The Struggle for Identity

Greeks and their Past
in the First Century BCE

Edited by Thomas A. Schmitz
and Nicolas Wiater

The Struggle for Identity
Edited by Thomas A. Schmitz and Nicolas Wiater

The Struggle for Identity

Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE

Edited by Thomas A. Schmitz and Nicolas Wiater

Contents

Acknowledgments

List of Contributors

Manuel Baumbach is Professor of Classics at Bochum University. His fields of research are the Ancient Greek Novel, Second Sophistic literature, Hellenistic poetry, and the history of reception. He is the author of *Lukian in Deutschland. Eine forschungs- und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Analyse vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* (2002), and the co-editor of *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (2004), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (2007) and *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (2010).

Barbara E. Borg is Professor of Classical Archaeology at the University of Exeter. She has published widely on Greek and Roman art and archaeology and edited a volume on *Paideia: The world of the Second Sophistic* (de Gruyter 2004) including a chapter on 'Glamorous Intellectuals: Portraits of Pepaideumenoi in the Second and Third Centuries AD'.

Ewen Bowie was Praelector in Classics at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from 1965 to 2007, and successively University Lecturer, Reader and Professor of Classical Languages and Literature in the University of Oxford. He is now an Emeritus Fellow of Corpus Christi College. He has published articles on early Greek elegiac, iambic and lyric poetry; on Aristophanes; on Hellenistic poetry; and on many aspects of Greek literature and culture from the first century BCE to the third century CE, including the Greek novels. He recently edited (jointly with Jaś Elsner) a collection of papers on Philostratus (CUP 2009), and is currently completing a commentary on Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* for CUP.

Albrecht Dihle is professor emeritus of Classics. He has held professorships at the universities of Göttingen, Cologne, and Heidelberg, and has been a visiting professor at Cambridge (Engl.), Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, Berkeley, Perugia, Sydney, and Durban. He holds honorary doctorates from several universities and has received prestigious awards such as the order 'Pour le Mérite'. His numerous publications treat almost all aspects of classical literature and philosophy from the Homeric epics to late antiquity.

Matthew Fox has been Professor of Classics at Glasgow since 2007. He has written two books which try to reshape thinking on historiography in Rome: *Roman Historical Myths* (Oxford, 1996) and *Cicero's Philosophy of History* (Oxford, 2007). He has also published on gender, reception, and ancient dialogue.

Thomas Hidber is currently Head of Academic Programme Development in the University of Zürich. He taught Greek and Latin at the Universities of Berne (1997–

2001) and Göttingen (2001–2007). He is author of *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass* (Teubner 1996) and of *Herodians Darstellung der Kaiserge-schichte nach Marc Aurel* (Basel 2006) and has published articles on Greek histori-ography in Imperial Times.

BEATE HINTZEN teaches Latin and Greek language and literature at Bonn University and is president of the German Neolatin Society (DNG). Her main areas of interest are Hellenistic poetry, poetics and rhetoric, and the reception of classical literature in the Early Modern Age.

GLENN W. MOST has taught at the Universities of Yale, Princeton, Michigan, Siena, Innsbruck, and Heidelberg. Since 2001 he has been Professor of Greek Philology at the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, since 1996 he has been a visiting Professor on the Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago; recently he has also become an external scientific member of the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin. He has published numerous books and articles on ancient and modern literature and philosophy, the history and methodology of Classical studies, comparative literature, cultural studies, the history of religion, literary theory, and the history of art. Most recently he has co-edited a one-volume companion to the Classical tradition, and is currently preparing a co-edited four-volume Loeb edition of the Presocratics, co-revising an English translation of the Greek tragedies, and co-editing and -translating the ancient and medieval commentaries to Hesiod's *Theogony*.

DENNIS PAUSCH was a member of the DFG funded research area 'memory cultures' from 2000 to 2005 and during this time finished his PhD on *Biographie und Bil-dungskultur. Personendarstellungen bei Plinius dem Jüngeren, Gellius und Sueton* (de Gruyter, Berlin 2004). Since then he has been teaching Latin and Greek at Gießen University and has published articles and collected volumes mainly on ancient biog-raphy and historiography as well as on Augustan poetry. With the aid of a research stay in Edinburgh as Feodor-Lynen Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foun-dation he has finished his habilitation in 2010. His second book on *Livius und der Leser. Narrative Techniken in* ab urbe condita has been awarded the Bruno Snell-Prize of the Mommsen-Gesellschaft and will be published by Beck (Munich) as part of the Zetemata series in 2012.

THOMAS A. SCHMITZ teaches Greek language and literature at Bonn University and is one of the founding members of the Bonn Centre for the Classical Tradition. His main areas of interest are imperial Greek literature, literary theory and its application to classical literature, and the reception of classics.

TIM WHITMARSH is Fellow and Tutor in Greek at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His most recent book is *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning*

Romance (Cambridge University Press, 2011). He is currently working on a project on Greek and near eastern fiction for Oxford University Press (New York), which will be followed by a book called *Battling the Gods: the Struggle against Religion in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Faber and Faber / Knopf).

Nicolas Wiater has taught at Bonn University from 2005–2010. In 2010–2011 he held a Feodor-Lynen Postdoctoral Scholarship of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation and was Oldfather Visiting Scholar at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Since 2011 he is a Lecturer in Classics at the University of St Andrews. He is author of *The Ideology of Classicism. Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (de Gruyter, Berlin 2011) and has published articles and book chapters on Greek historiography and intellectual culture of the late Hellenistic and early Imperial Period. His current major project is a book on conceptions of violence in Homeric epic and early Greek poetry.

List of Illustrations

Book cover: James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens* (= Stuart and Revett [509]), vol. 1, London 1762, ch. III pl. I.

