

To what extent did Posidonius and Theophanes record Pompeian ideology?

Claire Franklin

Department of Classics, University of Reading

This paper will examine the connections between two Greek-speaking intellectuals, Theophanes of Mitylene and Posidonius of Rhodes and Apameia, and Pompey the Great during the 60s and early 50s BC.¹ Their cases are of interest when trying to assess the nature of ‘Romanization’ in the first century BC, since, as scholars and representatives of Hellenic culture, Posidonius and Theophanes reflect the increasing importance of Rome as a centre and stimulus for intellectual activity, while their close association with one of the most influential Roman politicians and generals of the day links them to the growth in imperializing ideology which dominated this era.

While this paper would appear to have a much more literary theme than many of the others given at the ‘Romanization?’ conference, the role of those who taught or associated directly with the agents of Roman expansion seems an aspect which is not always taken into consideration. In the course of this paper I will show that while never entirely classed as ‘Romans’ (with all the contradictions and ambiguities which that term covered), the scholars Posidonius and Theophanes nonetheless played prominent roles in the development of imperialist ideology, by associating with and (as far as we can tell) writing for the prominent general and politician Pompey the Great.

Starting with a description of the backgrounds of Posidonius and Theophanes, I shall discuss their rise to prominence and cooperation with the Roman state, particularly as concerns their associations with Pompey and their services to him, but also (particularly in the case of Posidonius) with a view to understanding their wider relationship towards Rome and her growing power. I shall therefore discuss the evidence for Posidonius’ contribution to the ideology of imperialism later in the paper,

¹ A version of this paper was read at the ‘Romanization?’ conference held at the Institute of Classical Studies, Senate House, University of London on 15th November 2002. I am grateful for the support and comments that I received there from, in particular, Jonathan Prag, Andrew Merryweather, Ray Laurence and Michael Crawford. Likewise I am grateful to members of the Classics Department at Reading, especially my supervisors, Professor Tessa Rajak and Dr. Tim Duff, for their comments on both this and an earlier version read there.

as it forms an important part of our evidence as to his popularity as a thinker amongst Romans of his day.

Posidonius' and Theophanes' rise to prominence in Roman society

Although many Greek scholars who came into contact with Rome were forced into subservient roles, teaching Romans through poverty (as in the later Lucianic sketch²), this does not appear to have been a fate shared by either Posidonius or Theophanes. Their positions appear, to a certain extent, to have reflected their high standing within their own communities – Posidonius as a cultured *émigré* from Syria,³ with a philosophical school on Rhodes and a career in Rhodian politics behind him, and Theophanes as a politician in his native Mytilene, who was at some time honoured as the city's σωτήρ, 'saviour', and second founder.⁴

Although neither man was entirely dependent on the Roman *imperator*, nevertheless the relationships of Posidonius and Theophanes with Pompey took substantially different forms. Born in about 135 BC,⁵ Posidonius was far older than Pompey, and would have been in his seventies when the latter visited him on his way to and from the East.⁶ He seems, from the testimony of Cicero, to have been an imposing personality in his own right, turning his agonising gout into a vehicle for Stoic moralizing when Pompey came to meet him.⁷

² Lucian, *On Salaried Posts in Great Houses* (περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῶ συνοντῶν).

³ The extent of Posidonius' 'Syrian-ness' is unknown. Like Kidd (I. Kidd [1988a], *Posidonius. II. The Commentary: (i) Testimonia and Fragments 1-149* [Cambridge], 7-8; cf. I. Kidd [1999], *Posidonius. III. The Translation of the Fragments* [Cambridge], 3), I am inclined to view him as fundamentally 'Hellenic' in outlook. See also K. Reinhardt (1953), s.v. 'Poseidonios (3)', in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart), vol.22.1, col. 628; M. Laffranque (1964), *Poseidonios d'Apamée: essai de mise au point* (Paris), 49f; J. Malitz (1983), *Die Historien des Poseidonios* (Zetemata 79, Munich), 8.

