

# THE ELDER SENECA AND SPAIN

By MIRIAM GRIFFIN

*To the memory of Isobel Henderson*

## I

The Seneca family came to Rome from Spain, the province that Rome took from Carthage in the Second Punic War, acquiring thereby great mineral wealth, splendid soldiers, and a war of conquest that took nearly two centuries to complete. Rome's motive in acquiring Spain was strategic, yet she had been impressed by the wealth that had recently sustained Hannibal's armies and with the abilities of the Spanish troops that both sides had used.<sup>1</sup> But nothing so impressed the Romans with the military talents of the Spaniards as the resistance they put up to their rule. By the second half of the second century Baetica was already pacified, so that the main trouble there came from the raids of Lusitanian brigands; at that time horrific stories were being told of the Celtiberians who fought at Numantia; they in their turn were becoming τρυφῶτες when similar tales were being told, more than a century later, of the Astures and Cantabri with whom Augustus had to deal.<sup>2</sup>

From the start, the language of Roman administration was Latin, and no concessions were made in official communications to the vernacular languages, principally Punic, Greek, Celtic and Iberian. Aside from that, Rome did not attempt any suppression of local culture. Yet after one century of Roman rule (dating from the formal organization of the two provinces in 197), the coins show few native legends, and by the later reign of Augustus there were probably none at all, although local coinages persisted until Gaius' time and the reverse types were clearly left to local decision.<sup>3</sup> From the Augustan period on, private documents in Latin are found all over Spain. But Romanization did not proceed at a uniform rate: the remoter parts of Lusitania, Callaecia and Asturia show votive tablets to native gods, while not a single one has been found in all of Baetica. Inscriptions in the Iberian alphabet disappear in Baetica before they do at Saguntum. The people living along the Baetis had largely forgotten their native dialect but Strabo marked them as unusual.<sup>4</sup> The parts of Spain that presented the most Roman air were the urbanized areas of the Baetis valley, the southern coast, and the Ebro valley and the Eastern seaboard.<sup>5</sup>

There had been other imperial powers with interests in Spain before Rome, but neither Greek colonization nor Carthaginian rule provided precedents for the Roman impact on Spain. The Greek settlements were limited to the eastern coast, and there was no question of empire nor interest in assimilation.<sup>6</sup> Agrippa noted in his survey that the southern coast of Baetica was Punic in origin. Before the Greek colonization, the Phoenicians had founded Gades and probably Abdera, Sexi and Malaca, but they never penetrated beyond the litoral. After the battle of Alalia in 535, Carthage revived these colonies, founded Nova Carthago, and provided the coast settlements with a hinterland extending to the Anas river and the Sierra Morena range.<sup>7</sup> The good will shown by Hasdrubal's marriage with a Spanish princess and Hannibal's union with a woman of Castulo<sup>8</sup> suggests some assimilation with the native population. At Gades and Ebusus native coins continuing Punic types were struck during the first two centuries of Roman occupation.<sup>9</sup> That suggests a cultural

I must record my gratitude to Sir Ronald Syme and Dr. M. Winterbottom for many helpful criticisms and suggestions. Dr. Winterbottom also brought to my attention J. E. G. Whitehorne's 'The Elder Seneca: a Review of Past Work', *Prudentia* I (1969), 14 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Polybius III, 13, 7; x, 8, 1. Diodorus v, 38, 2 probably gives a typical Poseidonian exaggeration when he says that *none* of the Roman mines were new, all having been opened by the Carthaginians, but Pliny, *NH* xxxiii, 96 does report that many of the silver mines opened by Hannibal were still in operation. Livy xxiv, 49, 7-8; xxviii, 13; xxvii, 38, 11; Polybius xi, 31.

<sup>2</sup> Florus I, 34; Appian, *Iber.* 95-96; Strabo III, 4, 17-18.

<sup>3</sup> C. H. V. Sutherland, 'Aspects of Imperialism in Roman Spain', *JRS* xxiv (1934), 38; M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), 472-3.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo III, 2, 15; cf. Tac., *Ann.* iv, 45.

<sup>5</sup> For a summary of the whole process, see A. Garcia y Bellido, 'Latinización de Hispania', *Archivo Español de Arqueología* xl (1967), 3 ff.

<sup>6</sup> At Emporiae, for example, Greeks and natives lived in two separately walled cities surrounded by a common wall for protection (Strabo III, 4, 8) and were only united some time after Caesarian colonists were sent there in 45 (Livy xxxiv, 9). For problems about the unification, see P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower* (1971), 603-4.

<sup>7</sup> Pliny *NH* III, 8. R. Thouvenot, *Essai sur la province romaine de Bétique* (1940), 74-5.

<sup>8</sup> Diod. Sic. xxv, 12; Livy xxiv, 41, 7.

<sup>9</sup> A. Vives y Escudero, *La Moneda Hispanica* (Madrid, 1926) I, 51-67; III, 9 ff.

impact, yet there is the contrary evidence that hardly any examples of Punic names can be found in the area.<sup>10</sup>

The explanation of the rapid Romanization of Spain is to be found, not in efforts by the Roman government to achieve cultural uniformity or disrupt tribal cohesion, but in the presence of a large standing army in the province, in the large immigration from Italy, and in the opportunities given to native Spaniards first of fighting for the Romans, then of joining the Italian communities and of receiving Latin or citizen rights as members of communities or as individuals.<sup>11</sup>

Aside from its fertile land and numerous ports and rivers—attractions which it shared with Sicily, Africa and southern Gaul, there were special features that made Spain a natural centre of immigration from the third century B.C. onwards: a standing army, the earliest Rome maintained; the existence of mines that had already proved profitable; the large number of impregnable mountain hideouts which, with the presence of Italian settlers, attracted political exiles from Italy.<sup>12</sup> The army attracted civilian traders, while some soldiers would settle or be settled where they had served. First Tarraco and later on Gracchuris may have received veteran settlements.<sup>13</sup> In 205 Scipio certainly settled some of his wounded soldiers in a town he called Italica; the very name proves that not only legionaries but Italian auxiliaries were among the colonists,<sup>14</sup> and some natives may also have been included.<sup>15</sup> In 171 the effects of a standing army were dramatically presented to the senate in the form of a 'novi generis hominum legatio', representing 4,000 men, born of Roman soldiers and Spanish women. They were given Carteia with the status of a Latin colony, and natives of the town were offered membership in the colony. In 152 Corduba was provided with a mixture of Romans and select natives,<sup>16</sup> and shortly thereafter Valentia received the first of its two settlements: *peregrini* in 138, veterans after the war with Sertorius.<sup>17</sup> In such mixed settlements, veterans and Italian settlers made their most direct contribution to Romanization.

The mines, according to Diodorus, were the object of a gold-rush. Some Italians were drawn as owners or lessees from the state.<sup>18</sup> More immigration resulted from the economic unrest in Italy at the time of the Gracchan reforms, the Social War, the ensuing civil war and the Sullan proscriptions.<sup>19</sup> Spain, particularly Ulterior, with its large immigrant population and a topography that made small strongholds easy to defend,<sup>20</sup> was a natural haven for political exiles. Later on, Sextus Pompey, even after the defeat of his brother in 45, was able to hold out for two more years.

