Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 33 (1987)

Artikel: The mechanics of subversion in the Roman provinces
Autor: Bowersock, G.W.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661057

VIII

G. W. Bowersock

THE MECHANICS OF SUBVERSION IN THE ROMAN PROVINCES

> « Je vous ai d'abord surpris en vous montrant le carillon de l'ordre social et le jeu de la machine. »
>
> Balzac, *Le père Goriot* (Vautrin)

Provincial opposition to Roman imperial rule in the first century of the present era welled up here and there like hot and turbid springs in tranquil waters. The *pax romana* was incontrovertibly peaceful by comparison with the century that had gone before, and virtually no one contemplated overthrowing the Roman government altogether. Hostility, such as it was, was directed against the cruel and incompetent. It was the weapon of the fractious and ambitious. Apart from pagan revolts that had to be suppressed by military force, such as those of Florus and Sacrovir in Gaul and the queen Boudicca in Britain, to say nothing of Christians and Jews (who require separate treatment), opposition in the provinces took three principal forms: local sedition, troublemaking initiated by an external power (normally Parthia), and regional support for uprisings among a Roman soldiery mobilized by an aspiring commander. In instances of this kind, it is often difficult to

comprehend the causes of a riot in a provincial city, or the sources of support for a pretender that the Parthians had launched to claim the Roman throne, or the genesis of an inflated reputation that moved provincials and Roman soldiers alike to acclaim a commander in their midst as a new emperor. These things did not just happen, however much they reflected genuine sentiment, nor do they today. It is incumbent upon the historian of antiquity to disengage, if he can, the mechanism of sedition. He should be able to ascertain the techniques and procedures by which subversion is achieved, or at least attempted, with the same clarity that the modern historian can bring to an account of the mullahs who brought down the Shah in contemporary Iran.[1] Once the mechanics of subversion have been described, it should be possible to offer interpretations of events that have hitherto remained unexplained and often, for that reason, forgotten.

In the last year of Augustus' life, there was a revolt in Athens, of which we know little; but it can scarcely be accidental that among the first provincial arrangements made by Tiberius was the incorporation of Achaia and Macedonia into the administrative system of the Moesian province.[2] Presumably something serious and threatening had been going on. Or again, in Lycia in A.D. 43 some

[1] Observe R. MOTTAHEDEH, *The Mantle of the Prophet* (New York 1985), 328: "The government, aware of the active disloyalty on the part of some of the mullahs, wanted the 'models' and other high religious leaders resident in Iran to speak against this disloyal element, and it leaned on them heavily to do so. The high religious leaders refused to comply. . ." For the arrival of Khomeini in Iran, *op. cit.*, 375-77.

[2] Oros. *Hist.* VI 22, 2: the doors of the temple of Janus were opened *sub extrema senectute Augusti. . .Atheniensium seditione et Dacorum commotione*. Cf. Eus. *Chron.* in Lat. p. 170 Helm and in Arm. p. 212 Karst; Syncellus, *sub. ann.* 5513 (p. 602 Dindorf). Perhaps *IG* II/III [2] 3233 (cf. *Hesperia* 17 [1948], 41, no. 30) is relevant. See also G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965), 107. For the rearrangement of provinces, Tac. *Ann.* I 76, 2: note there *Achaiam ac Macedoniam onera deprecantis. . .*

Romans were killed in factional troubles, described as *stasis* by Cassius Dio and as *discordiae* by Suetonius, but we have no knowledge of the cause of this *stasis* or why it should have included the killing of Romans.[3] Again, on Rhodes in the following year the local authorities crucified some Romans.[4] We do not know why, nor do we know whether these were Rhodian Roman citizens, Roman settlers, or visitors. But the imposition of this savage penalty, normally reserved for slaves, implies some kind of judicial action in what was then a free territory within the Roman Empire.[5] What had these Roman citizens done to deserve or be thought to deserve such a death?

In his important study of the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor, Simon Price has shown clearly how the ceremonies, costumes, and spaces of the cult served to bring the subject peoples of Rome into a closer relationship with their emperor.[6] He has exposed the profoundly religious core of an institution that stabilized the provinces and made an alien rule seem somehow their own. What follows here is an exploration of the forces that worked against everything that Simon Price has described. This will be a look into the practices, politics, ceremonies, and mythmaking that were directed to destabilizing provincial society and to alienating the provincial peoples from their emperors. Destabilization and alienation lie at the heart of provincial opposition in the Roman provinces. These are the goals that any factional leader, any Parthian strategist, and any

[3] Dio Cass. LX 17, 3; Suet. *Claud.* 25, 3.

[4] Dio Cass. LX 24, 4. The verb is ἀνεσκολόπισαν, rendered in the Loeb edition as "impaled". But Lucian, *De morte Peregr.* 11, shows that in this imperial Greek ἀνασκολοπίζω is the equivalent of ἀνασταυρόω, as already noted in *LSJ* under the former verb.

[5] Cf. P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1970), 126-29.

[6] S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).

ambitious Roman general had to set before him. To begin our exploration of the means available to such dissidents and plotters, let us begin with two clear and well documented cases from the dying Republic.

In 48 B.C., according to ancient tradition, miracles proclaimed Julius Caesar's victory over Pompey at Pharsalus.[7] It is easy and sometimes legitimate to assume that reports of such portents were fabricated after the event in order to enhance the glory of the victor. But credulity could also be manipulated in advance, and there is no doubt that miracles were staged by priests in support of what they believed a good cause. *Fraus* it may have been, but *pia fraus*. At Pergamum before the battle of Pharsalus, sounds were heard from the temple of Dionysus. Caesar himself gives an explicit account in the third book of his *Civil Wars*: *Pergamique in occultis ac reconditis templi quo praeter sacerdotes adire fas non est—quae Graeci adyta appellant—tympana sonuerunt*.[8] Only priests were allowed in the inner part of the shrine from which the din emanated. It was the great merit of Mario Segre to recognize that this miracle must have been engineered by a well known supporter of Caesar in Asia Minor, Mithridates, the son of Menodotus, of Pergamum.[9] Described in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* as *fidei dignitatisque in amicitia Caesaris* and in Strabo's *Geography* as Καίσαρι τῷ θεῷ γενόμενος φίλος, Mithridates supplied valuable military help in the Alexandrian war.[10] Above all, he appears on two statue bases at Pergamum as a hereditary priest of Dionysus Καθηγεμών.[11] Mithridates clearly had access to the *adyton* of the temple of

[7] Caes. *Civ.* III 105; Plut. *Caes.* 47; Dio Cass. XLI 61, 4.

[8] Caes. *Civ.* III 105, 5.

[9] M. SEGRE, in *Athenaeum* N. S. 16 (1938), 120.