Fig. 1, p. 216:   adapted after Michael C. Hoff, 'Laceratae Athenae: Sulla's siege of Athens in 87/6 ʙᴄ and its aftermath', in Michael C. Hoff (ed.), *The Romanization of Athens. Proceedings of an international Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, Oxford 1997 (= Hoff [262]), fig. 1.

Fig. 2, p. 217:   adapted after Michael C. Hoff, 'The Politics and Architecture of the Athenian Imperial Cult', in Duncan Fishwick and Alastair Small (eds.), *Subject and Ruler, the Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity: Papers Presented at a Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of Duncan Fishwick*, Ann Arbor, MI 1996 (= Hoff [261]), 200 fig. 9.

Fig. 3, p 219:   after Michael C. Hoff, 'The Politics and Architecture of the Athenian Imperial Cult', in Duncan Fishwick and Alastair Small (eds.), *Subject and Ruler, the Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity: Papers Presented at a Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of Duncan Fishwick*, Ann Arbor, MI 1996 (= Hoff [261]), 198 fig. 7.

Fig. 4, p. 232:   James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens* (= Stuart and Revett [509]), vol. 1, London 1762, ch. III pl. III.

Thomas A. Schmitz and Nicolas Wiater

Introduction: Approaching Greek Identity

1.   Who Cared about Greek Identity?

Barbara Borg entitles her contribution to this volume 'Who Cared about Greek Identity?' In a similar vein, a few years ago, Simon Goldhill [215][1] raised the question 'Who Needs Greek?' In a provocative manner, these questions address a central issue: is it more than a mannerism when we speak of a 'struggle' about Greek identity? Who were the people who cared, sometimes passionately, about their identity? What did it mean to be Greek in the first century BCE? What were the intellectual processes by which these Greeks constructed, negotiated, debated, and problematized their individual and collective identities in the Augustan Empire? How can we recover the echoes and traces of these processes in the material, historical, and literary monuments that have been transmitted to us? These are some of the questions which the contributions in this volume pursue. Before we start to take a closer look at these various struggles and negotiations, we will attempt to explain the broader scholarly context into which this volume belongs.

Greek culture under the Roman Empire, in its various forms, has been one of the most prominent areas of our discipline during the last two decades. For a long time, until well into the twentieth century, a number of intellectual, aesthetic, and political prejudices had relegated Greek literature, philosophy, science, architecture, art, and religion of the imperial period to the garbage heap of history. Their new prominence began in the 1990s, with the publication of various ground-breaking studies.[2] Susan Alcock's 1993 book *Graecia Capta* [6] took a fresh look at the material evidence and discovered clear signs of an economic and intellectual recovery of mainland Greece during the early principate. Maud Gleason's 1995 discussion of the self-fashioning of Greek orators [208] analysed their, as Goldhill [213] put it, 'biographical fictions', in which claims to political and intellectual leadership are intermingled with complex negotiations of masculinity and in which the boundaries between physical appearance and rhetorical self-presentation are increasingly blurred. Simon Swain's [511] magisterial *Hellenism and Empire*, published in 1996, is a comprehensive analysis of Greek literary culture in the Roman empire, with extensive discussions of its most important representatives. One year later, Thomas

---

1 Numbers within brackets, both in the main text and in footnotes, refer to the numbered bibliography, below p. 273.
2 The following list is not meant to be exhaustive; it provides just a few signposts for readers who may be unfamiliar with the impressive amount of work published in this area.

Schmitz employed Pierre Bourdieu's theory of habitus and social distinction in his *Bildung und Macht* [472], which studies the role of education for both the rhetorical self-presentation and the actual political careers of the social and political elite in the Eastern half of the Roman Empire. Peter von Möllendorff's analysis of the playful treatment of παιδεία in Lucian's *True Histories* (Ἀληθῆ Διηγήματα) [555] examines the interrelation of education and fiction and the teasing construction of literary *personae* in Lucian's (literally) fantastic work.³ Tim Whitmarsh's influential account of the *Politics of Imitation* [583] explores the self-fashioning of Greek authors under the Roman Empire. Apart from these book-length studies, collections such as Susan Walker's and Alan Cameron's *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* [564], Simon Goldhill's *Being Greek under Rome* [214], Erik Nils Ostenfeld's *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks* [395], Barbara Borg's *Paideia. The World of the Second Sophistic* [49], or, most recently, Tim Whitmarsh's *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial World* [590] demonstrate the persisting scholarly interest in the subject of Greek identity under Roman rule.

It is obvious, then, that modern scholars regard the question of Greek identity under Roman rule an important and fascinating subject. However, most of these works focus on the 'Second Sophistic', the period comprising the second through fourth centuries CE. The question of Greek identity has only rarely been explored for Greek literature produced at the beginning of the Roman Empire. When we look at scholarly work on such texts as the *Historical Library* (Βιβλιοθήκη) of Diodorus Siculus, the critical essays and *Early Roman History* (*Antiquitates Romanae*) of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the *Geography* of Strabo of Amaseia, or the numerous epigrams written by Greek intellectuals and collected in the *Anthologia Palatina*, we realize that scholarly attention is focussed on topics such as the question of Diodorus' sources or the value of Dionysius' *Antiquitates* for a historical reconstruction of the early centuries of Roman history. Dionysius' critical essays are still primarily of interest to historians of linguistics or of rhetoric, and Nicolaus of Damascus' fascinating biography of Augustus is most vividly discussed under the aspect of its exact generic classification, its value for our understanding of ancient biography, and its precise date. These texts have not yet been examined in the light of recent interest for Greek identity under Roman rule. Yet it can be argued that these first decades of the Roman Empire are a pivotal period for the emergence of Greek self-definition in this new political world.

