Gruen, ‘Pompey, the Roman Aristocracy, and the Conference of Luca’, Historia 18 (1969) 87, points out that Lepidus and his brother Paullus were enemies of Pompey and allies of Caesar. The latter was responsible for the decree of friendship to Ptolemy Auletes, and this denarius issue may thus, moreover, be an indication of Lepidus’ support for Caesar’s activities in 59.

24. G. Huber, Untersuchungen zu Caesars Oberpontifikat, Tübingen, 1971, 93–97, suggested that Lepidus’ denarius with the ‘tutor regis’ reverse implied that the present pontifex maximus, in other words Caesar, was just the man to be sent to restore Ptolemy Auletes to his throne. Suet. Jul. 11, 13, noted that Caesar had been ambitious for an Egyptian command as early as 65. In 59 such a command certainly had more potential for personal gloria than a command north of the Alps. Crawford (above note 5) Addenda, 753, found this argument ‘inherently improbable’ due to the date of Lepidus’ moneyership, but his objections may now be ruled out.

25. My thanks to Harold Mattingly and Christine Chapman for their helpful and pertinent remarks on the draft of this paper. They are not, of course, responsible for any misconceptions which may still remain. Thanks is also due to Colleen Wharton-Hood whose perspicacious comments brought my attention to the problem of Lepidus and his coinage.
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JUVENAL AND THE HISTORIA AUGUSTA:
TWO POSSIBLE CONCORDANCES

Alan Cameron¹ suggested that the celebrated lines of Juvenal 3. 76–8, ‘grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, / augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit / Graeculus esuriens’ were consciously echoed in the HA, both at Hadr. 16.10, ‘grammaticos rhetores musicos geometras pictores astrologos habuit’, and Saturn. 8.3, ‘nemo illic (in Egypt) archisynagogus, Iudaorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes’, this latter passage occurring in an alleged letter of Hadrian.

Cameron’s conclusion was subsequently accepted by J. Schwartz.² Neither adduced the description of Hadrian presented in the Epitome de Caesaribus 14.2, wherein the emperor is called a ‘Graeculus’ adept in ‘canendi psallendi medendique scientia, musicus geometra pictor fictorque ex aere vel marmore proxime Polycletus et Euphranor’as. Here there is the same sequence of ‘musicus geometra pictor’. ‘Medendi scientia’ is (of course) tantamount to ‘medicus’. The collocation of ‘canere’ (or ‘cantare’) and ‘psallere’ is routine, the most pertinent example being Suetonius, Titus 3.2, where a similar inventory of that emperor’s cultural pursuits includes the phrase ‘cantaret et psalleret iucunde scienterque’. A further echo of
Juvenal might be detected in the epitomator’s ‘fictorque ... Euphranoras’, in the light of Sat. 3.215–7, ‘qui marmora donet ... aliquid praeclarum Euphranoras et Polycliti.’

So far, several possibilities beckon. The epitomator’s account of Hadrian is not based verbally upon that in Aurelius Victor 14, where the only similarity — ‘Graecorum more caerimonias leges gymnasia doctoresque curare occepit’ — is a remote one. The epitomator might himself have known Juvenal at first hand — he lived at the right time. Any notion that the HA got it from the epitomator would be something of a turn-up for the book, whilst to suggest that the biographer was the source for the Epitome might be deemed too revolutionary. Some will, inevitably, ascribe the verbal coincidence between biographer and epitomator to a lost common source.

Whoever copied whom, the verbal parallels with Juvenal remain striking. Yet there is need for more caution than others have evinced. Descriptions and registers of imperial hobbies and Hellenic pastimes are practically a literary sub-genre in themselves, in both Latin and Greek. There is a particularly eye-catching example in Athenaeus 184c, where Ptolemy VII is said to have rejuvenated all culture by filling up the towns and islands with ἀνθρώποι, γραμματικῶν, φιλοσόφων, γεωμετρῶν, μουσικῶν, ζωγράφων, παρατηρητῶν τε καὶ ἱστρῶν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τεχνῶν. Theme, lists, and phraseology are all prefigured in Horace, Ep. 2.1.28–33: ‘Si, quia Graiorum sunt antiquissima quaeque / scripta vel optima, Romani pensantur eadem / scriptores trutina, non est quod multa loquamur: / nil intra est olea, nil extra est in nuce duri, / venimus ad summum fortunae, pingimus atque / psallimus et luctamur Achivis doctius unctis’. In Juvenal's own day, Pliny thought a snide remark about physical jerks falling under the sway of ‘Graeculus magister’ worth including in his Panegyricus (13.5), whilst the satirist’s ‘in caelum iusseris, ibit’ finale (3.78) finds a close parallel in Dio Chrysostom. In the epitomated version of Dio Cassius’ account of Hadrian (69.3.1–2), we read that the emperor was ‘by nature fond of literature both Greek and Latin, and has left a variety of prose writings as well as verses. His insatiable ambition prompted him to every conceivable hobby, even the most trivial sort; for instance, he modelled and painted, and said that there was nothing about peace or war, imperial or private life, which he did not know.’ It is conceivable that Dio’s original text contained a longer register of the imperial Hellenic enthusiasms.