[10] *Bell. Alex.* 26, 1; Strab. XIII 4, 3, p. 625. Cf. Cic. *Div.* II 79.

[11] The remains of the two bases can be combined to produce the text that was inscribed on both: see M. SEGRE, *art. cit.* (*supra* n. 9), 120: ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν /

Dionysus and, by the creation of the miracle, secured Pergamum for Julius Caesar. Both Mithridates and the city were rewarded: Caesar appointed the priest ruler of the Bosporan kingdom and tetrarch of the Galatian Trocmi, and special privileges were granted both to Pergamum and its territory in recognition of its loyalty.[12]

About eight years later, when the renegade Roman known as Labienus Parthicus moved into Asia Minor with the support of the Parthians in an attempt to exploit the instability of the early Triumvirate in the interests of an alien power, those cities which remained loyal to Rome at this dangerous time ultimately reaped a rich reward. The new inscriptions from Aphrodisias provide eloquent testimony to Augustus' long memory in allowing privileges to the cities of Asia that stood firm,[13] and the claim of loyalty continued to be important, as Tacitus shows, in the reign of Tiberius as well.[14] Stratonicea in Caria was another of the loyal cities, and the repulse of the forces of Labienus that bore down upon the city is vividly described in a fragmentary but stunning inscription from the shrine of Panamara in the territory of Stratonicea.[15] The text refers to a large force of cavalry and infantry that invaded the territory and was suddenly and miraculously turned back

Μιθραδάτην Μηνοδότου τὸν διὰ γένους ἀρχιερέ[α] / καὶ ἱερέα τοῦ Καθηγεμόνος Διονύσου διὰ γένο[υς]. . .

[12] *Bell. Alex.* 78, 2; Strab. XIII 4, 3, p. 625; Dio Cass. XLII 48, 4; and App. *Mithr.* 121, 596 (mentioning only the Bosporan kingdom).

[13] Note Joyce REYNOLDS, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982), 104, no. 13.

[14] Tac. *Ann.* III 62: *Aphrodisienses posthac et Stratonicenses dictatoris Caesaris ob vetusta in partis merita et recens divi Augusti decretum adtulere, laudati quod Parthorum inruptionem nihil mutata in populum Romanum constantia pertulissent.*

[15] The definitive publication is in P. ROUSSEL, in *BCH* 55 (1931), 70-116, republished with slight modifications in Çetin ŞAHIN (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* I (*Inschr. griech. Städte aus Kleinasien*, Bd. 21 [Bonn 1981]), 10-12, no. 10. *Exempli gratia* supplements are superabundant in these editions, obliging the reader to be alert to exactly what stands on the surviving fragments.

by the epiphany of the god himself, Zeus Panamaros, in light and fire: μετὰ φω]τὸς φλόγα πολλὴν [α]ὐτοῖς ἐνετίναξεν.[16] Fiery flashes from the temple were accompanied by deep rumblings and flashes of what seemed to be lightning. The army was terrified and retreated at once, crying out in a loud voice, "Great is Zeus Panamaros!"[17]

The miracle of Panamara not only drove away the enemy; it encouraged at least some of these troops to desert and take refuge in the shrine.[18] The forces of Labienus were consequently both defeated and diminished. The inscription also makes reference to other unearthly phenomena, including the howling of dogs and the mysterious burning of candles inside the shrine.[19] There can be little doubt that the exploitation of the temple of Zeus Panamaros in the Roman interest was engineered by a priest or priests. The inscription that describes the miracle names one, Chaeremon, the son of Hecataeus, who is well known from other inscriptions at Stratonicea.[20] His father's name suggests a connection with the nearby shrine of Hecate in Lagina, which must also have remained loyal to the Romans at this time. Lagina, like Panamara, was a deme of Stratonicea. And Chaeremon's own name suggests that he may have been related to a well known and widely dispersed family from Nysa and Tralles that had a distinguished record of commitment to the Romans in the late Republic and early Empire.[21] In fact, two miracles at Tralles in favor of Caesar on the day of Pharsalus were undoubtedly the work of this

[16] *Ibid.*, ll. 5-7.

[17] *Ibid.*, l. 13: ἔτι δὲ ἀναβοών[των] μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ Μέγαν εἶναι Δία Πανάμαρον.

[18] *Ibid.*, l. 14.

[19] *Ibid.*, l. 25 (dogs) and l. 27 (candles).

[20] *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* I (n. 15), 38, nos. 105 and 106.

[21] For Chaeremon of Nysa, his son Pythodorus of Tralles, and subsequent generations, cf. G. W. Bowersock, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 2), 8 with notes.

family, although their role is not explicitly attested. A palm appeared on the altar of Victory, and the statue of Victory herself turned to face Caesar's.[22] Mithridates of Pergamum had used the resources at his disposal to bring his city to the side of Julius Caesar, and Chaeremon of Stratonicea had used the resources of his temple not only to secure allegiance to Rome but actually to turn away a host of invaders.

Priests were, as these striking examples demonstrate, extraordinarily well placed to influence local sentiment. The examples of Pergamum and Panamara provide the necessary information for understanding certain miraculous events of the early Empire that are associated with provincial opposition to the Roman government at the time when they occurred. Such opposition need not, of course, imply opposition to Roman rule overall.

When Caligula decided to remove the great statue of Olympian Zeus from its temple in Greece to Rome, a great miracle occurred. As the workmen were in the process of dismantling the statue, a tremendous laughter was heard within the temple, and the workmen fled in terror: *Olympiae simulacrum Iovis, quod dissolvi transferrique Romam placuerat, tantum cachinnum repente edidit, ut machinis labefactis opifices diffugerint.*[23] Thus was Caligula's mad plan effectively aborted. As Zeus of Panamara could turn away the enemy, so Zeus of Olympia could turn away the agents of the emperor. The episode is scarcely likely to have been invented after the fact since the statue remained at Olympia after the workmen had begun to remove it, and the possibility of giving signs of life to statues is well attested in ancient sources. Like their mediaeval counterparts, ancient

[22] Caes. *Civ.* III 105, 6. The miracles at Elis and Syrian Antioch in this same chapter are presumably to be explained in a similar way: cf. E.W. GRAY, in *JRS* 42 (1952), 123.