It has been estimated that, by the time of the Civil War of 49, over 10,000 male residents

<sup>10</sup> Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 51 reveals a Hasdrubal of Gades in 81 B.C.; the derivation of Balbus' name from Baal is dubious.

<sup>11</sup> For the various factors in the process from 218 B.C. to A.D. 14, see J. M. Blázquez, *Causas de las Romanización de Hispania* (1964), and Spanish work there cited.

<sup>12</sup> E. Gabba, 'Le origini della Guerra Sociale', *Athenaeum* xxxii (1954), 297 ff., A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (1966), 22-27; 29-40. Brunt, o.c. 210 doubts the evidence of Diodorus v, 36 (from Poseidonius) about Italians emigrating to work the mines, but Poseidonius must have known, for he visited Spain and Italy and the process may still have been going on in his time.

<sup>13</sup> There is no evidence. Brunt, o.c. 215-216 thinks Gracchuris was a native settlement. He omits Tarraco ('opus Scipionum' in Pliny, *NH* III, 21) and argues for a mixed settlement at Metellinum, which may be right.

<sup>14</sup> Appian, *Iber.* 38. The ancestors of Hadrian, originally from Picenum, were presumably among these (SHA *Hadr.* 1, 1).

<sup>15</sup> Gabba, 'Ricerche sull'esercito professionale Romano da Mario ad Augusto', *Athenaeum* xxix (1951), 219, n. 2.

<sup>16</sup> Livy XLIII, 3, 1-4; Strabo III, 2, 1.

<sup>17</sup> Wilson, o.c. (n. 12), 40-42.

<sup>18</sup> T. Frank, 'Financial Activities of the Equestrian Corporations, 200-150 B.C.', *CP* 28 (1933), 7, suggested that the silver mines were first run by the government directly, but were leased by the censors from 179. Brunt, 'The Equites in the Late Republic', *2nd Intern. Conf. of Econ. Hist.* 1 (1962), Appendix 1, 239, would date the control by the *publicani* to Cato's institution of *vectigalia* in 195. Strabo III, 2, 10 records that silver mines in his day were privately owned, by contrast with the public ownership he found in Polybius. As some silver mines appear to have been worked by *publicani* under the Empire (*ILS* 8708), it is possible that what Strabo says was true of some mines which had run low and were no longer profitable to the government. This suggestion (made by M. I. Henderson in her Arnold Prize Essay of 1930, pp. 48-51) seems preferable to taking the *societas argentariarum fodinarum* in that inscription as a private company, as did M. Rostovtzeff, *Dis. Epig.* 11, 583 s.v. conductor, followed now by C. Domergue, 'Lingots de plomb romains de Carthagène', *Arch. Esp. de Arqueol.* xxxix (1966), 66-67.

<sup>19</sup> The flight to Spain of Sertorius and the Lepidan remnants was preceded by that of M. Junius Brutus and others after Sulla's first victory, and that of Marcus Licinius Crassus before his second: Wilson, 29-31.

<sup>20</sup> *Bell. Hisp.* 8.

from immigrant or veteran families could be found in the Pompeian armies; the confiscations in that same war show the wealth and prosperity achieved by these settlers.<sup>21</sup> Careful studies of nomenclature have revealed that many immigrant families came originally from the remoter parts of Italy, particularly from the north (Etruria, Umbria and Illyria) and the Oscan centre (Samnium, the territory of the Marsi and Paeligni).<sup>22</sup> Catullus introduces us to Egnatius the Celtiberian—a Samnite name like that of the Decidius Saxa whom Caesar put into the Senate. The names of the would-be assassins of Cassius Longinus, citizens of Italica, are instructive: L. Mercello is probably Etruscan, T. Vasius Oscan.<sup>23</sup> More information about the origins of the immigrant might emerge if we were better informed about the pronunciation and use of words, but one detail does survive: Varro records that in Corduba, as in Latium (Lanuvium particularly) and in Etruscan Falterii, the word *cenaculum* preserved its original meaning.<sup>24</sup> Given more information, we might have drawn conclusions about the provenance and dates of arrival of the inhabitants of Corduba.

The immigrant stratum retained close ties with Rome. The notorious tribune of the plebs in 90, Q. Varius, was given the cognomen *Hybrida* 'propter obscurum ius civitatis' and, by way of insult, the epithet 'Hispanus', or in other versions 'Sucronensis'<sup>25</sup> (the more precise term is likely to be right). He may have been the product of the union of a Roman citizen and a native woman.<sup>26</sup> Coins reveal that in 81 one of the quaestors in Spain was L. Fabius Hispaniensis, whose cognomen should indicate immigrant stock.<sup>27</sup> Clearly being born in Spain would not prevent a Roman citizen from attaining office. Presumably such families maintained their political connections in the city. Even Egnatius the Celtiberian came home for visits<sup>28</sup> and in Cicero's *De Oratore*, set in 91, M. Antonius the Orator is made to cite as a type of inheritance case 'quod usu memoria patrum venit' the case of a Roman citizen who came to Rome from Spain leaving one heir, only to take on a second wife, and acquire a second heir in Rome.<sup>29</sup>

Despite ties with home, the Italic element did not remain a separate caste. Although there was no deliberate policy of cultural homogenization (as opposed to urbanization), the natives' desire to be assimilated was encouraged. Early on, they were not prevented from assuming the names of great Roman *gentes* whose representatives had served in Spain, even when citizenship was a dream of the future.<sup>30</sup> By the time of the Civil War of 49, a large number of natives had been given the franchise for serving under Roman generals with distinction: in 89, Pompeius Strabo granted the citizenship to a cohort of Spanish auxiliaries who had fought with him in Picenum; Sulla, Pompey and Metellus Pius, when fighting Sertorius, enfranchised many Spaniards.<sup>31</sup> Doubtless some of the residents enrolled in the Pompeian legions in the Civil War were enfranchised on enlistment.<sup>32</sup> With Caesar and Augustus, large-scale grants of Latin rights and citizenship to mixed native and Italian communities, as a reward for and incentive to loyalty, quickened Romanization, as did the

<sup>21</sup> Wilson, o.c. 10–11, 39; Brunt, o.c. 230–231.

<sup>22</sup> Gabba o.c. (n. 12), 32; R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), II, Appendix 80.

<sup>23</sup> Catullus 37; 39; *Bell. Alex.* 52, 4 ('Mercello' is Hübner's reading, based on *CIL* II, 2226); Schulze, *LE* 301, 425, 450–1.

<sup>24</sup> Varro, *LL* v, 162.

<sup>25</sup> Val. Max. III, 7, 8; VIII, 6, 4; Asconius in *Scaur.* 20; Quintilian v, 12, 10; *Vir. Ill.* 72, 11.

<sup>26</sup> cf. Pliny *NH* VIII, 213. *Hybrida* was a nickname for animals, signifying the product of a mixed union, of which one member was wild. The explanation of Varius' dubious status given by R. Baumann, *The Crimen Maiestatis in the Roman Republic and Augustan Principate* (1967), 64–67 seems less likely, and is not necessary to explain his conviction or the penalty under his own law; see E. Badian, 'Quaestiones Variarum', *Hist.* 18 (1969), 462 ff. Varius' uncertain status must have been shared by many others, Brunt, o.c. (n. 6), 206–7.