⁴ IG XII.2.163b = F. Jacoby (1929), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin), vol. 2.b, 918-23, no.188.T.10(b) (hereafter cited as *FrGH* 188).

⁵ See Laffranque (1964) for discussion of the chronology of Posidonius' life.

⁶ Strabo XI.1.6 = I. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd (eds.) (1989, 2nd edn), *Posidonius. I. The Fragments* (Cambridge), 11, testimonium 35 (66 BC) (hereafter cited as EK T.00 [= testimonium] or F.00 [= fragment]); Pliny, *NH* VII.112 = EK T.36; Solinus, *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*, 1.121 = EK T.37.

⁷ Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* II.61 = EK T.38. Cf. EK T.33-34.

Theophanes, on the other hand, acted in a military capacity for Pompey from the 60s to the 40s, as far as can be inferred from the scanty evidence,⁸ and is thus likely to have been younger than the general, who was born in 106 and had been involved in military campaigns from a precociously early age in his father Cn. Pompeius Strabo's army.⁹ But the details here are unclear. We can see, however, that the two scholars would naturally perform somewhat different functions as far as Pompey is concerned, due to the age differences between them.

When Pompey's acquaintance with Theophanes and Posidonius is first recorded, in the 60s, he had already attained great power; he had reached the rank of consul (early) and was an experienced campaigner, having celebrated two triumphs and commanded armies in Sicily, Africa, against Sertorius in Spain, and in the Slave Wars against Spartacus.¹⁰ Despite these achievements, there has long been a consensus among scholars that Pompey's education may have been somewhat limited.¹¹ This is not to say that he had no intellectual interests at all, or viewed them solely as a means of gaining social acceptance. For example, having stormed Mithridates' stronghold,¹² he took and read some of the king's medical treatises, apparently out of genuine interest and curiosity - he knew how to read Greek. Various other anecdotes point to interests in Greek literature, philosophy and oratory.¹³

Despite the fact that earlier generations had been wary of Greek culture,¹⁴ it became common during the first century BC for prominent Romans to associate closely with Greek intellectuals, to the extent that one might include a philosopher amongst one's household members, as Caesar, Cato, Brutus, the Pisones and many others did.¹⁵ There was, therefore, nothing particularly unusual in Pompey's

⁸ B. Gold (1985), 'Pompey and Theophanes of Mitylene', *AJPh* 106: 312 dates the association from 67 BC until Pompey's death. I am uncertain if we can be so sure as to the precise starting point of this, given the paucity of evidence.

⁹ See P. Southern (2002), *Pompey the Great* (Stroud and Charleston, USA), chs. 1-2 on Pompey's early youth.

¹⁰ Southern (2002), ch.3.

¹¹ W. Anderson (1963), *Pompey, his Friends, and the Literature of the First Century BC* (Berkeley and Los Angeles), ch.5, esp. 57, commenting on the opinions of Mommsen and Syme; for a more favourable view, E. Rawson (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London), esp. 105.

¹² *FrGH* 188.F.7 (6) and Rawson (1985), 105.

¹³ Anderson (1963), ch.4.

¹⁴ See, e.g., E.S. Gruen (1984), *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (California), 223-24; E.S. Gruen (1993), 'Cato and Hellenism', in idem, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (London), 56-58; N.K. Petrochilos (1974), *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (Athens), 163-96.

¹⁵ E. Rawson (1989), 'Roman rulers and the philosophic adviser', in J. Barnes and M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata: essays on philosophy and Roman society* (Oxford), 233-57; also J.P.V.D. Balsdon (1979), *Romans and Aliens* (London), 54-57.

friendships with Posidonius and Theophanes. Even so, Pompey's abnormal political career warns us to be alert to the wider motives behind such associations. A notable precedent was the link between the Stoic Panaetius, Posidonius' tutor and predecessor, and the statesman Scipio Aemilianus, which enabled Roman political problems to be discussed in the light of Greek philosophical thought.¹⁶

In the following sections I shall discuss the evidence for Pompey's relationships with Posidonius and Theophanes, starting with Posidonius.