It is only recently that signs of a change have become visible. With the publication of Kenneth Sacks' important study of *Diodorus and the First Century* [457], scholars have started to approach the *Library* not merely as a repository of lost sources but as a work that deserves being discussed in its own right. Instead of exploring which authors Diodorus compiled, scholars now begin to focus on the cultural criteria that influenced his decision to include particular passages and on the interpretation of past and present resulting from it.⁴ Similarly, with the work

---

3 Cf. Goldhill's chapter on Lucian in [215].

of Daniela Dueck [151] and Sarah Pothecary [153], scholarship has now begun to appreciate Strabo's *Geography* as an attempt to create an 'imaginary geography' which defined the position of Rome, geographical as well as ideological, in relation to other peoples and their cultural and political tradition.[5] Thomas Hidber's study of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' 'Classicist Manifesto' [252], the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, a series of critical essays on the style and lives of the exemplary classical authors, has laid the foundations for an appreciation of Dionysius' classicism as a system of thought rather than a phenomenon of purely linguistic interest.[6] Furthermore, Dionysius' historical work, the *Antiquitates Romanae*, an early Roman history covering the period from the foundation of Rome to the beginnings of the First Punic War, is now discussed as a document of Greek cultural identity rather than a mine for works of (now lost) Hellenistic and Roman historians.[7]

However, Diodorus, Strabo, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus are just the most prominent authors of the first century BCE. One reason for this prominence is the fact that substantial parts of their works have been preserved; the corpus of transmitted texts is so large that many more studies along these lines are to be expected.[8] Moreover, the first century teemed with Greek intellectuals who were prominent and influential men in their time but whose names are now known only to a small group of specialists: Metrodorus of Scepsis, a historian at the court of Mithradates, was nicknamed 'hater of the Romans';[9] his works as well as those of other pro-Mithradatic, anti-Roman authors were still circulating in Augustan Rome, as were Sibylline Oracles that prophesied the rise of a saviour from the East who would put an abrupt and violent end to Roman domination.[10] Furthermore, orators and politicians of Asia Minor, called the 'Asiarchs' by Strabo,[11] who represented an allegedly 'Asianist' rhetoric and are the targets of Dionysius' spiteful attack in his 'Classicist Manifesto', had been a major factor in Roman foreign policy since Republican times.[12]

---

4 See Schmitz' and Most's chapters in this volume; cf. Wiater [595] and [594], with further literature.

5 On the conception of the Roman empire, its boundaries, and its position within the *oikumene*, i.e. the 'imaginary geography' characteristic of Augustan Rome see Nicolet [384]; cf. Clarke [103] and the contributions in Foresti et al. [176].

6 Cf. Porter [420]; Wiater [596] and [597]. For a recent and sophisticated study of Dionysius' system of thought from a linguistic point of view, see de Jonge [121].

7 See Fox [180], [181], and [182]; Delcourt [124]; Gabba [192].

8 Daniel Hogg, for example, has submitted a PhD dissertation on the speeches in Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae* under the supervision of Christopher Pelling, and Wiebke Wagner is working on the role of religion in the *Antiquitates* with David Engels at the University of Brussels.

9 FGrH II B 184 T 6a (= Plin. *HN* 34.34).

10 Other Mithradatic historiographers include Heracleides of Magnesia, Teucer of Cyzicus, and Hypsicrates of Amisus, see Rizzo [438]; Gabba [191], esp. 51–2; cf. Fromentin [188] xxix–xxx; Gabba [190] has a balanced overview of opposition to Roman rule in Greek historiography, see esp. 634–5 on the third Sibylline Oracle and 641 on Mithradatic historiography.

11 Strab. 14.1.42, 649C, 2–4 Radt.

12 Pythodorus of Tralles, for example, a close friend of Pompey's, had been involved in the Roman Civil War, and his property was confiscated and sold by Caesar (Strab. 14.1.42, 649C, 4–8 Radt). His

These examples show that many, if not most of these scholars, historians, and orators were far from leading an obscure and inconspicuous life. They were involved in Roman foreign politics or played a role in Roman culture as a sort of 'public intellectuals' such as Timagenes of Alexandria (FGrH II A 88), who became a local celebrity and was supported by Asinius Pollio after publicly burning his account of Augustus' achievements after a major fall-out with the princeps, who had been his benefactor; he too was notorious for his hatred of the Romans.[13] Prominent and influential Romans (such as Asinius Pollio) obviously thought that supporting Timagenes contributed to their own reputation, and Timagenes himself must have been conscious that he represented an intellectual capital so much in demand by the Romans that it allowed him to offend the princeps in public. To a greater or lesser degree, the same holds true for the numerous grammarians, scholars, and poets who were active in the first century BCE, many of whom lived in Rome:[14] the works of all of them reveal a deep concern with defining 'the Roman', and Roman power in particular, its role in the world, and their own position as well as that of their cultural and political heritage in relation to it.

The first century BCE, then, is a fascinating and variegated chapter of Greek intellectual history that is rich in highly educated and ambitious Greek scholars and writers whose works are essential to our understanding of Greek cultural identity in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial time and of the Greek Renaissance which flourished during the second and third centuries CE. The aim of the present collection is to contribute to the ongoing discussion of Greek identity under Roman rule by bringing to the fore this period of Greek intellectual culture which has somewhat been overshadowed by scholars' concentration on the Second Sophistic. Thus on the one hand, the following chapters aim to offer novel perspectives on the works of the better-known authors such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, and Strabo of Amaseia, on the way they conceived of themselves as Greek men of letters, how they saw the Romans, and how they defined their role in the Roman Empire. On the other hand, there are essays on authors who are less known or whose works were so far of interest only to a small group of specialists such as the

contemporary Menodorus, also of Tralles, was put to death by Domitius Ahenobarbus because he held him responsible for a revolt of the fleet (ibid. 649C, 10–3), while Hybreas of Mylasa (Strab. 14.2.24) apparently supported both Octavian and Marc Antony and had to flee when Q. Atius Labienus came to Asia on a diplomatic mission in 41 BCE. Theophanes of Mytilene is also worth mentioning. He was a friend of Pompey and his historiographer and accompanied him on the military campaign against Mithradates. In 63 BCE, he was awarded Roman citizenship and received divine honours after his death in Mytilene because the city had regained political independence through his influence. On Metrodorus and Theophanes see Pédech [405]; on Theophanes see Bowie's contribution in this volume, p. 181–183.