<sup>27</sup> He later went over to be Sertorius after being proscribed (Sallust, *Hist.* III, 83M). On the distinction between *Hispanus* and *Hispaniensis* as one of Spanish blood vs. Spanish domicile, the basic texts are Charisius (*Gram. Lat.*, ed. Keil, 106) and

Vell. Pat. II, 51, 3 (where the ms. reading is corrupt).

<sup>28</sup> Apparently his Latin was good, as all the poet finds to criticize is his dentifrice and his long hair, a style he probably took over from the gay blades of the city (Cicero, *Cat.* II, 22)—on him see H. de la Ville de Mirmont, 'Les déclamateurs espagnols au temps d'Auguste', *Bulletin hispanique* XIV (1912), 342.

<sup>29</sup> *De Orat.* I, 183. At the date Cicero indicates, most Spanish Roman citizens would not be enfranchised natives. On the legal points about divorce and legitimacy raised by the case, see A. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (1967), 9, 53.

<sup>30</sup> E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (1958), 256–7. Compare the later strictness of Claudius who forbade *peregrini* to assume Roman gentile names (Suet., *Cl.* 25, 3).

<sup>31</sup> *ILS* 8888; Cicero, *Arch.* 25; *Balb.* 50. Such grants only became common after Marius established the custom which permitted generals to make them, as shown by Badian (above n. 30) and supported by Brunt, o.c. (n. 6), 205.

<sup>32</sup> Brunt, 208, discusses such recruitment and also usurpation of citizen rights abroad.

creation of new veteran settlements, in some of which, on the model of Italica, Carteia, and Corduba, natives were probably incorporated.<sup>33</sup>

## II

The Seneca family lived in Corduba, a town whose history comprises the main features of Roman relations with southern Spain. Corduba was the winter quarters of M. Claudius Marcellus, who in 152, after finishing his operations in Citerior, had founded there a town in which he settled Italians and Roman citizens.<sup>34</sup> After Marcellus, Corduba became the regular military headquarters for generals campaigning in Ulterior; by the time of the Civil War, according to the *Bellum Hispaniense*, it was considered the capital of the province.<sup>35</sup> It was in fact the administrative headquarters of the province of Hispania Ulterior<sup>36</sup> when Augustus, who sent veterans there and named it *Colonia Patricia*, made it the capital of one of the four juridical *conventus*.<sup>37</sup>

One of the native Spaniards that, according to Strabo, were invited into Marcellus' settlement, may well have been the ancestor of the Elder Seneca's close friend, Clodius Turrinus. His *nomen* indicates an enfranchised native or descendant of one, and also advertises a connection with some Roman Claudius—perhaps the founder of Corduba. The name Annaeus, however, is Etruscan or Illyrian,<sup>38</sup> and the family was probably one among many emigrating from those parts of Italy: an Etruscan origin can similarly be surmised for the family of the Corduban rhetorician, Statorius Victor.<sup>39</sup> The cognomen Seneca the Annaei may have brought with them from Italy or acquired in Spain.<sup>40</sup>

Had we the younger Seneca's life of his father, we might at least know about his grandparents.<sup>41</sup> As it is, our knowledge of the family begins with L. Annaeus Seneca,<sup>42</sup> the author of the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*, a Roman citizen of equestrian standing. His dates can be roughly determined. He lived to see the death of Tiberius in A.D. 37, for he speaks of that emperor in the past tense.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, he was not only able to read, but to quote, in a book he intended to publish himself, the works of Cremutius Cordus<sup>44</sup> which had been suppressed by Tiberius in A.D. 25, and he was able to note as accessible the writings of Cassius Severus which had been burned in A.D. 12; both these works were only republished early in Gaius' reign.<sup>45</sup> The *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* were composed after 37, and by the time of his son's exile in 41, he was dead.<sup>46</sup> The most likely date for his death then is the year 39 or 40.

<sup>33</sup> Something of the kind seems to be indicated by Strabo III, 2, 15 for Pax Augusta (Pax Julia), Augusta Emerita and Caesaraugusta (οἱ τε νῦν συνφοκισμένοι πόλεις): he says that these towns illustrate the changeover of Spaniards to the Roman way of life. For the variety of Roman solutions in dealing with native residents of colonial sites, see B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967), 68–75. Brunt, o.c. 250, doubts if many natives were enfranchised in the two Lusitanian colonies, but Strabo seems to mean more than simple physical residence.

<sup>34</sup> On its status, see below, Note A.

<sup>35</sup> *BH* III, 1.

<sup>36</sup> e.g. Cicero, II *Verr.* 4, 56; *Fam* X, 31–33.

<sup>37</sup> Pliny, *NH* III, 7 and 10.

<sup>38</sup> Syme, *Tacitus*, App. 80.

<sup>39</sup> Seneca, *Suas.* 2, 18; Schulze, *LE* 237.

<sup>40</sup> Though common in Spain, the cognomen Seneca is found on inscriptions also in Umbria, Picenum, Cisalpine Gaul, Africa and Narbonensis where, however, the variant Senecio is more common. A. Tovar, 'Sobre la estirpe de Seneca', *Humanitas* II (1948/9), 249, thinks the name was acquired in Spain. The cognomen of the youngest son Mela is common in Baetica, but occurs as a *nomen* at Tarquinii (*CIL* XI, 3377) and as a cognomen elsewhere in Italy (*ILS* 917, 8530). For the oldest son's cognomen Novatus, see n. 83. I am indebted to Professor Syme for help on these problems.

<sup>41</sup> Fr. 98–9 Haase. Compare the ancestral background in Tacitus' *Agricola*.

<sup>42</sup> The correct *praenomen* is probably Lucius (not Marcus). See H. J. Müller's edition of 1887, pp. VII–VIII; W. A. Edwards, *The Suasoriae of the Elder Seneca* (Cambridge, 1928), xxiii.

<sup>43</sup> *Suas.* 3, 7. Suet., *Tib.* 73 cannot be used as supporting evidence, since Suetonius is probably citing the younger Seneca, see below pp. 9–10. Some support, however, comes from the fact that he outlived Cassius Severus, described in the past tense in the preface to *Controversiae*, Bk. III. Jerome (*Chron.* Ol. 202, p. 176b) puts his death in the 25th year of his exile in A.D. 32. R. Helm, 'Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik', *Philol. Suppl.* XXI, 2 (1929), 75, argued that the exile began in A.D. 12 (Suet., *Gaius* 16; Dio LVI, 27, 1; Tacitus, *Ann.* I, 72) and Jerome's figure of 25 years was more likely to be right than his year of death; that puts the death of Cassius Severus in A.D. 37. For his conviction, see further n. 158 below.

<sup>44</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 10; *Suas.* 6, 19; 23. Seneca could, of course have read the works in a private copy (*Cons. Marc.* I, 3–4) but he could hardly have hoped to publish excerpts while the works were under an imperial ban. While Tiberius lived there was little hope that the ban would be lifted and Seneca was too old to count on outliving Tiberius and publishing after his death.

<sup>45</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* IV, 35, 5; Suet., *Gaius* 16.

<sup>46</sup> See below, p. 8; *Cons. Helu.* 2, 4–5.

