Annika B. Kuhn

Herodes Atticus and the Quintilii of Alexandria Troas: Elite Competition and Status Relations in the Graeco-Roman East

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **42 • 2012**
Seite / Page **421–458**
https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/457/5065 • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2012-42-p421-458-v5065.5

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor
Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München
Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see **https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron**
ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**
Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

ANNIKA B. KUHN

Herodes Atticus and the Quintilii of Alexandria Troas: Elite Competition and Status Relations in the Graeco-Roman East

In AD 174, while staying at Sirmium (Pannonia) on his campaign against the Sarmatians, the emperor Marcus Aurelius presided over a trial on several charges which the Athenians had brought before the emperor against one of their most distinguished citizens and greatest benefactors, Herodes Atticus, the immensely rich aristocrat, prominent politician and brilliant rhetor-sophist.[1] What exactly had motivated the accusations remains vague; this much, however, can be said that the origin and development of the bitter conflict with its sequence of charges and countercharges must be seen in the context of a fierce power struggle, in which local notables stirred up the Athenians against Herodes.

The episode has been given much scholarly attention because it sheds light on a variety of issues concerning Roman imperial policy.[2] Less attention has been paid so far to the fact that the trial actually implied more than the culmination of internal hostilities between Herodes and the city of Athens. The conflict was closely linked to another major quarrel – the personal antagonism between Herodes and the Quintilii.[3] These two brothers, Sex. Quintilius Condianus and Sex. Quintilius Maximus,[4] were governing Achaea, most probably as *correctores*,[5] at that time.[6] They originated from the

I would like to thank the editors of the journal and the external referee for their helpful comments on the present article.

[1] Philostr. soph. 559–561. For major studies on Herodes Atticus see Schultess (1904); Graindor (1930); Ameling (1983); Tobin (1997).

[2] See, for example, Oliver (1970); Millar (1977) 3–12; Ameling (1983) I 136–151; Kennell (1997); Harter-Uibopuu (2008); Wankerl (2009).

[3] See Graindor (1930) 111–123, who comments on Philostratos' report. The quarrel is briefly discussed by Bowersock (1969) 98–100; Oliver (1970) 66–72; Ameling (1983) I 108 f.; Anderson (1989) 199–202.

[4] See PIR² Q 21 and Q 27; Halfmann (1979) 163 nos 75, 76; Halfmann (1982) 627. For a comprehensive prosopographical analysis of the family see Trotta (1998) (with stemma).

[5] The exact official title of their office in Greece is unknown, but the majority of scholars regard them as *correctores*. For a recent discussion of the nature of their office cf. Fournier (2010) 483 f. and Hoët-van Cauwenberghe (2011) 312 f. (with reference to earlier literature). On the office of *corrector* in the Greek East see also Guerber (1997). Graindor (1930) 32 n. 1 notes that the exact term for a *corrector* was *legatus Augusti ad corrigendum statum civitatum liberarum*.

[6] Their governorship has been dated to AD 171–175 by Groag (1939) col. 139, followed by

Roman *colonia* of Alexandria Troas in the northwest of Asia Minor and had both been *cos. ord.* in AD 151. The strained relationship between them and Herodes Atticus must have been a well-known topic of discussion and rumour in the East – and so noteworthy that it found its way into the literary tradition. Thus Philostratos, the great admirer of Herodes Atticus, reports in his Vitae Sophistarum on three episodes of the quarrel with reference to the popular views about its causes:[7]

«His quarrel with the Quintilii began, as most people assert, over the Pythian festival, when they held different views about the musical competition; but some say that it began with the jests that Herodes made to Marcus at their expense. For when he saw that, though they were Trojans, the Emperor thought them worthy of the highest honours, he said: ‹I blame Homer's Zeus also, for loving the Trojans.›»

Philostratos obviously does not give much credit to these anecdotal explanations of their rivalry; he emphasizes that «the following reason is nearer the truth», drawing attention to the political background to the trial at Sirmium:[8]

«When these two men were both governing Greece, the Athenians invited them to a meeting of the assembly, and made speeches to the effect that they were oppressed by a tyrant, meaning Herodes; and finally begged that what they had said might be forwarded to the Emperor's ears. And when the Quintilii felt pity for the people and without delay reported what they had heard, Herodes asserted that they were plotting against him, for they were inciting the Athenians to attack him.»

From Philostratos' account of the circumstances which gave rise to the antagonism between Herodes and the Quintilii it is evident that the argument pertained to several

---

Hanslik (1963) col. 984 and above all Oliver (1970) 66–72, who convincingly based his argumentation on a newly found inscription from the Roman Market at Athens. See in contrast Graindor (1930) 111–113, who holds that the tenure of the Quintilii's office in Achaea must have been before their consulship (i.e. before AD 151). He suggests that they served as *proconsul* and *legatus* of the province in AD 147/8. Trotta (1998) 15f. has tried to reconcile both views: he does not exclude the possibility that the Quintilii held a proconsulship in AD 147/8 before their posts in Achaea in the 170s. This might be suggested by a subtle linguistic distinction which Philostratos makes when referring to the Quintilii's «governorship of Greece» (soph. 559: ὁπότε ἦρχον τῆς Ἑλλάδος/ὁπότε ἄμφω τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἠρχέτην). This view should not entirely be ruled out, but it seems rather probable that the Quintilii were only active in Greece in the 170s, since almost all relevant evidence comes from this period.

[7] Philostr. soph. 559: Ἦρξε δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς Κυντιλίους διαφορᾶς, ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοί φασι, Πυθικὴ πανήγυρις, ἐπειδὴ ἑτεροδόξως τῆς μουσικῆς ἠκροῶντο, ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι, τὰ παισθέντα περὶ αὐτῶν Ἡρώδῃ πρὸς Μάρκον· ὁρῶν γὰρ αὐτοὺς Τρῶας μέν, μεγάλων δὲ ἀξιουμένους παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως «ἐγὼ» ἔφη «καὶ τὸν Δία μέμφομαι τὸν Ὁμηρικόν, ὅτι τοὺς Τρῶας φιλεῖ.» (Translation: W. C. Wright).

[8] Philostr. soph. 559: ἡ δὲ ἀληθεστέρα αἰτία ἥδε· τὼ ἄνδρε τούτω, ὁπότε ἄμφω τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἠρχέτην, καλέσαντες ἐς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀθηναῖοι φωνὰς ἀφῆκαν τυραννουμένων πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην ἀποσημαίνοντες καὶ δεόμενοι ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐς τὰ βασίλεια ὧτα παραπεμφθῆναι τὰ εἰρημένα. τῶν δὲ Κυντιλίων παθόντων τι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον καὶ ξὺν ὁρμῇ ἀναπεμψάντων ἃ ἤκουσαν, ἐπιβουλεύεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔφασκεν ὡς ἀναθολούντων ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους.

overlapping levels of disagreement: an aesthetic-cultural level (the dispute about artistic taste at the Pythian Games), a socio-ethnic level (Herodes' ironical allusion to the Quintilii as ‹Trojans›) and a political level (the alleged conspiracy of the Quintilii, inciting the Athenian citizens against Herodes). As suggested by these multiple layers of dispute and the fact that it occurred on a number of occasions, the quarrel was far more complex, substantial and deeply-rooted in diverging fundamental convictions and attitudes than it appears at first glance. Philostratos' ‹anecdotal› report offers a unique vantage point for any attempt to see behind the deeper implications and ulterior motives of the rivalry and hostilities, and the three episodes related by him will be used in the following analysis as paradigmatic points of reference.[9]

There is no doubt that Herodes Atticus is one of the most intensely studied notables from the Greek East, whereas the Quintilii have (unjustly) not been treated with the same scholarly attention, though the colonial family played a much more significant role in Roman politics than their cameo in Philostratos' *vita* of Herodes suggests. In the following analysis the two prominent families from the Graeco-Roman East will not be dealt with as isolated social entities. Instead we will be concerned with the ‹parallel lives› of the Quintilii and Herodes Atticus, focusing on their relation to each other, points of social contact, the intersection of their careers, or coincidental encounters. In fact, their career paths crossed several times over the decades and were interwoven in a number of ways, directly or indirectly. Their antagonism reveals much about contemporary thought and mentality in general and the key issues in the socio-cultural discourse of the time in particular: the different approaches of notables from Greece and Asia Minor to the Roman status system; the fierce competition and status wrangling in the inner circles of the Roman aristocracy; and aspects of the self-definition and self-awareness of members of the ‹senatorial elite› during the second century AD. Thus, Philostratos' report on the origin of the quarrel between Herodes and the Quintilii ultimately epitomizes the clash between two leading families from Greece and Asia Minor, whose social and political careers were largely determined by their specific social and cultural identities.

* * *

When examining the ‹parallel lives› of Herodes and the Quintilii, it becomes evident that the origin of their antagonism reaches back a long way. It may be traced back at least to the 130s, forty years before the trial at Marcus' headquarters at Sirmium. In that decade their biographies apparently crossed for the first time when Herodes conducted several building projects in Alexandria Troas, the *patria* of the Quintilii. The colony was the first (and maybe the only) city in Asia Minor to benefit from Herodes'

[9] Despite some errors, imprecisions and obscurities, Philostratos' Vitae have been credited with an altogether good historical reliability. See Bowersock (1969) 15; Jones (1974); Swain (1991).

extraordinary munificence. Philostratos reports that when Herodes was *corrector* of the free cities of Asia in AD 134/5, he realized that the colony was ill-supplied with water. He therefore wrote to Hadrian asking him for an allowance of three million *drachmae* on the grounds that such an ancient and well-located city should not be allowed to fall into decay.[10] It should be noted in this context that Herodes' mandate as *corrector* was in principle confined to the free cities of the province of Asia, so the attention he devoted to the Roman colony located in the Troad is quite remarkable.[11] A desire to emulate the emperor's munificence – a recurring motive underlying senatorial building activities – may have been a driving force behind Herodes' building projects at Alexandria Troas.[12] As may be inferred from a dedication that the colonists of Alexandria Troas had raised in Athens in AD 132, Hadrian had obviously acted as a generous benefactor of the colony as well as of individual citizens (*multa beneficia quae viritim, quae publice praestitit*) and was celebrated by the Alexandrians as the *restitutor coloniae suae*.[13] Herodes may also have been aware that Hadrian strongly advocated the construction of urban utilitarian facilities (especially aqueducts) rather than such ephemeral benefactions like the provision of games, as a letter of Hadrian to the city of Aphrodisias (Caria) in AD 125 attests.[14] Herodes was thus in line with imperial policy when employing public funds for the improvement of the colony's water supply. His large-scale projects in Alexandria Troas involved the building of an aqueduct, a nymphaeum and an impressive bath-gymnasium complex.[15] However, because of his notorious φιλοτιμία and lavish attitude, Herodes exceeded the approved budget considerably.[16] When complaints about the waste of tributes for this one colony came to Hadrian's ears from the procurators of Asia, Herodes' father Atti-

[10] Philostr. soph. 548.

[11] See Boatwright (2000) 116–118.

[12] On the emulation of the emperor's building activities by senators and equestrians see Quass (1993) 221f.

[13] I.Troas T 124 = ILS 315 = CIL III 7282, ll. 5–6. The dating is based on the mention of Hadrian's holding of the tribunician power for the sixteenth time. The inscription, found at the Gymnasium of Hadrian, forms part of a dossier of statue bases dedicated by Greek cities in the Olympieion and other places at Athens that honour Hadrian as κτίστης: see e.g. IG II² 3290; 3297; 3300; 3304f. For an identical dedication in Latin by another Roman colony see CIL III 7283 (Pisidian Antioch, AD 132). Pausanias (1.18.6) mentions the erection of numerous statues by Greek cities in honour of Hadrian in the Olympieion. The statue dedications coincide with the inauguration of the Panhellenion (see below). Cf. Højte (2000) 230f. See also I.Troas 21 = Mühlenbrock (1994) 194 (Hadrian as *conservator*); I.Parion 7 (Hadrian as *conditor col(oniae) n(ostrae)*). On Hadrian as *restitutor* see Zahrnt (2007), esp. 209.

[14] SEG 50.1096. For an interpretation of the inscription see Reynolds (2000); Coleman (2008). On Hadrian's efforts to promote public building see Boatwright (2000) 108–143; cf. also Mitchell (1987) 344f.

[15] On the baths see Yegül (1992) 282; Smith (1979) 23–50; Tobin (1997) 328f.; on the fountain see Longfellow (2011) 147–150.

[16] The construction of aqueducts represented one of the most costly building projects for a city. See Eck (1987) 72f. and Coleman (2008) 40–43.

cus intervened on behalf of his son and simply topped up the budget from his own pockets by the incredible sum of four million *drachmae*, stating magnanimously: «Do not, o Emperor, allow yourself to be irritated on account of so trifling a sum. For the amount spent in excess of the three million I hereby present to my son, and my son will present it to the town.»[17] The incredibly large donation of the Claudii Attici left its mark on the colony, and their colossal buildings now dominated the urban landscape.[18] Although Herodes may have been genuinely concerned about the colony's desolate water provision, his magnanimity in Alexandria Troas, where he acted in the capacity of both an imperial agent and a private benefactor, was undoubtedly primarily aimed at advertising and increasing his family's public esteem, which now extended beyond Greece into Asia Minor.[19]

It is important to view Herodes' euergetism from a perspective which also considers its perception and socio-political dimensions in the colony: a project of such scale inevitably outshone the local eminence of the colony's own elite families – above all, that of the Quintilii. By that time, the Quintilii were one of the most distinguished families of Alexandria Troas, whose wealth, according to Cassius Dio, must have been enormous.[20] They traditionally maintained close bonds to their place of origin, as one can infer from the fact that their relationship with the colony's civic community was also expressed in a more official sense: the grandfather of the Quintilii brothers, Sex.

---

[17] Philostr. soph. 548: «ὦ βασιλεῦ», εἶπεν «ὑπὲρ μικρῶν μὴ παροξύνου, τὸ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὰς τριακοσίας μυριάδας ἀναλωθὲν ἐγὼ μὲν τῷ υἱῷ ἐπιδίδωμι, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τῇ πόλει ἐπιδίδωσι.» For Philostratos, Atticus' donation is a characteristic example of his amazing μεγαλοψυχία. Atticus had become immensely rich after he had (purportedly) come across a treasure in his newly acquired house (cf. Philostr. soph. 547 f.). It had possibly been hidden by his father Hipparchus to evade Domitian's confiscations.

[18] Even today, the remains of the baths and the aqueduct on the archaeological site give some idea of the monumentality of the buildings, which were such impressive and conspicuous landmarks, visible far out at sea, that early European mariners mistook them for the ‹Palace of Priam›. See Ricl (1997) 231. Clarke (1812) 152 mentions this misappellation of the baths in his Travels. A drawing of the ruins by M.-F. Préaulx (c. 1801, Victoria and Albert Museum, SD.821), who probably accompanied Clarke, is still entitled «Interior of the Palace of Priam, Alexandria Troas».