13 On Timagenes' strife with the princeps see FGrH 88 T 3 (= Sen. *de ira* 3.23.4–5); FGrH 88 T 8 (= Sen. *ep*. 91.13) for his hatred of the Romans.

14 The most important Greek scholars, historians, rhetors, poets, philosophers, and grammarians active in Rome in the second half of the first century BCE are now conveniently accessible in the appendix to Hidber's chapter in this volume; see further Dihle and Hintzen (this volume); there is a good overview of Greek scholars in Augustan Rome in Dueck [151] 130–44.

grammarians and rhetoricians, Nicolaus of Damascus, and those Greeks from *Asia Minor* who combined a successful political career with literary activity and wrote epigrams which addressed their relationship with their Roman patrons. Some of these works are discussed here for the first time under the aspect of Greek cultural identity, and these discussions allow us to locate the works of Dionysius, Strabo, and Diodorus within a larger social-cultural framework.

It is our hope that the new perspectives on the works of better-known authors and the insights into the works of their lesser-known contemporaries will make this volume useful to scholars working on Greek literature and culture of the late Hellenistic and Imperial Roman periods. At the same time, the great variety of authors and genres discussed will make it a helpful point of reference for those interested in a first overview of the diversity of early Imperial Greek culture. Thus, we hope, this collection will help create an awareness of the extraordinary and fascinating variety of Greek literature and intellectual culture in the first century BCE; moreover, as the first large-scale study of Greek identity in this period, it will also provide the Greek perspective that will complement the growing number of studies on Roman cultural identity in the same period.[15] Finally, we believe that scholars working on the Second Sophistic will find the contributions to this volume valuable because they contribute to our knowledge of the development of many of the constituents of the Greek intellectual and literary culture of the second through the fourth centuries CE.

2. A 'Struggle' for Identity? Some Theoretical Considerations

Before proceeding to a summary and discussion of the subjects and authors addressed in the various chapters of this volume, we will make some clarifying remarks on two interrelated and equally difficult concepts that are crucial to this collection. In this section, we will try to explain in what sense we speak of a 'struggle' for identity and what we mean by 'identity'. The following considerations do not, however, represent a general theoretical framework to which all authors of the papers in this collection would necessarily subscribe. Rather, they are an attempt to find an approach to identity that is valid for most of the essays collected here, a definition of 'identity' that integrates the different approaches to Greek literature while taking into account the specific problems related to inquiries of the construction(s) of identity in the ancient world.

Although Greek reaction to Roman power, as the example of Timagenes' autodafé demonstrates, could occasionally take on rather extreme forms, it would be difficult to point to struggles between Greeks and Romans in the sense that the latter actively sought to foist a certain world view and complex of values upon the former. On the contrary, the Greeks in Roman Athens, as Barbara Borg points out,

---

15 See, e.g., Wallace-Hadrill [566], [567], and [568]; Woolf [603]; Habinek [231].

proved to be ready to incorporate Roman elements into the public display of their self-image. In social life, however, a 'struggle' need not necessarily involve a physical confrontation or a visible attempt of one party to subjugate another. Rather, the term 'struggle' is used here in the sense of Pierre Bourdieu's conception of social life as a 'struggle over representations [of reality], in the sense of mental images but also of social demonstrations whose aim it is to manipulate mental images'. As such, these 'symbolical struggles' over different conceptions of identity are less a matter of objectively measurable and perceivable physical struggles than of

> acts of perception and appreciation, of cognition and recognition, in which agents invest their interests and their presuppositions, and of *objectified representations* in things (emblems, flags, badges, etc.) or acts, self-interested strategies of symbolic manipulation which aim at determining the (mental) representation that other people may form of these properties and their bearers.[16]

'Struggles over ethnic or regional identity' – a list to which cultural identity could be added – Bourdieu continues,

> are a particular case of the different struggles over classifications, struggles over the monopoly of the power to make people see and believe, to get them to know and recognise, to impose the legitimate definition of the divisions of the social world and, thereby, to *make and unmake groups*. What is at stake here is the power of imposing a vision of the social world through principles of division which, when they are imposed on a whole group, establish meaning and a consensus about meaning, and in particular about the identity and unity of the group, which creates the reality of the unity and the identity of the group.[17]

Bourdieu's approach to identity as inextricably connected with the organization of social life in communities which seek to establish and maintain their particular vision of the world against competing conceptions of other groups receives further support from the findings of Social Identity Theory. These suggest that the life of each human being is constituted by several co-existing sub-groups each of which provides us with a specific outlook on the world or *Weltanschauung*. Shibutani therefore speaks of 'compartmentalized lives, shifting from one perspective to another as they participate in a succession of transactions that are not necessarily related. In each social world they [human beings] play somewhat different roles, and they manifest a different facet of their personality.'[18]

Not only are these 'sub-groups', or 'social worlds', extremely variegated and include 'the underworld, ethnic minorities, the social elite, or isolated religious cults' as well as 'networks of interrelated voluntary associations – the world of medicine,

---

16 Bourdieu [53] 220–1.
17 [53] 221. Later ([53] 224), Bourdieu speaks of 'the specific logic of the social world, that "reality" which is the site of a permanent struggle to "define" reality'.
18 Shibutani [489] 139; for the term *Weltanschauung* see ibid. 137.

the world of organized labor, the world of steel industry, or the world of opera' and 'loosely connected universes of special interest – the world of sports, the world of the stamp collector, or the world of women's fashion'.[19] The *Weltanschauung* which underlies their members' feeling of communion also depends on the distinction from outlooks on the world provided by other groups.