Services to Pompey: the nature of Posidonius' relationship with him

Posidonius had held public offices in Rhodes; his high standing within that community is apparent from the fact that he had also represented the Rhodians on embassies to Rome.¹⁷ As for his intellectual activities, as Panaetius' successor in the Stoic school on Rhodes, Posidonius clearly had much authority of his own as a philosopher; he appears to have had a steady stream of Greek and Roman students there, although we know nothing about the organisation of the school.¹⁸ By the 60s he had presumably written the bulk of his philosophical and historical works, which from the remaining fragments appear to have been unusually extensive.

Pompey visited Posidonius on Rhodes on at least two occasions, in 66 and 62 BC. While he may have gone to the island for reasons more practical than intellectual (Florus suggests that it was to increase his naval resources¹⁹), he took time to consult the philosopher in the midst of his busy schedule, and the fact that he went to see Posidonius for a second time (at least) indicates that he felt he had profited from his associations with the philosopher.

The question remains, however, of how much influence Posidonius exerted on Pompey. From the hard evidence, their association was not a close one, and it has not been given much weight by scholars interested in Pompey's associates.²⁰ Yet they may have met on more occasions than have been recorded, or corresponded (Cicero was in touch with both men in this way); although to benefit from Posidonius intellectually, Pompey need not have spent a great amount of time with him, as he could have read his books. Their attitude towards one another was one of mutual

¹⁶ M. van Straaten (1962, 3rd edn), *Panaetii Rhodii Reliqui Fragmenta* (Leiden); also A. Erskine (1990), *The Hellenistic Stoa: political thought and action* (Ithaca, NY), 181-204 (esp. 192-200); F. Sandbach (1985), *Aristotle and the Stoics* (Cambridge), 59-62.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Marius* 45.7 = EK T.28 = F.255.

¹⁸ EK T.29-45.

¹⁹ Florus 1.41.8; see Kidd (1988a), 27-28.

²⁰ E.g., Anderson (1963).

respect. Pompey lowered his *fascēs* in front of Posidonius' door upon his return from the east in 62, a mark of great honour; and, perhaps in 66, Posidonius gave him the advice, 'be ever the best, and pre-eminent over others', quoting Peleus' advice to his son Achilles (*Iliad* VI.208), which Kidd has suggested indicates a paternal attitude towards Pompey on Posidonius' part.²¹

There are less well-attested ways that Pompey may have benefited from Posidonius. Chief among these is the possibility that Posidonius wrote an account of Pompey's activities, as a monograph. He is likely to have completed his *Histories*, a continuation of Polybius, by the time he met Pompey (it seems only to have gone down to the 80s BC), but Strabo also refers to τὴν ἱστορίαν ... περὶ αὐτόν (sc. τὸν Πομπηϊόν) in his *Geography*, which may have been a separate work dealing with Pompey's career.²²

There has been a certain amount of argument as to whether this work in fact existed independently of the *Histories*. Put briefly, the case for the monograph argues that the *Histories* could not have covered the time of Pompey's campaigns if, as the *Suda* states, they were in 52 books and were a continuation of Polybius.²³ Book 49 dealt with the Marsian war of 91-89 BC,²⁴ while the last known fragment relates to 86 BC.²⁵ The timescale involved seems too great for the narrative to cover from the early 80s down to Pompey's activities in the 60s in just three books. It is thus argued that Posidonius wrote up Pompey's campaigns separately in the 'History' referred to by Strabo, who mentions that this was specifically about Pompey.

Modern commentators have varied in their opinions on the existence of such a monograph. Reinhardt postulated its existence,²⁶ but many other scholars, including Aly, Malitz, Theiler, and Kidd have been sceptical.²⁷ It is evident that Posidonius did write about Pompey in some form, as Strabo elsewhere accuses Posidonius of being ignorant regarding information, which, he says, he should have known about from Pompey (see below, footnote 59). Since, chronologically, this seems unlikely to have

²¹ Kidd (1988a), 28.

