans' political thought at that time, less that Stoic philosophy had any direct influence on politics and administration. Cicero was not a Stoic devotee. However, in his works there is a clear interpretation of many problems concerning Roman domestic politics and expansion in the light of Stoic ethics. Above all, what is worth repeating here is that – as I have tried to show – this 'discourse' was held in the shadow of Rome's exceptional political accomplishments. It was this unusual territorial development that determined a vital part of Stoic ethics at Rome – to a great degree Roman Stoicism itself was thus the result of the Roman political conquests.

With the end of the republican conquests and the annexation of Egypt the process of ruling the inhabited world was essentially finished. It also witnessed a fundamental change: now, from the victory over Antony the external, inhabited world has received the *limes*. They were the limes of Roman world (see Livy, *Praef.* 3; 1.16.7; 21.30.10; 34.58.8; 42.39.3). In this respect, *Gemma Augusta* provides, I think, a valuable testimony to our understanding this transition and change.

In the supplementary volume to the *CAH*, vol. VII (chapter 'Asia Minor' by Susan M. Sherwin-White)⁷⁶, there is a fine reproduction of the marble relief showing the apotheosis of Homer. The relief was to be placed in sanctuary of Homer in Alexandria. This IInd century B.C. masterpiece was – as it is believed – probably commissioned by the Egyptian king Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–205 B.C.); its sculptor was the famous Archelaus of Priene⁷⁷. What is here especially important, among many personifications also *Oecumene* ('the Inhabited World') figures: Homer, the prince of poets, is crowned by the goddess, and it is a fine way to show how much was Greek culture indebted to epic poetry⁷⁸. Generally, personifications of 'the inhabited world' are rare in the Hellenistic art⁷⁹, so it is with this exceptional example. If anywhere, it is this relief which proves the working of rule the American art historian Jerome J. Pollitt has called 'cosmopolitan outlook'⁸⁰, being something like a peculiar trait of Hellenistic thinking at all. *Oecumene* was also important in Greek ethics, to recall Diogenes the Cynic's famous statement that he is citizen of the world (Diogenes Laertius, 6. 63: ἐρωτηθεὶς πόθεν εἴη, "κοσμοπολίτης," ἔφη; ed. H.S. Long)⁸¹. This famous sentence recalls Cicero's judgement that according to the

⁷⁶ *The Cambridge Ancient History. Plates to Volume VII, Part 1*, ed. R. Ling, Cambridge 1984, pp. 44–45, fig. 55.

⁷⁷ See M.L. BERNHARD, *Historia starożytnej sztuki greckiej IV. Sztuka hellenistyczna*, Warszawa 19932, pp. 333–334.

⁷⁸ See J. HARBONNEAUX, R. MARTIN and F. VILLARD, *Hellenistic Art (330 – 50 B.C.)*, London 1972, p. 292; also A. CAHN, as in n. 23, above.

⁷⁹ There is no separate study on *Oikumene* in the collection edited by E. STAFFORD and J. HERRIN (*Personification in the Greek World. From to Byzantium*, Aldershot – Burlington 2005), although K. SEAMAN devotes a separate chapter to the *Personification of the Iliad and the Odyssey in Hellenistic and Roman Art*, esp. p. 174. Cf. especially register in M.H. CRAWFORD's, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974.

⁸⁰ *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge 1986, p. 10.

⁸¹ E. BROWN, *Hellenistic Cosmopolitanism*, [in:] *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, eds. M.-L. GILL and P. PELLEGRIN, Malden Mass. – Oxford 2000, 549; cf. G. SHIPLEY, *The Greek World after Alexander 323–30 BC*, London – New York 2000, pp. 183 – 187. As the careful analysis of Gisinger has shown (cf. n. 23, above), the term was not only confined to Stoics; see D. KONSTAN, *Cosmopolitan Traditions*, [in:] *Comp. Gr. & Rom. Polit. Thought*, pp. 473f.

Stoics polis constitutes a cosmos (*Nat. deor.* 2.154). Thinking of such kind indicates that such and similar sentiments must have been ‘in air’, for the same sentiment was ascribed to Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, by the Platonic philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea (I/II century AD). In the diatribe *On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander* (*De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute*), in the collection of his ethical writings called *Moralia* (329a–b)⁸², he claims that it was Alexander the Great who realized Zeno’s powerful idea of living freely, without being divided into cities or states. The famous sentiment in Plutarch’s version runs:

Καὶ μὴν ἡ πολὺ θαυματομένη πολιτεία τοῦ τὴν Στωικῶν αἵρεσιν καταβαλομένου Ζήνωνος εἰς ἓν τοῦτο συντείνει κεφάλαιον, ἵνα μὴ κατὰ πόλεις μηδὲ δήμους οἰκῶμεν ἰδίους ἕκαστοι διωρισμένοι δίκαιοις, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἠγώμεθα δημότας καὶ πολίτας, εἰς δὲ βίος ἢ καὶ κόσμος, ὥσπερ ἀγέλης συννόμου νόμῳ κοινῶ συντρεφομένης. τοῦτο Ζήνων μὲν ἔγραψεν ὥσπερ ὄναρ ἢ εἰδῶλον εὐνομίας φιλοσόφου καὶ πολιτείας ἀνατυπωσάμενος, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἔργον παρέσχεν (‘Moreover, the much-admired *Republic* of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic sect, may be summed up in this one main principle: that all the inhabitants of this world of ours should not live differentiated by their respective rules of justice into separate cities or communities, but that we should consider all men to be of one community and one polity, and that we should have a common life and an order common to us all, even as a herd that feeds together and shares the pasturage of a common field. This Zeno wrote, giving shape to a dream or, as it were, shadowy picture of a well-ordered and philosophic commonwealth; but it was Alexander who gave effect to the idea’; ed. W. Nachstädt, Teubner; transl. F.C. Babbitt, Loeb).

This passage, although Plutarch connected it with the Macedonian warrior-king’s earthly astonishing achievements, leaves no doubts that Zeno did not think in the terms of any political organization or empire: as far as we can state, neither Alexander nor his successors were mentioned by Zeno⁸³. Brunt (*Stoicism and Principate*, p. 16) is thus right in stressing out that: ‘city of Gods and men which was not a city in any ordinary sense, nor a world-state that might one day be brought into being, but the providentially ordered Universe in which all live here and now’⁸⁴. Also Cle-

⁸² M. Schofield, *Social and Political Thought*, [in:] *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield, Cambridge 1999, p. 768.

⁸³ It was rather Plutarch, himself living under the blessing, Roman sun, who plausibly inferred from Roman analogy of his own day the view of Alexander the Great as the first king who realized Zeno’s ideal. Or, alternatively, it were the Romans themselves who since the victories over Hannibal, with the new conquests (especially after Pydna in 168 B.C., not to mention of the destruction of Carthage in 146) began slowly to connect their own political supremacy in the Mediterranean with the legacy of Alexander. A clear evidence for such efforts would be that famous digression in Livy (9.17–19; cf. R. Morello, *Livy’s Alexander Digression (9.17–19): Counterfactuals and Apologetics*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 92 (2002), pp. 62f.) that is in fact, a clear evidence for Roman sense of pride. It goes without saying that Augustus’ interest in Alexander should be read in this context (cf. n. 91, below). On the passage in Plutarch see R. W. Sharples, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics. An Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy*, London – New York 1996, pp. 124–125.

⁸⁴ λέγουσι γὰρ καὶ οἱ Στωϊκοὶ τὸν μὲν οὐρανὸν κυρίως πόλιν, τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ γῆς ἐνταῦθα οὐκέτι πόλεις· λέγεσθαι μὲν γὰρ, οὐκ εἶναι δέ (ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel and U. Treu). Brunt cites the testi-

ment of Alexandria (*Stromat.* 4.26.172.2 = v. Arnim, *SVF* III, no. 327) preserved the information that ‘The Stoics say that the *ouranos* is in the proper sense a city but that those here on earth are not: for they are called cities, but are not’⁸⁵. The idea, it is believed, was expressed also in Cleanthes’ famous hymn to Zeus⁸⁶.

When did the Roman begin to interpret the development of their state in the terms of a world-city?⁸⁷ It is difficult to decide and hint one decisive moment. The historians usually begin with the testimony of Polybius, a Greek politician and historian (he lived in Rome between 168–150 B.C.), who was under a strong impression of Rome’s growing power and attempted to explain her astonishing successes in the march towards world expansion (1.3)⁸⁸. As Professor Walbank states (*Polybius*, pp. 70–71), ‘Between some date in the third century (which might have been variously put at 264 or 241 or 222 or 217 or 212 or 205 or even 200) and some date in the second (which might have been put in 189 or 167 or 146) the Romans became masters of the Mediterranean world in the sense that henceforth they were decisive force in it’. There is general agreement that in 167 BC Rome (that’s, after crushing the Macedonian king Perseus at Pydna in 168) became the master of the Mediterranean world. At 3. 1. 4 Polybius aims to explain πῶς καὶ πότε καὶ διὰ τί πάντα τὰ γνωριζόμενα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων δυναστείαν ἐγένετο. At 3.3.9 of his *Histories* he says of the Romans (Ῥωμαῖοι) who whole inhabited world (πᾶσαν ἐποιήσαντο τὴν οἰκουμένην) made subjugated to their power (ὑπήκοον αὐτοῖς). He also asserts (3.3.4) that τὰ ὅλα καὶ πεσεῖν εἰς τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐξουσίαν.