However, the existence of the boundaries separating different communities defies any '"objective" assessment: it is a matter of feeling, a matter which resides in the minds of the members themselves'.[20] Therefore, 'boundaries perceived by some may be utterly imperceptible to others':[21] communities, and the communality on which they rest, are mental constructs, they 'exist in the minds of [their] members, and should not be confused with geographic or sociographic assertions of "fact"'.[22] Social Identity Theory thus complements Bourdieu's theoretical approach by providing a more precise idea of how this 'struggle' is realized in everyday life. It is in this sense of an ongoing negotiation between different outlooks on the world provided by the various social groups in which human life is organized, that we speak of a 'struggle for identity'.

The crucial role of these 'compartments' of social life for humans' 'understanding and experiencing of their social identity, the social world and their place in it'[23] also raises some fundamental issues regarding scholarly attempts to study identity. When discussing 'identity', Greek or otherwise, we have to remember that our sources allow us access only to a fraction of the self-image of a person and that the people whose self-image we are able to explore are representative only of a small fraction of ancient society. The consequences of the latter point are well-known: studies of 'Greek identity' are limited to the self-presentation of the members of the male elite.[24]

The former point, however, requires some additional comment. Social Identity Theory draws attention both to the complexity of the concept of 'identity' and the concomitant difficulties inherent in any attempt to give a comprehensive description of another's 'identity'. The very term 'identity' implies the idea of a person's 'sameness', some sort of unity integrating all the different facets of a personality and her or his activities into one coherent concept. Yet, such a holistic conception of 'identity' is challenged by the fact that our lives as social beings are constituted by

19 Shibutani [489] 135–6.
20 Cohen [105] 20–1.
21 Cohen [105] 2.
22 Cohen [105] 98.
23 Davies and Harré [119] 45, quoting Frazer [185] 282.
24 For the Second Sophistic see esp. Schmitz [472]; Gleason [208].

a number of different, sometimes even contradictory roles which vary along with the social contexts in which we are moving.[25]

This is why the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur [436] 73 suggested to distinguish the usage of 'identity as sameness' from 'identity as self'. Knowledge of the self, Ricoeur argues, is a person's interpretation of his or her self chiefly mediated by narrative: 'this mediation borrows from history as much as fiction making the life story a fictive history or […] an historical fiction' (73). From this point of view, a person's image of his or her character as a coherent entity and as based on an uninterrupted, continuous development, in Ricoeur's terms, of 'identity-as-permanence' (74), can itself be seen as a function of this narrative of the self: 'the narrative constructs the durable character of an individual, which one can call his or her narrative identity' (77).

These observations have an important consequence for discussions of identity: when speaking of 'identity', we must be aware that we can only ever get access to one particular facet of the personalities of the people in question, namely the way in which they represented themselves to others (and, potentially, how they saw themselves) in a particular social context at a specific time. If understood as the construction of a narrative aiming to integrate different aspects of our lives, identity is necessarily a flexible construct which undergoes changes as the social, political, and cultural circumstances of our lives change. These constant changes to the stories about and of our lives, which we tell to ourselves and to others, however, are bound to go largely unnoticed as one of the primary functions of these stories is, precisely, to create continuity and the sense of a stable self that has remained essentially the 'same' over the years. Consequently, in order to understand a person's identity one would have to monitor the changes undergone by his or her narrative of the self, the re-formulations of his or her life-story. Only the sum total of all these different versions of the self, each one represented by a snap-shot, as it were, taken at individual stages of the person's life, could then provide an approximation of this person's 'identity'. Scholars of antiquity do not have such a constant, comprehensive access to the minds of the people they study: in most, almost all cases, we are limited to one of those 'snap-shots', in certain cases to a few, if we are lucky. This limitation is important to keep in mind when reading a volume on 'cultural identity' in the ancient world: the title should not give rise to the illusion that a comprehensive understanding of the identity of any of the authors discussed here can be achieved. What we can achieve, however, are glimpses into their self-definition in a specific social role (as historians, grammarians, clients, literary critics, etc.) at a specific time and under specific sociocultural circumstances.

---

25 On the potential 'incongruent and conflicting definitions' arising from this plurality of perspectives see Shibutani [489]. He notes, however, that 'most reference groups of a given person are mutually sustaining', or that, if they are not, inconsistencies usually go unnoticed if they 'occur in dissociated contexts'. It is only when people are 'caught in situations in which conflicting demands are made upon them' that they become 'acutely aware of differences in outlook' (139).

This is further complicated by the specific situation faced by scholars of classical antiquity, namely that most of our sources are works of literature or were written for publication. This means that our sources are by definition public documents and the Greeks who wrote them address their recipients as authors. What sounds like a truism is, in fact, a crucial difference between historians discussing the cultural identity of Greek intellectuals in Rome as compared to, for example, a sociologist studying the self-definition of Greek intellectuals living in 21st-century London. Ancient writings are not private documents which can help us understand how their authors actually 'felt' and what they 'really thought' about themselves and their lives and activities as Greeks in Rome; how they perceived their absence from their home countries; whether, and if so, to what extent, they were integrated into Roman society; and how they perceived their contemporaries' view of them. Instead, our insights into Greek identity are limited to the image as public personae they wanted to convey to their recipients, i.e. as authors and, more specifically, as intellectuals who deliberately engaged in public discourse through their writings. Therefore, the only facet of these Greeks' identity which we are able to study is the way in which they wanted their recipients to perceive them as intellectuals.