²² Strabo XI.1.6 = EK F.79; see Kidd (1988a), 331-33.

²³ *Suda*, s.v. Ποσειδώνιος 2108 = EK T.1a; s.v. Πολύβιος, Codex A, *in marg.* = EK T.1b.

²⁴ Malitz (1983), 70; F. Jacoby (1926), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin), vol. 2.a, no.87.F.27 (hereafter cited as *FrGH* 87) = EK F.78.

²⁵ Athenaeus VI.266e-f = EK F.51 (enslavement of the Chians by Mithridates, dateable to 86 BC; see Kidd (1988a), 277-80.

²⁶ Reinhardt (1953), cols. 630-41, esp. 638-39.

²⁷ W. Aly (1957), *Strabonis Geographica* (Bonn), vol.4, 94ff; Malitz (1983), 71-73; W. Theiler (ed.) (1982), *Posidonius: Die Fragmente* (Berlin), vol. 2, 59; Kidd (1988a), 331-33.

fitted into the scope of the *Histories*, it seems sensible to me to propose that he wrote such a monograph.

While no definite solution can be reached on the question of the monograph, its existence certainly seems a possibility, given Posidonius' undoubted literary ability. An additional piece of evidence testifies to this: the fact that Cicero asked him to write up his own account of the suppression of Cataline '*ornatius*',²⁸ suggests that Posidonius was acclaimed as a stylist, and Cicero may have been encouraged to ask the favour because of the success of Posidonius' earlier work on Pompey. Whatever the case was, it demonstrates the impact that Posidonius' learning had upon Cicero. We do not know if it was just his prose style, or also his penetrating political analysis which had impressed Cicero, but it is interesting to note that although not a Roman (there is no evidence that he ever became a citizen, as instead Theophanes eventually did, in turn adopting another Roman, Balbus of Gadara²⁹), he was entrusted with a subject involving Roman politics, and one very dear to its author's heart.

Posidonius and Roman imperialism

A further reason for Roman interest in Posidonius may have been his views on the formation and ethics of empire. His involvement with this subject has sparked much interest.³⁰ As with the argument for the monograph above, I cannot give a complete discussion of the topic here, as it is a particularly complex one, which relies on close readings of the fragmentary sources, and inferences from Diodorus Siculus, who probably used Posidonius' works,³¹ but I shall give a résumé of the most salient points.

Firstly, it is clear that Posidonius had extensive contacts within Rome. He had served as the Rhodian ambassador during the Marian and Sullan era,³² became acquainted with Pompey and Cicero, and may have had some contacts with the family of the Marcelli, whom he often mentions.³³ This would indicate that, like Polybius, he was at ease in the upper echelons of Roman society. Although he came from Syria,³⁴ he denigrated the local Syrians and the ruling Ptolemies, whom he saw as debauched

²⁸ Cicero, *Ad Att.* II.1.2 (= SB 21.2) (60 BC) = EK T.34.

²⁹ Gold (1985), 322-24.

³⁰ See, e.g., Erskine (1990), F. Strasburger (1965), 'Poseidonios on problems of the Roman empire', *JRS* 55: 40-53, W. Capelle (1932), 'Griechische Ethik und römischer Imperialismus', *Klio* 25: 86-113.

³¹ Reinhardt (1953), cols. 630-41.

³² Strabo VII.5.8 = EK T.27 (prytany); Plutarch, *Marius* 45.7 = EK T.28.

³³ Suda, s.v. Ποσειδώνιος, 2107-10 = EK T.1a; F.86e = Hermias, in *Platonis Phaedrum* 114; Plutarch, *Marcellus* 1.1-3, 9.4-7, 20.1-11, 30.6-9; *Fab. Max.* 19.1-4 = EK F.257-61.