Similar views he also repeats earlier: at 1.1.5 and 3.1.4. As we know today, Polybius was acquainted with the Stoic ideas; he was a colleague of Panaetius of Rhodes, whom he introduced (probably) to the intellectual circle of Scipio Aemilianus.

When after his victorious campaign Augustus in 30 BC visited the royal Ptolemaic necropolis in Alexandria he refused to see the tombs of the kings from Ptolemaic dynasty. Instead, he went to see Alexander the Great’s sarcophagus (called

monies collected by H. v. Arnim in his *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* [SVF] III, nos. 333–339. But leaving aside philosophical discourse, this observation does not exclude the possibility that usual, geographical meaning of the term as physical world, without indicating a political entity, a state, was also often in use – a point reminded by Gisinger, [in:] *RE*, col. 2164; cf. P. Chantaine, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* II, Paris 1970, p. 782. O. Höfer, s. v. *Oikumene*, [in:] *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* III. 1, hrsg. W.H. Roscher, Leipzig 1897–1902, p. 748 reminded the passage from Athenaeus, 12. 536a, who says of a painting representing the king Demetrius Poliorcetes wandering the inhabited world. However, it is doubtful if there was a personification of *Oikumene*.

⁸⁵ Translation cited after J. Moles, *The Cynics and the Politics*, [in:] *Justice and Generosity. Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy*, eds. A. Laks and M. Schofield, Cambridge 1995, p. 133.

⁸⁶ See H.C. Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind in the Greek Thought*, Cambridge 1965, p. 151. Baldry rightly calls the attention to the writings of Eratosthenes of Cyrene, a famous geographer.

⁸⁷ The literature is, as usually, immense, see, e.g. M. Geiler, *Die Anfänge des römischen Weltreich*, [in:] *Kleine Schriften* II, Wiesbaden 1963, pp. 4f.

⁸⁸ On Polybius see the studies of F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I, Oxford 1957, esp. pp. 16–26; also his *Polybius*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1972, pp. 68f.; recently B. McGing, *Polybius’ Histories*, Oxford 2010, pp. 3f.; also H.C. Baldry, *Unity of Mankind*, p. 175; also J.E. North, *The Development of Roman Imperialism*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 71 (1981), pp. 1f.; see M. Crawford, *Rzym w okresie republiki*, Polish ed.; tr. J. Rohoziński, Warszawa 2003, p. 93.

Sema; cf. Cassius Dio, 51.16)⁸⁹. The famous incident was also told by Suetonius (*Div. Aug.* 50)⁹⁰. Why the visit at all, one asks? Here the historians leave no doubt: it was a part of Augustus' ideological program of construction a new world order: what did Alexander not achieve (he died prematurely), the Romans have realized (see n. 83, above)⁹¹. As usually, a connection between monarchy of Alexander and Roman Principate would be absurd, if historical realities are at stake. But for ideological reasons they fitted well. In itself, it was justification of the Roman empire. Little wonder that many Stoics of the empire welcomed Rome's world-rule.

The process that has begun in the times of Augustus is plain, for example, in Seneca who was typical Roman and Stoic when expressing the ideas about Roman rule and power as just, beneficial and necessary to all the world; it may be considered as characteristic for men of his intellectual circle. The philosopher straightforwardly confesses that it was (Stoic) providence that brought the power and empire to the valiant Romans (*De benef.* 2.23.2; 3.33.2). At other places, Seneca adduces many additional examples (cf. *De brevit.* 18.3; *Cons. Helv.* 9.7; *Cons. Marc.* 14.3; *De ira*, 1.11.7); he frequently repeats that the Roman conquests of the world and her rule are held for the good of the subjugated. C.B. Wells in his book on the Roman Empire reminds another telling passage⁹². The sentiment comes from Pliny the Elder's famous encyclopedia called *Historia naturalis*. In the Book XXVII, 1.3 the imperial erudite expresses a proud claim of the *immensa Romanae pacis maiestas* (also Horace, *C.* 4.3.13; 4.14.43; 4.15.13; cf. A. Erskine, *Roman Imperialism*, Edinburgh 2010, p. 4). The term means a never-ending time of prosperity, welfare and happiness. His view was not unique; it was shared by many Greeks in Roman service, including Plutarch, Arrian of Nicomedia and Aelius Aristides. Pliny's opinion is not only 'political', although on a basic level it seems to be such. Yet, there is much more in it. One should not confine it to the 'political' sphere and see it an expression of bare Roman power only. What is particularly striking in his sentiment is the context of

⁸⁹ See F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC – AD 337)*, London 1977, p. 9.