[23] Suet. *Cal.* 57, 1.

statues could laugh (as here), sweat, bleed, and turn round on their pedestals.[24] In 43 B.C. the statue of the mother of the gods on the Palatine turned of its own accord from east to west, while a statue of Minerva near Mutina, where the decisive battle was to be fought, sent forth not only blood but milk (presumably not at the same time).[25] A famous example from the city of Rome, a statue of Julius Caesar on the island in the Tiber, turned from west to east and was understood to have proclaimed the ascendancy of Vespasian as emperor.[26]

The foregoing examples illustrate the potential of miracles as a means of destabilizing the order at any chosen moment and of alienating sentiment from one person in favor of another. Augustus, who knew well that shrines had served the Roman cause in the triumviral period, was himself confronted with a hostile use of them during his travels in the East between 21 and 19 B.C. When he was on his way to Athens, that city, which had been loyal to Antony at the time of Actium, produced a miracle that the emperor took seriously. The statue of Athena on the Acropolis turned round on its base to face west instead of east and spat blood.[27] In anger Augustus refused to enter the city and remained throughout the winter on the island of Aegina. During his sojourn there he deprived Athens of possession of both Aegina and Eretria, from which they had been receiving tribute.[28] In 21 B.C. it still could not have been clear to the provincials that Augustus was going

[24] Otto WEINREICH assembled a valuable set of references to *Statuenwunder* in his admirable study, *Antike Heilungswunder* (Giessen 1909), 146. He rightly remarks, "Häufig werden Lebensäusserungen von Standbildern berichtet". Cf. also F. BÖMER's commentary on Ovid's *Fasti* III 46.

[25] Dio Cass. XLVI 33, 3 (Palatine); 4 (Mutina).

[26] Tac. *Hist.* I 86; Suet. *Vesp.* 5, 7; Plut. *Otho* 4, 8-9.

[27] Dio Cass. LIV 7, 2-3.

[28] *Ibid.*, with [Plut.] *Reg. et imp. apophth., Aug.* 13, 207 F. Cf. G. W. BOWERSOCK, in *CQ* N. S. 14 (1964), 120-21.

to be the first of a long succession of Roman *principes*, and those who had supported Antony might well have anticipated a new reversal and even contemplated encouraging one. That the miracle of Athena in 21 B.C. was an act of opposition seems incontestable.

The same trip to the East brought more troubles to Augustus. At Cyzicus he found that Roman citizens had been flogged and executed, and at Tyre and Sidon he found factional strife that he addressed as potentially seditious.[29] These cases tend to reinforce the view that at this early period in Augustus' regime the eastern provinces were not yet convinced of his longevity. At the same time new claimants to the Roman power were making themselves known. Tiberius already had strong support in Sparta, where he had resided as a child.[30] It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that when he was on his way to install Tigranes in Armenia, on the instructions of Augustus, he encountered a miracle near the plains of Philippi. According to Cassius Dio, as he was approaching the scene of the battle, "A tumult was heard coming from the field of the battle, as if from an army, and fire blazed up spontaneously (αὐτόματον) from the altars which Antony had built in the fortified camp."[31] Once again a tendentious miracle that could easily have been—and probably was—engineered.

In the West miraculous apparitions were no less understood to be an essential part of the mechanics of subversion. Suetonius Paulinus led the Roman forces to the island of Anglesey. He was attempting to thwart a powerful outbreak of opposition to Roman rule in Britain on the part of the Druids. Their bloody but deeply rooted Celtic cult had been forbidden by Tiberius, very probably because

[29] Dio Cass. LIV 7, 6. Cf. G. W. Bowersock, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 2), 103.

[30] Suet. *Tib.* 6, 2.

[31] Dio Cass. LIV 9, 6.

it had been at the core of the rebellion of Florus and Sacrovir in A.D. 21.[32] Exiles and supporters had gathered in the decades between Tiberius' interdict and Paulinus' invasion on Anglesey, known at that time as Mona. When the Roman forces arrived, the priests choreographed a savage ballet that almost turned back the Romans, as Zeus of Panamara had repelled the forces of Labienus. Tacitus records that, as the Roman ships arrived, an extraordinary vision confonted them.[33] Weaving in and out among the waiting enemy were women clad as Furies, bearing torches and with their long hair flowing behind them. Round about were Druids with their hands raised to heaven, and the whole spectacle terrified the Roman soldiery (*novitate adspectus*). Only the vigorous exhortations of the commander led them to recover their courage, *ne muliebre et fanaticum agmen pavescerent*. The cruel ceremonies of the Druids, including human sacrifice, served in themselves to strike terror just as miracles did elsewhere in the Roman provinces. The sight of blood and human remains in the Druid grove was no miracle, but it was comparable in its effect and no less rooted in cult. Such success as the revolt of Boudicca had was partly indebted (it is unclear how far) to the strength of the Druids, especially in opposition to the recently implanted imperial cult. The temple of Claudius at Camulodunum was considered *quasi arx aeternae dominationis*.[34] And during the Gallic uprisings after the death of Nero, the Druids once again played a role, according to Tacitus.[35]

[32] Plin. *Nat.* XXX 13: *Gallias utique possedit, et quidem ad nostram memoriam. Namque Tiberii Caesaris principatus sustulit Druidas eorum et hoc genus vatum medicorumque.* Suet. *Claud.* 25, 5, errs in assigning this measure to Claudius. Cf. R. SYME, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958), I 457 with n. 6 and 458 with n. 4.

[33] Tac. *Ann.* XIV 30.

[34] Tac. *Ann.* XIV 31, 4.

[35] Tac. *Hist.* IV 54, 2.

Among the most celebrated subversive miracles in the history of the early Roman Empire were those wrought by Vespasian after his arrival in Alexandria in A.D. 69. These were miracles of healing, recorded in circumstantial detail by Tacitus.[36] In fact, the historian goes out of his way to comment that those who were present at the time still vouched for the accuracy of the story, even though there was no longer anything to be gained by telling it. A blind man and a man with a withered hand both approached Vespasian at the explicit bidding of the god Serapis (*monitu Serapidis dei*).[37] The blind man asked the future emperor to heal his eyes by spitting on them, and the man with the withered hand appealed to him to step on his hand in order to heal it. Astonished and incredulous, Vespasian appealed to those around him for advice and finally consulted some doctors as to whether or not these measures could possibly have any effect.[38] When it was suggested that they might be effective, if the god wished them to be, Vespasian spat and stepped as directed, and the healings took place.

In connection with these miracles carried out on the advice of Serapis, Vespasian chose to enter the Serapeum itself and to consult the god on the future of the Empire. After entering the sacred precinct, he had a vision of a certain Basilides, an Egyptian notable. When he reported to the priests that he had seen Basilides inside the temple, they assured him that the man was far from Alexandria and could not possibly have returned to be present at that time. Accordingly, the apparition was construed as a favorable portent, and Vespasian's ascendancy to the throne of the

[36] *Hist.* IV 81, 1-3. Cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 7, 2; Dio Cass. LXVI 8, 1. Cf. the thorough treatment of these events in A. HENRICHS, in *ZPE* 3 (1968), 65-76.

[37] *Hist.* IV 81, 1. Suet. *Vesp.* 7, 2, replaces the hand with a foot (*debili crure*),—certainly easier to step on, but Tacitus has his eyewitnesses.