³⁴ EK T.1a-2b (and see references below).

and inept,³⁵ and supported Pompey, so he must have approved to a certain extent of the order which Rome was striving to bring to the region.

Secondly, according to the *Suda* (see above), Posidonius' *Histories* were a deliberate continuation of Polybius. While Posidonius need not have adopted all of the earlier writer's views, this does suggest that he approved of Polybius' main purpose, namely, to recount the rise of Rome.³⁶ He need not have been entirely blind to Rome's faults, even so; many of the fragments of his *Histories* castigate vice in almost whimsical terms (although it may be relevant to note that all those named are non-Romans),³⁷ and if much of the work was written in such a satirical tone, it is possible that he may have shown that Rome later abused her power, having striven so hard to achieve it.

Thirdly, as a Stoic, Posidonius was the pupil of, and successor to, Panaetius.³⁸ The latter had had contacts with the Scipiones, and as leader of a Stoic school on Rhodes is credited with playing a major role in shaping the often anti-authoritarian, 'cynical' (in the philosophical sense) views of the earlier Stoics to fit the changed conditions Greece experienced under Roman rule.³⁹ While very little of his actual works have survived,⁴⁰ Cicero, by his own admission, followed Panaetius' ethical work *Περὶ καθήκοντα* very closely in his *De Finibus*, so it is evident that he taught a form of Stoicism which was particularly well-suited to the needs of the Roman statesman.⁴¹

Posidonius is closely associated with Panaetius, since as well as the simple fact that he was his pupil, he also criticised and developed Panaetius' views,⁴² for example, extending his classification of the types of virtue (Diogenes Laertius VII.92 = EK F.180). Since Cicero's views on the philosophical underpinning of empire were heavily influenced by Panaetius,⁴³ I am sure that he would have been greatly interested in Posidonius' comments on Panaetius' arguments. Although we must take into account Cicero's own outlook as a Roman politician and must be wary of

³⁵ See Athenaeus XIV.649d = EK F.54, VI.252e = EK F.56, XII.549d-e = EK F.58.

³⁶ As expressed in Polybius, I.1 and elsewhere.

³⁷ E.g., EK F.56 (Hierax); F.58 (Ptolemy VIII Physcon); F.59 (Damophilus); F.61a-b (Antiochus VII Sides); F.253 (Athenion); F.257 (Marcellus and Nicias of Engyium).

³⁸ *Suda*, s.v. Ποσειδώνιος, 2107 = EK T.1a; Cicero, *De Div.* 1.6 = EK T.10.

³⁹ M. Pohlenz (1948), *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung* (Göttingen), vol.1, 197.

⁴⁰ For the remaining evidence see van Straaten (1962).

⁴¹ J. Rist (1969), *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge), ch.10; Pohlenz (1948), 194-257.

⁴² Association with Panaetius: *Suda*, s.v. Ποσειδώνιος, 2107 = EK T.1a; Athenaeus XII.549d-e = EK T.7; Cicero, *De Off.* III.8 = EK T.9; *De Div.* 1.6 = EK T.10; development of Panaetius' views: EK F.41c, T.10.

⁴³ See, e.g. Cic., *De Leg.* III.14; *De Div.* 1.6, II.88, 97; *De Fin.* 1.6, IV.23, 79; *De Off.* 1.7-10, 152, II.60.

viewing his political works as mere translations of Greek originals, it is clear that these writings did have a considerable impact on his thought.