[19] Eck (2008) 42 notes that Alexandria Troas must have had sufficient water supply for the colony's primary care: Herodes' procurement mainly pertained to the provision of a bath-gymnasium as a central improvement of the standard of living and as a prestige object for the colony. According to Philostratos (soph. 548), however, the need for a better water supply appears to have been more pressing than the construction of some prestigious baths: ἰδὼν δὲ τὴν Τρῳάδα βαλανείων τε πονήρως ἔχουσαν καὶ γεῶδες ὕδωρ ἐκ φρεάτων ἀνιμῶντας ὀμβρίων τε ὑδάτων θήκας ὀρύττοντας («… he observed that Troy was ill-supplied with baths, and that the inhabitants drew muddy water from their wells and had to dig cisterns to catch rain water»).

[20] Cass. Dio 73.5.5: ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ πολυκτήμονες καὶ παμπλούσιοι. On the family's fortunes see also Pflaum (1972) 205–207. We know that they had landed property at Pergamum (AvP VIII 3, 88 f. no. 44) and possibly also in Syria (Trotta [1998] 20). For their estates in Rome and Italy see SHA, Tac. 16.2; Cass. Dio 73.13.4; Herodian 1.12.2; CIL XIV 2661/2. See also Andermahr (1998) 115.

Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus, is honoured in an inscription at the beginning of the second century AD as *patronus coloniae*.[21] This honorific title, which consolidated the family's connections with their *patria*, may have been bestowed on him for various public services performed on behalf of the city.[22] In many cases, city patronage implied munificent activities of the patron for the client community – or rather an implicit expectation that he would act as a benefactor.[23] To date, however, there is still no evidence of any building activities of the *gens Quintilia* in Alexandria Troas. In view of the poor water supply that Herodes observed in the colony in the 130s they must have neglected their inherited patronal responsibility to some extent, including the enhancement of local amenities. In contrast, with his outstanding generosity, Herodes (who was not a native of Alexandria Troas, after all) could style himself as the true patron of the colony, surpassing any euergetic activities that the colonial elite had undertaken so far. Another aspect to be observed here is that, from the perspective of the Quintilii, Herodes represented not merely a wealthy local notable from Athens interfering with their sphere of influence in their hometown. Even more important was that their *dignitas* had been challenged at a local *and* supra-local level by a peer from the senatorial order: Herodes and the Quintilii were among those successful notables from the Greek East who had attained the highest Roman rank and were actively involved in Roman administration. In order to get an in-depth view of the nature of their profound antagonism it will be expedient in the following to shed some light on the genealogy of the two families and their Roman careers.

*

Although the Quintilii are usually regarded as an ‹Anatolian› family, their colonial (and especially cultural) background fundamentally distinguished them from native Eastern senators, which became a significant feature in the Herodes-Quintilii conflict. It is a well-known fact that the bulk of the first Eastern equestrians and senators hailed from the provincial Roman colonies, especially Pisidian Antioch, Apameia, Parium, and Alexandria Troas.[24] These colonies represented communities of mainly Italian settlers, who in turn were mostly veterans and Italian businessmen (*negotiatores*). Their political and social structure was entirely modelled on Roman norms and values, which made them Roman enclaves in a Greek environment.[25] Alexandria Troas,

[21] I.Troas 39.

[22] On city patrons in the Greek East see Nicols (1990); Touloumakos (1988); Eilers (2002). Further *patroni coloniae* at Alexandria Troas: T. Iunius Montanus (see above; I.Troas 37); possibly: P. Memmius Regulus (CIL III 7090).

[23] Eilers (2002) 84–108 rejects the idea that under the empire city patronage automatically implied euergetism as an obligation of patrons.

[24] On senators and equestrians from Roman colonies in the East see Levick (1967) 103–120; Halfmann (1982) 605–613; Spawforth (2002) 107; Kuhn (2010). See also Zoumbaki (2008), who has pointed out that if the different backgrounds of the colonists (Italian, non-Italian, *negotiatores*) are considered in the analysis, the number of ‹proper›, Italian colonists of equestrian and senatorial rank turns out to be rather limited.

[25] See Sartre (2001) for a synoptical analysis of Roman colonies in the East.

too, had been founded as a veteran colony on the site of a Hellenistic city during the Augustan period.[26] After the colony's foundation, the city's political institutions ceased to exist and were superseded by a Roman administrative structure.[27] The legal and political status of the pre-colonial Greek inhabitants within the colony is difficult to assess due to the dearth of evidence.[28] In any case, it was the presence of a strong Italo-Roman nucleus of colonists with a socially demarcated elite group of *decuriones* and magistrates that dominated the picture of the social strata in Alexandria Troas during the first century AD. It was from this colonial elite that a high number of equestrians and senators was recruited.[29] In AD 81, the colony's Italo-Roman core elite supplied the first known consul from Asia Minor, T. Iunius Montanus.[30] Some fifteen years later, the first known member of the Quintilii, the aforementioned Sextus Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus, entered the Senate. A base inscription of a statue erected on behalf of the *ordo decurionum* explicitly mentions that he was promoted to senatorial rank by Nerva, after holding municipal offices at Alexandria Troas and the equestrian post of a *praefectus fabrum*.[31] The family had thus worked their way into the Senate via the equestrian order – a step-by-step advancement which is characteristic of the colonial elite.[32] According to the honorific inscription, Maximus served as

---

[26] On the history of the colony of Alexandria Troas and the date of the foundation see Ricl (1997) 1–21; Schwertheim (1996; 1999; 2008); Laffi (2004).

[27] In this respect, Alexandria Troas was not a ‹double community› (coexistence of the pre-colonial *polis* and the *colonia*). Cf. Mitchell (1979) 438; Esch (2008) 207f., 215f. However, Haake (2011) 151f. has recently called for a re-examination of the evidence: in a newly discovered Greek inscription from the second century AD (honours for the sophist L. Flavius Stlaccius from Sardis), the term *polis* is used in an *official* document. This, however, appears to indicate the gradual ‹Hellenization› of the colony rather than the existence of a double community (see below).

[28] For an analysis based on the onomastic data see Sugliano (2005).

[29] Nine equestrians (mainly from the first century AD) and eight senators (from only two families: the Iunii [2] and the Quintilii [7]) have been recorded so far. For the senators cf. Halfmann (1979) nos 6, 6a, 40, 49, 76, 118, 119; Schwertheim (2008). On the equestrians from the colony see now Römhild (2011) 172f.

[30] See I.Troas 37.

[31] I.Troas 39: *Sex(to) Quinctilio Sex(ti) f(ilio) Ani(ensi tribu) Valerio Maximo, lato clavo exornato a divo Aug(usto) Nerva, quaestori Pont(i) et Bithyniae, patrono coloniae, pontifici, IIviro, prae(fecto) fabrum, IIviralibus et sacerd(otalibus) ornament(is) honor(ato), d(ecreto) d(ecurionum), vicus X.* It is interesting to note that he first held the *ornamenta duoviralia et sacerdotalia* before being elected to the offices themselves. On Maximus' career see PIR² Q 25. See Stein (1927) 218; Halfmann (1979) 136 no. 40; Rémy (1989) 87f.; Ricl (1997) T 175; Trotta (1998) 11–14. On the *praefectura fabrum* see Dobson (1965); Saddington (1985); Demougin (1988) 383–385; 682–684, esp. 682 n. 15; Cerva (2000).

[32] A recently published inscription features another senatorial member of the Quintilii, the *legatus* P. Quintilius Maximus (in an honorific inscription for his daughter Quintilia Apphia). The inscription has been dated to the early period of the colony and would thus attest to the first known (senatorial) member of the *gens Quintilia*. See Schwertheim (2008) 180–183. However, a later date (second century) seems probable (see below).

quaestor of Pontus and Bithynia. It has generally been accepted in scholarship that he can most likely be equated with Pliny's *amicus* Maximus,[33] who was appointed by Trajan as *legatus ad ordinandum statum liberarum civitatum* in Achaea in c. AD 107/8, which corresponds to the post of a *corrector*.[34] This, incidentally, means that the grandfather of the Quintilii brothers had held the same post in the (adoptive) hometown of the Claudii Attici about 25 years before Herodes was in charge of the free cities in Asia. We may assume that during the tenure of his post in Achaea, Maximus, whose mission involved intervening into local affairs to organize the cities' finances and settle local disputes, got to know Herodes' father Atticus, as well as his immense wealth and prominence at Athens.

Of particular interest for our analysis is the advice Pliny offers Maximus about the treatment of the Greek cities, their inhabitants and the appreciation of their traditions and culture on the occasion of his appointment as *corrector*:[35]

«Consider that you are sent to the province of Achaea, that real, genuine Greece where politeness, learning, and even agriculture itself, are supposed to have first arisen. You are commissioned to superintend the affairs of free states; in other words, of men who are in the fullest sense men, and freemen who are in the highest sense free. (…) Cherish sentiments of respect for their antiquity, their colossal achievements, and even for their legends. Let no man's dignity, liberty, or vanity, suffer the least diminution at your hands. Remember it was from this land we derived our legal code, that she gave us laws not by right of conquest, but as a favour. Remember it is Athens you approach; it is Lacedaemon you govern; and to snatch from such a people the shadow that remains, the name that is left, of their freedom, would be a harsh, cruel, nay, barbarous, act. (…) Recollect each city's former greatness, but not so as to despise her for having lost

[33] See above all Mommsen on CIL III 6108; Tod (1939); Syme (1985) 329f.; Cébeillac (1972) 170–172; Rémy (1989) 87f. Contra Sherwin-White (1966) 479, who refers to a certain Maximus in Plin. ep. 6.8 and 6.34, who is of Cisalpine descent. For a discussion and refutation of Sherwin-White's arguments see Trotta (1998) 12f. Sex. Quin(c)tilius Maximus might also be identical with a certain Maximus in Plin. ep. 7.26 and paneg. 70.1, which again has been doubted by Sherwin-White.

[34] Cf. Plin. ep. 8.24. Maximus is the first attested *corrector* in the Greek East. Cf. Guerber (1997) 215. If he is also identical with the *quaestor* Maximus in Plin. paneg. 70.1, his quaestorship may be dated to AD 97/98. See PIR² Q 23. Further prestigious offices held by Maximus (like those of *tribunus plebis* and *praetor*) have been deduced from Pliny's letter (8.24).

[35] Plin. ep. 8.24.8: *Cogita te missum in provinciam Achaiam, illam veram et meram Graeciam, in qua primum humanitas, litterae, etiam fruges inventae esse creduntur; missum ad ordinandum statum liberarum civitatum, id est ad homines maxime homines, ad liberos maxime liberos. (…) Sit apud te honor antiquitati, sit ingentibus factis, sit fabulis quoque. Nihil ex cuiusquam dignitate, nihil ex libertate, nihil etiam ex iactatione decerpseris. Habe ante oculos hanc esse terram, quae nobis miserit iura, quae leges non victis sed petentibus dederit, Athenas esse quas adeas Lacedaemonem esse quam regas; quibus reliquam umbram et residuum libertatis nomen eripere durum ferum barbarum est. (…) Recordare quid quaeque civitas fuerit, non ut despicias quod esse desierit; absit superbia asperitas. Nec timueris contemptum.*

it. Far be pride and asperity from my friend; nor fear that a proper condescension can breed contempt.»

It is instructive to see how strongly Pliny feels urged to remind Maximus of the venerability of the «real, genuine Greece» (*vera et mera Graecia*), warning him against the adoption of a patronizing stance and emphasizing the need for an appropriate attitude towards its proud inhabitants, their history and culture.[36] As a native of a colony located in Asia Minor, Maximus was certainly not void of some Hellenic influence and would not have required this instruction, but Pliny's advice reveals the ‹cultural gap› still perceived between Roman colonists from the East and native Greeks; it also suggests an apparently low degree of ‹Hellenization› among the elite of Alexandria Troas at the beginning of the second century AD, which still had the character of a strictly Roman outpost embedded in a Greek environment. The colony's *potentes*, like the Quintilii, tenaciously maintained their distinct Italo-Roman identity by conforming to the Roman value system. Their rise into the top ranks of Roman society tied them even more closely to Rome.[37] The Quintilii's provenance from Asia Minor, however, appears to have made them ideal candidates for administrative posts in Greece: Maximus' homonymous son, the father of the Quintilii brothers, also served as *legatus pro praetore provinciae Achaiae* during Trajanic times (c. AD 115).[38]

Most likely, it is the same Sex. Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus (i.e. the grandfather of the Quintilii brothers) who appears in the sources as the partner of the Greek-Stoic philosopher Epictetus in a controversial dialogue at Nicopolis in AD 107/8, in which the topic of the cultural difference between Greece and Rome is broached.[39] Maximus is described here as «commissioner/*corrector*» (διορθωτής) of the free cities, «judge of the Greeks» (κριτὴς τῶν Ἑλλήνων) and an adherent of Epicurean philosophy. During his visit, Maximus questions Epictetus about ἡδονή as the objective of wealth, whereupon Epictetus exposes the false doctrines of Epicureanism. The episode is especially revealing with regard to Epictetus' criticism of the vanity of the Roman social prestige system, in which Maximus is deeply rooted. Casting doubt on Maximus' qualification as a «judge of the Greeks», he asks him:[40]

---

[36] The letter has often been quoted as a testimonial of Roman attitudes towards Greek culture. See Galimberti Biffino (2007) 287–289; Spawforth (2011) 239.

[37] A similarly obstinate clinging of the colonial elite to their Roman identity may be observed in Pisidian Antioch. See Levick (1967) 133–144.

[38] Cf. IG V 1.380 (Sparta). Cf. Groag (1922/24) 443 f. On his career: CIL XIV 2609 (Tusculum): *Sex(to) Quintilio Sex(ti) f(ilio) Ani(ensi tribu) / Valerio Maximo / leg(ato) provinciae Achaiae, praetori / tr(ibuno) [p]l(ebis), quaestori provinciae Achaiae / tr(ibuno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) I Italicae et XIII Geminae / IIIvir viar(um) cur(andarum)*. Cf. also Arr. Epict. diss. 3.7.3. See PIR² Q 26; Trotta (1998) 14 f.; Halfmann (1979) 141 f. no. 49.

[39] Thus Tod (1939), esp. 336 f.; likewise Millar (1965) 108; Trotta (1998) 13 f.

[40] Arr. Epict. diss. 3.7.30–31: Οἶδας κρίνειν; τί σε ἐποίησεν εἰδέναι; – Καῖσάρ μοι κωδίκελλον ἔγραψεν. – Γραψάτω σοι, ἵνα κρίνῃς περὶ τῶν μουσικῶν· καὶ τί σοι ὄφελος; ὅμως δὲ πῶς κριτὴς ἐγένου; τὴν τίνος χεῖρα καταφιλήσας (…).

E: «Do you know how to judge? Who taught you to know?»

M: «Caesar wrote to me a codicil.»

E: «Let him write and give you a commission to judge of music; and what will be the use of it to you? Still how did you become a judge? Whose hand did you kiss?»

While the humiliating lengths that careerists go to in order to achieve imperial posts is a central issue throughout Epictetus' work, here he is also questioning the capability and expertise of this Roman official to govern Greece and appreciate its cultural traditions. It is a remarkable coincidence that the example Epictetus gives in this context refers to the judgement of music: after all, one reason for the quarrel of the Quintilii with Herodes Atticus was, according to Philostratos, their different assessment of the music performances during the Pythian Games.

Further offices held by Sex. Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus are not attested, but he may have been promoted after his post as *corrector*.[41] His homonymous son certainly consolidated the family's role in Roman administration, thus paving the way for the exceptional careers of his sons, the ‹Quintilii brothers›, Maximus and Condianus.