The only positive evidence for his date of birth is the well-known passage in the preface to Book I of the *Controversiae* :

Omnes autem magni in eloquentia nominis, excepto Cicerone, videbar audisse nec Ciceronem quidem aetas mihi eripuerat, sed bellorum civilium furor, qui tunc orbem totum pervagabatur, intra coloniam meam me continuit : alioqui in illo atriolo, in quo duos grandes praetextatos ait secum declamasse, potui adesse . . . (11)

The teaching sessions here referred to are, of course, those attended by Hirtius and Pansa, in April and May of 44 B.C., when Cicero was virtually in retirement.<sup>47</sup>

It is perhaps worth stating first what this passage does *not* prove. By saying that he was old enough to have heard Cicero declaim at home, Seneca does *not* imply that he was too young to have heard him in public delivering the *Philippics*<sup>48</sup> : only Cicero the declaimer, not Cicero the orator, is relevant to Seneca's point that he is qualified to record the hitherto unrecorded *facunde dicta* of the *maximi declamatores* because he has heard nearly all of them except Cicero. Nor, on the other hand, does Seneca necessarily mean that he was old enough to start his rhetorical studies when Cicero was giving lessons, an assumption that would give us the limits 61-55 for Seneca's birth, as children generally left the *grammaticus* between 11 and 16.<sup>49</sup> Not only does his survival after A.D. 37 make a birth date much before 50 B.C. unlikely, but the mood of the passage precludes pressing it so hard. Seneca cannot be completely serious, when he says that if not for the Civil Wars, he, a young hopeful from Spain, could have studied with Cicero. Like his description of Cicero's teaching ' duos grandes praetextatos ', taken from a lost letter of Cicero,<sup>50</sup> the remark about himself is facetious. Probably he means no more than that, as far as age went, he could have heard Cicero in 44 B.C. Since he may have taken it as normal to go to Rome very young,<sup>51</sup> all we can fairly conclude is that the Elder Seneca was born about 50 B.C. and died about A.D. 39.

Seneca, then, was a child when the Civil Wars began, and a young man in his twenties when they finished. Corduba was deeply involved in the war, but in a fashion too complicated to justify the common assumption that the Seneca family had Pompeian sympathies (see below, p. 13 ff.). If they existed, they were probably short-lived, for Corduba seems the likely place of origin for that friendship with Asinius Pollio that the promising young man later enjoyed in Rome. The evidence for this relationship is Seneca's statement that, although Pollio never declaimed ' *admissa multitudo* ', he heard him ' *et viridem et postea iam senem, cum Marcello Aesernino nepoti suo quasi praeciperet.*'<sup>52</sup> These private performances of Pollio (the later ones probably at home) must all belong to the period of retirement after his triumph in 39 or 38 B.C. and Seneca must have heard him first in the 30's, though *viridem* is hardly precise. That was quite an honour for a young provincial, and craves an explanation. Pollio may have known the family in Hispania Ulterior whither he was sent by Caesar in 44 to deal with Sextus Pompey. He spent the spring of 43 in Corduba virtually *incommunicado*, surrounded by *latrones* and beguiling his enforced idleness by writing historical tragedy.<sup>53</sup> He will have had time to meet some of the prominent families of Corduba and to have developed his interest in the literary accomplishments of men from that province. It was a lasting interest. Pollio in Rome gave detailed criticisms of Porcius Latro's declamations and was invited by Messala Corvinus to hear the Corduban poet Sextilius Ena.<sup>54</sup> It is true that Pollio criticized Latro harshly and disliked the poem because

<sup>47</sup> S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation* (1949), 31.

<sup>48</sup> This inference is made by Edwards, *The Suasoriae of the Elder Seneca* xxiv, who derives from it a birth date c. 50.

<sup>49</sup> This assumption is made both by H. Bornecque, *Les Déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque Le Père* (1902), 10, and by H. de la Ville de Mirmont, ' Les Déclamateurs Espagnols au temps d'Auguste ', *Bulletin Hispanique* xii, 1910, 1 ff., though they come to different conclusions about Seneca's birth. Bornecque's limits of 58-55 are better, though based on his belief that Hirtius and Pansa were practising in 43; those of la Ville de Mirmont, i.e. 63-59, rest on the assumption that 15 to 17 was the normal age for learning rhetoric.

But Persius at least started at 11/12, according to the *Vita Persi*. 55 appears to be the standard date for Seneca's birth now, e.g. A. Momigliano, *Quarto Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici* 242.

<sup>50</sup> As is shown by ' *ait secum declamasse* '. In the surviving letters Cicero is often facetious, calling his friends *discipuli* and himself *magister* (*Att.* xiv, 22, 1; *Fam.* ix, 16, 7.)

<sup>51</sup> See below p. 6.

<sup>52</sup> *Contr.* iv, pref. 2-4. The passage following shows that more than two occasions are meant, against the contention of R. Hess, *Quaestiones Annaeanae* (1898), 33.

<sup>53</sup> Cicero, *Fam.* x, 31-33.

<sup>54</sup> *Contr.* ii, 3, 13; iv, 6, 3; *Suas.* 6, 27.

it praised Cicero, but one need not conclude that he did not like Spaniards.<sup>55</sup> Pollio criticized everyone harshly ;<sup>56</sup> it is more significant that he listened. To the end of his life, though Seneca had reservations about Pollio's declamatory style and disagreed with his assessment of Cicero, he maintained a great admiration for his historical writing, his iron self-control<sup>57</sup> and that passionate insistence on free speech which Seneca shared.<sup>58</sup>

As an *eques*, Seneca was one of many wealthy men in Baetica : Strabo tells us that in his day Gades alone had five hundred men assessed as *equites*, a number unequalled by any Italian city except Patavium.<sup>59</sup> There were many ways to amass wealth in Southern Spain. Along the coast were factories for salting fish, above Corduba in the Sierra Morena were mines producing gold, silver, lead, Rome's entire imported supply of cinnabar, and copper of unsurpassed quality.<sup>60</sup> Many of these mines were run for the state by *publicani*, some were privately owned.<sup>61</sup> Finally, the region around Corduba was noted for its fertility : Strabo describes the banks of the Baetis as covered with groves and gardens. The area did a thriving export trade in wheat, olive oil and wine.<sup>62</sup> Seneca does not tell us the source of his wealth. His friend Clodius Turrinus had lost his father's fortune in the Civil Wars and repaired the loss by his eloquence as an advocate in Spain.<sup>63</sup> Seneca's long periods of absence from Spain make it unlikely that he followed that profession at home, nor is there the slightest reason to believe that he taught rhetoric at Rome.<sup>64</sup> His son, the philosopher Seneca, reveals that he and his brothers owed their wealth to him, and that their mother administered her sons' *patrimonia*.<sup>65</sup> That is a valuable clue, for, whereas it is difficult to imagine her managing an export business or mines, she could have supervised vineyards or olive groves.<sup>66</sup> Some indirect confirmation comes from the great interest of her philosophical son in 'scientific agriculture'. He took a personal interest in his Italian estates and bought the one at Nomentum for its remarkable vineyards, which continued their rich yield under his management. As an old man he was still eager to learn about transplanting trees and transferring vines.<sup>67</sup> He may have inherited his knowledge and interest from his parents.