⁹⁰ See A. Stewart, *Alexander in Greek and Roman Art*, [in:] *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, ed. J. Roisman, Leiden – Boston 2003, p. 58; cf. D. Kienast, *Augustus und Alexander*, *Gymnasium* 76 (1969), pp. 430f.

⁹¹ See A. Veril Cameron, *Rome and the Greek East: Imperial Rule and Transformation*, [in:] *The Greek World. Classical, Byzantine and Modern*, ed. R. Browning, London 1985, p. 203; cf. S. Morton Braund, *Latin Literature*, London – New York 2002, p. 72. Elisabeth Rawson in her article *Caesar's Heritage: Hellenistic Kings and Their Roman Equals* (*Journal of Roman Studies* 65, 1975, pp. 148–159, here at pp. 150–151) pays the attention to the fact that:

'When republican Rome first came into contact with the Hellenistic monarchies, she had, as is generally realized, a reputation for hostility to kings. Her insistence on freeing Greece from Philip of Macedon made a vast impression, and the Scipiones had to write to Prusias of Bithynia to counteract the propaganda of Antiochus by explaining that the Romans had in fact on several occasions supported monarchies-in Illyria, Spain and Africa – and had indeed been lenient to Philip as well. Senatorial policy did later, for various reasons, become more conciliatory; but Perseus, if we may trust a probably Polybian notice in Livy, tried to get support from Eumenes of Pergamum and Antiochus of Syria on the grounds that kings and free states. were necessarily enemies, and that the populus Romanus was picking off kings one by one – 'et quod indignum sit, regum viribus reges oppugnant'. Subsequently, it was true that the Senate did away, or tried to do away, with kings in a number of areas – Macedon itself, Epirus, Cappadocia and Cyrene – and seems to have thought that it was thereby doing the inhabitants a favour'.

⁹² *Cesarstwo rzymskie*, Polish ed.; tr. T. Duliński, Warszawa 2004, p. 265.

the writer's arguing. Let us say that when Pliny points out the blessings of the *pax Romana* which was a continuation of the *pax Augusta*, he does not say of Roman conquests and her subjugating enemies by helping friends and allies. He must not do so. Instead, he connects the term of 'empire' with harmony achieved in natural environment. He simply suggests that common peace brought by the Roman imperial administration carries also peace to the physical world. In his argumentation, plants and animals also benefit from the peace guarded by Roman legions. We are told that political safety guarantees thus prosperity to the nature (which, by the same, still is Roman nature). In such a way environment depends on Roman civilization (cf. n. 113, below). Explicitly it is said that flora and fauna blossom under the civilizing force of Roman imperial peace⁹³. The case of Rome became thus a realization of the old, Heraclitean idea of *logos* (an idea borrowed by the Stoics). As W.K.C. Guthrie wrote (*A History of Greek Philosophy* I, Cambridge 1962, pp. 428), the Ephesian philosopher's *logos* was 'universal, and all-pervading'; it was 'the governing principle of the Universe'. By the term Heraclitus understood 'law by which the world is ordered, and which can be comprehend in human minds'. If one applies these words to Pliny's praise, an astonishing parallel appear. In writing so Pliny presents himself as a child of the political program started by Augustus and his advisors:

immensa Romanae pacis maiestate non homines modo diversis inter se terris gentibusque, verum etiam montes et excedentia in nubes iuga partusque eorum et herbas quoque invicem ostentante! aeternum, quaeso, deorum sit munus istud! adeo Romanos velut alteram lucem dedisse rebus humanis videntur ('the peace that reigns under the majestic sway of the Roman power, a peace which brings in presence of each other, not individuals only, belonging to lands and nations far separate, but mountains even, and heights towering above the clouds, their plants and their various productions! That this great bounteousness of the gods may know no end, is my prayer, a bounteousness which seems to have granted the Roman sway as a second luminary for the benefit of mankind')⁹⁴.

The very same idea appears in Plutarch. His diatribe *De tranquillitate animi*, 9 (= *Mor.* 469d) contains a following passage: ζῶμεν ὑγιαίνομεν τὸν ἥλιον ὀρῶμεν· οὐ πόλεμος οὐ στάσις ἐστίν ('we live, we are of good health, we look at the sun, there is neither war, nor civil discord'). The addressee, when reading such words rightly feels as if hearing something well known. It is the repeating of an older political idea, formulated already by Vergil in his first eclogue⁹⁵.