[38] *Hist.* IV 81, 2.

Caesars was thereby predicted.[39] The two miracles and the oracle by apparition were thus all intimately connected with the priests of Serapis, and historians who have examined this material have rightly concluded that the entire scenario must have been staged by one of Vespasian's partisans. In the case of the healings, Vespasian himself seemed to have been caught by surprise. The Egyptian Jew, Tiberius Julius Alexander, who was at the time the prefect of Egypt, is generally and plausibly credited with this particular manipulation of the divine machinery available in Alexandria.[40] Josephus explicitly attests that Alexander zealously undertook to bring the population of Egypt over to the support of Vespasian as the next emperor.[41]

The oracle given to Vespasian in the Serapeum is by no means the only oracle to figure in subversive movements in the provinces of the early Empire. Dio Chrysostom reports that Trajan once consulted an oracle in Asia Minor and received a prognostication of future rule.[42] The date of this oracle and indeed the shrine that provided it are both in doubt, but the consultation may have occurred when Trajan's father was proconsul of Asia in the early eighties. Trajan's subsequent munificence to Miletus and to Apollo of Didyma suggests that this was the oracle that had favored him.[43] But it is also possible that Trajan had taken an interest in Claros. We know that in the middle seventies, when the elder Trajan was engaged in the construction of canals at Antioch, a consultation of that oracle was made

[39] *Hist.* IV 82; Suet. *Vesp.* 7, 1. On this episode, see A. HENRICHS, in *ZPE* 3 (1968), 54-65.

[40] Cf. A. HENRICHS, *art. cit.*, 75-76: "It has often been maintained that Tiberius Alexander was the chief propagandist and the one who governed back stage. Such a view is correct and is supported by a passage in Josephus."

[41] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* IV 618.

[42] Dio Chrys. *Or.* XLV 4.

[43] So C. P. JONES, in *Chiron* 5 (1975), 403-6.

after the alarming discovery of the bones of a giant in the bed of the river Orontes.[44] Pausanias ascribes the consultation to the ruling emperor, unnamed but evidently Vespasian.[45] It seems likely, however, that the governor in charge of the province selected the site. If so, his son might also have turned to Claros.

We know in any case that one of the most distinguished scions of the early Julio-Claudian house, the popular Germanicus, solicited Apollo at Claros for a prediction of his future during his appointment to the eastern provinces under Tiberius.[46] Since Germanicus' diplomacy in the East was consistently and strenuously resisted by the governor of Syria, Cn. Calpurnius Piso, who had been appointed in place of one of Germanicus' relatives at precisely the moment Germanicus undertook his tour,[47] it would not be surprising if Piso endeavored to tamper with provincial sentiment by making use of the mechanisms we have already exposed. Certainly the existence of magical *defixiones* in Antioch at the time of Germanicus' death attest to a strong but surprising animosity toward someone who was generally recognized to be one of the most engaging figures in the Roman Empire.[48] Germanicus received an ominous oracle from Apollo at Claros, predicting his early

[44] Paus. VIII 29, 3 (cf. Philostr. *Heroic.* I 1, 3, p. 288; p. 138 in Kayser's Teubner) together with H. W. PARKE, *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor* (London, etc. 1985), 139-40. For other canal building at Antioch in the middle seventies, see the remarkable inscriptions recently published by D. FEISSEL, in *Syria* 62 (1985), 77-103.

[45] On Vespasian as the most likely candidate for ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς, D. VAN BERCHEM, in *Bonner Jahrbücher* 185 (1985), 68.

[46] Tac. *Ann.* II 54, 2-4.

[47] Tac. *Ann.* II 43, 2: *sed Tiberius demoverat Syria Creticum Silanum per adfinitatem conexum Germanico.*

[48] Tac. *Ann.* II 69, 3: *carmina et devotiones et nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum.*

death.[49] If this oracle is not simply a fabrication after the event, it must be understood as an effort to subvert the position of Germanicus either in support of the personal hostility of Piso or, if we are to believe that such existed, in conjunction with the secret *mandata* that Tacitus reported Tiberius sent to ensure the demise of Germanicus.[50] That the oracle in Claros was exploited to undermine Germanicus' position becomes more likely when one considers the similarly pessimistic oracle delivered to him in Egypt. There he consulted the Apis bull which gave its answers by leading the enquirer into one of two chambers—one portending a positive response, the other negative—after taking food from the enquirer's hand. When Germanicus consulted the Apis bull, he refused even to take the food.[51] The prognostication could not have been worse.

In the western provinces oracles could also be helpful in furthering the ambitions of contenders for the Roman throne. When Galba was at New Carthage in Spain and received an invitation from Julius Vindex to present himself as the redeemer of the human race, he did not delay for long. He was reassured to discover that an honest virgin prophesied a favorable outcome to his undertakings and that a priest of the shrine of Jupiter at Clunia had learned in a dream that a similar prophecy had been issued by a mantic girl two hundred years earlier, to the effect that a *princeps* and lord would arise at some time out of Spain.[52]

But the shrines and temples of the provinces provided still more resources than miracles and oracles. The sacred

[49] Tac. *Ann.* II 54, 4: *et ferebatur Germanico per ambages, ut mos oraculis, maturum exitum cecinisse.*

[50] Tac. *Ann.* II 43, 4: *credidere quidam data et a Tiberio occulta mandata.* Ovid's comparison of Germanicus with Apollo of Claros at *Fast.* I 20 shows that the prince was known to have a special interest in the oracle. Cf. R. E. FANTHAM, in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5 (1985), 249.

[51] Plin. *Nat.* VIII 185.

[52] Suet. *Galba* 9, 2.

precincts sheltered people as well, and they constituted another indispensible and complex piece of the machinery of subversion. If one can judge from the pattern reported in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, without actually crediting individual details as history, it would appear that lifelong opponents of the Roman government and the kind of ideological misfits in society that Apollonius represented regularly took up their abode in the temples and shrines of the traditional gods of paganism. This point emerges nearly half a dozen times in Philostratus' biography and presumably made sense both to Philostratus and to his readers. Apollonius is said to have taken up residence early in his career at the sanctuary of Asclepius at Aigeae in Cilicia;[53] and, at another point in the early career of this pagan saint, Apollonius is made to declare that he intended to live in any sanctuary that would have him.[54] On another occasion he is said to have spent most of his life moving from one sanctuary to another as he preached his Neo-Pythagorean gospel.[55] By book five of Philostratus' biography he is said to have spent at least a winter in nearly all the shrines of Greece.[56] Toward the end of his career, we find him residing inside the temple of Zeus at Olympia.[57]

Apollonius himself did not always find the company he kept in these temples to his taste. In a remarkable letter preserved in the corpus of Apollonius' *Letters* that do not appear in Philostratus' biography, he is alleged to have said to the Ephesians who tended the temple of Artemis, "Those who dwell in the goddess's temple both by night and day are blameworthy. Otherwise thieves, pirates, kid-

[53] Philostr. *Vit. Ap.* I 8.