*

While the Quintilii, then, had established themselves as a new senatorial *gens* at the beginning of the second century, the Claudii Attici at Athens had not yet attained equestrian, let alone senatorial rank.[42] They maintained close ties to Rome, though, as the family's tenure of the imperial priesthood (of Tiberius and Nero) and especially the conferment of the Roman citizenship on Herodes' great-grandfather attest.[43] However, it was not before late Trajanic times, or more probably under Hadrian, that the family enjoyed a meteoric rise to senatorial dignity: Herodes' father Atticus was granted the *ornamenta praetoria* and was subsequently admitted to the Senate by adlection *inter praetorios ex s.c.*; in AD 133 he reached the suffect consulship.[44] As an

[41] On the basis of a reconstruction of SEG 6.650 (Attaleia), Viale (1925–26) 365–368 proposed that Maximus returned to his home province in a senior position, as *legatus Augusti pro praetore Asiae*, in AD 113. However, Şahin (1997) 149f. republished the inscription (SEG 47.1784) and, supported by the information in SEG 47.1785, identified the honorand as M. Plancius Varus. Groag (1922–24) 443f. even assumed that Maximus crowned his career with a suffect consulship.

[42] See, however, Stein (1927) 342 n. 1, who suggests that Ti. Claudius Herodes, the great-grandfather of Herodes Atticus, was granted not only the Roman citizenship, but also equestrian rank. A ‹block grant› of the *civitas Romana* and equestrian rank is not unusual (cf. Demougin [1999] 585), but in the case of Ti. Claudius Herodes there is no compelling evidence that would corroborate this assumption.

[43] Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes: see PIR² C 801; Ameling (1983) I 13; Halfmann (1979) 120–122 no. 27.

[44] On the date see now Eck – Holder – Pangerl (2010), esp. 194. Cf. AE 1990, 763; RMD IV 247; CIL XIV 174; RMD III 159. Cf. Birley (1997) 209–211; Eck (2003) 236–239. In contrast, Ameling (1983) I 26 had previously dated Atticus' consulship to Trajanic times (AD 108). The inscription would then refer to Atticus' second consulship, which Philostratos does mention. See Philostr. soph. 545: ὁ σοφιστὴς Ἡρώδης ἐτέλει μὲν ἐκ πατέρων ἐς τοὺς

immensely rich and distinguished Athenian family, the Claudii Attici conducted their extraordinary career in Roman society during the time of Hadrian, whose devotion to Greek παιδεία and culture, to Greece in general and Athens in particular, constituted a kind of philhellenism unparalleled at the imperial court so far.[45] As A. Spawforth has shown, Hadrian continued the Augustan policy of the ideal of *Graecia vera*, which implied a Roman concept of Hellenism that embraced the glorious legacy of classical Greece.[46] Apart from benefactions and the restoration of cities, Hadrian's most ambitious plan for reviving the past of ‹classical Greece› was through the establishment of the Panhellenion at Athens, an association of *poleis* that could claim descent from the Greeks.[47] It is important to realize that, as a highly educated and cultured Athenian family, the Claudii Attici played a key role in the panhellenic programme Hadrian pursued. The family's Greekness could not be more marked: they claimed mythic descent from Herakles, Kekrops, Theseus and Hermes,[48] in addition to kinship with such prominent Greeks as Miltiades and Kimon.[49] Hadrian will have made the acquaintance of Herodes' family as early as AD 111/12, when he sojourned in the city as a consular. He returned to Athens as emperor on three visits in 124/5, 128/9, and 131/2 – the year that marked the inauguration of the Panhellenion.[50] The significance of the Claudii Attici in both the Greek and Roman world at that time becomes evident in their official positions: Herodes was made ἄρχων of the Panhellenion, while his father Atticus held the suffect consulship at Rome during the same period (AD 133). His promotion to the highest Roman office was relatively late in comparison with the integration of *homines novi* from other provinces, but irrespective of this Atticus is the first known consul and maybe even the first senator originating from mainland Greece.[51] Given the fact that the Claudii Attici would easily have fulfilled all the requirements for

---

δισυπάτους («Herodes the sophist on his father's side belonged to a family which twice held consulships»). Interestingly enough, this would coincide with Sex. Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus' appointment as special commissioner of the free cities in Greece. Contra Birley (1997) 210, who excludes the possibility of a second consulship.

[45] It has rightly been pointed out by Vout (2006) that Hadrian's engagement in Greece does not necessarily indicate his full identification with the Greek cultural system, but was merely derived from a general imperial policy of provincial integration. Vout suggests a more differentiated view of Hadrian's philhellenism qua emperor. Yet, the «Greekling's» abiding love of Greece cannot be denied. On the nickname see Front. ad M. Caes. 3.3.

[46] Spawforth (2011) passim. According to Spawforth, Hadrian reprised the «official Augustan narrative of a Hellenism fit for Roman usage» (p. 243).

[47] On the Panhellenion see Spawforth – Walker (1985; 1986); Willers (1990); Jones (1996); Romeo (2002). According to Jones, the initiative for the founding of the Panhellenion came from the Greeks themselves, which was merely approved by Hadrian.

[48] His descent from Hermes derives from his mythical forefather Keryx. See IG XIV 1389.

[49] See IG II² 3606 (Herakles); IG XIV 1389 (Kekrops); Philostr. soph. 546 (Miltiades and Kimon). On the genealogical claims of the Claudii Attici see Ameling (1983) I 3–14.

[50] For Hadrian's provincial tours see Martín (1982); Halfmann (1986) 41f.; Birley (2000) 136–145; Boatwright (2000); Jones (2011) 319–321.

[51] Thus argued by Birley (1997) 209–212.

admission to the Senate during the first century, A. Birley has suggested that the late entry of Atticus into the Senate might be accounted for by a certain reluctance on his part to become a senator.[52] Birley's explanation is not implausible.[53] Atticus may well have been convinced to accept (the burdens of) senatorial membership as soon as he came to realize the advantages of a Roman career for his own local standing, and moreover for his son Herodes.

Herodes was considerably more involved in the Roman status system than his father. In his youth, he spent some years at Rome in the house of Calvisius Tullus Ruso, *cos. ord.* in AD 109 and grandfather of Marcus Aurelius, and must have received the *latus clavus* soon after his father's enrolment in the Senate.[54] He then embarked on a regular *cursus honorum*, which included the office of *quaestor (principis)* (129), *tribunus plebis* (131), and *praetor* (133), before he went to the province of Asia as *corrector* of the free cities in AD 134/5. As the special honour of being a candidate of the emperor suggests,[55] his Roman career prospects derived foremost from his close relationship with Hadrian. It is noteworthy that, in parallel with his Roman *cursus*, Herodes also pursued a municipal career in Athens, holding the prestigious posts of ἄρχων, ἀγορανόμος, and ἀγωνοθέτης of the Panatheneia. Being an ‹insider› in both the Greek and Roman elite circles, Herodes is therefore generally viewed as the epitomy of Graeco-Roman biculturalism. His was a hybrid identity, with the Greek element naturally predominating and furthered by the emperor's philhellene disposition.[56]

*

From our survey of the career histories of several of their members it is evident that the Quintilii and Claudii Attici represented two distinguished families from the Graeco-Roman East who rose in the imperial orbit to high social and political positions in the first half of the second century AD. Their paths may have crossed more than once – in a spectacular way with Herodes' remarkable building activities at the Quintilii's hometown of Alexandria Troas. It was in Rome that their careers would overlap again. After their admission to the senatorial order, the Quintilii had obviously transferred their primary place of residence to Rome, which accounts for their apparently loose

[52] Birley (1997) 212. Birley suggests that unfamiliarity with Latin may have been an obstacle for his admission.

[53] It is an interesting phenomenon that some prominent notables from Asia Minor never entered the Senate, e.g. C. Vibius Salutaris (Ephesus), C. Iulius Demosthenes (Oenoanda), or even gained the Roman citizenship, e.g. Opramoas (Rhodiapolis), Iason (Kyaneai). For studies on these notables see Rogers (1991a; 1991b); Wörrle (1988); Kokkinia (2000); Reitzenstein (2011) 108–113. Berling (1993) assumes that Iason did hold the Roman citizenship and was even of equestrian rank, but did not advertise his Roman status.

[54] Front. ad. M. Caes. 3.2.1. On his career see PIR^2 C 802; Ameling (1983) I 61–83; II 1–15.

[55] See Syll.^{3} 863 no. 1. On the *quaestores principis* see Pistor (1965) 82–86; Frei-Stolba (1967) 216–220; Cébeillac (1972).

[56] On Herodes' ‹fluid› Graeco-Roman identity see most recently Gleason (2010).

‹patronal› relationship with Alexandria Troas.[57] Although Herodes remained closely tied to Greece throughout his life, he, too, soon found himself more attached to the capital than has often been acknowledged. His more distinct orientation towards Rome may be noted after AD 138, the year when his most important pillars of support, his ‹mentor› Hadrian and his father Atticus, died. The new emperor, Antoninus Pius, did not share the philhellenism and cosmopolitanism of his predecessor and once more made Rome the steady domicile of the *princeps*. In fact, Herodes' move to the capital in these years was not an entirely voluntary decision, but prompted by a push factor. Philostratos reports that Herodes got into serious trouble with the Athenians over the execution of his father's testament. In his will Atticus had ordained that every Athenian should receive a *mina* annually.[58] Herodes, however, managed to change the onerous provisions of the will and deprive the Athenians of a large part of his father's bequest. His slyness and trickery led to a bitter feeling of resentment against him and a rapid loss of local influence and esteem.[59] Against this background, it is not surprising that Herodes soon tried to escape the hostile atmosphere at Athens and left for Rome, where some attractive positions were awaiting him: he became the teacher of the future emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus and reached the highest Roman honour, the ordinary consulship, in AD 143.[60] It is obvious that Herodes now focused his efforts on enhancing and strengthening his standing within the Roman nobility. A decisive step in this direction was his marriage to a wealthy young woman from one of the leading Roman families of patrician rank: Appia Annia Regilla.[61] She was the daughter of Appius Annius Trebonius Gallus, *cos. ord.* of AD 139, who had co-founded with Herodes the priestly college for the worship of Hadrian. The *gens Annia* could claim a venerable genealogy of several generations of consuls and friendly relations with the imperial *domus*. For the king-like Athenian magnate, Regilla, «little queen» by name, was thus an appropriate match.[62] The matrimonial bond catapulted Herodes into the top echelons of Roman aristocracy, not least because of the generous dowry that Regilla brought to the marriage.

---

[57] On the obligation of provincial senators to invest one third of their fortune (under Trajan; one fourth under Marcus Aurelius) into landed property in Italy see Plin. ep. 6.19.4; SHA, M. Ant. Phil. 11.8. Cf. Krieckhaus (2001) 239–244.

[58] See Philostr. soph. 549.

[59] Interestingly enough, he was not elected to the imperial priesthood, which had been held by the Claudii Attici for generations. A member of another Attic family, Ti. Claudius Lysiades III of Melite, unexpectedly took the post. Cf. Ameling (1983) I 68. On the Claudii of Melite see Woloch (1969); Clinton (1974). For a discussion of the imperial priesthood at Athens see Camia (2008).

[60] Fronto was not suffect consul in the same year, but in AD 142. See Eck (1998).

[61] PIR² A 720; Raepsaet-Charlier (1982) no. 66. On Regilla's life, see Pomeroy (2007).

[62] On matrimonial alliances of Eastern senators see Rémy (1993) 174–178 and 186f. The exogamic marriage of an Eastern senator with an Italian senatorial woman is highly unusual. See Woloch (1973) 169.

Along with this dowry Herodes inherited a vast estate near the third milestone of the Via Appia known as the «Triopion».[63] It is a remarkable coincidence that due to this new domicile Herodes and the Quintilii brothers should become close neighbours. The Quintilii's magnificent villa was located beyond the fifth milestone of the Via Appia, not far from the site of Herodes' estate.[64] One can well imagine that, locked in neighbourly rivalry, an overambitious notable like Herodes must have felt challenged by the Quintilii's opulence in architecture. The extant archaeological remains stretching between the Via Appia Antica and the Via Appia Nuova bear witness to the huge dimensions the residential estate of the Quintilii must have had.[65] The construction of the villa began in Hadrianic times, and during the second century it was subsequently developed into a palace-like property, comprising a large bath complex, a nymphaeum, and a stadium.

It was in the same years, while Herodes was occupied in Rome as a consul and teacher, that the Quintilii brothers were augmenting their political influence in the Roman government in accord with their socio-economic strength.[66] We may conjecture that in these years they witnessed the trial at Rome in which the Athenians brought claims against Herodes following his conduct at Athens.[67] The trial was initiated by Herodes' Athenian enemy Ti. Claudius Demostratus and defended by Fronto, *cos. suff.* in AD 142.[68] It may have been on this occasion that the Quintilii got to know Demostratus, whom they would later support in his attack against Herodes on the charge of tyranny. All this is, of course, hypothetical.

The high political aspirations of the Quintilii were ultimately fulfilled in AD 151 when the two brothers achieved the extraordinary honour of jointly holding the highest magistracy, the ordinary consulship.[69] This ‹dyarchy› within the senatorial order was truly exceptional, which underlines the high esteem the Quintilii enjoyed and the responsibility they were entrusted with. Their unshakable brotherly concord became

---

[63] On the estate see Pisani Sartorio – Calza (1976) 132–141; Tobin (1997) 355–371; Galli (2002) 109–127; Thomas (2007) 83.

[64] Cf. CIL XV 7518; Cass. Dio 73.13.4; SHA, Tac. 14.2. On the villa of the Quintilii see Ricci (ed.) (1998); Paris (ed.) (2000); Mayer (2005) 119f.; Newby (2005) 139.

[65] See Paris (ed.) (2000) 5–28.

[66] As noted above (n. 6), Graindor (1930) 111–113 holds that the two brothers served in Greece as *proconsul* and *legatus* respectively during that period (c. AD 147/8–150) and dates the beginning of the open hostilities between them and Herodes to these years. In this way, their dispute with Herodes at the Pythian Games (see below) might already fall into this period (Pythian Games of AD 147).

[67] Front. ad M. Caes. 3.2–4; Philostr. soph. 555. The issue of the trial is unknown. The trial is usually dated to the early 140s, whereas Champlin (1974) 142 and Bowersock (1969) 97 argue for a date in the late 150s. Van den Hout (1999) 94–97 has re-examined the evidence and argues in favour of the earlier date (AD 140–142).

[68] It can be ruled out that the Demostratus in Front. ad Anton. Imp. 3.4.1 is identical with the Athenian Ti. Claudius Demostratus. See van den Hout (1999) 278.

[69] Degrassi (1952) 43.

proverbial.[70] According to Cassius Dio,[71] «they had offered the most striking example ever seen of mutual affection; and at no time had they ever been separated, even in the offices they held. They had grown prosperous and exceedingly wealthy, and were wont to hold offices together and to act as assistants to each other.»