⁹³ Cf. the excellent book by M a r y B e a g o n, *Roman Nature. The Thought of Pliny the Elder*, Oxford 1992; cf. also H. S i d e b o t t o m, *Philosophers' Attitude to War under the Principate*, [in:] *War and Society in the Roman World*, eds. J. Rich and G. Shipley, London – New York 1993, p. 243; see A. K a m m, *The Romans*, p. 180.

⁹⁴ Tr. J. B o s t o c k and H. T. R i l e y, *Pliny the Elder, The Natural History*, London 1855; see especially S. C a r e y, *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture. Art and Empire in the Natural History*, Oxford 2003, pp. 41–74.

⁹⁵ Cf. S. E. A l c o c k, *Graecia capta. The Landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge 1993, p. 17.

As Graham Shipley wrote, ‘Landscapes exist differently for different cultures and for different groups within a society’⁹⁶. This observation finds its realization in the long period when the Roman empire flourished. In the times of Augustus the process of transforming Rome from purely political power to the more metaphorical ‘landscape’, *orbis terrarum*, compelled the next generations of the Roman citizens to express a conviction that they all live in all-embracing, divinely inspired nature. During the first and second century (especially under the Antonines) the philosophical *kosmos* of the Roman empire has reached its zenith.

Aelius Aristides, a famous Greek orator and sophist wrote of this phenomenon as follows in his long panegyric speech *To Rome*:

‘Now all the Greek cities rise up under your leadership and the monuments which are dedicated in them and all their embellishments and comforts redound to your honor like beautiful suburbs. The coasts and interiors are filled with cities, some newly founded, others increased under and by you [...] Taking good care of the Hellenes as of your foster parents, you constantly hold your hand over them, and when they are prostrate, you raise them up’ (§§ 94, 96)⁹⁷.

Such and similar statements should be analyzed in a strict connection with the works of the Roman art. Among the latter a small *Gemma Augustea* must take a privileged place.

IV. SUMMARY

In the chapter 28.3 of his biography of Augustus Suetonius inserts the information that one of the most desirable wishes of the *princeps* was to leave Rome in security and prosperity. Additionally he wished to be remembered by posterity as the creator of the best government. This best regime was to possess solid bases (*fundamenta rei publicae*). In more metaphorical way, Rome has been adorned by marbles, not by the bricks: *Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset* (‘Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he so beautified it that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble’; ed. and transl. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb). This goal Augustus certainly has achieved, so the great admiration of next generations, lasting practically until now. Sometimes, however, one would wish to know more about the mentality of this great world constructor as it was this mentality which lay behind these *fundamenta*. Partly, we know it – from the

⁹⁶ G. Shipley, *Preface*, [in:] *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity. Environment and Culture*, eds. G. Shipley and J. Salmon, London – New York 1996, p. 12.

⁹⁷ Translation after: S. Alcock, *Graecia capta*, p. 24. Andrew Lintott acutely observed that there is a great difference between the conception of the *oikumene* in Polybius and in this speech: the former means a world being conquered by the Romans; in the latter case Aristides says about Roman *oikumene*, in which he just lives: A. Lintott, *Imperium Romanum. Politics and Administration*, London – New York 1993, p. 186.

Suetonius' *vita* or Augustus' own *Res gestae*, inscribed on the stone found in Ancyranum. Nevertheless, one may attempt to speculate about a more general justification that lay behind the creation of the 'new world order'. Did Augustus think right to tell about it at all? In his Augustus – *vita* Suetonius states (ch. 85) that the *princeps* has written several works. Among them the two look today particularly interesting, and it is a great pity that they have perished – the loss the more deplorable that they were philosophical treatises. The first was a polemical writing *A Reply to Brutus on Cato* (*Rescripta Bruto de Catone*)⁹⁸: it probably contained some interesting thoughts on Stoic conceptions. The second, even more intriguing, was *Exhortations to Philosophy* (*Hortationes ad philosophiam*)⁹⁹. Both titles contained, one may suppose, something like an exposition of Augustus' philosophical views. On this occasion, perhaps one could find in them a more clear explication what did the term *oecumene* mean. This would also be very fascinating experience, given that one of Augustus' advisors was the Stoic Athenodorus of Tarsus¹⁰⁰, of whom we know from the inscription now reprinted in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (cf. Brunt, *Stoicism and Principate*, p. 7: *PIR*² A 1288 = *FGrH* 746)¹⁰¹: if so, one may ask, why did Augustus think justified to criticize such committed Stoics as Brutus and Cato the Younger were? The answer would be that many Stoic thinkers did not oppose to Roman monarchy as such (Brunt's thesis).