In his extant writings, Posidonius appears to champion the rule of a strong power over weaker subjects. While this seems alien to the normal position of the Stoa, Strasburger and Capelle have emphasised that such rule was to be maintained through goodwill;⁴⁴ Imperialism was tolerable so long as the ruling state did not abuse its powers. This outlook is illustrated by the fragment in which Posidonius describes how the weak-minded Mariandynoi gave themselves up into the power of the Heracleots of the Black Sea region because they recognised that both would benefit from such a course of action.⁴⁵ As one influenced by Aristotle's doctrines,⁴⁶ Posidonius may have shared some of his views on so-called natural slavery. Strasburger has suggested that Posidonius' teaching influenced Pompey's humane treatment of the captured pirates in his wars against them,⁴⁷ which is an attractive theory, although there is no definite evidence with which to back it up, and Pompey's lauded 'humanity' may simply have been a much-praised piece of propaganda.

The overall picture of Posidonius' relationship to Roman imperialism is one of acceptance and compromise. We cannot say that he accepted it unconditionally; this was a man who was stubborn enough on one occasion (perhaps c.62 BC) to treat Pompey to a lecture on virtue when he would far rather have had praise for his recent campaigns,⁴⁸ and whose propensities for irony have been noted above; yet he recognised that Roman rule brought certain benefits and was content to coexist with Romans, no doubt enjoying the honour which this brought him.

Theophanes and Roman imperialism

Returning to Theophanes, while it is clear that he wrote about Pompey,⁴⁹ he does not, from the surviving evidence, seem to have done much else, intellectually speaking, although he did busy himself with political issues for the Pompeian party, serving Pompey faithfully in the field (as a lieutenant) as well as off it, and he took up the Roman custom of adopting an heir (Cn. Pompeius Balbus Theophanes).⁵⁰ He is not connected with any of the philosophical schools, which is perhaps unsurprising if he

⁴⁴ Strasburger (1965), 34-37; Capelle (1932), 99, 103.

⁴⁵ Athenaeus VI.263c-d = EK F.60. See Erskine (1990), 201f.

⁴⁶ Sandbach (1985), esp. 59-62.

⁴⁷ Strasburger (1965), 49-51.

⁴⁸ Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* II.61 = EK T.38 (see also T.35).

⁴⁹ Clear from all the *FrGH* 188 fragments, and stated explicitly by Cicero, *Pro Archias* 24 = *FrGH* 188.T.3(a).

⁵⁰ Gold (1985), 312, 315, 319-20.

spent much of his time engaged in military service, as the same can be said for Julius Caesar.

Like Posidonius, Theophanes was known to Cicero, who used him as a sounding-board for Pompey's thoughts; he often dealt with Theophanes rather than the great man himself.⁵¹ Theophanes was thus far more of a Pompeian agent than Posidonius. Cicero, Plutarch and even Tacitus commenting on the fate of Theophanes' descendants, testify to Theophanes' place *inter intimos* (to use Tacitus' phrase) of Pompey.⁵²

Theophanes' loyalty to Pompey stands out clearly if we look at the surviving fragments of Theophanes' history, many of which are on geographical and ethnographical themes (this is partly due to the bias of their main transmitter, Strabo). While both Theophanes and Posidonius use geography within their historical works, as was common at the time, Posidonius' references are frequently gleaned from his own travels in the Near East, Italy, Gaul, North Africa and Spain, which took place in the 90s or 80s BC. Theophanes', on the other hand, concern Asia, Armenia, Bithynia and Scythia, all of which relate to areas visited by Pompey in the course of his campaigns against Mithridates, whom he finally defeated in 63 BC.

Both writers seem to have recorded what they saw with their own eyes. Posidonius, for instance, describes the Gauls' curious practice of displaying enemy heads on stakes and how at first it worried him, but subsequently he became used to it.⁵³ (Strabo adds, incidentally, that the Romans put a stop to this barbarous practice shortly afterwards.) Another fragment reveals how Posidonius witnessed the humanlike behaviour of apes in Libya and found it very amusing.⁵⁴

In a similar manner, Theophanes gave vivid descriptions of the violent snowstorms on the Armenian-Colchian border in which 'whole caravans are swallowed up';⁵⁵ Mithridates Eupator's fortresses in the same borderlands;⁵⁶ and the 'thrips' (Θρίπες- the word literally means 'woodworm'), which were strange creatures that lived in the snow (although this sounds a little too fantastic for an eyewitness account). He also calculated the size of Armenia, which Strabo said was an overestimate.⁵⁷ Presumably Theophanes was working from measurements provided

⁵¹ E.g., Cicero, *Ad Att.* IX.1.3 (= SB 167.3) = *FrGH* 188.T.8(a).