Seneca *père* blamed the Civil Wars for his failure to come to Rome before the death of Cicero. In normal times, he would probably have been sent there at least in time for studies with a *grammaticus* : long before he was born Cicero had been able to ridicule the pretensions of a Sicilian to prosecute in a Roman court because he had learned his *litteras Latinas* at Lilybaeum instead of Rome, and Seneca's son was brought to Rome as a small boy and his grandson as an infant of eight months.<sup>68</sup> The only detail he gives us of this stage of his education is that his school, which we may assume was in Corduba, had about 200 pupils, whom he treated to displays of his extraordinary powers of memory.<sup>69</sup> After leaving the *grammaticus*, Seneca and his friend Porcius Latro studied rhetoric with a certain Marullus, of whom they had no very high opinion. Seneca does not tell us where the school was, but it was probably in Rome,<sup>70</sup> for schools of Latin rhetoric are not attested in the provinces until the Augustan period. But Marullus, like his two pupils, may have come from Spain.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>55</sup> As does La Ville de Mirmont, *Bull. Hisp.* xv (1913), 159.

<sup>56</sup> *Contr.* iv, pref. 3.

<sup>57</sup> *Suas.* 6, 25; *Contr.* iv, pref. 5-6.

<sup>58</sup> It was probably in his *atrium libertatis* that Pollio instituted formal public recitations (A. Dalzell, 'Asinius Pollio and recitations at Rome', *Hermathena* lxxxvi (1955), 20-28). There he read the history in which he praised Brutus and Cassius.

<sup>59</sup> III, 5, 3. His connections in high places suggest that he was not merely an *eques* by census, but *equeo publico*. There is no proof.

<sup>60</sup> Pliny, *NH* xxxiii, 118; xxxiv, 4.

<sup>61</sup> Pliny, *NH* xxxiii, 118; xxxiv, 165; Sextus Marius owned the famous copper and gold mines near Corduba (Tacitus, *Ann.* vi, 19). For silver, p. 2, n. 18.

<sup>62</sup> Strabo III, 2, 6.

<sup>63</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 16. The passage does not show that he ran a school of rhetoric (cf. La Ville de Mirmont, *Bull. Hisp.* xv (1913), 155). His interest in declamation (*Contr.* x, pref. 15) would be natural in a professional advocate.

<sup>64</sup> If he had, some reference to his pupils, some

anecdote about a distinguished visitor to his school would surely have appeared even in the incomplete version of his work that we have, though modesty might have prevented him from quoting his own *sententiae*.

<sup>65</sup> *Cons. Helv.* 14, 3.

<sup>66</sup> Compare the supervision of Agricola's estates in Narbonensis by his mother after the death of his father (Tacitus, *Agric.* 7, 2).

<sup>67</sup> Pliny, *NH* xiv, 51; Columella, *RR* III, 3, 3; *NQ* III, 7, 1; *Ep.* 112, 1; 12, 1 ff.; 86, 14 ff.

<sup>68</sup> Cicero, *Div. in Caec.* 39; *Cons. Helv.* 19; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 611.

<sup>69</sup> *Contr.* 1, pref. 2. Suet. *Gramm.* 3 reports that in the first century B.C. the study of *grammatica* had penetrated the provinces.

<sup>70</sup> *Contr.* 1, pref. 22. Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 179.

<sup>71</sup> The name is found frequently, though not exclusively, in Spain, e.g. *CIL* II, 2144, 2150, 4332, 3265, 1995. The name of Hadrian's ancestor, Aelius Marullinus is a variant. Marullus occurs as the name of a local magistrate at Osca, Grant (above, n. 3), 167-8.

It is usually assumed that Seneca would only have been detained in Corduba by the war until 42 B.C., when Sextus Pompey left Spain. But Sextus menaced the sea to the west of Italy until his defeat, so that Seneca and Latro may not have arrived until after 36. His rhetorical education might therefore have been slightly delayed by the war, but at fourteen or so he could still describe himself as *puer*.<sup>72</sup> In fact, none of the incidents that Seneca recounts at first hand need be placed before this date: the earliest, Pollio declaiming in his prime, belongs after 38, as we have seen.

This visit to Rome was a long one, for Seneca tells us that the task his sons have set him of reporting the best sayings of the declaimers of his time, meant, for the most part, going back to the memories of the 'best years of his life', when his memory was keenest.<sup>73</sup> His numerous citations of Marullus, Porcius Latro, Arellius Fuscus, Albucius Silus, and Rubellius Blandus will date from the earlier part of Augustus' reign. Around 30 B.C. he heard the boy Ovid declaim before Arellius Fuscus.<sup>74</sup> Some time before, but not long before 9 B.C., when Passienus died, he had a conversation with Cassius Severus.<sup>75</sup> At this period, he clearly enjoyed access to the best literary circles, as is illustrated in the charming story of his visit to Messalla Corvinus, in company with his young friend Junius Gallio, an intimate of Ovid's, to report on the maiden speech of the declaimer Nicetes.<sup>76</sup> Not long afterwards he returned to Spain.

Some time between 4 and 1 B.C., the younger Lucius Annaeus Seneca was born in Spain.<sup>77</sup> A first son Annaeus Novatus had probably already been born there,<sup>78</sup> so that a date around 8 B.C. for Seneca's return to Corduba will not be far wrong. While there, he lost his friend Porcius Latro, who took his own life, according to Jerome, in 4 B.C.<sup>79</sup> Earlier, on this same visit home, Seneca heard Latro defend his relative Porcius Rusticus, in a performance that discredited declamation as a method of training advocates; Latro was so flustered that he opened with a solecism.<sup>80</sup> Of Seneca's wife we know only what his son reveals in the *Consolatio* he wrote to his mother when he was in exile: her name was Helvia and she was an only child (18,9). She had lost her mother at birth and had been brought up *strictly* by a stepmother (2,4; 16,3). She was probably a good deal younger than her husband, for in A.D. 41-9, when the Consolation was written, her father was still alive (18,9). Her family was probably wealthy, since her generosity to her sons while still a *filia familias* (14,3) can only be explained by a considerable dowry. That Helvia was brought up in a family of some social standing is suggested by the marriage of her step-sister<sup>81</sup> into a prominent family of Ariminum: her husband, C. Galerius, eventually became Prefect of

<sup>72</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 3.

<sup>73</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 1, 3.

<sup>74</sup> *Contr.* II, 2, 8. For the date, see Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 188.

<sup>75</sup> *Contr.* III, pref. The date of Passienus' death is Jerome's and therefore far from certain. But the anecdote in any case belongs around this time, as Passienus is said by Cassius (14) to be the orator 'qui nunc primo loco stat' in comparison with Asinius Pollio and Messalla Corvinus, who must then have been past their prime. Evidence for Seneca's stay in Rome is often found in his account of Latro's *faux pas* in 17 B.C. (*Contr.* II, 4, 13), but there is no reason to assume Seneca's presence. Despite his claim to be reporting from memory what the declaimers said (*Contr.* I, pref. 4-5) he reports sayings known only through others (e.g. the remarks of certain Greek rhetors (*Contr.* I, 2, 23; I, 8, 15; X, 5, 26; *Suas.* 2, 11; 2, 14) and of Marcus Marcellus (*Contr.* IX, 4, 15; IX, 5, 14; IX, 6, 18) on which see Bornecque, 29. Notice also *Contr.* IX, 4, 20—a speech before the *senate* which he introduces with 'dixisse memini'). Usually, only the presence of an *audivi* or *memini* with the present infinitive can guarantee that a report is first-hand (Madvig, *Latin Grammar*, chap. 7, para. 408, obs. 2).