[54] I 16.

[55] IV 40.

[56] V 20.

[57] VIII 15.

nappers, and every criminal and sacrilegious person would not be issuing forth from the temple. Why, the temple is a walled shelter for robbers (τὸ τῶν ἀποστερούντων τεῖχος)."[58] Apollonius sought the protection of temples as a base for issuing his philosophical protests against the Roman *régime*. If Apollonius was an outcast, he was a noble one and clearly felt ill at ease with the more sordid outcasts that he found as bedfellows.

Apollonius' description of the population of the temple at Ephesus can be confirmed from other sources. The criminals were there because they enjoyed the temple's right of *asylum* and were therefore inviolate. The institution of *asylia* in the Greek world was an old and precious one, and temples that had this privilege were determined to keep it. Yet *asylia* attracted the unsettled and unprincipled population of the earth to take refuge on the sacred ground, and the presence of such people in substantial numbers provided an obvious reservoir of seething opposition to the established *régime*. Tiberius faced this problem squarely in A.D. 22 when he observed that the right of *asylum* in the temples of certain Greek cities had led to concentrations of the worst of the slave population, debtors, and murderers: *nec ullum satis validum imperium erat coercendis seditionibus populi, flagitia hominum ut caerimonias deum protegentis*.[59] That is to say, under the guise of ritual (*caerimonias deum*) the criminal and seditious people of the provinces enjoyed protection and could not be properly restrained.

Tiberius' experience of the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in the preceding year may well have impelled him to look at the East as well as the West with an eye to potential sources of sedition in the shrines and temples. He

[58] *Epist. Apoll.* 65. See R. J. PENELLA (ed.), *The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana* (Leiden 1979), 123 f. The translation is Penella's on p. 73.

[59] Tac. *Ann.* III 60, 1.

instructed all those cities of the Greek East that had claims to *asylum* to present formal justification of those claims, and Tacitus gives a detailed account of the petitions presented by the most important cities.[60] Decisions in each case were placed in the hands of the Senate, which, overwhelmed by the number of embassies, asked the consuls for advice. Senatorial decrees ultimately prescribed unspecified limitations on the rights of *asylum* for the future (*modus tamen praescribebatur*).[61] Suetonius is astonishingly careless in reporting that Tiberius simply abolished the rights of *asylum*.[62] There is no doubt that the great temples at Ephesus, Aphrodisias, Stratonicea, Pergamum, and elsewhere continued to enjoy these rights to some degree.

But the issue of *asylum* in the traditional shrines and temples remained a source of tension under the early Empire because *asylum* could also be sought at the statue of the emperor. Simon Price has justly emphasized the importance of imperial statues as places of refuge in the provinces,[63] and he cites as an illustration a revealing anecdote in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*. It does not matter much whether this story is fiction or not; it is the underlying presumption that counts. When Apollonius came to Aspendus, he discovered that the inhabitants, suffering from a shortage of grain, were proposing to burn the governor alive, even though he was clinging to the emperor's statue. Philostratus observes that statues of the emperor were "more feared and venerated than the statue of Zeus at Olympia since the emperor was Tiberius."[64] Apollonius then succeeded in calming the fury of the mob and direct-

[60] *Ann.* III 61-63.

[61] *Ann.* III 63, 1 and 4.

[62] Suet. *Tib.* 37, 3.

[63] S. R. F. Price, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 6), 191-95.

[64] Philostr. *Vit. Ap.* I 15. The translation is by C. P. Jones (Penguin edition, 1970). Cf. S. R. F. Price, *op. cit.*, 202.

ing them to put the torches they had lit for the governor on some nearby altars, which Price rightly assumes must have been there for imperial sacrifices. Roman law explicitly recognized *asylum* both at the temples of gods and at the statues of the emperors.[65] Accordingly, there was an inevitable competition between the old temples and the imperial statues, and it is scarcely surprising that seditious elements would be more inclined to take up residence in the sacred precincts of the gods. Hence the anxiety of Tiberius.

Only three years after Tiberius' inquisition into *asylia*, an incident at Cyzicus served to confirm his fears and to demonstrate the importance of the temples as vehicles of sedition. The city abandoned a plan to build a shrine to Augustus, and one man sold along with his home a statue of Augustus that had been inside it.[66] This *incuria caerimoniarum divi Augusti*, as Tacitus terms it,[67] served to unleash a wave of anti-Roman sentiment that led to violence and the incarceration of Roman citizens. So conspicuous a rejection of the statue of a Roman emperor probably entailed an affirmation of rights at one of the traditional sanctuaries of Cyzicus. Competing claims to *asylia* can be paralleled by the remarkable inclusion of an appeal from Crete among the petitions to Tiberius in A.D. 22 from old and venerable sanctuaries. The Cretans requested confirmation of *asylia* for their *simulacrum divi Augusti*.[68]

Among the more bizarre events of the early Empire were the appearances of no less than three persons who claimed to be Nero after his death. These false Neros, as they were called, took advantage of instability in the east-

[65] Gaius, *Inst.* I 53; *Dig.* XLVIII 19, 28, 7 (Callistratus).

[66] Dio Cass. LVII 24, 6-7. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* IV 36, 2; Suet. *Tib.* 37, 3.

[67] *Ann.* IV 36, 2.

[68] Tac. *Ann.* III 63, 3.

ern provinces and, at the same time, aggravated that instability. The pretenders seem to have been launched with the blessing of the Parthians, who saw an effective means of destabilizing the region in much the same way as Labienus Parthicus had done a century earlier. What is remarkable is the support that the false Neros received. The first appeared less than a year after Nero's death, and Tacitus reports that Achaia and Asia were both terrified: *falso exterritae velut Nero adventaret.*[69] Many persons were disposed to believe that the deceased emperor was still alive, and a slave or freedman (the reports vary), who bore a striking resemblance to the original and was adept at singing and playing the lyre, won a substantial following. According to both Tacitus and Cassius Dio, this false Nero found his support among the dregs of provincial society—deserters from the eastern armies, slaves, and criminals.[70] The plan was to move on to join forces with the Syrian army and to set up a kingdom in Syria or Egypt.[71] Although the pretender was hunted down and killed on Cythnus, we are left to wonder by what means he managed to assemble so frightening a band of supporters. The one place in the cities of the Greek East where deserters, slaves, and criminals could be found all together and in abundance was precisely the temple precincts with rights of *asylum*. Tacitus' and Dio's description of the false Nero's supporters coincides perfectly with the descriptions we have of the residents of the temples, and it is accordingly reasonable to assume that it was by appealing to the misfits there

[69] Tac. *Hist.* II 8.