Yet, given the crucial role of an author's work for his or her 'self-fashioning', the fact that it is impossible for us to achieve a full psychological profile, as it were, of the Greek authors is not necessarily a disadvantage.[26] In fact, as Stephen Greenblatt has argued, the image which a speaker creates for his or her audience, his or her public image, is not an entirely artificial construction and cannot (and need not) strictly be separated from his or her self-definition. Greenblatt helps us appreciate the importance of texts as a primary means of establishing and representing 'a distinctive personality, a characteristic address to the world, a consistent mode of perceiving and behaving' ([222] 2). This concept of authorial 'self-fashioning' should not be confused with an attempt to return to a positivistic, biographical reading of texts. Rather, in accordance with the conception of human life as an ensemble of different coexisting social roles coordinated and combined by the individual to form a coherent story, texts can be viewed as one of several means of a person's social interaction alongside, for example, his or her clothing, gestures, and other ways of verbal and non-verbal communication.[27]

---

26 For the term 'self-fashioning' see the title of Greenblatt's 1980 study [222].

27 Cf. Goffman's [210] conception of social life as a 'performance' and Bourdieu's [52] notion of the *habitus*, i.e. a person's style of life, his or her use of language, clothing, gestures, and taste, all of which combined represent how an individual sees him- or herself and wishes to be seen by others. Bourdieu, too, stresses the interdependence of a person's perception of the outside world and his/her perception of him-/herself and his/her role within it, see Bourdieu [52] 169–75, esp. 172: 'inevitably inscribed within the dispositions of the habitus is the whole structure of the system of conditions, as it presents itself in the experience of a life-condition occupying a particular position within that structure', and 175 (on the 'classificatory system' as 'the product of the internalization of the structure of social space, in the form in which it impinges through the experience of a particular position in space'.

Such a combination of Social Identity Theory and Greenblatt's conception of authorial 'self-fashioning' provides a helpful approach to ancient literature in particular. As members of the educated elite, all authors had had a thorough rhetorical education and were aware of (spoken or written) language as a means of self-presentation through the creation of ἦθος (*ēthos*).[28] While Aristotle regarded the speakers' ἦθος merely as a functional element of the speech and an instrument to gain the audience's trust,[29] already Isocrates and later intellectuals such as Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Quintilian blurred the distinction between a speaker's words and his actual character:[30] '[t]here is not generally in classical thought such a sharp distinction, as is now commonly made, between a person's moral character and a person's public behavior […]. Character for the classical Greeks and Romans is not generally regarded as separable from public image or public behavior. Individuals are what they are partly in relation to society.'[31]

Yet, the creation of *ēthos* should not be imagined as a straightforward, one-sided process in which the speaker foists his *persona* upon the hearer. The speaker hopes, of course, that the recipients will accept the image of himself which he proposes to them, and it is designed for that purpose. On the recipients' side, however, the speaker's self-image is an invitation to share a certain perspective on a situation described (or constructed) in the text, an invitation which the addressee can accept or reject. Accepting this offer often means accepting the interpretation of reality offered by the speaker. By means of the *ēthos* an addresser offers himself as a model of a certain behaviour or stance towards a given set of events.

The identification with the speaker thus plays an important role in a text's potential to exert influence on the extratextual world by influencing the self-image and world view of its public. As a result, we have to redefine the purpose of hermeneutics which, as Ricoeur argues convincingly, is 'no longer […] the search for another person and his psychological intentions that hide behind the text […]'; rather, 'to interpret is to explicate a sort of being-in-the-world unfolded in front of the text.'[32] The image which an author creates of himself in and through the text is an important element of the interpretative process engendered by the text and crucial to a text's opening up 'new possibilities of being-in-the-world […] within everyday reality'.[33]

---

28 On ἦθος in ancient rhetoric see the still useful overview in Sattler [463]; Fantham [165]; Gill [207]; Carey [90]. For a more detailed discussion of ἦθος and 'self-fashioning' see Wiater [597] 75–7.

29 See Arist. *Rhet*. 1356a1–13, esp. 8–10.

30 The most famous expression of this idea is probably Quintilian's *uir bonus dicendi peritus*, on which see, e.g., Morgan [369], esp. 240–70 and [368]; cf. Brinton [76]. On Isocrates' conception of language and civic identity see Too [534]; on Isocrates' influence on Dionysius' notion of classical language and identity see Hidber [252] 44–51; Wiater [597] 65–74.

31 Brinton [76] 174.

32 Ricoeur [435] 140.

33 Ricoeur [435] 141. On the same page, Ricoeur calls fiction 'the privileged path to the redescription of reality'. Similarly, Iser [284] conceives of fictional literature as a crossing of the boundaries of text and extratextual world. There is no need, however, to limit this model of a text's influence on the outside world to fictional literature.

Such a conception of the interaction of text and extratextual world and the role of the author's self-representation in it need not be limited to speeches, although the concept of *ēthos* is originally a rhetorical one.[34] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, is very explicit about the purpose of his historical work as a direct reflection of his character (ψυχή),[35] and there is no reason not to suppose likewise for the authors of the other texts discussed in this volume.[36] The works of all of them are here discussed as attempts to propose interpretations of the world, especially of the Romans, their culture and power, and their relation to the Greeks. By seeking to convince his readers that his version of 'being Greek under Rome'[37] is the most convincing one, each author is creating, in Bourdieu's sense, a community 'by imposing on it common principles of vision and division, and thus a unique vision of its identity and an identical vision of its unity',[38] while creating a role for himself in this social world by way of his authorial self-fashioning. The 'struggle' for identity should therefore also be read as a reference to the fact that the Greek authors discussed here are offering alternative, sometimes competing conceptions of the Graeco-Roman world, each of which, in turn, provides the foundations for their self-image as intellectuals.