<sup>76</sup> *Suas.* 3, 6.

<sup>77</sup> For the place, *Cons. Helv.* 19, 2; evidence for the date in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 617.

<sup>78</sup> Novatus is always named first in the dedications to the various books. That this fact shows that he was the oldest son is suggested by the case of Mela, who is always named last and who was clearly the youngest of the three, the one whose future is not yet decided, who is still studying in *Contr.* II, pref. 3. Statius, *Silvae*, II, 7, 30 may show that Novatus was also born in Spain (see below, n. 131). The *praenomen* of Novatus is unknown, of Mela uncertain as between Marcus and Lucius (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 613). The younger Seneca gives his own, Lucius (*Benef.* IV, 8, 3).

<sup>79</sup> Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 188-89.

<sup>80</sup> *Contr.* IX, pref. 3. Votienus Montanus introduces the story: 'hoc quod vulgo narratur, an verum sit, tu melius potes scire,' which shows that Seneca was present.

<sup>81</sup> We know of her only from *Cons. Helv.* 19 where she is called *soror*, and her husband *avunculus noster*. She cannot be Helvia's sister, in the strict sense, as Helvia was her father's only child (18, 9). Another possibility is that she was an uterine sister by the mother in an earlier marriage. The use of *avunculus* here to mean aunt's husband is unparalleled (this passage is the only exception in *TLL*, II, 1609, II): 'carissimum virum . . . avunculum nostrum' (19,4) may conceal some double relationship.

Egypt for sixteen years.<sup>82</sup> The origins of Helvia's father are not revealed by the name : common enough in Spain, it is also found all over Italy, and if Helvius was born in Spain, he could have been *Hispanus* or *Hispaniensis*.<sup>83</sup> It is likely at any rate that he brought up his daughter in Spain : Seneca would hardly have brought back an Italian wife to Corduba when he himself had probably been away for over twenty years and then left her there to manage the family estates, while he returned to Rome with his sons.

Seneca was back in Rome before A.D. 5, in time to hear Asinius Pollio as an old man instructing his grandson. This visit too was probably long, though it may not have been uninterrupted. Of his reminiscences, some at least of the performances by Asellius Sabinus, Vibius Rufus, and Junius Otho must belong to the later years of Augustus or to Tiberius' reign.<sup>84</sup> He was a member of the audience that disapproved of the brutality with which Cestius Pius criticized the young Quinctilius Varus, ' tunc Germanici gener adhuc praetextatus ', comparing his negligence in speaking with his father's in fighting. The incident cannot be earlier than A.D. 16.<sup>85</sup> Seneca was probably in the city when someone in the senate, probably Gallio, told him how Asellius Sabinus delivered a long speech asking why the *Seiamiani* in prison were living in style while he was kept starving. With his sons, he went to hear the rhetorician Musa, of whom he had a lower opinion than Mela. Shortly before A.D. 33, they all went to hear Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus declaim at the house of Marcus Lepidus.<sup>86</sup>

How often the Elder Seneca returned to Spain in these years we cannot tell. His friendship with the Spanish declaimers Gavius Silo and Clodius Turrinus, neither of whom came to Rome, could belong principally to the years before his second visit to Rome, since the only item of any chronological significance that he clearly reports at first-hand is the continual sparring between Porcius Latro and Turrinus over the proper use of *colores*.<sup>87</sup> Nonetheless, we can guess that he made short visits home, for the journey from Rome to Corduba could be made within twenty days.<sup>88</sup> If he was still alive, he probably returned for the birth of Mela's son Lucan in November of 39, and died there about a year later when all his sons were absent from Spain.<sup>89</sup> ' Tibi luctus nuntiatum est omnibus quidem absentibus liberis ': this reference to Seneca's death in his son's *Consolatio ad Helviam Matrem* (2,5) is usually taken to mean that he died away from Spain, for Helvia was clearly there at the time, and it is inferred from *nuntiatum* that he was not.<sup>90</sup> But *nuntiatum* might only prove that his wife was not actually with him at the moment of death, which does not preclude his dying in Corduba. In fact, in the previous sentence, the loss of an absent uncle ' cum adventum eius expectares, amisisti ' is contrasted with that of her husband ' intra tricenisimum diem . . . extulisti ', which suggests that ' extulisti ' indicates that Helvia was present at her husband's funeral, or at least arranged for it : the word in its metaphorical extension means to kill, not to lose.<sup>91</sup> Finally, since the passage is an enumeration of all of Helvia's woes previous to her son's exile, the death of her husband *in absence* would have been explicitly mentioned.

<sup>82</sup> The identification of C. Galerius (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> G 25) with Seneca's uncle in *Cons. Helv.* 19, 2-7 was first made by L. Cantarelli in *Röm. Mitt.* XIX (1904), 15-22. The family origin was identified by E. Birley, *Gnomon* XXIII (1951), 443.

<sup>83</sup> La Ville de Mirmont, *Bull. Hisp.* XIV (1912), 20 suggested that the name derived from M. Helvius, a general in Hispania Ulterior in 197 B.C. The cognomen of Helvia's father is unknown—perhaps Novatus, which would explain the cognomen given to Seneca's oldest son : Mela's son Lucan derived his cognomen from his maternal grandfather, Acilius Lucanus, and Helvii Novati are attested in an inscription seen in Baetica *CIL* II, 999.

<sup>84</sup> For Asellius Sabinus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1213), *Contr.* IX, 4, 20 gives an indication of date. Vibius Rufus (*PIR* V 396) was consul in A.D. 16, Junius Otho (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 788) was made a praetor by Sejanus (*Tac., Ann.* III, 66).

<sup>85</sup> *Contr.* 1, 3, 10. Unless one of the two infants who died (*Suet., Gaius* 7) was female, Germanicus' eldest daughter was born in A.D. 15 so that, even if betrothal to an infant is meant, A.D. 16 is the earliest

possible date. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 674 date the incident to after A.D. 18, the birth of the youngest daughter.

<sup>86</sup> *Contr.* IX, 4, 20; *Contr.* X, pref. 9. *Contr.* X, pref. 3. (This man, the *praeceptor* of Germanicus' son Nero according to *Contr.* II, 3, 23 is more likely to be M. Lepidus, *cos.* A.D. 6, than M.' Lepidus, *cos.* A.D. 11, for M. Lepidus' daughter was married to Nero's younger brother (*Tacitus, Ann.* VI, 40 and Syme, *JRS* 1955: *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (1970), 44-5). M. Lepidus died in A.D. 33 (*Tacitus Ann.* VI, 27); ' novissime ' puts the incident shortly before that.

<sup>87</sup> *Contr.* X, pref. 13, 15-16. Latro died in 4 B.C.

<sup>88</sup> Helvia or a messenger made the journey in about that time (*Cons. Helv.* 2, 5, cf. 15, 2).

<sup>89</sup> Seneca, and probably Novatus too, were senators in 39 and preparing to stand for office in 37 and 38. Mela may well have been in Rome before Lucan's birth, returning there with his son in the summer of 40 (Vacca Life).