[70] *Loc. cit.* together with Dio Cass. LXIII 9, 3. Clemens, the false Agrippa Postumus under Tiberius, provides an interesting parallel for Italy, with his following of seditious drifters: Tac. *Ann.* II 39-40 (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 25, 1; Dio Cass. LVII 16, 3-4). It was thought that Agrippa had escaped death *munere deum* (*Ann.* II 40).

[71] Tac. *Hist.* II 9, and Dio Cass. *loc. cit.* (n. 70).

that the false Nero had as much success as he did. This interpretation, moreover, explains satisfactorily why Tacitus can describe the provinces overall as being terrified by such a renegade, who brought those poor souls out of their isolation directly into the life of the provincials.

Our information on the other false Neros tends to support this analysis. In the year A.D. 80, another man who looked like Nero, had his voice, and played the lyre came out of Asia. His name was Terentius Maximus, and he attracted a large following as he made his way successfully to the Euphrates to join forces with the Parthian king, angry at that time with Titus.[72] It is evident that the Parthians were behind the dramatic emergence of this man and used him to destabilize the situation in the Greek East. The Jewish author of the fourth *Sibylline Oracle* makes reference to this pretender and his aspiration, doubtless nourished by Artabanus, to go forth from the Euphrates in a grand conquest of the West.[73]

Only eight years later, a third false Nero was launched. According to Tacitus' elusive reference in the prefatory lines of his *Histories*, there was very nearly a Parthian invasion *falsi Neronis ludibrio*.[74] At the end of his biography of Nero, Suetonius mentions the same pretender as coming on the scene twenty years after the original's death, and he says, *tam favorabile nomen eius apud Parthos fuit ut vehementer adiutus et vix redditus sit*.[75] As a manoeuver Parthian backing of false Neros was parallel to the support for Labienus, but one is left to ask why the pretense always took the form of a Nero. The answer must surely be the emperor's celebrated and strident philhellenism, which culminated in his

[72] Dio Cass. LXVI 19, 3 b-c.

[73] *Orac. Sibyll.* IV 119-24. The pretender is foretold in prophetic fashion just after the eruption of Vesuvius.

[74] Tac. *Hist.* I 2.

[75] Suet. *Nero* 57, 2.

liberation of the Greeks near the end of his reign. Even the sober and loyal Plutarch had to admit that this monstrous emperor deserved some measure of praise for his love of the Greeks.[76] Accordingly, the appeal of a resurrected Nero would probably have been greatest in the traditional shrines and temples of the Greek world, in just those places where there were unscrupulous and unemployed people to follow him.

No other emperor enjoyed a comparable posthumous life in either the West or the East of the early Empire. But a deranged character in Gaul during the same unstable months that witnessed the first false Nero can be seen as some kind of parallel in terms of the means by which he secured recognition. A certain Mariccus declared himself a god appointed to restore the liberty of the Gauls. He managed to assemble a force of eight thousand men and to win over towns of the Aedui. Only after the arrival of troops from Vitellius' army was Mariccus' band dispersed and the god himself killed.[77] He is unlikely to have enjoyed such a success if he had simply presented himself as a new and quite independent god in Gaul. It is more than likely that he worked in concert with the Druids, who were the most outspoken opponents of Rome in the region. And Tacitus' description of his followers as a *fanatica multitudo* would support this assumption.[78] Tacitus uses the word *fanaticus* at only one other point in his extant oeuvre, and that is in the *Annals* in his account of the weird spectacle that confronted Suetonius Paulinus as he prepared to invade Mona.[79]

[76] Plut. *De sera num. vindicta* 22, 567 F-568 A: . . . ὀφείλεσθαι δέ τι καὶ χρηστὸν αὐτῷ παρὰ θεῶν ὅτι τῶν ὑπηκόων τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον γένος ἠλευθέρωσε.

[77] Tac. *Hist.* II 61.

[78] *Loc. cit.*

[79] Tac. *Ann.* XIV 30, 2. This point about *fanaticus* is made by R. Syme, *Tacitus* I 458 n. 5. H. Last's view of Roman policy toward the Druids (in *JRS* 39 [1949],

Many of the ancient allusions to anti-Roman demonstrations in the provinces record these events in the context of factional struggles or *stasis*. It is well recognized that inside the cities dissident elements worked through supporters who congregated in clubs or *collegia* that would clash periodically with other such groups. It was for this reason that the Roman administration normally viewed *collegia* (ἑταιρίαι in the East) with suspicion and sought to ban all but the most essential and innocuous of them.[80] It is striking that, wherever we have details of the operations of seditious clubs or groups, we come round once again to the local shrines and temples.

The fullest and most memorable account of seditious clubs in the early Empire is Philo's description of the arch-demagogue Isidore of Alexandria. Here is Philo's description of Isidore and his gangs, in Box's vivid translation:

> "Isidorus was. . . a turbulent fellow, a demagogue, a past master in creating disorder and confusion, a foe to peace and stability, a genius at manufacturing commotions and disorders when they did not exist and at cementing and inflaming them after they had come into being, who made it his aim to have about him a disorderly and turbulent mob composed of a promiscuous flotsam which he distributed into sections after the fashion of committees (συμμορίαι).
>
> There are numerous confraternities in Alexandria, the source of whose association is no wholesome thing, but unmixed wine and strong drink . . . They are given the names of Synods (σύνοδοι) and Couches (κλῖναι) by the natives. In all or the greatest number of confraternities

---

1-5) endows the Romans with an excess of humanitarian sentiment that would have surprised them.

[80] See, above all, *Dig.* XLVII 22 and Plin. *Epist.* X 33-34; 92-93, and 96, 7. See the remarks in A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford 1966), 608-9; 610; 688-89; 708.

> Isidorus carries off the first prize and is called toast-master (συμποσίαρχος), feast-master, city-troubler. Then, whenever he wants to perpetrate some unprofitable act, at one signal they come together in a body and say and do what they are bidden." [81]

It is in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus from the series of documents known as the *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* that we find a detailed description of Isidore's methods of intrigue.[82] The papyrus describes a prearranged and secret meeting of Isidore, Dionysius of Alexandria, and a mysterious woman together with the prefect Flaccus. The interview is presumably to be dated to the period in which Isidore was still courting Flaccus in his antisemitic cause. What is striking here is that the scene is set in the Serapeum, and the presence of the god Serapis is clearly important in guaranteeing the commitments of the conspirators. The mysterious appeal made by an old man to Dionysius has the appearance of being orchestrated by Isidore, as the interview itself was.[83] The old man in the scene would appear to be one of those many people described by Philo as willing to do whatever Isidore tells them to do. It has long been clear from the literary evidence that Isidore could marshal the mobs in the streets of Alexandria according to his will, but the papyrus shows us this skillful intriguer exploiting the numinous authority of the Serapeum.[84] Serapis would have been useful to him in exacerbating anti-Jewish sentiment in Alexandria while he was still currying the favor of Flaccus, and it would have been equally useful when he turned against the prefect.