These theoretical considerations in mind, we will now turn to an overview of the contributions in this volume. The following section is designed as an interpretive discussion, rather than a series of abstracts of the individual chapters. No mere summary would do justice to the rich and complex arguments presented in each of them, and each chapter deserves to be read in its own right. Moreover, we felt that the best way to realize the full potential of the essays collected here would be to read them and discuss their results alongside each other. We will therefore briefly characterise each of the contributions and then point out areas in which different chapters overlap, discuss observations which we thought were particularly interesting, and add some observations of our own. In so doing, we seek to identify key elements of Greek cultural identity in the first century BCE and present a broad picture, based on an analytical reading of the chapters, in which the major cultural, historical, and material factors that influenced Greek self-fashioning will emerge.

3. Greek Cultural Identity in the First Century BCE: A Synthetic Approach

Albrecht Dihle, the keynote speaker at the conference of which this volume is the result, provides an impressive overview of Greek intellectual culture in Augustan

---

34 On the authorial self-fashioning of orators in the Second Sophistic see Gleason [208]; Whitmarsh [583]; Schmitz [472].

35 *Ant. Rom.* 1.1.3, on which see Wiater's contribution in this volume.

36 The importance of self-representation and *ēthos* for the interpretation of ancient technical literature is now stressed by Fögen [175], esp. 5–6.

37 We are borrowing this phrase from Goldhill [214].

38 Bourdieu [53] 224.

Rome and is therefore an appropriate point to start this volume. Dihle singles out the origins and development of Atticism as one of its most significant elements. In an attempt to relate the 'social condition of the Greeks in general and in particular of those in Rome' to their desire 'to enhance the inherent classicism of their literary tradition and develop a programme of radical Atticism',[39] he concludes that Augustus was most likely not responsible for this development given that there is evidence for *Roman* Atticism 20 years before the beginning of the principate. Instead, Dihle stresses the fact that 'all the accomplishments of Greek civilisation to be identified and looked for in the Roman society of the first century BCE had, in fact, deep roots in the past, in the glorious time of classical Athens. The idea that a return to these golden days could initiate a rebirth of the Greek world was by no means far-fetched.'[40]

Dihle mentions several topics which recur in the other contributions and can therefore be regarded as being of constant relevance to Greek self-fashioning in the first century BCE. The role of the Greek past in the Roman present is one of the most prominent among them, as is the related question of how to define 'the Romans', given that these leaders of the world were so deeply immersed in Greek culture and education.

The dominant models under which modern scholars analyse Graeco-Roman cultural exchange view the Greeks as those who give, and the Romans as those who receive and adopt. In general terms, this assumption is certainly correct. The Romans themselves were aware that they were and aways had been drawing heavily on Greek culture, just as the Greeks were aware that they were providing what the Romans wanted. Many of the contributions in this volume suggest, however, that Graeco-Roman interaction was a much more complex and many-faceted process. In fact, as Nicolas Wiater points out, 'Greek' and 'Roman' themselves were not fixed, well-defined entities but were largely a matter of negotiation between two different poles: Dionysius of Halicarnassus' discussion of historical writing shows that he was aware that 'Greek' or 'Roman' identity depended largely on the narrative one invented for oneself, or which was invented by others, and thus, ultimately, on how convincing this narrative was. His *Antiquitates Romanae* is a case in point. The purpose of Dionysius' historical narrative is to prove that the Romans were actually Greeks, ethnically as well as ethically. Moreover, Dionysius' historical work also shows that the question of what the *Romans* were (Greeks? Barbarians? something in between? something entirely different?) was just as important to the Greeks as their own identity: in fact, Dionysius' definition of Augustan Rome as the new Athens and his own role as the mediator between this present and the classical Greek cultural capital, in short, his entire world view, hinges on his definition of the Romans as Greeks.

39 Dihle p. 55.
40 Dihle, p. 56.

This flexibility of the categories 'Greek' and 'Roman' presented a problem above all to Roman intellectuals who were aware of Rome's extensive cultural debt to the Greeks and were deeply worried that the boundaries between Greek and Roman might be blurred. To borrow (and abuse) Harold Bloom's famous expression, one could even speak of a veritable 'anxiety of influence'[41] of which the introduction to Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* (1.1–2) is perhaps the most famous expression. Cicero here attempts clearly to distinguish between Roman institutions which were adopted from the Greeks (and improved by the Romans) and genuinely, 'natural' (*natura*) Roman qualities (such as the military and the ancestral virtues) which distinguished the Romans from the Greeks as well as from all other peoples (*neque cum Graecia neque ulla cum gente sunt conferenda*). The explicit mention of the Greeks, among other things, shows that Cicero was primarily concerned with establishing clear-cut and immovable (note the stress on nature) boundaries between Greeks and Romans. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, by contrast, represents the other side of this same process: he emphasizes the complete and inescapable Greekness of the Romans and specifically includes the very ancestral virtues which Cicero was keen on claiming for his own people.[42] This suggests that there was a at least one 'struggle for identity' going on in the first century BCE, a struggle that was carried out between Greeks and Romans over whether there were any genuinely Roman qualities that distinguished the two peoples and, if that premise was accepted, whether these had priority over the overwhelming Greek influence on Roman cultural identity.