The HA itself elsewhere (Sev. Alex. 27.5–9) subsumes the listing technique into its elaborate account of the cultural pursuits of Severus Alexander: ‘faciundae Graecae magis quam Latinae nec versus invenustus et ad musicam pronus, matheseos peritus ... haruspicinae quoque peritissimus fuit, orneoscopos magnus ut ... augures vicerit. geometriam fecit. pinxit mire, cantavit nobiliter ... lyra, tibia, organo cecinit, tuba etiam ... palaestes
primus fuit.’

With regard to ‘aliptes’ in the so-called letter of Hadrian adduced by the HA at Saturn.8.3, Cameron argued that it must come from Juvenal because it was a natural word for the satirist to use of the ‘Graeculus esuriens’, but a peculiar one for the philhellenic Hadrian or anyone else to employ of Jewish, Samaritan and Christian priests. Following Mayor’s note on Juvenal 3.76, Cameron also stressed the rarity of ‘aliptes’ and its purely medical sense outside the satirist and the HA. One may point out that, though certainly infrequent in what remains of Latin literature, the term does occur in Cicero, Ad fam. 1.9.15, and in a letter from Marcus Aurelius to Fronto (33.23 Van Den Hout Leid. = Haines 1.150), and hence is clearly not just an obscure technical term; the compound ‘iaptraliptes’ (Petronius, Sat. 28.2; Pliny, Ep. 10.5) also implies a fairly common currency.

The biographer’s sentence in Saturn. 8.3 is a perfectly balanced one, with three kinds of priest and three professions in exact counterpoint. ‘Aliptes’ must, then, refer only to the Christian. This makes perfectly good sense, since we need go no further than Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon to see that in Christian Greek both ἀλέξιταις and cognate nouns can refer not only to athletic trainers or masseurs but also to anointers and baptisers. It could obviously comport the same sense in Latin.

The point of all this is not to deny the possible Juvenalian pedigree of the two HA passages, but to show that it is not so cut and dried as Cameron and Schwartz would have us think, and also to emphasise the elusive nature of tracing literary debts. Yet this is something that can and should be tried, and for which the HA still cries out.

Hence the second stage of this paper. Schwartz piled up a large number of possible Juvenalian reminiscences in the HA, of which Cameron felt only two were worth considering — unfortunately, he did not specify which two! At stake here is Elag. 29.9 ‘amabat sibi pretia inaiora diei earum rerum quae mensae parabantur, orexin convivio hanc esse adserens’, connected by Schwartz with Juvenal 11.127, ‘hinc surgit orexis’, on the basis of the appearance in both passages of the word ‘orexis’, very rare in Latin dress and (late glosses and medical texts apart) elsewhere only in Juvenal again, at 6.428, also having to do with food.

Despite its rarity, ‘orexis’ alone, albeit suggestive, is not enough to certify the HA passage as a debt to Juvenal. A subsidiary linguistic argument might be got from the concordance between the preceding sentence (Elag. 29.8), ‘semper sane aut inter Flores sedit aut inter odores pretiosos’, and Juvenal 11.121–2, ‘putere videntur / unguenta atque rosae’. But what may tip the balance is the way in which the biography serves up a gastronomic-cum-moralising motif, one also on display in a letter of Fronto to Marcus Aurelius (14.20–23 Van Den Hout Leid. = Haines 1.164), with a slight
change of point designed either to mitigate his debt or show off his literary versatility.

NOTES

1. 'Literary Allusions in the Historia Augusta,' Hermes 92 (1964) 363–77, esp. 365. R. Syme, Ammianus Marcellinus and the Historia Augusta (Oxford 1968) 85, was seduced by the Saturn. 8.3 item, though he resisted Hadr. 16.10 and some of Cameron’s other Juvenalian suggestions; Schwartz’ inventory is briskly dismissed (85, n. 3) as ‘not very convincing.’


4. The Epitome concludes with the interment of Theodosius I on 8 November, 395. In the words of T.D. Barnes, The Sources of the Historia Augusta (Brussels 1978) 91, ‘There is no sign that the Historia Augusta knows the Epitome. Indeed, the latter may have been written later.’

5. Likewise, the elder Pliny (HN 29.11), in the course of a characteristic diatribe against foreign doctors and the craze for quack cures at Rome, does not miss the chance to grumble that ‘ingeniorum Graeciae flatu impellimur, palamque est, ut quisque inter istos loquendo palleat, imperatorum illico vitae nostrae necisque fieri.’

6. Or. 21.9, adduced and quoted in full by Friedlaender in his note on Juvenal 3.76; his repertory of pertinent passages includes Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. 4.11, ‘tractator geometra musicus.’


9. Their details vary, but the common point of Juvenal and Fronto is that all food gains piquancy from being served in expensive dishes on expensive tables. As Fronto puts it, ‘nullum adeo vile aut vulgatum est holus aut pulpamentum, quin elegantius videatur vasis aureis adposidum.’

Postscriptum

Ammianus’ celebrated remark (28.4.14) ‘quidam detestantes ut venena doctrinas, Juvenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore studio legunt, nulla volumina praeter haec in profundo otio contractantes, quam ob causam non iudiciali est nostril’, is suggestive of Juvenal’s late fourth century popularity in some quarters, but is not decisive (alas!) for my present argument. Ammianus’ polemical tone implies some bitter in-fighting among various literary salons, something that might repay separate study.
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