It is obvious that the Quintilii found their way easily into the Roman aristocracy due to their markedly Rome-oriented colonial background, fully identifying themselves with the senatorial ethos. In contrast, Herodes' assimilation into the top echelons of Roman society turned out to be a more complex process. In fact, Herodes, who had not been socialized in a Roman environment, reveals a conceptualization of his senatorial identity that essentially differs from the traditional mindset. The patronage of Greek culture by Hadrian, or rather the sense of cultural superiority that this imperial advancement implied as well as the attention and individual promotion which he personally received from the emperor, had been formative for Herodes' attitude towards his participation in Roman elite society. He did not actually regard himself in direct competition with his senatorial colleagues. Instead, his bearing as a Graeco-Roman senator was grounded in his conviction that he was on a par with the imperial family itself.

A most instructive testimony for this self-perceived position in the Roman hierarchy is the architectural programme of the famous Nymphaeum at Olympia, which Herodes and Regilla dedicated in the early 150s.[72] The building features two symmetrical semi-circles of statues: the imperial family are set up in the lower gallery, while the families of Herodes and Regilla occupy the upper one. A statue of Zeus serves as the apex in each gallery. The statues represent four generations of ancestors. Divus Hadrianus, whose niche was presumably located directly beneath Herodes' statue, is displayed as the only forefather of the imperial family of Antoninus Pius. This again attests to Herodes' close relationship with the emperor, whom he may have regarded as the personification of a new harmonious alliance of Greek and Roman culture. Apart from a (headless) male statue dressed in the Greek *himation*, all the senior male members of Herodes' family wear the Roman *toga*. It is difficult to identify the *himation*-dressed statue: it must be either Herodes or his father Atticus.[73] However, the correct identification is not of paramount importance, since the central meaning of the scenario is evident: the Greek element of the Claudii's identity is represented as integral to their acquired Roman status.

---

[70] Amm. Marc. 28.4.21. The sources do not suggest that the Quintilii brothers were twin brothers.

[71] Cass. Dio 72.5.4: διαπρεπέστατα γὰρ τῶν πώποτε ἐφίλησαν ἀλλήλους, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς διεχωρίσθησαν. ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ πολυκτήμονες καὶ παμπλούσιοι, καὶ ἦρχον ὁμοῦ καὶ παρήδρευον ἀλλήλοις (Translation: E. Cary).

[72] The statue programme of the nymphaeum has been analyzed by Bol (1984). See also Smith (1998) 75–77; Gleason (2010) 130–135. On the dating cf. Bol (1984) 98–100; Tobin (1997) 321f.

[73] Smith (1998) 77 proposes that the *togatus* should be identified as the statue of Herodes' father. Gleason (2010) 132f. follows this interpretation.

While the sculptural arrangement of the monument has been interpreted in terms of a symbolic expression of Herodes' hybrid Graeco-Roman identity,[74] it also discloses Herodes' view of his standing in relation to the senatorial *gens* of the Annii and the emperor. The juxtaposition of the Claudii Attici with the patrician family of the Annii places emphasis on the issue of ancestry and noble birth, suggesting a parity between Herodes' Greek εὐγένεια and Roman patrician rank.[75] Moreover, and more importantly, the symmetrical arrangement of the two galleries announces the close alignment of Herodes' family with the imperial dynasty. It lays claim to forms of self-representation and public display used by the imperial family itself.[76] Despite the nuance of hierarchy that is maintained, the monument's message surely navigates a suggestively fluid course, alluding to a socio-political correspondence between the imperial family and the Attici. As for the Greek visitor to the Nymphaeum, it gives expression to Herodes' intended message that his standing in Greece should be seen as parallel to and equal with the emperor's position at Rome and in the empire. Monumental forms of self-representation that combine portraits of the benefactor with images of the emperor and mythological figures are common in the Greek East.[77] However, the artistic programme of the Nymphaeum with its clear visual reference to the imperial family remains unique. Such high pretension may have derived not only from Herodes' exceptional social distinction – and arrogance – but also from his teacher-student relationship with members of the imperial family, which, at least in his eyes, entailed a natural authority, if not (intellectual) superiority over them.

*

With his prestigious marriage to a patrician woman, a magnificent residence in the capital and the performance of high imperial offices, Herodes had managed to thrust himself to the top of Roman society. He was evidently keen to augment his social and political standing inside the circles of the old Roman nobility. However, this orientation towards Rome did not result in an unreserved adaptation to the social hierarchy. Instead, Herodes markedly distinguished himself from his senatorial peers: corresponding to his self-perception, he was resolved to occupy a pre-eminent, *princeps*-like position similar to his family's influence in the East.

His further ambitions at Rome, however, were dramatically dashed when Regilla died in c. AD 157, which marked a caesura in Herodes' life. His personal grief took on

---

[74] Thus Smith (1998) 77.

[75] On this aspect see below.

[76] Thus also Tobin (1997) 94: «By displaying his family at Olympia and Delphi Herodes was advertising his family as a powerful dynasty, lesser but essentially parallel with the imperial family.» See also the recent discussion of the nymphaeum in Gleason (2010) 130–135, esp. 133. On the representation of imperial rank in relation to senatorial rank see Zimmermann (2011).

[77] Most notably: the gate complex of Plancia Magna (Perge), the library of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (Ephesus), the gymnasium of P. Vedius Antoninus Phaedrus Sabinianus and his wife Flavia Papiane (Ephesus), and the statue programme of M. Livinius Dexter and C. Sallustius Dexter (Bulla Regia). Cf. Bol (1984) 95.

extreme forms of public display, most notably through the construction of the Odeon at Athens in Regilla's memory and the erection of numerous portrait steles on his estates in Attica. His excessive expression of grief may have been triggered by rumours that he had murdered his pregnant wife himself.[78] Deprived of his direct connection to the patrician Annii, Herodes suddenly found himself faced with the mistrust, envy and deep-rooted animosities that many fellow senators felt towards their complacent and overbearing colleague from Greece. In their eyes he was a nouveau riche, who had intruded into their circle courtesy of a strategic marriage, and, above all, a *Graeculus* (as Fronto ridiculed him), who stood out because of his distinctive Greek habitus.[79] Herodes' marked sense of cultural superiority did not fit without friction into the social framework of Rome's aristocracy. One of his fiercest opponents was Regilla's brother Appius Annius Atilius Bradua, who brought the charge of murder against Herodes.[80] Bradua even waited until his consulship in AD 160 before opening the trial in order to be able to face the ex-consul Herodes in consular dignity. In his speech he did not furnish any clear proof of Herodes' complicity in a crime; instead he presented a boastful eulogy on his patrician pedigree, underlining his noble lineage by the ostentatious display of a patrician status symbol, the crescent-shaped ivory buckle on his shoe.[81] His provocative gesture left Herodes, the non-patrician widower, unimpressed. Ridiculing the consul's long-winded speech on the noble pedigree of his family, he sarcastically stated: «You have your pedigree on your toe-joints.»[82] The trial was, in fact, not so much concerned with the charge of murder. It ultimately served as a battleground for a clash of opinions about the superiority of Roman patrician rank versus the Greek concept of εὐγένεια, fought out between old-established Roman families and those newly admitted to the Senate from the provinces. With his dismissive remark Herodes had exposed the consul's formal status pedantry which, in his view, was merely compensating for the lack of real power and true nobility.[83]

Herodes was acquitted thanks to the intervention of Antoninus Pius. There is suggestive evidence that in the aftermath he began to withdraw from Rome, its aristocratic circles and status system. He showed a certain indifference to further promotion

---

[78] On the murder of Regilla and Herodes' guilt see Pomeroy (2007), who unlike Philostratos views Herodes' public grief as «tantamount to a confession» (p. 124).

[79] Front. ad M. Caes. 3.3.3.

[80] For the following see Philostr. soph. 555f. The motive for the accusation may have been some inheritance claims.

[81] On this status symbol see Alföldi (1952); Dossin (1969); Goldman (2001) 101–131. According to Plutarch (de tranq. anim. 470 C) and Statius (silv. 5.2.27f.), plebeian senators also wore the lunate medallion. However, Herodes' remark is only reasonable if the *calcei patricii* were still the exclusive right of patricians.

[82] Philostr. soph. 555: «σὺ» ἔφη «τὴν εὐγένειαν ἐν τοῖς ἀστραγάλοις ἔχεις.»

[83] Furthermore, when Bradua referred to his acts of munificence in one Italian city, Herodes contrasted them with the incomparable scale of his euergetism. See Philostr. soph. 556: ὁ Ἡρώδης «κἀγὼ» ἔφη «πολλὰ τοιαῦτα περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ διῆειν ἄν, εἰ ἐν ἁπάσῃ τῇ γῇ ἐκρινόμην.» («I too could have recited many such actions of my own in whatever part of the earth I were now being tried»).

in the Roman hierarchy and to honours derived from Roman status: Herodes did not cast lots for a proconsulship,[84] his daughter Athenais got married to an Attic aristocrat (and not to a Roman senator)[85] and, as Philostratos explicitly emphasizes, he made no secret of the fact that he cherished the orator's extempore speaking more than the title of consul or descendant of consuls.[86] In addition, Herodes certainly did not fail to notice the favours the Quintilii brothers received from Antoninus Pius' successor, Marcus Aurelius. Sex. Quintilius Maximus held the proconsulship of Asia between c. AD 168–170, probably assisted by his brother Condianus as *legatus*.[87] Their posts in Asia constituted yet another stage in their successful climbing of the Roman career ladder under the patronage of the emperor. The Quintilii obviously maintained close amicable links to Marcus Aurelius, who highly esteemed the brothers and would refer to them intimately as «my Quintilii».[88] In contrast, Herodes' relationship with Marcus is more difficult to gauge. We may infer, however, that he tried to establish a close relationship with Marcus' imperial colleague and brother, Lucius Verus. Herodes accompanied him on his way to the East for the campaign against the Parthians and played a generous host to him at Athens in AD 162/3.[89] If we believe Philostratos, there were even rumours that he was conspiring with Lucius against Marcus, and Marcus himself is said to have entertained such suspicions against Herodes.[90] Yet the imperial power lay with Marcus, not with Lucius Verus. Herodes was well aware of his diminishing influence in the centre of power and that it was now the Quintilii who enjoyed a pre-eminent standing.

Herodes could have put up with this state of affairs, given his obvious disillusionment with and indifference towards Rome on the one hand and the strengthening of his authority in Greece on the other. Through his generous donations and the performance of liturgies (from which he was actually exempt as a senator) he had been able to improve the strained relationship with the Athenian *demos* and even consolidate his position by the occupation of the ἀρχιερεία.[91] The Greek East was to be again his primary focus of attention.

---

[84] Philostr. soph. 556. Philostratos' wording could also imply a second consulship instead of a proconsulship. Cf. Ameling (1983) II 7–9.

[85] L. Vibullius Rufus/Hipparchus, who was her second cousin. See PIR[1] V 423.

[86] Philostr. soph. 536: ἦρα μὲν γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοσχεδιάζειν ὁ Ἡρώδης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ὕπατός τε καὶ ἐξ ὑπάτων δοκεῖν.

[87] IGR IV 580; French (1976) 77f.

[88] SEG 29.127, plaque II, l. 40: τοῖς ἐμοῖς Κυιντιλίοις.

[89] Cf. Herodes' poem in honour of Lucius Verus: Ameling (1983) II 177f. no. 186. On Herodes' hospitality towards Lucius Verus see Papalas (1978).

[90] Philostr. soph. 560f. However, Philostratos' credibility has been doubted in this case. Cf. Brunt (1974) 6 n. 28; Swain (1991) 163. See, however, Papalas (1978), who maintains that Herodes' relationship with Lucius Verus was the underlying charge against him in the trial at Sirmium.

[91] Ameling (1983) II 9–11; 108–113 nos 88–93. Cf. also Herodes' donation of white χλαμύδες for the ephebes. See IG II–III[2] 2090, l. 6.

In AD 171, however, the Quintilii brothers were appointed special commissioners in Achaea/Hellas – and thus intruded directly into Herodes' sphere of authority in Greece and Athens.[92] It was the same position that Herodes had held in Asia c. 35 years before. The fact that one son of the brothers, (Sex.) Quintilius Maximus (2), attained the ordinary consulship just one year later, in AD 172,[93] bears witness to the powerful role the family from Alexandria Troas came to play and the great favours they could enjoy under Marcus Aurelius.

*

It is against the background of these developments that Herodes voiced his disapproval of the emperor's conferment of imperial honours on the Quintilii by the witty quip: «I blame Homer's Zeus also, for loving the Trojans.»[94] Herodes' ironical allusion playfully associates his antipathy against the Quintilii with the mythic battle between the Greeks and Trojans, even though the equation of Alexandria Troas with Troy/Ilion is, of course, an elaborate hoax. Taken at face value, Herodes' attack is merely targeted at the promotion of the two brothers, who – in contrast to Marcus Aurelius (who is indirectly criticized in his role as Zeus)[95] – he did not deem worthy of the imperial honours they received. But when we take a closer look at the deeper implications underlying the quip, it becomes clear that in his derogatory words Herodes verbalizes contemporary Greek notions about Greekness, Romanness and noble birth. They go far beyond the banal metaphorical or historical comparison that Herodes' gibe may at first sight appear to be.

At the core of Herodes' trenchant criticism lies the fundamental issue of Troy's relationship to the origins of Rome and Greek views of this foundation myth. The central question in the conflict was: what did ‹being Trojan› imply both in general and for Herodes? Rome's Trojan ancestry, with a focus on Aeneas as the founding father of Rome (and the *gens Iulia* in particular), had always been a key element of imperial ideology.[96] Genealogical claims of Trojan descent were tantamount to an assertion of a core Roman identity. It is no wonder, then, that the Hellenized cities in the Troad,

---

[92] On the dating of their governorship and the nature of their office see above n. 5 and 6.

[93] PIR² Q 24. Cf. Degrassi (1952) 48.

[94] Philostr. soph. 559.

[95] The syncretization of Zeus with the Roman emperor was already fostered under Augustus. Hadrian in particular was identified with Zeus and shared cult with the Olympian god. Cf. Kuhlmann (2002) 250. Annibaldi (1935) points to a sanctuary of the worship of Zeus Bronton, which was associated with the emperor. It was located near to the properties of the Quintilii and Herodes on the Via Appia and already existed in the mid-second century AD. See Paris – Pettinau (2008). Besides, the formulation πρὸς Μάρκον in Philostratos' report on the incident may be read in the sense of «before Marcus» as well as «against Marcus». As Trotta (1998) 18 aptly suggests, the latter reading, which might be plausible in view of Herodes' friendship with Lucius, would then suggest a verbal attack against Marcus (= Zeus), which was almost tantamount to an insubordination.

[96] On this important aspect see the comprehensive study by Battistoni (2010).

above all Ilion (the ancient site of Troy), eagerly promoted this connection and identified themselves with the Trojan past of their surroundings:[97] in the cities' diplomatic contacts with Rome, their affinity with the Trojans served as a crucial link to Roman and imperial kinship.[98] Yet the kinship mythology undoubtedly held an antagonistic element, considering that its subject was the deep hostility between Greeks and Trojans. In fact, among Greek intellectuals the denigrating assessment of the Trojans as ‹barbarians›, who, moreover, had been defeated by the Greeks, was common even under Roman rule.[99] This Greece-Troy antithesis was strengthened under the philhellene Hadrian: the emperor's promotion of the ideal of *Graecia vera* advanced the notion of cultural disparity between a superior mainland Greece and a subordinate Asia Minor.[100] This ideal served as a guiding principle for membership in the Panhellenion: the basic criterion for admission was authentic ethnic Greekness as opposed to a culturally defined Hellenism based on Greek παιδεία.[101] Thus, the Panhellenion provided a strong incentive for cities in Asia Minor to construct foundation myths of a συγγένεια with the Greeks in order to be eligible for membership in the new association.[102] It automatically entailed a certain suppression of the Trojan legend in favour of Hellenizing origin stories.