Wiater's discussion of Dionysius' conception of past and present is complemented by Matthew Fox' examination of the interplay of language and time in Dionysius' thought and its larger intellectual context, in particular Polybius, Stoicism, and Ciceronian philosophy. As Fox demonstrates, for Dionysius the notion of time is inextricably bound up with his conception of classical language and literature. In the idea of a reproduction of the classical style, the boundaries between past and present are blurred; 'the past itself ceases to be reinterpreted: it has one function: that of providing models for the statesmen of the future. In the same way the present also ceases to evolve.'[43] While Wiater points out the importance of Dionysius' interpretation of the Romans to his self-image as a classicist critic, Fox emphasizes the similarity in focus between 'Dionysius' recreation of early Rome and his sifting of the canonical orators for tips on stylistic improvement […]. They are both ways of looking at the past for a form of inspiration in the present, rather than for any recognition of the difference between historical and contemporary culture.'[44]

Fox demonstrates that it is illuminating to consider Dionysius' 'ahistorical' approach to history against the background of other models of historical development

---

41 See Bloom [44].

42 For a full discussion see Wiater [597] 182–4, 216.

43 Fox p. 94; on Dionysius' classicist model of history see also Hidber (this volume) p. 119 and cf. Wiater [597] 60–5.

44 Fox p. 98.

which would have been available to him, namely Polybius' explanation of Roman power in terms of providential *tychē* and the related vision of history along the lines of 'Stoic doctrines of providence and predictability'.[45] Yet, it might have been Cicero's skeptical attitude towards such interpretations of historical development, which was paired with an acute interest in stylistic analysis and its historical implications, Fox argues, that might have made Cicero a 'sympathetic model' for Dionysius.[46]

Fox' suggestion that Cicero's attitude towards language and history might have influenced Dionysius points to another important aspect of Graeco-Roman cultural exchange that is not considered very often. Given that Greek intellectuals were highly connected with the Roman nobility, can we really exclude that outstanding Roman intellectuals such as Cicero might have influenced the development of Greek thought?

The question is a notoriously difficult one because our sources do not allow us to pinpoint any direct connections between Dionysius and Cicero. Bowersock, for example, suggested that Dionysius' association with the Tuberones might have brought him into contact with Strabo and other Greek and Roman acquaintances of theirs. Through these channels he might also have become familiar with Cicero's ideas.[47] Furthermore, we know that Dionysius' colleague (maybe even friend) Caecilius of Caleacte wrote a comparison (σύγκρισις) of Demosthenes and Cicero,[48] which at the very least suggests a certain familiarity with Cicero's life and writing in Dionysius' intellectual environment. Although answers to this question must needs remain speculative, the question itself remains worth asking, if only to remind us that the cultural interaction of Greeks and Romans was probably not a one-way track.

Thomas Hidber's contribution to this volume can be read alongside Fox' discussion of a possible Ciceronian influence on Dionysius. Reexamining the interest of Greek intellectuals of the first century BCE in the Romans, with special emphasis on Dionysius' classicism, Hidber concludes that 'it seems fair to assume that interaction between Greek teachers and Roman students accelerated and inspired the rise of classicism' and that the most plausible source of inspiration for Dionysius' conception of *philosophos rhētorikē* was Cicero's oratorical theory and practice.[49] Hidber's discussion not only complements Dihle's investigation of Graeco-Roman intellectual culture and the origins of Atticism; he also provides a fascinating overview of the astonishing number of Greek men of letters in Rome and illuminates Rome's role as a 'new Athens' in the 'imaginary geography' of the Greeks.

Another crucial element of Greek cultural identity in the first century BCE (as in all other periods of Greek history) is language. On the one hand, this concerns

---

45 Fox p. 111.
46 Fox p. 112.
47 Bowersock [56] 68–9, 124, 129.
48 Ofenloch IX; see Hidber (this volume) p. 120.
49 Hidber p. 120.

the Greek language; Dionysius' classicism is clear evidence of interest in questions of language. The classical language, as Fox points out, encapsulates the essence of being classical Greek; it is the medium through which past and present are merged into one ahistorical continuum and through which classical Greek identity is both acquired and enacted.[50] While Hidber, Fox, and Wiater look at the, so to speak, ideological side of Dionysius' notion of classical language, Beate Hintzen explores the complex linguistic side of the debate. She retraces the development of the idea of a pure Attic dialect and the criteria by which scholars from Alexandrian times on sought to define what 'correct' Attic (ἑλληνισμός) was. Along with Dihle's enquiry into the origins of Atticism, Hintzen thus illuminates the historical background of the Greeks' attitude towards their language in the first century BCE and enables us to address this crucial aspect of Greek identity within a broader cultural-historical context. In so doing, she also disentangles the complex Hellenistic discourse about Greek grammar, syntax, and vocabulary bound up with names such as Philoxenus, Tyrannion, Tryphon, Asclepiades, and others, thus making this invaluable source of information accessible to non-specialists in the field of the history of ancient linguistics.[51]

On the other hand, as Hintzen points out, the Latin language, too, was an object of study of Greek grammarians such as Tyrannion and Philoxenus. Both of them actually claimed that Latin was a Greek dialect, a fact which Philoxenus explained by affirming that the Romans were originally Aeolian colonists. It is hardly coincidental, Hintzen argues, that such statements are made by intellectuals who had been living in Rome for a long time, and she compares Dionysius of Halicarnassus' claim, discussed in greater detail by Fox and Wiater, that the Romans were of Greek descent and genuinely Greek character. It is fascinating to see how these grammarians conceived an interpretation of 'the Romans' based only on the study of the most basic elements of language. In many ways their linguistic theory complements Dionysius' more comprehensive approach to the classical Greek language (and culture in general) as deeply connected with Roman identity.

These examples show in an impressive way in how many fields the Romans influenced the direction of Greek thought and stimulated the Greeks to conceive of different ways to look at their language, their heritage, and themselves. After all, a genuinely classical author such as Isocrates would have found it difficult to accept the idea that Latin is a Greek dialect and that Roman power and classical Athenian culture are intimately related. At the very least, then, these examples clearly demonstrate that the Greeks' notorious idealisation of their classical heritage and the concomitant commitment to preserving it as a timeless entity should not blind us to the fact that the Romans exerted a profound influence on the development of Greek thought and the construction of Greek cultural identity.

---

50 On language and identity in Dionysius see also the discussion in Wiater [597] 60–119.
51 For a historical-linguistic discussion of Dionysius' classicism see now also de Jonge's comprehensive study [121].