In his chapter on *Imperial Oecumene*, P. Fibiger Bang states that the 'The secret to governing the polyethnic conglomerate which was the Roman empire lay in the establishment of universal institutions'¹⁰². Roman power was thus 'infrastructure', to use Fibiger Bang's term (p. 675). Well said. But this Roman 'infrastructure', one should add, owed much, although in a more general way, to Greek intellectual speculation: it was Greek speculation but adopted by the Romans. Adaptation meant, by necessity, a change of the nature of the speculation. In our case the pragmatic sons of she-wolf just borrowed the old philosophical concept of all-pervading imagined community and (metaphysical) dimension (*oecumene*, 'the inhabited world') in which a true Hellenistic sage should live, to label with this term a more concrete political reality they themselves began to put into being with the republican conquests, a process which has been ended essentially with the establishing of the Augustan *imperium sine fine*¹⁰³. The process was finely summarized in the second century AD by the Greek historian Appian of Alexandria (*Praef.* 1–5). His remarks, to some extent are not far from these expressed by Polybius.

Every adept of the school courses in Latin remembers Horace's memorable sentence from his letter written about AD 14 to Augustus (*Epist.* 2.1.156): *Graecia cap-*

⁹⁸ As Cicero noted (*Epist. ad Att.* 12. 21), in 46 BC Brutus has written a praise of Cato; cf. Rutherford, *Meditations*, p. 69.

⁹⁹ Cf. M. Cytowska i H. Szalest, *Literatura rzymska. Okres augustowski*, Warszawa 1990, p. 21.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. J. Annas, s. v. *Athenodorus*, [in:] *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, eds. S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow, Oxford 2012⁴, p. 195.

¹⁰¹ Another Stoic in the Augustan court was Arius Didymus, on which see D. Sedley, *The School, from Zeno to Arius Didymus*, [in:] *Cambr. Comp. Stoicism*, p. 31.

¹⁰² *Imperial Oecumene and Polyethnicity*, [in:] *Oxf. Handbook of Rom. Studies*, p. 674; cf. A. Kamn, *The Romans*, p. 181f.

¹⁰³ Trajan's Parthian war, AD 114–117, was an exception to the rule.

*ta ferum victorem cepit*¹⁰⁴. Often these words are meant today as expressing Roman self-consciousness of Greek intellectual superiority and Roman sense of debt to the literary culture (the famous *paideia*) of the old Greece¹⁰⁵. As a sensible expert of Greek poetry, Horace also perfectly knew how much did Roman civilization (to use that solemn word) borrow from the Greeks (cf. Gruen, *Hellenistic World & Coming of Rome* I, pp. 251f.). All this is of course true. But it should not be taken as a sign of Horace the man's modesty. To the contrary, he is proud of the Roman 'global' achievement, which is worth fighting and dying for¹⁰⁶. And understandably so. Here he speaks (to paraphrase his own words) as a typical *Augusti de grege porcus*¹⁰⁷. The poet perfectly bears in mind (vv. 161–162), as the old *princeps* did too, when did this Roman march into victory begin: it was after the Punic wars, that's, from 146 BC onwards when a new epoch in the Roman history has started to be realized. Here (and elsewhere in his beautiful poems) Horace speaks to us with that peculiar kind

¹⁰⁴ See the title of the book of S.E. Alcock, see n. 91, above; see the commentary of N. Rudd, *Horace, Epistles, Book II and the Epistle to the Pisones*, Cambridge 1989, p. 101.

¹⁰⁵ On the passage see A. Barchiesi, *Roman Perspectives on the Greeks*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, eds. B. Boys-Stones, B. Graziosi and P. Vasunia, Oxford 2009, p. 103; cf. G.W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965, ch. 6, pp. 73f.