As a Roman colony with a Hellenistic heritage (and located in the Troad), Alexandria Troas occupied a special place in this respect. It could have kept aloof from the Hellenizing trend, for its a priori close relationship with Rome did not necessarily require additional forms of kinship diplomacy with the emperor. It is, therefore, most notable that the *colonia* Alexandria Troas, despite its close ties with Rome, did join the inter-*poleis* rivalries for provincial precedence and imperial favours during the second century AD.[103] Instead of emphasizing its Trojan connections (as Ilion continued to do tenaciously), Alexandria Troas began to advertise the history and traditions of

[97] Erskine (2001) 93–127, 195–197. Sartre (2001) 125 even presumes that due to the Trojan connection of Alexandria Troas and its ideological significance for the *gens Iulia* Augustus granted special favours in the form of the enfranchisement of all pre-colonial inhabitants with the Roman citizenship. An onomastic survey, however, shows that this thesis is unfounded.

[98] On kinship diplomacy cf. Jones (1999; 2001; 2010).

[99] See Erskine (2001) 98f.

[100] Spawforth (2011) 240f. maintains that this antagonism provoked a ‹counter-culture› in the cities of Asia Minor, a kind of cultural regionalism.

[101] On this aspect see Romeo (2002), esp. 31–37.

[102] On the importance of foundation myths in the imperial period see Weiss (1984); Leschhorn (1984); Strubbe (1984–86); Scheer (1993); Lindner (1994); Kuhn (2009). In the Panhellenion, direct descendants from the mother-cities of mainland Greece and its ancestral colonies took precedence over the Hellenistic foundations located in Asia Minor.

[103] The (Latin!) inscription (I.Troas T 124) set up by the colony at Athens in honour of Hadrian in AD 132 – the year of the inauguration of the Panhellenion – should not be mistaken as evidence of its membership in the assembly, but it certainly evinces the colony's efforts to demonstrate its solidarity with the emperor's panhellenic outlook. See above n. 13.

the pre-colonial Hellenistic *polis*.[104] A gradual process of ‹Hellenization› may be observed in several areas of the colony's civic life, which testifies to the fact that the Latin enclave was not entirely immune to the social and cultural impact of its Greek surroundings.[105] This process of assimilation also pertained to the Italo-Roman elite of the colony. Several intermarriages between Roman colonists and Greeks are attested at Alexandria Troas – including the Quintilii.[106] In a recently published inscription from Alexandria Troas, a certain Quintilia Apphia, the daughter of the *legatus Augusti* P. Quintilius Maximus, is honoured as *sacerdos Victoriae Augusti et Divae Augustae* and as priestess of Liber Pater and Apollo Smintheus.[107] Quintilia Apphia obviously belonged to another senatorial branch of the Quintilii (since the *praenomen* of her father differs from the hitherto known members of the *Sex. Quintilii*). Her name indicates that her mother was of local descent.[108] E. Schwertheim has tentatively dated the inscription to the early period of the colony, but in the light of our previous considerations it is possible that it dates from the second century, not least because it would be surprising to encounter a senatorial member of the family before the reign of Claudius.[109] Moreover, the Quintilii's frequent employment in the Greek East underlines their considerable knowledge of and familiarity with Greek affairs. They were praised for their great learning and are said to have written an agricultural

---

[104] Convincing proof of this has been provided by meticulous analysis of the numismatic evidence, which sheds light on the new adoption and prevalence of Greek myths and traditions in the Roman colony. This is especially true in the reference to the alleged foundation of the *polis* by Alexander the Great (instead of Antigonos) as evidence of its εὐγένεια. See Weiss (1996); Ziegler (1998). For the coinage of Alexandria Troas: Lucchelli (2007) 140–218; Bellinger (1958; 1961); Burnett (1998).

[105] As the newly published letters of Hadrian to Dionysiac artists (AD 134) attest, Greek agonistic games also formed part of the colony's cultural life. See Petzl – Schwertheim (2006); Jones (2007).

[106] Cf. I.Troas 124 (T. Iunius Montanus and Xanthe); CIL III 399 (T. Aufidius Spinter and Tullia [Pergamum]).

[107] Schwertheim (2008) 180–184.

[108] Apphia is a widespread name in Asia Minor. Robert (1963) 348 regards it as a ‹Lallnamen› (child's word): «Les noms indigènes sont essentiellement de ces «Lallnamen», d'origine indigène, mais que l'ont peut dire d'apparence internationale, ayant leurs semblables ou leurs parallèles en toute langue.» It appears unlikely that her *cognomen* renders a Hellenized translation of the Latin *nomen gentile* Appia.

[109] See Schwertheim (2008) 180f. Schwertheim bases the early dating of the inscription on the assumption that as *sacerdos Victoriae Augusti et Divae Augustae* Apphia was priestess of the newly established cult of Livia and of the personified Victory of Augustus, but he rightly notes (n. 43) that we should then expect *sacerdos Victoriae Divi Augusti*. In fact, the cult of the goddess Victoria was not confined to the Iulio-Claudian dynasty, and *diva Augusta* may well refer to a later divinized female member of the imperial *domus*, such as Trajan's sister Marciana (who, along with Diva Matidia, is also epigraphically recorded in Alexandria Troas: I.Troas 19) or Antoninus Pius' wife Faustina. Furthermore, it is worth remembering that Sextus Quin(c)tilius Valerius Maximus had been adlected to the Senate by Nerva. See I.Troas 39.

treatise in Greek.[110] According to Cassius Dio, Condianus (2), a son of the Quintilii brothers, surpassed all «in character and education» and was «intimately connected» with τὰ Ἑλληνικά.[111]

Comparing the *vitae* of Herodes and the Quintilii, we may thus discern two different modes of biculturalism under the label of a ‹Graeco-Roman identity›: while Herodes had, as a Roman senator and consul, combined his fundamental Greekness with a Roman element, the Quintilii's Italo-Roman identity was to a certain extent affected by a Greek substratum. Yet, there is no denying the fact that the Quintilii's Romanity was the basic constituent of their cultural outlook, irrespective of their origin from an Eastern colony that was gradually Hellenized.[112] In fact, their Greek παιδεία must be seen as a common feature of the educated Roman elite rather than a mark of ‹genuine› Greekness. We can well imagine that Herodes took a similar view of the ‹Greekness› of the colonists: although he was a well-known protagonist of the Second Sophistic movement, which proclaimed the unity of Greekness and παιδεία rather than γένος as the formative factor of Greek identity,[113] he was inclined to embrace the ideological concept of *Graecia vera* in his capacity as the first ἄρχων of the Panhellenion and especially after his retreat to Greece after Regilla's death.[114] In the eyes of a native Greek like Herodes, the ‹colonists› of Alexandria Troas were nothing but ‹would-be Greeks›, and Alexandria Troas would at best rank as a Roman centre of Greek culture, despite its (diplomatic) emphasis on its Hellenistic roots.[115]

---

[110] Cass. Dio 73.5.3; Athen. deipnosoph. 14.649d.

[111] Cf. Cass. Dio 73.6: (…) φύσει τε καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρων; (…) τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν (…) διεπεφύκει. Dio reports in this episode that after the death of Commodus an imposter pretended to be Condianus, the surviving son of the Quintilii (on the circumstances see below), in order to recover their wealth and rank, and was for some time successful in his deceit. The imposter was finally convicted by the emperor Pertinax, who found out that the man, when he was asked about τὰ Ἑλληνικά, did not share in Condianus' learning and knowledge of Greek culture.

[112] The emphasis on Trojan rather than Greek affiliations by the Quintilii is suggested by a dedicatory inscription from Ilion (Merkelbach – Stauber [2001] 08.01.06): about forty years after Hadrian's visit to Ilion and the re-building of the tomb of the *Greek* hero Ajax (Philostr. heroic. 8.1), Sex. Quintilius Maximus restored the statue and the tomb of a *Trojan* protagonist of the Homeric epos: Laodice, the daughter of Priam, the king of Troy. The inscription can be dated to Maximus' proconsulship (c. AD 168–170).

[113] Cf. Schmitz (1999) 84–87.

[114] Interestingly enough, most sophists originated from Asia Minor, and it was from the orbit of the Asiatic sophists themselves, especially Antonius Polemon, that the dichotomy between ethnic-Greeks and culture-Greeks and thus the opposition between mainland Greece and Asia Minor was formulated. Cf. Romeo (2002) 31–37.

[115] Cf., in contrast, his attitude towards Alexandria Troas some decades earlier, in AD 134/5, where he acknowledged the venerable ancestry of the city. See Philostr. soph. 548. It should be noted that the family of Herodes' mother, the Vibullii, originated from the Roman colony of Corinth, so his Greek descent was also fused with some Roman lineage. Cf. Gleason (2010) 127.

These observations alone would suffice to illuminate the contemporary mindset underlying Herodes' gibe. It was certainly a bitter irony for Herodes that these ‹inferior› but politically more successful ‹Trojans› were now governing Greece. But we can assume that their Trojan lineage was a thorn in Herodes' side for another reason: its association with patrician rank. Claims to Trojan descent by patrician families had a long tradition, reaching back to Republican times, when *gentes* like the Iulii, Fabii and Metelli employed this prestige-generating genealogy as a strategy for their self-aggrandizement.[116] We should remember that Herodes was not a patrician himself (cf. his tenure of the plebeian post of the *tribunus plebis*), but had derived his patrician affiliation from his marriage with Regilla. In the trial against him, Regilla's brother Bradua had bluntly displayed the insignia of his patrician nobility, from which Herodes was now excluded after Regilla's death. Probably in direct response to this attempt at denigrating him before the Senate, Herodes commissioned a remarkable ‹manifesto› of his personal view of Graeco-Roman relations and nobility. It is a funerary poem in honour of Regilla, inscribed on two marble steles in the Triopion on the Via Appia.[117] Generally speaking, the poem translates the visual programme of the Nymphaeum at Olympia into the written word. The first part deals with Regilla's mythic ancestry, which is traced back into the Trojan past through Aeneas and Anchises, who are given as her direct forefathers.[118] The poem then proceeds:[119]

> Caesar [Antoninus Pius] granted Herodes' son [Bradua Atticus]
> the privilege of wearing
> on his feet the sandals decorated with stars
> which they say Hermes too wore
> when he led Aeneas from the war against the Achaians
> through the dark night; around his feet was set,
> shining as a protecting saviour, the [half] globe of the moon.

---

[116] On this aspect see Wiseman (1974); Hölkeskamp (1999). The genealogical reference was also employed by the *gens Quintilia* in Republican times: Dion. Hal. ant. 3.29.7. According to Ovid (fast. 377 f.), the Quintilii were the followers of Romulus, whereas the comrades of Remus were called Fabii (hence the distinction between Luperci Quintilii and Luperci Fabii).

[117] IG XIV 1389 (IGUR III 1155); See Ameling (1983) II 153–159 no. 146, who follows the corrections by Peek (1979); SEG 29.999. Regilla was probably buried in Kephisia, along with her children. See Pomeroy (2007) 137–176.

[118] IG XIV 1389, ll. 1–7.

[119] IG XIV 1389, ll. 23–37: αὐτὰρ ὃ ἀστερόεντα περὶ σφυρὰ παιδὶ πέδιλα | δῶκεν ἔχειν, τὰ λέγουσι καὶ Ἑρμαῶνα φορῆναι, | ἦμος ὅτ' Αἰνείαν πολέμου ἐξῆγεν Ἀχαιῶν | νύκτα διὰ δνοφερήν· ὁ δέ οἱ περὶ ποσσὶ σαωτὴρ | παμφανόων ἐνέκειτο σελ[ήνη]ς κύκλο[ς ὅ]μο[ι]ος· | τὸν δὲ καὶ | Αἰνεάδαι πε̣ρ̣ ἐνεγράψαντο πεδίλῳ | [ἔμμεναι] Αὐσ̣ο̣ν̣[ίο]ις ε̣ὐ̣ηιγενέεσσι γέραα. | οὔ μιν ὀνόσσηται καὶ Κεκροπίδην περ ἐόντα | Τυρσηνῶν ἀρχαῖον ἐπισφύριον γέρας ἀνδρῶν | Ἔρσης ἐκγεγαῶτα καὶ Ἑρμέω, εἰ ἐτεὸν δὴ | Κῆρυξ Ἡρώδεω πρόγονος Θησιάδαο. | τοὔνεκα τειμήεις καὶ ἐπώνυμος, ἦ μὲν ἄνασσα[ν] | ἐς βουλὴν ἀγέρεσθαι, ἵνα πρωτόθρονες ἕδραι, | Ἑλλάδι δ' οὔτε γένος βασιλεύτερος οὔτε τι φωνὴν | Ἡρώδεω, γλῶσσαν δέ τέ μιν καλέουσιν Ἀθηνέων. (Translation: S. Pomeroy).

> The descendants of Aeneas once stitched this on the sandal
> to be an honour for the noble Ausonians [Italians].
> Not begrudged to him, a descendant of Kekrops,
> is this old gift of Tyrrthenian men [Etruscans] on his ankle
> if truly born of Hermes and Herse was
> Keryx, ancestor of Herodes, descended from Theseus.
> Therefore he is honoured and gives his name to the year.
> He is included at the lordly Senate in the front row of seats.
> In Greece there is no family or reputation more royal than
> Herodes'. They call him the ‹voice of Athens›.

The poem is a rhetorical masterpiece containing multiple allusions to the tension between Greek and Roman culture, elite identity and εὐγένεια.[120] Great emphasis is put here on the fact that Herodes' son, Bradua Atticus, was awarded patrician rank by Antoninus Pius.[121] This act of imperial benevolence towards Herodes' family has been interpreted as a consoling gesture by the emperor after Herodes' loss of patrician family status.[122] Now Bradua Atticus could also wear the footgear of a patrician – just as Bradua, Herodes' brother-in-law, who had shown off this privilege – certainly with discriminatory intention – before Herodes in the trial. Herodes' poem, however, not only aims to underscore that the Claudii Attici (again) rank among Rome's patrician families, but also provides an etiology for the exclusive status symbol from a specific Greek stance: Hermes rescued Aeneas from the battlefield by showing him the way with the lunate reflectors on his shoes. Since Hermes was the mythic ancestor of Herodes, the story implicitly suggests that the Greek god and forefather of Herodes' family was the saviour god of the Trojan Aeneas and consequently of the patrician *gentes*.[123] Patrician lineage was thus attributed to the rescue by a Greek; their status symbol merely formed an imitation of Hermes' footgear. The following eulogy on Herodes' ancestry equally bridges the gap between Roman and Greek noble provenance, for Herodes' descent from the Kerykes is presented as on a par with patrician ancestry. The poem then refers to Herodes' consular honour and his membership in the Senate, comparing and contrasting it with his even higher authority in Greece: in addition to his senatorial dignity, he could boast of quasi-royal standing in Greece due to his birth and his extraordinary oratorical skills – a position unrivalled by any Roman senatorial colleague sitting next to him «in the front row of seats».