[81] Philo, *In Flaccum* 135-37.

[82] *POxy.* 1089, reprinted in H. A. Musurillo (ed.), *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (New York 1954), 4-6. Musurillo's commentary appears on pp. 93-104.

[83] *POxy.* 1089, ll. 33-35: ἰδοῦ, δ[ε]σπ̣[ότ]α̣ Διονύσιε, ἀν/τικρὺ τοῦ Σα̣[ρά]π̣ι̣ο̣[ς] ὁ γεραιός· μὴ βι/άζου πρὸς τὸ[ν] Φλ[ά]κκον.

[84] Notice the oath at ll. 49-50 and the five talents in gold at l. 57.

Another of the faction-ridden cities of the early Empire for which we have somewhat more than an occasional allusion is Sardis. Plutarch devoted an entire treatise to instructing the Sardians in settling their factional disputes.[85] And in the corpus of *Letters* of Apollonius of Tyana, there are arresting details about these factions (τάγματα or γένη).[86] The factions were evidently organized on a tribal basis according to ancestry, and they bore obscene names that must have been of immemorial antiquity.[87] Even Apollonius found the names shocking and marvelled that the Sardians could have proclaimed them with such enthusiasm. Above all, these factions were under the protection of the great goddess of the city, Demeter. "So why is it that you alone," asked Apollonius, "the special wards of Demeter, have clans that are at odds with law, nature, and established custom?"[88] For Apollonius the startling names of the factions and the constant internecine strife were somehow interconnected in a failure to reconcile the protection of Demeter with Demeter's generous character as a goddess. What is important to recognize here is the grounding of the factions in local cult. In other words, the source of *stasis* at Sardis was ultimately the shrine of Demeter herself. Consistent preservation of what must have been cult names in the various τάγματα reflects the fierce commitment of Demeter's votaries.

[85] See Plut. *Praec. ger. reip.* 17, 813 E-F; 32, 825 D; and cf. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971), 117 and 136.

[86] *Epist. Apoll.* 38-41; 56; 75-76. Note the letter added to the corpus as 75a by R. J. Penella, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 58). See also his treatment of this letter in *HSCP* 79 (1975), 305-11.

[87] For discussion of the names Κόδδαροι and Ξυρησίταυροι see R. J. Penella, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 58), 110-11. Cf. U.v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, in *Hermes* 60 (1925), 307-13; R. J. Penella, in *Mnemosyne* S. IV 26 (1973), 337-41; id. and J. Henderson, in *Mnemosyne* S. IV 27 (1974), 293-97.

[88] *Epist. Apoll.* 75a (see n. 86).

It is in contexts such as those at Alexandria and Sardis that one should try to understand the tantalizingly brief references to *stasis* in the early Empire. Naturally *stasis* was by no means necessarily a phenomenon that inflamed opposition to the Roman government, but it was a political situation in which such opposition could very easily arise. Hence those Lycians who killed some Romans in A.D. 43 in the course of *stasis* or *discordiae* may well have done so because of an affront, real or imagined, to a local deity.[89] Similarly, when Romans were crucified on Rhodes in A.D. 44, so savage and surprising a penalty could best be explained in terms of violations of a temple or shrine.[90] At any rate, it seems increasingly evident that, wherever there was pagan provincial opposition to Rome in the provinces, it was normally expressed through the traditional cults. The actual killing of Romans, a palpably dangerous and seditious move, is most likely to have occurred when sacred boundaries were transgressed. The mechanics of subversion operated no less inexorably in these cases than when ambitious Romans or pretenders solicited support from the priests and denizens of a temple.

And so at the center of provincial subversion stood the local temples, revealed to have been far more vital than many have thought. Yet the expenses that were lavished on them and the rites that were performed there had all along demonstrated the continuing vigor of the old gods in the Roman Empire. The use to which their sanctuaries were put was generally no cynical abuse of a Voltairean kind, although a professing Cynic like Oenomaus of Gadara under Hadrian saw enough abuse to denounce oracular cheating in his vitriolic tract entitled Γοήτων φωρά .[91] A little

[89] See n. 3 above.

[90] See n. 4 above.

[91] For Oenomaus on oracular injustice, ignorance, ambivalence, and mischief cf.

later Alexander of Abonouteichus profited extravagantly from the credulity of his contemporaries, but in his case many a provincial would have perhaps objected strongly to Lucian's rationalist indictment.[92] The temples and their priests provided a pulse and rhythm to provincial life that must be pronounced ultimately salubrious. The delicate machinery that both reflected and shaped pagan popular sentiment effectively counterbalanced the equally potent force of the imperial cult.

We may conclude with the moving example of one who did not attempt subversion, to his cost. The irreproachable Corbulo was judged in antiquity to have had but one major fault, unswerving loyalty to his emperor.[93] In all his years in the eastern provinces he never seized the opportunity to remove Nero. No miracles, no oracles, no demonstrations of support occurred to unsettle the *princeps*. Rumors circulated that the great general had been in touch with Rubellius Plautus. *Vana haec,* according to Tacitus.[94] And a certain Arrius Varus (who later made himself agreeable to Antonius Primus) denounced Corbulo to Nero, who was prepared to believe any charges because of the conspiratorial acts of some of Corbulo's relatives.[95] But Ammianus

---

Eus. *PE* V 18-36. Presumably Oenomaus' work entitled Κατὰ χρηστηρίων is the same as the Γοήτων φωρά: cf. H. J. METTE, in *RE* XVII 2 (1937), 2250.

[92] Observe L. ROBERT, *À travers l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1980), 421: «Une réflexion encore sur le caractère de charlatan trompeur et vicieux attribué à Alexandre. C'est la thèse de Lucien et de son entourage. Ainsi les oracles furent considérés comme manipulés par des prêtres imposteurs et cyniques dans la tradition du XVIII^e^ siècle, chez Fontenelle et Voltaire et longtemps ensuite. S'il y eut assurément de tels cas, des témoignages mettent aussi en évidence la dévotion du prophète envers son dieu, s'adressant à lui pour ses affaires personnelles. . .».

[93] Dio Cass. LXII 19, 4: τοὺς μέντοι ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους καθ'ἓν τοῦτο μόνον ὁ Κορβούλων ἐλύπησεν, ὅτι τὴν πρὸς τὸν Νέρωνα πίστιν ἐτήρησεν. Likewise LXII 23, 5-6.