<sup>90</sup> Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 12 and La Ville de Mirmont, *Bull. Hisp.* XIV (1912), 11 think he was on a voyage to Spain.

<sup>91</sup> *TLL* V, 2, p. 142, 34.

## III

Seneca had enjoyed hearing the professors of rhetoric declaim in their schools and elsewhere, before glittering audiences.<sup>92</sup> He had also enjoyed the literary criticism, often malicious, that followed these performances. But, although he continued in his old age to hear declaimers, it was clearly not the sole or principal occupation of his maturity, for he regarded the composition of the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* as a chance to relive his 'iuvenilia studia'. By the time he was nearing the end of the *Controversiae*, he felt not only bored but ashamed: 'iam me pudet, tamquam diu non seriam rem agam.'<sup>93</sup>

What was the *seria res* that occupied him after his studies? Seneca himself never tells us. The cognomen 'Rhetor', introduced by early editors to distinguish his works from those of his son, rests on no ancient evidence and does not correspond to fact (above, p. 6). We can also rule out the possibility of his having held high office in Corduba. In the *Controversiae*, Seneca reports that he once asked Cassius Severus why he was never as impressive in declamation as in pleading. In the course of his reply, Cassius said, 'Cum in foro dico, aliquid ago; cum declamo, id quod bellissime Censorinus aiebat de his qui honores in municipiis ambitiose peterent, videor mihi in somniis laborasse.' It is true that tact was not Cassius' strong point, but persuasiveness was, and he could not have hoped to prove the futility of declamation to a municipal dignitary by adducing such a parallel.<sup>94</sup>

One conjecture commonly offered<sup>95</sup> is that Seneca was a financial procurator like his son Mela, probably in Spain. There is no evidence for this whatsoever, except that the pattern of a father in the equestrian imperial service with sons in the senate is a common one. But Seneca's sons had an uncle who was Prefect of Egypt, so that no procuratorship need be assumed for their father. Seneca describes Mela as 'paterno contentus ordine', but indicates that his own early ambitions were realised in his two older sons who 'foro . . . se et honoribus parant, in quibus ipsa quae sperantur timenda sunt', adding 'ego quoque eius alioqui processus avidus, et hortator laudatorque vel periculosae, cum honestae modo, industriae, duobus filiis navigantibus, te in portu retineo.'<sup>96</sup> This remark makes it clear that Seneca had once wished to rise above his rank, and had encouraged his sons in that direction. He probably neither held nor desired a procuratorial position. We may conclude that he lived as a gentleman on the income from his estates, perhaps, like Latro, pleading occasional cases on rare visits to Spain, but otherwise devoting himself to literary pursuits.

The *seria res* then can only be the 'historia ab initio bellorum civilium, unde primum veritas retro abiit, paene usque ad mortis suae diem', as the work is described in the fragment of his son's *De Vita Patris*.<sup>97</sup> Seneca's interest in history could be guessed from the zeal with which he quotes various historical accounts of Cicero's death, hoping to persuade his sons 'ut his sententiis lectis solidis et verum habentibus a scholasticis recedatis'.<sup>98</sup> Though sometimes inaccurate in citing historical facts<sup>99</sup> or in assigning remarks to historians,<sup>100</sup> Seneca had clearly studied the technique of writing history<sup>101</sup> and enjoyed the opportunity for historical digression.<sup>102</sup>

The fragment of his son's biography proves that the history was not published in Seneca's lifetime and that he was still working on it in his last years.<sup>103</sup> It also strongly suggests that the history started with the civil wars that killed the Republic, the wars after which truth could be said to have disappeared.<sup>104</sup> Perhaps it began with the clash between

<sup>92</sup> For the type of occasion on which Seneca heard the teachers, 'no mere gathering of school-boys', see Bonner, o.c. (n. 47), 39-40. The excellent discussion in this book of the declaimers has induced me to concentrate here on other aspects of Seneca's life and work.

<sup>93</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 1.

<sup>94</sup> *Contr.* III, pref. 12. For the notion that indifference to municipal office was not uncommon in Spain see J. J. van Nostrand, 'Roman Spain' in *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* III (1937), 211-212 commenting on Chap. 51 of the *Lex Municipii Malacitani* (ILS 6089); Rostovzeff, *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup> 215 adduced the poverty and the slow growth of a city *bourgeoisie*—hardly applicable to Corduba.

<sup>95</sup> e.g. by O. Rossbach, P-W I, 2237; Bornecque, 13; R. Waltz, *La Vie politique de Sénèque* (1909), 21.

<sup>96</sup> *Contr.* II, pref. 3-4.

<sup>97</sup> Seneca, *Fr.* 99 Haase.

<sup>98</sup> *Suas.* 6, 16 ff.

<sup>99</sup> *Suas.* 1, 5. See Edwards, *Suasoriae* ad. loc., pp. 91-2.

<sup>100</sup> *Suas.* 2, 11. contains an erroneous attribution to Herodotus; *Contr.* IX, 1, 13 one to Thucydides.

<sup>101</sup> Note *Suas.* 6, 21 on the 'quasi funebris laudatio' invented by Thucydides.

<sup>102</sup> *Suas.* 1, 7.

<sup>103</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 5. 'seriam rem agenti' may also show that his work on the history was contemporary with that on his rhetorical treatise.

<sup>104</sup> For the debate on the meaning of *bella civilia*, see Peter, *HRR* II (1906), cxviii. For the use assumed here, see Suet., *Claudius*, 41, 2 and Seneca's own usage in *Contr.* I, pref. 11.

Caesar and Pompey. The death of Cicero must have been included, for Seneca not only collected historical accounts of the event, but sifted them for the identity of Cicero's murderer.<sup>105</sup> No certain fragments of these histories survives. The two passages regularly assigned to this work, i.e. Lactantius, *Inst. Div.* 7, 15, 14 and Suetonius, *Tiberius* 73, are both more likely to come from the lost works of his more famous son, attributed as they are to 'Seneca' *tout court*. That the son did not write history<sup>106</sup> is no obstacle: the Lactantius passage comparing the periods of Rome's history to the stages in the life of man suits the philosophical son better than the unspeculative father,<sup>107</sup> while the description of the dying Emperor clutching his ring and still trying to issue orders sounds like a moral *exemplum*.<sup>108</sup> Suetonius thought he was citing the philosopher, nor is he likely to have confused their works, since knowledge of the fact that there were two literary Senecas can hardly have disappeared between Martial's day and Suetonius'.<sup>109</sup> Yet it has been argued that, since Suetonius in his *Nero* introduces the son as Annaeus Seneca (7, 1), and refers to him thereafter in that work as 'Seneca praeceptor' (35, 5; 52), his simple references to 'Seneca' do refer to the father.<sup>110</sup> That would secure for Seneca *père* not only the description of the death of Tiberius for his *historiae*, but also the story about Julius Montanus in the *Vergil* 29 (as preserved by Donatus) for his rhetorical works, and the adverse imperial judgment on 'Seneca's' style in *Gaius* 53. But the latter must surely refer to the son, of whose eloquence Caligula was said to have been jealous.<sup>111</sup> Even the remark about Julius Montanus could just as easily belong to the younger Seneca who mentions Montanus in his letters.<sup>112</sup> He should certainly inherit *Tiberius* 73.