---

[120] For a discussion of the poem see Skenteri (2005) 29–47; Pomeroy (2007) 161–174; Gleason (2010) 147–156. On the relationship between Greek εὐγένεια and Roman patrician rank see Badel (2005) 292–329.

[121] Cf. also IG XIV 1392 (IGUR I 341); see Ameling (1983) II 151 f. no. 145. The inscription, probably originating from Regilla's cenotaph at Deus Rediculus (Pomeroy [2007] 156), explicitly mentions the conferment of patrician rank on Bradua, which had been decreed by the Senate on the initiative of Antoninus Pius.

[122] Ameling (1983) I 107.

[123] Thus already Gleason (2010) 150.

Thus, by harmonizing Greek and Roman mythological genealogies, the poem advocates the parity of Herodes' social status with that of the patrician Annii. But it goes a step further: it aims at diminishing the significance of Trojan descent for noble birth by ultimately postulating the superiority of Greek εὐγένεια over patrician rank. When we consider that Hermes had rescued the Trojans at Zeus' behest, Herodes' reprimand of the Homeric Zeus «for loving the Trojans» may thus be seen from a different angle: it is to the intervention of Zeus, the highest god of the Hellenes, that the Roman patrician *gentes* owe their privileged status.

On the basis of our previous observations, we can now better contextualize and assess Herodes' verbal attack against the Quintilii. Even though Herodes' spontaneous comment may not have been intended to carry such sophisticated interpretational weight, his *interpretatio Graeca* nevertheless mirrors various contemporary notions as regards Rome's foundation myth; the relations between Greece and Rome; the antagonism between Greece and Asia Minor and between ethnic-Greeks and culture-Greeks; the superiority of Greece to Troy/Rome; and the superiority of Greek nobility to patrician ancestry. Herodes had possibly hoped that, after Antoninus Pius, the philhellene Marcus Aurelius would adopt a stance of Roman Hellenism similar to that of Hadrian. The emperor's benevolence towards the Quintilii, however, apparently proved the opposite and so prompted Herodes' criticism.

*

Herodes' gibe must thus be viewed as both the manifestation of a strong personal antipathy towards the family from Alexandria Troas nurtured over several decades and a self-assured advocacy of the concept of the dominance of *Graecia vera*. As far as we may judge from the extant testimonies, the antipathy had not yet broken out into open hostility, and it could have continued to simmer on the level of pointed verbal sideswipes. It was only during the Quintilii's term in Achaea, on the occasion of the Pythian Games at Delphi in AD 171, that Herodes openly gave vent to his hostile feelings towards the brothers in a direct confrontation with them.

For Herodes, Delphi represented a place of great personal import, since his family maintained several long-standing connections with the sanctuary. Herodes' grandfather had been a priest of the Pythian Apollo during the reign of Domitian.[124] A monument to Herodes' family, an *exedra* similar to the Nymphaeum at Olympia, attests to some form of munificent activity by Herodes at Delphi.[125] The building of a stadium dedicated to the Pythian god must have coincided with his activities in the sanctuary at the end of the 160s / beginning of 170s.[126] There is also good reason to believe that Herodes funded the Pythian Games in AD 171.

---

[124] FD III 2.65–66. See Weir (2004) 110.

[125] On Herodes' euergetism in Delphi see Galli (2002) 239–248; Weir (2004) 110 f. See also Tobin (1997) 303–309.

[126] Philostr. soph. 551; see also Paus. 10.32.1.

Herodes was probably a member of the jury of the musical competitions.[127] Since Apollo was the local deity of Alexandria Troas (and Quintilia Apphia held the priesthood of the shrine of Apollo Smintheus), the Quintilii could also claim some special relationship with the sanctuary. As one of the panhellenic festivals, the Pythian Games constituted a centre of Greek history, culture and religion, so it is no wonder that Herodes' marked cultural sensitivity towards genuine Greekness came to the fore here. Against this background the argument between him and the Quintilii over the issue of musical expertise is a logical consequence.[128] The quarrel may have pertained to contrary notions about artistic styles, or, even more fundamentally, to the essentially different significance accorded to music in Greek and Roman culture and education.[129] It is conceivable that Herodes entertained the same doubts about the Quintilii's capacity for the judgement of Greek music as Epictetus had done towards the competence of their grandfather Sex. Quintilius Maximus as a «judge of music» in AD 108 (see above).

We do not know who finally prevailed in this clash of cultural pedantries. It must have been fierce enough to merit mention in Philostratos' biography, and it is likely that the Quintilii were able to ultimately assert their opinion in what appears to be a trial of position: as special commissioners in Greece, they had a powerful say in Greek affairs, especially in the field of jurisdiction – and were able to raise objections against Herodes' opulence.[130] While Herodes' omnipresent building projects and monuments in Greece were yet more examples of his self-aggrandizement and extraordinary munificence that he had likewise lavished on the Quintilii's *patria* some decades earlier,[131] the Quintilii took offence with a particular *private* extravagance of Herodes: the statues and herms that he had erected for his foster-sons throughout the countryside

[127] Ameling (1983) I 108 holds that both Herodes and the Quintilii sat on the jury panel, but it might be more probable to assume that the Quintilii were merely attending the Pythian Games. See in this context Arr. Epict. diss. 3.4.1–6., where the partisanship of the governor at public games is vehemently criticized. Cf. Haensch (1997) 328; 665.

[128] See also Tobin (1997) 37: «(…) a symptom of a power struggle over the arbitration of taste and culture, close to the heart of the cultured elite.»

[129] Herodes may have been a devotee of an ‹archaic› style of music in contrast to contemporary ‹modern› tastes among the Roman elite. Cf. Ps.-Plut. de mus. 32; Schultess (1904) 28 n. 38. On the difference between Greek and Roman attitudes towards the value of music see Scott (1957) passim. While music was viewed as an integral part of παιδεία in Greek society, it was far less valued as a component of education by the Romans.

[130] The surviving fragments of the imperial decisions taken at Sirmium reveal that their jurisdiction comprised such central issues as membership in the συνέδριον of the Panhellenion or in the Areopagus. Cf. SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 20–23; 27–30. On the administration of the free cities in Greece see Guerber (2009); Fournier (2010); Hoët-van Cauwenberghe (2011).

[131] Accordingly, Graindor (1930) 189–191; 223 assumes a connection between the quarrel and Herodes' construction of the stadium at Delphi.

as a sign of his mourning at their deaths.[132] They must have died in the period between 165 and 170/1 AD,[133] and, just as in the case of Regilla, Herodes' despair and grief were literally boundless.[134] His setting up of numerous monuments to his beloved adoptive sons is reminiscent of Hadrian's homage to Antinous, and conscious imitation of the manifestation of the emperor's mourning may again have been the ulterior motive underlying Herodes' commemorative measures. Herodes inscribed the statue bases with curses to prevent the mutilation or removal of the images – possibly a necessary precaution in view of the open criticism he was faced with. For when the Quintilii saw Herodes' practice of honouring his deceased foster-sons on a lavish scale, they chided him for putting up the statues «on the grounds that they were an extravagance», whereupon Herodes retorted laconically: «What business is it of yours if I amuse myself with my poor marbles?»[135]

Herodes' response certainly reveals much about the main cause of his conflict with the Quintilii at Athens: he believed that they were undermining his authority and prestige through their interference both in private and public affairs. Although the free city of Athens was, in theory, autonomous in its local administration, the Quintilii as *correctores* and, what is more, *consulares*, could wield an authority in Achaea that none of their proconsular predecessors had been able to exert, above all not towards the *consularis* Herodes.[136] We may only speculate why the Quintilii focused their criticism on the statues for his τρόφιμοι in particular. In the first instance, their accusations were directed against his obvious eccentricities and exaggerated self-pity. At the same time, the Quintilii will have been alert to the *political* dimension that Herodes' impressive commemoration implied. By virtue of his monumental building projects all over Greece, the scores of statues and inscriptions in honour of him and members of his family as well as his activity as an acclaimed sophist-rhetor, Herodes had inextricably inserted himself into public awareness – in a way that made him more omnipresent in Greece than the emperor himself. Against this background, Herodes' megalomania must have been regarded with suspicion by the Quintilii as an attempt to assume a preeminent position.

It is thus evident that the hitherto socio-cultural dimension of the hostilities between the Quintilii and Herodes now took on a political dimension. The latent op-

---

[132] Herodes had raised three τρόφιμοι named Achilles, Memnon and Polydeukion, possibly in reaction to the deaths of his own children and his alienation from his son Bradua (see Philostr. soph. 558). They were well educated, noble-minded and cultured; Polydeukion even attained equestrian rank (cf. SEG 26.255 = IG III 811).

[133] On the dating cf. Ameling (1984) 485–487. Aulus Gellius witnessed the erection of the statues during his stay at Athens (c. 165–167 AD): Gell. 19.12.

[134] Philostr. soph. 558.

[135] Philostr. soph. 559: Κυντιλίων δέ, ὁπότε ἦρχον τῆς Ἑλλάδος, αἰτιωμένων αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν μειρακίων τούτων εἰκόσιν ὡς περιτταῖς «τί δὲ ὑμῖν» ἔφη «διενήνοχεν, εἰ ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐμπαίζω λιθαρίοις;»

[136] Thus Oliver (1970) 72.

position towards Herodes by rivalling Athenian families found a favourable ally in the Quintilii, who in turn welcomed an invitation from the Athenians to appear in the assembly,[137] where the charge of tyranny was levelled against Herodes.[138] The Quintilii – purportedly out of pity for the Athenians, but surely not without partiality – forwarded the charge to the emperor «without delay» (ξὺν ὁρμῇ), as Philostratos notes.[139] What Philostratos presents as the expression of ‹public opinion›, a consensus of the whole *demos*, had undoubtedly been instigated by Herodes' adversaries at Athens as well as the Quintilii. It is, however, not clear who was the initiator of the charges: Herodes suspected the Quintilii to have hatched a plot against him, but at the same time indicted three local notables – Demostratus, Praxagoras and Mamertinus – for joining in the conspiracy.[140] While Herodes tried to appeal to a proconsular court, his opponents managed to bring the case before the emperor at his temporary headquarters at Sirmium. They were obviously counting on Marcus' ‹democratic› disposition and his distrust of Herodes, since the emperor had not forgotten the allegation that Herodes and Lucius Verus were conspiring against him.[141] The close ties of the Quintilii with Marcus and the fact that they were representing him as judges *vice principis* in Achaea put the plaintiffs in an even more favourable position.

The trial, however, ended with a surprise verdict: Herodes was acquitted; instead, his freedmen were found guilty of nefarious activities.[142] The verdict is all the more intriguing when we consider Herodes' defiant, highly emotional appearance before the tribunal. Dismayed and frantic after the fatal accident of his two quasi-adoptive daughters the day before,[143] Herodes, one of the greatest orators of his time, the «tongue of Athens» (γλῶσσα Ἀθηνέων), was incapable of delivering his speech with any rhetorical artistry; he even lost his control when verbally attacking the emperor.

Marcus, on the other hand, was deeply moved by the evidence the Athenians provided against Herodes. Yet, in a sudden reversal of favour, the indictment was no longer directed against Herodes, but Herodes' freedmen. The sources do not mention the reason for Marcus' change of heart. We may assume that the direct encounter with his former teacher, now aged over 70, revived some personal affection, admiration and sympathy in Marcus, which made him refrain from taking any serious steps against

[137] Philostr. soph. 559. It was, in fact, unusual for Roman governors to attend meetings of the assembly. Apart from the case of the Quintilii, there is one further attestation: Dio Chrys. or. 45.15. Bowersock (1969) 100 assumes that in their special function as *correctores* the Quintilii may have had the right to attend the assembly. It must be noted, however, that they had been *invited* by the Athenians (… καλέσαντες ἐς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀθηναῖοι).

[138] On the charge of tyranny cf. Kennell (1997); Tobin (1997) 285–294.

[139] Philostr. soph. 559.

[140] Philostr. soph. 559.

[141] Cf. Philostr. soph. 560.

[142] SEG 29.127; cf. Oliver (1970) 32f.

[143] Philostr. soph. 560. The two girls, the daughters of his freedman Alcimedon, were killed by a thunderbolt that struck the building where they were staying in Sirmium.

him. He will have judged Herodes' dominant position at Athens as harmless rather than despotic, weighing his enormous benefactions and achievements for the *polis* against the political charges. Accordingly, in a letter which Marcus wrote to the Athenians he exhorts and encourages them to reconcile with Herodes:[144]

«For what could be lurking still in anyone's mind after the memory of the causes has been expunged, when effort has been expended on all matters so that it might be possible for the Athenians to love my – and their very own – Herodes, since no yet further obstacle hinders their goodwill afterwards?»

The letter conveys the formal reinstatement of Herodes at Athens. The Athenians did not fail to understand the imperial message. When Herodes returned to the city from his (self-imposed) exile in Epirus, he was welcomed by an ἀπάντησις, a form of reception traditionally reserved for an emperor or king. It was a symbolic recognition of the quasi-royal pre-eminence he had always claimed for himself, and Herodes was so flattered at the city's welcome ritual that he commissioned a poem to commemorate the event.[145] When he died a few years later, in c. AD 177, the Athenians gave him an honorary burial and dedicated an epigram to him, which concisely attests to their reconciliation with their greatest benefactor: «Herodes, son of Atticus, from the deme of Marathon, to whom all this belongs, lies in this tomb, renowned throughout the world.»[146]

*

The question remains how the conflict with the Quintilii came or was brought to an end. At Sirmium, Marcus had to deal with several other appeals by the Athenian citizens.[147] In some cases he delegated the final judgement on the matter to the Quintilii. One case concerned the membership of an Athenian citizen in the συνέδριον of the Panhellenion, another the membership in the Areopagus.[148] Both issues underline

---

[144] SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 91–94: Τί γὰρ ἂν ἔτι ὑποκαθέζοιτο ἐν γνώμ[ηι τι]νός, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαλειφθῆναι τὴν ἐπὶ [τ]αῖς αἰτίαις μνήμην, τῆς θεραπείας ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐκπεπονημένης [ἵνα] Ἀθην[α]ίοις ἐξῇι τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ τὸν ἴδ[ι]ον αὐτῶν Ἡρώιδην στέργειν, οὐδενὸς ἔτι ἑτέρου τῆι εὐνοίαι με[γάλου] ἀντικρούοντος; See the commentaries by Oliver (1970) 25–27; Jones (1971) 181f.; Follet (1979) 39f.; Kennell (1997) 361 (translation).

[145] IG II^2 3606; cf. SEG 49.217; SEG 57.185. On the reception of Herodes Atticus and the poem see in particular Skenteri (2005) 97–100. Examples of a reception in the form of an ἀπάντησις have been discussed by Robert (1987) 470–474. For a discussion of the ceremonies for the arrival of the governor see Pont (2008). On the ritual of *adventus* during the principate see Lehnen (1997); Benoist (2005).