⁵² Cicero, *Pro Archias* 24 = *FrGH* 188.T.3(a); Plutarch, *Pompey* 76.6 = *FrGH* 188.T.8(d); Strabo XIII.2.3 = *FrGH* 188.T.1; Tacitus, *Annals* VI.18 = *FrGH* 188.T.10(a).

⁵³ Strabo IV.4.5 = EK F.274.

⁵⁴ Strabo XVII.3.4 = EK F.245.

⁵⁵ Strabo XI.14.4 = *FrGH* 188.F.5(4), my translation.

⁵⁶ Strabo XII.3.28 = *FrGH* 188.F.7(6).

⁵⁷ Strabo XI.14.11 = *FrGH* 188.F.6(5).

by military surveys and explorations for such facts – but he may also have been trying to make the account sound even more impressive than it was.

While Strabo's statement that Theophanes' measurements were incorrect appears to damn him as an accurate reporter, it should be borne in mind that Strabo likewise criticises Posidonius for reporting the cycle of tides off the coast of Spain incorrectly,⁵⁸ and even for getting wrong the measurement of the 'Caucasian isthmus' near Colchis, when, Strabo says, he should have known the facts from Pompey's campaigns there – a passing confirmation that Posidonius did utilise information from Pompey.⁵⁹

Other fragments of Theophanes refer to the Scythian tribes of the Gelai and Legai, who are said to live between the Albanians and the Amazons, and who were apparently visited by Pompey, and the Mariandynoi, a tribe of Bithynia whose voluntary submission to slavery on account of their weak intellect was also of interest to Posidonius, as we have seen above. All these references, both in Posidonius and Theophanes, are no doubt linked to the Mithridatic campaigns of 67-63 BC, which Theophanes took part in and Posidonius may have heard about from Pompey and his followers.

All the fragments of Theophanes contain what can be broadly categorised as historiographical material and can be linked with the Mithridatic campaigns, reinforcing the view of him as 'Pompey's historian'. The appearance of geographical and ethnographical material suggests that his writings may have followed similar lines to the *Commentarii* of Caesar concerning his campaigns in Gaul, which despite propagandistic intent display much interest in ethnography, geography (some of which was essential to describe the course of a military expedition), and occasionally even the zoology of the regions visited. Theophanes may have done the same,⁶⁰ emphasising the exciting worlds being opened up by Roman conquest,⁶¹ and hence glorifying their conqueror, a form of propaganda, which was to continue into the Augustan age and beyond. If more of his work survived, we would get a clearer view of his intentions, which are difficult to discern precisely from the remaining fragments.

The fact that Posidonius too, in his mention of the Mariandynoi and Strabo's assertion that he should have known of the Caucasus area, seems to have gleaned material from Pompey, perhaps reinforces the view that he wrote his *Histories* in

⁵⁸ Strabo III.5.7-8 = EK F.217.

⁵⁹ Strabo XI.1.5-6 = EK F.206.

⁶⁰ E.g., Strabo XI.14.4 = *FrGH* 188.F.5(4).

⁶¹ For this theme in literature see C. Nicolet (1991), *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor).

extreme old age, as Kidd suggests,⁶² although, as we have seen, the material could equally have come from a work on Pompey. There is also the question of Posidonius' work on the Jews, which was condemned as inaccurate and hostile by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*,⁶³ and seems to have been used by Diodorus Siculus and others. This may have formed part of an account of Pompey's campaigns in Judaea and his brief involvement in Jewish politics in 63-62, but not enough survives for certainty.⁶⁴ While there is no doubting Posidonius' ability to write a work on Pompey, if he had written one it would have been right at the end of his long life and would have formed only a small part of his immense and varied output.