[94] Tac. *Ann.* XIV 58, 2-3.

[95] Tac. *Hist.* III 6. For Arrius Varus, *PIR*^2^ A 1111. On Corbulo's relatives, R. SYME, *Tacitus* II 560; also id., in *JRS* 60 (1970), 27-39, reprinted in *Roman Papers*

Marcellinus insists on the general's good faith in the provinces where he was in command.[96] He was a victim of his own fidelity, and when he committed suicide at Nero's behest he said, ἄξιος, "I deserved this." Cassius Dio tells us explicitly what he meant, although not everyone has noticed the gloss: only at the end did Corbulo realize that he was wrong to have spared Nero and trusted him. For making such a mistake he acknowledged that he deserved to die.[97]

II (Oxford 1979), 805-24. M. T. GRIFFIN infers, in *Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (New Haven/London 1984), 178, "Corbulo must have felt the net closing in on him for some time."

[96] Amm. XV 2, 5: *provinciarum fidus defensor et cautus.*

[97] Dio Cass. LXIII 17, 6: τότε γὰρ δή, τότε πρῶτον ἐπίστευσεν ὅτι κακῶς ἐπεποιήκει καὶ φεισάμενος τοῦ κιθαρῳδοῦ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλθὼν ἄνοπλος. The ever vigilant and perceptive Arthur Stein did not, however, miss Dio's point: "da stiess sich D. (Domitius Corbulo) selbst kraftvoll das Schwert in den Leib, indem er sagte, es geschehe ihm recht, weil er einem solchen Kitharöden gedient habe und unbewaffnet zu ihm gekommen sei" (in *RE* Suppl.-Bd. III [1918], 407-8).

I am grateful to C. P. Jones for critical comments on this paper.

DISCUSSION

M^me Levick: Professor Bowersock's paper has both demonstrated (and richly illustrated) the power of religion in the Roman Empire and shown most convincingly sources of support of the false Neros.

As for the theme of 'opposition' as such, some of the incidents (the Spanish oracle of 69, whether forged or second hand and previously brought out much more innocuously in support of Scipio Aemilianus after the capture of Numantia) clearly tended to the promotion of a candidate for Empire against the present incumbent, but others (the flames on Antony's altars at Philippi) are flag-waving for a man with Antonian connexions and no attack on any other politician in 20 B.C. (the answers that Germanicus received from Apollo of Claros and Serapis are a very different case). The cult of Serapis did very well out of Vespasian's miracles; the priests would have been very willing collaborators with Vespasian's subordinates who organized them.

As to the vagrants who emerged from the temples and followed the false Neros, the religious element seems less strong. But they do have some resemblances to the aging hippies who emerged in vans or buses from their London squats (from which they could not be evicted) in the summer of 1986 (as in previous years) to make their way to Stonehenge and Glastonbury—centres of the ancient, legendary, but 'true' Britain which they opposed to the reality. Like the *asylum* vagrants, they aim for an idealized version of what they know.

M. Eck: Die Hinweise auf die *falsi Nerones* zeigen m.E., dass der Widerstand gegen das Kaisertum und das Reich wenig grundsätzlichen Charakter hatte, wenn man gerade den Exponenten dieses Reiches funktionalisieren konnte. Damit ist eine Bejahung der Existenz verbunden. Es geht also wiederum um das 'Wie', weniger um die Existenz an sich.

M. Bowersock: The excellent observations of Barbara Levick and Werner Eck illustrate, among other things, the inherent imprecision (or should I say elasticity?) of the term opposition. Support of one party implies, potentially at any rate, opposition to another, but in some cases—as with Tiberius at Philippi—the 'flag-waving' should be considered by far the more important aspect. And the exploitation of memory of a Roman emperor, such as Nero, in an evidently hostile action on the part of Parthia certainly does mean that opposition of this kind was not calculated to overthrow the Roman Empire (at least not then and there) but rather to weaken it.

M. Momigliano: One of the many points which have emerged from Professor Bowersock's most important contribution is that the same sanctuaries could be used both to support and to fight the emperors. From this point of view the God of the Jews was an exception. As far as I know, this God never supported—that is, made miracles in favour of—the Roman emperors. This of course suggests comparison with the God of the Christians. But (to leave aside the dubious evidence of the *Historia Augusta*) a beginning of change is visible in the encounter of Julia Mamaea with Origen.

M. Giovannini: Le rôle des sanctuaires et de leurs prêtres comme foyers de 'résistance' au pouvoir impérial dans les provinces orientales paraît en effet avoir été considérable. Mais on peut le constater déjà à l'époque hellénistique, où l'on voit par exemple un des derniers Séleucides faire d'importantes concessions au sanctuaire de Baetocece (C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* [New Haven 1934], n° 70, pp. 280 sqq.). Le sanctuaire de Ma à Comana (Strab. XII 3, 3, p. 535) a été lui aussi un véritable Etat dans l'Etat du royaume de Cappadoce. Il semble bien que ces sanctuaires indigènes ont su préserver à travers les âges une large autonomie, et l'on peut penser qu'ils ont âprement défendu leurs privilèges sous l'Empire romain, comme ils l'avaient fait contre les rois hellénistiques.

M. Eck: Wenn man sich überlegt, welchen Ansatzpunkt für Destabilierung und Widerstand lokale Kulte und grosse Tempel boten,

gewinnt die andersartige Haltung des Christentums im späteren 2. und insbesondere im 3. Jhdt. umso stärkeres Relief. Denn zumindest nach unserer Überlieferung hat es kollektiven Widerstand der Christen, und zwar insbesondere in den umfassenden Verfolgungssituationen vor allem seit der Mitte des 3. Jhdts., nicht gegeben. Dies widerspricht wesentlich dem, was man auf Grund der aufgezeigten Möglichkeiten der paganen Kulte eigentlich erwarten könnte. Zumindest ein Grund muss wohl in der christlichen Theologie liegen.

M. Bowersock: I fully support M. Giovannini's point about sanctuaries and priests in the Hellenistic Age. The example of Baetocaece is well chosen to illustrate continuity into the Empire. The letter of an Antiochus cited as Welles no. 70 is part of a large inscription that also includes a letter of Valerian, Gallienus, and Saloninus guaranteeing *regum antiqua beneficia* as well as a decree of the city transmitted to Augustus: J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* VII (Paris 1970), nº 4028. Resistance to the independence of Baetocaece can be inferred from the words of Valerian and his colleagues *remota violentia partis adversae*. With M. Eck's remark about the Christians, I am of course in complete agreement. The absence of church opposition must surely be due to Jesus' teaching that to Caesar should be rendered the things that are Caesar's.