¹⁰⁶ On the global character of the Roman empire cf. R. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture. Unity, Diversity and Empire*, London – New York 2005, p. 69; cf. J.P. Tonner, *Rethinking Roman History*, Cambridge 2002, p. 13, and J. Huskisson, *Looking for Culture, Identity and Power*, [in:] *Experiencing Rome. Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*, ed. J. Huskinson, London – New York 2000, p. 11. Already D.S. Potter said of 'geographical monstrosity' (*The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180 – 395*, London – New York 2004, p. 36). Particularly the two maps of the Roman empire by R.J.A. Talbert are convincing: the first (p. 102) shows the territory in 60 BC; the second indicates the Roman possessions in 60 AD (pp. 128–129); [in:] *Atlas of Classical History*, ed. R.J.A. Talbert, London 1985; cf. also R.S. Bagall, J.F. Drinkwater, C.B. Welles, *Provinces of the Roman Empire at the Death of Trajan (AD 117)* [the map 100], [in:] *The Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. R.J. Talbert, Princeton 2000. In this place it would be appropriate to remind that Roman interest in producing maps is also characteristic: some scholars believe that it was a direct effect of maintaining control over such vast territories; cf. R.J.A. Talbert, *Rome's Provinces as Framework for World-View*, [in:] *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, eds. L. de Light, E.A. Hemelrijk and H. Singor, Amsterdam 2004, pp. 21f.; especially R. Syme, *Military Geography at Rome*, *Classical Antiquity* 7 (1988), pp. 227f.; see also O.A.W. Dilke, *Maps in the Service of the State: Roman Cartography to the End of the Augustan Era*, [in:] *Cartography in Prehistory, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean* [History of Cartography. Volume One], eds. J.B. Harley and D. Woodward, Chicago 1987, pp. 207f. The famous Peutinger Map, a medieval monument of the art of cartography, made from pieces of parchment and showing the whole world, also is a copy of a lost Roman map, see E. Albu, *Rethinking the Peutinger Map*, [in:] *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh Perspectives, New Methods*, eds. R.J.A. Talbert and R.W. Unger, Leiden – Boston 2008, pp. 211–212. Not differently from this was the Roman geographical literature: for example, both Tacitus' *Germania* as Arrian's *Periplus* (written in Greek but by the addicted Roman commander of Cappadocia) bring geographical descriptions but reveal the same Roman pride of controlling the barbarian fringes of the inhabited (Roman) world: Arrian's treatise is in fact a letter from his military inspection of the Black Sea.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. M.S. Santirocco, *Horace and Augustan Ideology*, *Arethusa* 28 (1995), pp. 229f. See especially the opinion of G.B. Conte (*Latin Literature*, Baltimore 1994, p. 251): 'What we call Augustan ideology is certainly not the mechanical product of a ministry of propaganda that directly controls writers' pens; it is a political-cultural cooperation in which the poets play an active, individual role'; see generally M. Lorie, *Horace and Augustus*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, ed. S. Harrison, Cambridge 2007, pp. 77f.

of self-confidence which only supreme position of a winner can give¹⁰⁸; indeed, he presents himself as *victor*. This was possible since he feels to be a part of the Roman *oecumene* which in the Roman new conception became a synonym of the ruling and civilizing power (both terms of J.H. Oliver from his two learned studies¹⁰⁹) the Romans successfully exercised. From now the horizon of this new *oecumene* was to embrace everything, including the poet's Sabinum, not to mention physical environment: landscapes, *nives*, *gramina*, *arbores* and *campi*. Horace's native *orbis terrarum*, although poetical and sometimes idealized, remains nevertheless more concrete, more physical, more tangible than it was in the case of the Hellenistic spiritual and non-political space called οἰκουμένη: it is beautiful, sunny Italian landscape. As he wrote in a famous ode against Cleopatra (composed on the occasion of her suicide), *nunc est pede libero pulsanda tellus* (C. 1.37)¹¹⁰. In this sentence the Roman attitude toward power and empire mirrors very well: earth must be 'beaten', even if in this context it only means mere joy and dance.

There is also another excellent, panegyric passage, similar to the sentiments expressed by Augustan bards. It is quoted by Flavio Conti in his lavishly illustrated book *Historia starożytnego Rzymu*¹¹¹. The author of the praise of Italy under Roman rule was Rutilius Namatianus (his *floruit* falls on the first half of the Vth century AD), practically known from one poem, *De reditu suo*¹¹². If one did not know the date of its writing, it easily might think of it as composed in the times of Augustus. In fact, the poem may be seen as the closure of the golden epoch of the Roman empire. But the imperial nostalgia remained long-lasting and the same in fact (1. 47–66). Let us allow the poet say:

*Exaudi, regina tui pulcherrima mundi,
inter sidereos, Roma, recepta polos;
exaudi, genetrix hominum genetrixque deorum:
Non procul a caelo per tua templa sumus.
Te canimus semperque, sinent dum fata, canemus:
Sospes nemo potest immemor esse tui.
Obruerint citius scelerata oblivia solem
quam tuus e nostro corde recedat honos.
Nam solis radiis aequalia munera tendis,
qua circumfusus fluctuat Oceanus;
volitur ipse tibi, qui continet omnia, Phoebus
eque tuis ortos in tua condit equos.
Te non flammigeris Libye tardavit arenis;
non armata suo reppulit ursa gelu:*

¹⁰⁸ See T. C o r n e l l & J. M a t t h e w s, *Rzym*, Polish ed.; tr. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1995, p. 76; cf. C.A. Barton's interesting book *Roman Honor. The Fire in the Bones*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 2001, p. 47.