Conclusions

The evidence given above differentiates Theophanes from Posidonius in a number of ways; Posidonius had the more varied field of interests, but Theophanes was perhaps more understanding of Pompey's mindset and a better man to produce campaign records. In addition, Posidonius was at least thirty years older than Pompey, suffered from excruciating gout by the 60s BC and so was in no position to travel with him on campaign.

Although there is little of Theophanes' history left to go by, features such as the fantastic 'thrips' and Strabo's criticisms, together with the apparently limited range of his intellectual knowledge and the anecdotal descriptions of Mithridates' fortresses, reinforce the impression that he was solely concerned with providing an account of his friend Pompey's exploits. Posidonius, by contrast, was engaged in a wide variety of intellectual activity, often working within a 'scientific' format, as a commentator on and participant in an established academic tradition. For example, he cites Aristotle and Parmenides to back up the points he makes when discussing the Ocean;⁶⁵ he criticises the ethical and psychological studies of one of his predecessors in the Stoa, Chrysippus;⁶⁶ his geography and ethnography appear to have been reinforced by mathematical measurements;⁶⁷ and he is praised by later authors such as Galen for his theories and scientific methods.⁶⁸

⁶² Kidd (1988a), 276-80.

⁶³ Josephus, *CA* II.7.79-96 = EK F.278.

⁶⁴ See Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, I.127f; also Southern (2002), 74-75, 162-63; P. Greenhalgh (1981), *Pompey, the Roman Alexander* (Columbia), 142-43; J. Leach (1978), *Pompey the Great* (London), 93-94; and M. Grant (1973), *The Jews in the Roman World* (London), 53-58.

⁶⁵ Strabo II.2.2-2.3 = EK F.49.

⁶⁶ E.g., EK F.144, 146, 33, 147, 34, 151-52, 156, 158, 164-67.

⁶⁷ Strabo II.2.2-3.2 = EK F.49; see also EK F.205, 208, 210, 223, 249, 280-81.

⁶⁸ E.g., Galen, *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* IV.390 (p.362.5-9 M) = EK T.83.

Posidonius appears to have discussed and formulated ethical models which took Roman power into consideration. It would seem that despite some interest in Roman politics, he was primarily a scientist and thinker, engaged in his own researches and interested in building on the theories of his philosophical predecessors, but because of his great reputation he was sought out by Romans such as Cicero and Pompey. It is difficult to say whether he was interested in Roman politics for its own sake or whether his Roman associates encouraged him to write or lecture on the subject. Theophanes, on the other hand, probably made notes while out in the field with Pompey. While this was a valid form of historiography, he certainly did not strive to reach the same heights as Posidonius. It is likely that the performance, and then the recording, of military duties were his chief occupations.

As to Posidonius' and Theophanes' respective levels of integration within Roman society, it would appear from the evidence that they both commanded respect in their roles. Posidonius may have been the more widely renowned of the two, as his fame was not wholly bound up with his associations with Pompey, as appears to have been the case with Theophanes. His standing as a scholar appears to have commanded Roman respect, although in the final analysis he was still very much a representative of Greek culture, and although he seems to have dealt with the question of Roman power, many of his intellectual activities constituted a continuation of traditional Hellenistic philosophy, which remained unchanged by the advent of Rome. Theophanes became the more 'Romanized' of the two, through his very close association with the Pompeian party, the fact that he was granted citizenship, and through his association with the Pompeian Balbus.

To sum up, I have tried to give a fair account of how Posidonius and Theophanes contributed to the Pompeian cause as Greek intellectuals, and how, through their associations with Rome, participated more widely in the stimulating and varied intellectual culture of their time. I hope that in so doing I have not damned Theophanes unjustly as an intellectual (it was not my intention). It is clear that there was room for both Posidonius and Theophanes in Pompey's 'retinue'.