[146] Philostr. soph. 566: Ἀττικοῦ Ἡρώδης Μαραθώνιος, οὗ τάδε πάντα κεῖται τῷδε τάφῳ, πάντοθεν εὐδόκιμος. On the burial of Herodes see Rife (2008). The first and the last line of the text on the altar dedicated to Herodes (IG II^2 6791) were later erased. Rife suggests that the Quintilii may have been among the perpetrators of this *damnatio memoriae* (p.120).

[147] Kennell (1997) 346–351 maintains that most cases recorded on Plaque 1 of Marcus' letter were concerned with affairs of Herodes. On the individual cases see further Harter-Uibopuu (2008); Wankerl (2009).

[148] SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 20–23; 27–30.

the far-reaching responsibility which the *correctores* Quintilii (whose degree of discretion was comparable to that of an *arbiter*),[149] were entrusted with in important domains of Greek civic life, besides their decision-making authority in matters of the city's financial administration.[150] However, the trial of Aelius Praxagoras concerning an inheritance dispute indicates that Marcus also arranged a final settlement of the antagonism between Herodes and the Quintilii.[151] Praxagoras was one of the accused «conspirators» mentioned by Philostratos, and his case was indeed connected to Herodes: he had been illegally deprived of a property bequest including estates, part of which had then fallen to Herodes. Marcus ordained that the landed property should be restored to Praxagoras. The Quintilii were to take charge of the regulations regarding the harvests of the estates, with the explicit exception of the estates acquired by Herodes: here it was a certain Ofillius Ingenuus who was to pronounce judgement.[152] By these provisions, Marcus tried to avoid any further clashes between the three opponents. His letter to the Athenians, which assured imperial backing for Herodes, also implicitly advised the Quintilii to refrain from any further interference in Herodes' affairs.

After the culmination of the controversy at Sirmium, no further instances of any direct or indirect confrontation between Herodes and the Quintilii are reported. Their careers followed different routes: Herodes, now reinstalled as a patron at Athens, focused on his regional dominance and his activities as a rhetor. As we may gather from his lively correspondence with Marcus after the trial, Herodes was now on friendly terms with the emperor.[153]

As for the family of the Quintilii, the trial had in no way affected their high reputation with Marcus, and they continued to play a prominent role in Roman politics. The two brothers appear to have accompanied the emperor on his tour of the Eastern provinces after the revolt of Avidius Cassius: they are mentioned by Philostratos in an anecdote about Marcus' encounter with Aelius Aristides at Smyrna in AD 176, where the two brothers arranged a meeting between the emperor and the sophist.[154] A year later, two Quintilii – either Maximus and Condianus or their sons Sex. Quintilius Maximus (2) (*cos. ord.* AD 172) and Condianus (2) – were sent to Pannonia, possibly as *legati Augusti provinciae Pannoniae Superioris*, to defeat the Danube tribes in the

[149] Wankerl (2009) 67.

[150] This fiscal authority is explicitly stated in the inscription: SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 83–84.

[151] SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 35–46.

[152] SEG 29.127, plaque II, ll. 81–86.

[153] See Philostr. soph. 562: χαῖρέ μοι, φίλε Ἡρώδη («I greet you, friend Herodes!»).

[154] Philostr. soph. 582. On the meeting see Pack (1947); Gascó (1989). According to Philostratos, the meeting happened well before the earthquake at Smyrna (AD 178). In fact, it would be tempting to assume that the anecdote dates to the year of Maximus' proconsulship of Asia, i.e. AD 168–170, but there is no indication of a visit to Asia by the emperor during this period, while he was occupied with his campaign against the Germans on the northern frontier. On Marcus' itinerary through the East see Astarita (1983). It is also possible that Philostratos does not refer to the Quintilii brothers (*cos. ord*. AD 151), but to their homonymous sons.

Sarmatian War (AD 177/8).[155] To the great disappointment of Marcus, however, the Quintilii «had been unable to end the war, although there were two of them and they possessed great shrewdness, courage and experience».[156] When Commodus became sole emperor in AD 180, Sex. Quintilius Condianus (1) crowned his Roman career by holding the ordinary consulship a second time.[157] It was the zenith of the Quintilii's career. But they soon fell from the emperor's favour: in AD 182 Commodus had the Quintilii brothers and one of their sons put to death. On the circumstances of their murder Cassius Dio notes:[158]

«Commodus likewise killed the two Quintilii, Condianus and Maximus; for they had a great reputation for learning, military skill, brotherly accord, and wealth, and their notable talents led to the suspicion that, even if they were not planning any rebellion, they were nevertheless displeased with existing conditions. And thus, even as they had lived together, so they died together, along with one of their sons.»[159]

It was obviously the combination of these «notable talents» that aroused Commodus' suspicion, viewing the Quintilii as a potential threat to his power and alleging that they were able to conspire against him. They thus fell victim to the ‹purges› of senior senators, most of them *amici* of Marcus, which followed the assassination plot of Commodus' sister Lucilla. The Quintilii's magnificent villa at Rome was confiscated as imperial property and became one of the emperor's favourite places of residence.[160]

* * *

[155] For the identification with the Quintilii brothers see Oliver (1970) 66–72. Ritterling (1897) 30f., followed by Hanslik (1963) and Alföldy (1977) 237f. and 261f., identifies the two Quintilii in Pannonia as their homonymous sons. See PIR² Q 22 and Q 24.

[156] Cass. Dio 72.33.1: οἱ γὰρ Κυιντίλιοι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν, καίπερ δύο τε ὄντες καὶ φρόνημα καὶ ἀνδρίαν ἐμπειρίαν τε πολλὴν ἔχοντες, τὸν πόλεμον παῦσαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἀναγκαίως αὐτοὶ οἱ αὐτοκράτορες ἐξεστράτευσαν.

[157] Cf. Degrassi (1952) 50; CIL XIV 2393. The second consulship is confirmed in CIL VIII 24117 and Corp. Pap. Lat. 238, no. 122. Cf. Ricl (1997) 263. Condianus (2) has wrongly been identified as *cos. ord*. in AD 180. See Alföldy (1977) 237f.; PIR² Q 24.

[158] Cass. Dio 73.5.3: ἐφόνευσε δὲ καὶ τοὺς Κυιντιλίους, τόν τε Κονδιανὸν καὶ τὸν Μάξιμον· μεγάλην γὰρ εἶχον δόξαν ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ στρατηγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοφροσύνῃ καὶ πλούτῳ. ἐκ γὰρ δὴ τῶν προσόντων σφίσιν ὑπωπτεύοντο καλῶν, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν νεώτερον ἐνενόουν, ἄχθεσθαι τοῖς παροῦσι. καὶ οὕτως αὐτοί, ὥσπερ ἔζησαν ἅμα, οὕτω καὶ ἀπέθανον μεθ' ἑνὸς τέκνου. Cf. also the anecdote referred to in Cass. Dio 72.7.2: at Mallus (Cilicia), Condianus (2) was given an oracular dream, whose response he drew on a tablet. It depicted a boy strangling two serpents (i.e. Commodus hanging the Quintilii brothers) and a lion pursuing a fawn (i.e. Commodus prosecuting Condianus).

[159] It is likely that the son who was killed was Sex. Quintilius Maximus (2). His brother, Sex. Quintilius Condianus (2), was staying in Syria when he heard that the sentence of death had been passed upon him. Cassius Dio (73.6), who had met Condianus before in Cilicia, relates that Condianus feigned his death and then vanished in disguise, which prompted an empire-wide search for him. Although many people who resembled him or who had supported him were punished, it is not known whether Condianus was ever killed or was able to escape, as Dio states.

[160] Cass. Dio 73.13.4.

The ‹parallel lives› of the two Graeco-Roman families, the Claudii Attici from the free city of Athens and the Quintilii from the Roman colony of Alexandria Troas, are instructive paradigms of the social discourse and power struggle within the senatorial order during the second century AD, which saw the growing infiltration of senators from the Greek East. As Herodes' pre-occupation with status has revealed, he was not entirely unaffected by the Roman honour system, as has often been maintained. His status wrangling was a matter of asserting his regional supremacy in the empire-wide social pyramid, which resulted in a self-confident claim of a kind of parity with the emperor – a sense of superiority that proved incompatible with Rome's status system. It was his lasting attachment to his *patria* that eventually enabled Herodes to translate this claim into genuine socio-political pre-eminence at Athens, with the support and approval of the emperor himself. While Herodes devoted his social ambitions to becoming ‹*par inter principes*›, the Quintilii's efforts were driven by their identification with the senatorial *ordo* and aimed at eliminating Herodes as a ‹*primus inter pares* [i.e. *senatores*]› – but in vain. Their equally outstanding supra-local careers could only be tolerated by the emperor as long as they were navigating along the established pathways of power. Yet, in contrast to the individual influence of Herodes, the Quintilii gradually expanded their political and military influence through a family network, forming jointly with their sons a powerful ‹tetrarchy› within the senatorial order. Once the fear arose in Commodus that this power base could no longer be controlled, they had to face the consequences of imperial elite policing.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Historisches Seminar
Alte Geschichte
Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1
80539 München

Bibliography

Alföldi, A. (1952), Der frührömische Reiteradel und seine Ehrenabzeichen.
Alföldy, G. (1977), Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen. Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Führungsschicht.
Ameling, W. (1983), Herodes Atticus, 2 vols.
Ameling, W. (1984), Aulus Gellius in Athen, Hermes 112, 484–490.
Andermahr, A. M. (1998), *Totus in praediis.* Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der frühen und hohen Kaiserzeit.
Anderson, G. (1989), The Pepaideumenos in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire, ANRW II 33.1, 79–208.
Annibaldi, G. (1935), Scoperta di ruderi di edificio rustico e rinvenimento di sculture al VII chilometro dell'Appia Nuova, NSA, 76–104.
Astarita, M. L. (1983), Avidio Cassio.
Badel, C. (2005), La noblesse de l'empire romain: les masques et la vertu.
Battistoni, F. (2010), Parenti dei Romani: mito troiano e diplomazia.

Bellinger, A. R. (1958), The Late Bronze of Alexandria Troas, ANSMN 8, 25–53.
Bellinger, A. R. (1961), Troy. The Coins, Supplementary Monograph 2.
Benoist, S. (2005), Rome, le prince et la cité: pouvoir impérial et cérémonies publiques, 1er siècle av.–début du 4ème siècle apr. J.-C.
Berling, L. G. (1993), Das Iason-Monument von Kyaneai, in: F. Kolb (ed.), Lykische Studien I: Die Siedlungskammer von Kyaneai, 25–37.
Birley, A. R. (1997), Hadrian and Greek Senators, ZPE 116, 209–245.
Birley, A. R. (2000), Hadrian to the Antonines, CAH² XI, 132–194.
Boatwright, M. T. (2000), Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire.
Bol, R. (1984), Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums.
Bowersock, G. (1969), Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire.
Brunt, P. A. (1974), Marcus Aurelius in his Meditations, JRS 64, 1–20.
Burnett, A. (1998), The Earliest Coinage of Alexandria Troas, in: U. Peter (ed.), Stephanos nomismatikos. Edith Schönert-Geiss zum 65. Geburtstag, 165–168.
Camia, F. (2008), Imperial Priests in Second Century Greece: a Socio-political Analysis, in: A. D. Rizakis – F. Camia (ed.), Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire, 25–43.
Cébeillac, M. (1972), Les *quaestores principis et candidati* aux Ier et IIème siècles de l'Empire.
Cerva, M. (2000), La *praefectura fabrum.* Un'introduzione, in: M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni (ed.), Les élites de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la mort de Domitien entre continuité et rupture. Classes sociales dirigeantes et pouvoir central. Actes du colloque de Naples, 6–8 février 1997, 177–196.
Champlin, E. (1974), The Chronology of Fronto, JRS 64, 136–159.
Clarke, E. D. (1812), Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. Part 2.1: Greece, Egypt and the Holy Land.
Clinton, K. (1974), The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries.
Coleman, K. (2008), Exchanging Gladiators for an Aqueduct at Aphrodisias (SEG 50.1096), AClass 51, 31–46.
Degrassi, A. (1952), I Fasti consolari dell'Impero Romano: dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo.
Demougin, S. (1988), L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens.
Demougin, S. (1999), L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure. Histoire d'une romanisation, in: S. Demougin et al. (ed.), L'ordre équestre: histoire d'une aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque international (Bruxelles-Leuven, 5–7 octobre 1995), 579–612.
Dobson, B. (1965), The *praefectus fabrum* in the Early Principate, in: M. G. Jarrett – B. Dobson (ed.), Britain and Rome, 61–84.
Dossin, G. (1969), La «lunule» des sénateurs romains, Latomus 102, 240–243.
Eck, W. (1980), Die Präsenz senatorischer Familien in den Städten des Imperium Romanum bis zum späten 3. Jahrhundert, in: W. Eck et al. (ed.), Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift F. Vittinghoff, 282–322.
Eck, W. (1987), Die Wasserversorgung im römischen Reich. Soziopolitische Bedingungen, Recht und Administration, in: Frontinus-Gesellschaft e.V. (ed.), Die Wasserversorgung in antiken Städten I, 50–101.
Eck, W. (1998), M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, *consul suffectus* im J. 142, RhM 141, 193–196.
Eck, W. (2003), Suffektkonsuln der Jahre 132–134 und Hadrians Rückkehr nach Rom im Jahr 132, ZPE 143, 234–242.
Eck, W. (2008), Roms Wassermanagement im Osten. Staatliche Steuerung des öffentlichen Lebens in den römischen Provinzen?, Kasseler Universitätsreden 17.

Eck, W. – Holder, P. – Pangerl, A. (2010), A Diploma for the Army of Britain in 132 and Hadrian's Return to Rome from the East, ZPE 174, 189–200.
Eilers, C. (2002), Roman Patrons of Greek Cities.
Erskine, A. (2001), Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power.
Esch, T. (2008), Zur Frage der sogenannten Doppelgemeinden. Die caesarische und augusteische Kolonisation in Kleinasien, in: E. Winter (ed.), Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Kleinasien in der Antike. Festschrift Elmar Schwertheim, vol. 1, 188–216.
Follet, S. (1979), Lettre de Marc-Aurèle aux Athéniens (EM 13366): nouvelles lectures et interprétations, RPh 53, 29–43.
Fournier, J. (2010), Entre tutelle romaine et autonomie civique. L'administration judiciaire dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain (129 av. J.-C.–235 apr. J.-C.).
Frei-Stolba, R. (1967), Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit.
French, D. H. (1976), S. Quintilius Maximus, Proconsul (of Asia), ZPE 21, 77.
Galimberti Biffino, G. (2007), Pline et la culture grecque, in: Y. Perrin (ed.), Neronia VII. Rome, l'Italie et la Grèce. Hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle après J.-C., 285–301.
Galli, M. (2002), Die Lebenswelt eines Sophisten. Untersuchungen zu den Bauten und Stiftungen des Herodes Atticus.
Gascó, F. (1989), The Meeting between Aelius Aristides and Marcus Aurelius in Smyrna, AJPh 110, 471–478.
Gleason, M. W. (2010), Making Space for Bicultural Identity: Herodes Atticus Commemorates Regilla, in: T. Whitmarsh (ed.), Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World, 125–162.
Goldman, N. (2001), Roman Footwear, in: J. L. Sebesta – L. Bonfante (ed.), The World of Roman Costume, 101–129.
Graindor, P. (1930), Un milliardaire antique. Hérode Atticus et sa famille.
Groag, E. (1922–24), Prosopographische Beitrage, JÖAI 21–22, 425–478.
Groag, E. (1939), Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian.
Guerber, E. (1997), Les *correctores* dans la partie héllenophone de l'Empire romain du règne de Trajan à l'avènement de Dioclétien. Étude prosopographique, Anatolia Antiqua 5, 211–248.
Guerber, E. (2009), Les cités grecques dans l'Empire romain. Les privilèges et les titres des cités de l'Orient hellénophone d'Octave Auguste à Dioclétien.
Haake, M. (2011), L. Flavius Stlaccius aus Sardis, der «beste Sophist», in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), Studien zum antiken Kleinasien 7, 147–158.
Haensch, R. (1997), Capita provinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit.
Halfmann, H. (1979), Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.
Halfmann, H. (1982), Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches vom 1.–3. Jahrhundert (Asia, Pontus-Bithynia, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia), in: Epigrafia e ordine senatorio II, 603–650.
Halfmann, H. (1986), Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich.
Hanslik, R. (1963), Quinctilius, RE 24, col. 894–984.
Harter-Uibopuu, K. (2008), Die Anlassverfahren für die Appellationen an Mark Aurel (Athen, EM 13366), ZRG 125, 214–250.
Hoët-van Cauwenberghe, C. (2011), Rome et la liberté des Grecs sous les Antonins et les Sévères en Achaïe romaine, ou l'art d'administrer les Grecs avec délicatesse, in: S. Benoist et al. (ed.), Figures d'empire, fragments de mémoire. Pouvoirs et identités dans le monde romain impérial (II^e s. av. n. è. – VI^e s. ap. n. è.), 287–319.