¹⁰⁹ Although it was Athens which was called by Oliver 'civilizing power'.

¹¹⁰ Cf. J. C i e c h a n o w i c z, *Rzym. Ludzie i budowle*, Warszawa 1987, p. 91.

¹¹¹ Polish ed.; tr. M. N e n y c z, Warszawa 2004, p. 8.

¹¹² The Loeb ed. by J.K. M a i d m e n t, *Minor Latin Poets II*, Cambridge Mass. – London 1934.

*Quantum vitalis natura tetendit in axes,
tantum virtuti pervia terrae tuae.
Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam;
profuit iniustis te dominante capi;
dumque offers victis proprii consortia iuris,
Urbem fecisti, quod prius orbis erat*¹¹³.

GEMMA AUGUSTEA I RZYMSKI STOICYZM

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł poświęcony został problemowi tak zwanego rzymskiego stoicyzmu – ostatniego etapu rozwoju filozofii i szkoły stoickiej.

Punktem wyjścia jest scena uwieńczenia Oktawiana Augusta przez boginię *Oikumene* na tak zwanej *Gemma Augustea*, pięknej kamei, która pochodzi z początków panowania cesarza Tyberiusza.

Obecność postaci *Oikumene* jest tam zastanawiająca, bo jak wiadomo pojęcie to było używane w filozofii hellenistycznej (stoickiej i cynickiej) na oznaczenie świata zamieszkałego.

Fakt, że postać *Oikumene* została włączona do imperialnego programu cesarza Augusta, dowodzi, iż Rzymianie nadali temu pojęciu inny sens: w ich rozumieniu *Oikumene* oznaczała teraz *sensu stricto* świat rzymski. Był to symboliczny sposób wyrażenia panowania rzymskiego nad światem. Tym samym figura *Oikumene* na gemmie jest dowodem, że Rzymianie nie powtarzali biernie nauki stoickiej, ale wykorzystali niektóre jej elementy do opisanie ich panowania nad światem. Co ważniejsze, sam fakt posiadania tak olbrzymiego imperium określił niejako przy okazji charakter rzymskiego stoicyzmu.

DIE GEMMA AUGUSTEA UND DER RÖMISCHE STOIZISMUS

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Artikel wurde dem Problem des sogenannten römischen Stoizismus gewidmet. Das war die letzte Phase in der Entwicklung und Geschichte der stoischen Philosophie.

Der Ausgangspunkt ist hier die Darstellung Kaisers Octavianus Augustus auf dem Edelstein, der als die *Gemma Augustea* bekannt ist. Augustus ist von der Göttin *Oikumene* mit dem Kranz geschenkt. Diese schöne Kamee stammt aus der Zeit der Herrschaft des Imperators Tiberius.

¹¹³ A similar character bears an earlier, famous epyllion *Mosella*, written by Decimus Magnus Ausonius of Burdigale (c. 310–390 AD). It contains an idyllic description of the landscape and its natural amenities alongside the river, as the river itself. But, as some scholars think, it is by the same a panegyric in praise of the Roman civilization and its defender, the Emperor Valentinianus I (I am indebted to Dr. Tatiana Krynicka, who kindly reminded me of this poem).

Die Gestalt der *Oikumene* ist sehr wissenwürdig, als es bekannt ist, daß der Begriff der *Oikumene* sehr popular in der hellenistischen Philosophie war, besonders bei den Kynikern und Stoikern. Er bedeute dort 'die wohnhafte Welt'.

Die Tatsache, daß die Gestalt der *Oikumene* zu dem imperialen Programm des Augustus angeschlossen worden ist, dient als ein Hinweis, daß die Römer diesem Begriff eine andere Bedeutung gaben. Sie verwendeten sie an, um die römische Welt zu beschriften. Das war eine symbolische Weise ihre Herrschaft über die ganze Welt zu äußern. Die Figure der *Oikumene* auf die Kamee ist ein Beweis, daß die Römer nicht passiv das stoische Doktrine nachgeieffert haben, sondern nützten manche ihre Elemente, um ihre Weltherrschaft und Expansion zu beschreiben und zu nennen. Was dabei noch interessanter ist, daß der römische Imperialismus und die große Macht der Stadt an dem Tiber das Wesen des römischen Stoizismus bestimmten.