Højte, J. M. (2000), Imperial Visits as Occasion for the Erection of Portrait Statues?, ZPE 133, 221–235.
Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (1999), Römische *gentes* und griechische Genealogien, in: G. Vogt-Spira – B. Rommel (ed.), Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma, 3–21. (Republished in: id. [ed.], *Senatus populusque Romanus.* Die politische Kultur der Republik – Dimensionen und Deutungen, 2004, 199–217.)
Jones, C. P. (1971), A New Letter of Marcus Aurelius to the Athenians, ZPE 8, 161–183.
Jones, C. P. (1974), The Reliability of Philostratus, in: G. W. Bowersock (ed.), Approaches to the Second Sophistic. Papers presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association, 11–16.
Jones, C. P. (1996), The Panhellenion, Chiron 26, 29–56.
Jones, C. P. (1999), Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World.
Jones, C. P. (2001), Diplomatie et liens de parenté: Ilion, Aphrodisias et Rome, in: V. Fromentin – S. Gotteland (ed.), Origines gentium, 179–186.
Jones, C. P. (2007), Three New Letters of the Emperor Hadrian, ZPE 161, 145–156.
Jones, C. P. (2010), Kinship (συγγένεια) in Two Cities of the Troad, Chiron 40, 29–39.
Jones, C. P. (2011), An Edict of Hadrian from Maroneia, Chiron 41, 313–325.
Kennell, N. M. (1997), Herodes Atticus and the Rhetoric of Tyranny, CPh 92, 346–362.
Kokkinia, C. (2000), Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien.
Krieckhaus, A. (2006), Senatorische Familien und ihre *patriae* (1./2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.).
Kuhlmann, P. (2002), Religion und Erinnerung. Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Hadrians und ihre Rezeption in der antiken Literatur.
Kuhn, A. B. (2010), Senatorial and Equestrian Rank in the Cities of Roman Asia Minor, c. 30 BC – AD 212, DPhil thesis Oxford.
Kuhn, C. T. (2009), Mythos und Historie im kaiserzeitlichen Smyrna. Kollektive Identitätsstiftung im Kontext der Romanisierung, SCI 28, 93–111.
Laffi, U. (2004), La colonia augustea di Alessandria di Troade, in: G. Salmeri et al. (ed.), Colonie romane nel mondo greco, 151–164. (Republished in: id., Colonie e municipi nello stato romano, 2007, 175–186.)
Lehnen, J. (1997), *Adventus principis.* Untersuchungen zu Sinngehalt und Zeremoniell der Kaiserankunft in den Städten des Imperium Romanum.
Leschhorn, W. (1984), ‹Gründer der Stadt›: Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte.
Levick, B. (1967), Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor.
Lindner, R. (1994), Mythos und Identität. Studien zur Selbstdarstellung kleinasiatischer Städte in der römischen Kaiserzeit.
Longfellow, B. (2011), Roman Imperialism and Civic Patronage: Form, Meaning, and Ideology in Monumental Fountain Complexes.
Lucchelli, T. (2007), Ricerche sulla monetazione di Alexandria Troas: le «emissione civiche», RIN 108, 169–218.
Martín, F. (1982), La documentación griega de la cancillería del emperador Adriano.
Mayer, J. W. (2005), *Imus ad villam*. Studien zur Villeggiatur im stadtrömischen Suburbium in der späten Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit.
Merkelbach, R. – Stauber, J. (2001), Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, vol. 2: Die Nordküste Kleinasiens.
Millar, F. (1965), Epictetus and the Imperial Court, JRS 55, 141–148.
Millar, F. (1977), The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC–AD 337.
Mitchell, S. (1979), Iconium and Ninica. Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor, Historia 28, 409–438.

Mitchell, S. (1987), Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces, HSPh 91, 333–365.
Mühlenbrock, S. (1994), Hadrian in Alexandria Troas? Eine neue Inschrift, in: E. Schwertheim – H. Wiegartz (ed.), Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas I, 193–195.
Newby, Z. (2005), Greek Athletics in the Roman World: Victory and Virtue.
Nicols, J. (1990), Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate, ZPE 80, 101–108.
Oliver, J. H. (1970), Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East.
Pack, R. A, (1947), Two Sophists and Two Emperors, CPh 42, 17–20.
Papalas, A. J. (1978), Lucius Verus and the Hospitality of Herodes Atticus, Athenaeum 56, 182–185.
Paris, R. (ed.) (2000), Via Appia. The Villa of the Quintili.
Paris, R. – Pettinau, B. (2008), Devozione privata e culto pubblico: il santuario di Zeus Bronton sull'Appia Nuova, in: B. Palma Venetucci (ed.), Culti orientali: Tra scavo e collezionismo, 189–198.
Peek, W. (1979), Zu den Gedichten des Marcellus von Side auf Regilla und das Triopion des Herodes Atticus, ZPE 33, 76–84.
Petzl, G. – Schwertheim, E. (2006), Hadrian und die dionysischen Künstler. Drei in Alexandria Troas neugefundene Briefe des Kaisers an die Künstler-Vereinigung.
Pflaum, H.-G. (1972), La valeur de l'information historique de la *Vita Commodi* à la lumière des personnages nommément cités par le biographe, in: Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium 1970, 199–247.
Pisani Sartorio, G. – Calza, R. (1976), La villa di Massenzio sulla Via Appia, vol. 1: Il palazzo, le opere d'arte.
Pistor, H.-H. (1965), Princeps und Patriziat in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus.
Pomeroy, S. B. (2007), The Murder of Regilla: A Case of Domestic Violence in Antiquity.
Pont, A.-V. (2008), Rituels civiques (*apantēsis* et acclamations) et gouverneurs en Asie Mineure à l'époque romaine, in: O. Hekster et al. (ed.), Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network «Impact of Empire» (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007), Impact of Empire 9, 185–211.
Quass, F. (1993), Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit.
Raepsaet-Charlier, M-T. (1982), Épouses et familles de magistrats dans les provinces romaines aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire, Historia 31, 56–69.
Rémy, B. (1989), Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C. – 284 ap. J.-C.). Pont-Bithynie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Lycie-Pamphylie et Cilicie.
Rémy, B. (1993), Les alliances matrimoniales des sénateurs anatoliens au Haut-Empire, Anatolia Antiqua 2, 171–191.
Reitzenstein, D. (2011), Die lykischen Bundespriester. Repräsentation der kaiserzeitlichen Elite Lykiens.
Reynolds, J. M. (2000), New Letters from Hadrian to Aphrodisias: Trials, Taxes, Gladiators and an Aqueduct, JRA 13, 5–20.
Ricci, A. (1986), La villa dei Quintili (circ. XI), BCAR 91, 614–615.
Ricci, A. (ed.) (1998), La villa dei Quintili: fonti scritte e fonti figurate.
Ricl, M. (1997), The Inscriptions of Alexandreia Troas.
Rife, J. (2008), The Burial of Herodes Atticus: Élite Identity, Urban Society, and Public Memory in Roman Greece, JHS 128, 92–127.
Ritterling, E. (1897), Die Statthalter der pannonischen Provinzen, Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen 20, 1–40.
Robert, L. (1963), Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine, vol. 1.
Robert, L. (1987), Documents d'Asie Mineure, 460–477 (first published as: Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXII. Documents pergaméniens 1. Un décret de Pergame, BCH 108, 1984, 472–489.)

Rogers, G. M. (1991a), The Sacred Identity of Ephesus. Foundation Myths of a Roman City.
Rogers, G. M. (1991b), Demosthenes of Oinoanda and Models of Euergetism, JRS 81, 91–100.
Romeo, I. (2002), The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece, CPh 97, 21–40.
Römhild, J.-H. (2011), Römische Bürger in der Troas, in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), Studien zum antiken Kleinasien 7, 159–179.
Saddington, D. B. (1985), *Praefecti fabrum* of the Julio-Claudian Period, in: E. Weber – G. Dobesch (ed.), Römische Geschichte, Altertumskunde und Epigraphik. Festschrift für Artur Betz zur Vollendung seines 80. Lebensjahres, 529–546.
Şahin, M. (1997), Grabdenkmäler aus Isaurien und ihre Künstler, EA 29, 75–82.
Sartre, M. (2001), Les colonies romaines dans le monde grec. Essai de synthèse, in: E. Dąbrowa (ed.), Roman Military Studies, 111–152.
Scheer, T. (1993), Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte.
Schmitz, T. A. (1999), Performing History in the Second Sophistic, in: M. Zimmermann (ed.), Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr. Kolloquium zu Ehren von Karl-Ernst Petzold (Juni 1998) anläßlich seines 80. Geburtstags, 71–92.
Schultess, C. (1904), Herodes Atticus.
Schwertheim, E. (1996), Neue Inschriften aus Alexandreia Troas, Antandros, Skepsis und Kebren, in: E. Schwertheim – H. Wiegartz (ed.), Die Troas. Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas II, 99–124.
Schwertheim, E. (1999), Zur Gründung der römischen Kolonie in Alexandria Troas, in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), Die Troas. Neue Forschungen III, 95–101.
Schwertheim, E. (2008), Neues zur Frühgeschichte der römischen Kolonie in Alexandria Troas, in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), Studien zum antiken Kleinasien 6, 173–184.
Scott, J. E. (1957), Roman Music, in: The New Oxford History of Music, vol.1: Ancient and Oriental Music, 404–420.
Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966), The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary.
Skenteri, F. (2005), Herodes Atticus Reflected in Occasional Poetry of Antonine Athens.
Smith, A. C. G. (1979), The Gymnasium at Alexandria Troas. Evidence for an Outline Reconstruction, AS 29, 23–50.
Smith, R. R. R. (1998), Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D., JRS 88, 56–93.
Spawforth, A. (2002), Italian Elements among Roman Knights and Senators from Old Greece, in: C. Müller – C. Hasenohr (ed.), Les Italiens dans le monde grec. II^{e} siècle av. J.-C. – I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration, 101–107.
Spawforth, A. (2011), Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution.
Spawforth, A. – Walker, S. (1985), The World of the Panhellenion, Part I, JRS 75, 78–104.
Spawforth, A. – Walker, S. (1986), The World of the Panhellenion, Part II, JRS 76, 88–105.
Stein, A. (1927), Der römische Ritterstand. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Personengeschichte des römischen Reiches.
Strubbe, J. H. M. (1984–86), Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität, AncSoc 15–17, 253–304.
Sugliano, A. (2005), La composizione civica delle colonie romane d'Asia Minore, in: M. G. Angeli Bertinelli – A. Donati (ed.), Il cittadino, lo straniero, il barbaro, fra integrazione ed emarginazione nell'antichità, 437–452.
Swain, S. (1991), The Reliability of Philostratos' Lives of the Sophists, ClAnt 10, 148–163.
Syme, R. (1985), Correspondents of Pliny, Historia 34, 324–359.
Thomas, E. (2007), Monumentality and the Roman Empire. Architecture in the Antonine Age.
Tobin, J. (1997), Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines.

Tod, M. N. (1939), The *Corrector* Maximus, in: W. M. Calder – J. Keil (ed.), Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler, 333–344.
Touloumakos, J. (1988), Zum römischen Gemeindepatronat im griechischen Osten, Hermes 116, 304–324.
Trotta, A. (1998), Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche: un ritratto di famiglia, in: A. Ricci (ed.), La villa dei Quintili: fonti scritte e fonti figurate, 11–27.
van den Hout, M. P. J. (1999), A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.
Viale, V. (1925–26), Relazione sull'attività della missione archeologica di Adalia nell'anno 1922, ASAA 8–9, 357–392.
Vout, C. (2006), What's in a Beard? Rethinking Hadrian's Hellenism, in: S. Goldhill – R. Osborne (ed.), Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece, 96–123.
Wankerl, V. (2009), *Appello ad principem*. Urteilsstil und Urteilstechnik in kaiserlichen Berufungsentscheidungen (Augustus bis Caracalla).
Weir, R. G. A. (2004), Roman Delphi and its Pythian Games.
Weiss, P. (1984), Lebendiger Mythos. Gründerheroen und städtische Gründungstraditionen im griechisch-römischen Osten, WJA 10, 179–208.
Weiss, P. (1996), Alexandria Troas: Griechische Traditionen und Mythen in einer römischen Colonia, in: E. Schwertheim – H. Wiegartz (ed.), Die Troas. Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas II, 157–173.
Willers, D. (1990), Hadrians panhellenisches Programm. Archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian.
Wiseman, T. P. (1974), Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome, G&R 21, 153–164.
Wörrle, M. (1988), Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda.
Woloch, M. (1969), Four Leading Families in Roman Athens (AD 96–161), Historia 18, 503–510.
Woloch, M. (1973), Roman Citizenship and the Athenian Elite A.D. 96–161. Two Prosopographical Catalogues.
Yegül, F. (1992), Bath and Bathing in Classical Antiquity.
Zahrnt, M. (2007), Hadrians «Provinzmünzen», in: R. Haensch – J. Heinrichs (ed.), Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit, 195–212.
Ziegler, R. (1998), Alexander der Große als Städtegründer. Fiktion und Realität, in: U. Peter (ed.), Stephanos nomismatikos. Edith Schönert-Geiss zum 65. Geburtstag, 679–697.
Zimmermann, M. (2011), Die Repräsentation des kaiserlichen Ranges, in: A. Winterling (ed.), Zwischen Strukturgeschichte und Biographie: Probleme und Perspektiven einer neuen Römischen Kaisergeschichte zur Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus, 181–205.
Zoumbaki, S. (2008), The Colonists of the Roman East and their Leading Groups. Some Notes on their Entering the Equestrian and Senatorial Ranks in Comparison with the Native Elites, Tyche 23, 159–179.