The lack of fragments does not in itself prove that the history was never published. We probably have no actual citations from the rhetorical works either,<sup>113</sup> yet they were published and used.<sup>114</sup> On the other hand, there is nothing to prove that the history was published or used.<sup>115</sup> In the fragment of his *De Vita Patris*, the younger Seneca shows that he has not yet published the work but intends to publish it at some later date, meanwhile regarding the biography as an alternative means of assuring his father's fame: 'si quaecumque composuit pater meus et edi voluit, iam in manus populi emissem, ad claritatem nominis sui satis sibi ipse prospexerat . . .' If he never published them, we can only guess the reasons. Despite the fuss made about the restoration of free speech, the work of Cremutius Cordus was re-issued in a softened version:<sup>116</sup> Seneca may have feared the consequences to himself and his brothers of some acrid remarks about the living or of an anti-imperial bias (though it would then seem odd that he indicated this characteristic of

<sup>105</sup> *Suas.* 6, 14 ff.; *Contr.* VII, 2, 8.

<sup>106</sup> Quintilian in listing Seneca's work (X, 1, 29) does not mention history.

<sup>107</sup> Haase, *fr.* 99 n; Peter, *HRR* II, 91. For the Lactantius fragment, see Note B.

<sup>108</sup> A. Klotz, who first put the case for non-publication in full and convincing form (*Rh. Mus.* LVI (1901), 429), subsequently revised his view that no fragment of the history survives, and in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1909, 1527 admitted Suet., *Tib.* 73, because, he said, it did not fit with the philosopher's consistently hostile view of Caligula, but by exonerating Gaius from the charge of suffocating Tiberius justified his accession. In fact, the story only rules out one form of murder by Gaius, for it is perfectly consistent with the other rumours of slow poison or starvation in Suetonius. It sounds like one of the philosopher's moral *exempla* (cf. *Brev. Vit.* 20, 3), and accords well with his dislike of Tiberius.

<sup>109</sup> Martial, *Epig.* I, 61, 7; IV, 40.

<sup>110</sup> A. Grisart, 'Suétone et les deux Sénèques', *Helikon* I (1961), 302.

<sup>111</sup> Dio LIX, 19, 7.

<sup>112</sup> *Ep.* 122, 11. He is mentioned by the Elder Seneca in *Contr.* VII, 1, 27.

<sup>113</sup> The passage about Julius Montanus in the life of Vergil, is the likeliest candidate for a fragment. Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 30 has rightly assigned Quintilian IX, 2, 98, to the son; VIII, 3, 31 which Haase (*fr.* 99 note) also assigned to the father certainly belongs to the son, who was contemporary

with Pomponius the tragedian. Bornecque allowed that Quintilian IX, 2, 42 might be a citation from a *controversia* delivered by the Elder Seneca, but the son must also have declaimed in the period when he was a prominent orator.

<sup>114</sup> Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 30-32. Winterbottom (*OCT* Quintilian II, p. 508), notes the similarity of Quintilian IX, 2, 91 and *Contr.* II, 3, 6 which Quintilian may have used; but the scepticism of Bornecque, 25 seems justified.

<sup>115</sup> I. Hahn, 'Appien et le cercle de Sénèque', *Acta Antiqua* XII (1964), 169 ff. has renewed the theories of Rossbach and Piganiol, who thought that Seneca's history was a major source for Florus and Appian respectively. His case rests on three suppositions, all of which are dubious: (1) that the Lactantius fragment is the work of the Elder Seneca; (2) that the history treated of *bella civilia* from at least the struggle of Marius and Sulla; (3) that similar ideas and expressions common to either or both of the authors and Lucan and/or the younger Seneca go back to the history of the Elder Seneca. But these are explicable either as direct borrowings from the poet and philosopher or as part of the fund of phrases and arguments developed in the rhetorical schools, where the figures of Sulla, Pompey, Cato and Cicero figured often in declamations. (1) and (2) are dealt with below in Note B and above n. 104.

<sup>116</sup> Quintilian X, 1, 104. (The emendation of Nipperdey which gives us 'Cremutius' in the text is virtually certain).

them in the biography).<sup>117</sup> It is more likely that he thought them lacking in stylistic merit or otherwise unable to compete with the recently re-issued history of Cremutius Cordus, who had covered the same period with at least as much *veritas*. Later on he may have hesitated to publish a rival work to the Emperor Claudius' account of the period.<sup>118</sup>

When were the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* published? The sentence quoted above from the biography does not of course show that they were not then in circulation. It might only mean that these works were not among those Seneca asked his son to publish and not those expected to bring him glory. After all, *commentarii*<sup>119</sup> on the declaimers of the last generation can only have had a limited appeal. Seneca himself would have regarded his historical work as his real contribution. If the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* were not among the books he wanted to be published after his death, they must have been published by his son after his death without his authorization, or he must already have published them himself. The latter is the more likely alternative, as he certainly intended from the start that his work would reach the public.<sup>120</sup> As is commonly noted,<sup>121</sup> the work was not started until 37: passages datable to the period after Tiberius' reign occur not only in the *Suasoriae*, which were written after the *Controversiae*, but in the third book of the *Controversiae*, which was written early.<sup>122</sup> (The many cross-references show that Seneca wrote the work in the order in which we read it.) Nor is there anything in the work that need have been written before that date. Seneca may have written it quickly and published it early in the reign of Gaius when free speech was in vogue, and one could safely issue an attack on book-burning<sup>123</sup> and praise the recently revived works of Cassius Severus and Cremutius Cordus. Not that the work would have been altogether pleasing to Gaius, since the author makes evident his admiration for Vergil and Livy whose works the emperor thought of removing from the libraries.<sup>124</sup>

History was a traditional consolation for men suffering enforced *otium* from public life. Why did Seneca fail in his early ambitions for a public career? He had powerful friends: Asinius Pollio and Messala Corvinus could have helped him. His independence of thought was not necessarily against him. It is true that some provincial senators were known for flattery and opportunism: Domitius Afer worked for Sejanus and flattered Gaius;<sup>125</sup> Junius Gallio wrote in defence of Maecenas' favourite and played up to Tiberius—once too often, as it turned out.<sup>126</sup> But in contrast to these and the repulsive Togonius Gallus<sup>127</sup> stands Julius Graecinus, who reached the praetorship but finally paid for his courage with his life.<sup>128</sup>

For provincials, Seneca's may have been a lost generation between two successful ones.<sup>128a</sup> Caesar had put a Decidius Saxa into the Senate as a reward for his military services, and perhaps the father of the Titii Hispani for similar reasons. Caesar or the triumvirs put Aelius Marullinus of Italica in the Senate.<sup>129</sup> It was left to the triumvirs to honour Cornelius Balbus, the wily *equus* from Gades who had served both Pompey and Caesar and ended as a supporter of Octavian, with a consulate, but his nephew's quaestorship in 44 came from the Dictator. The Greek Pompeius Macer, praetor in A.D. 15, had the foundations of his career under Augustus laid by his ancestors—men like the two Balbi, with Pompeian and triumviral connections.<sup>130</sup> War, especially civil war, accelerates social change. A period of consolidation followed. Seneca was an old man when the next wave of provincials entered the Senate, in the reign of Tiberius or shortly before: Junius Gallio from

<sup>117</sup> H. Schendel, *Quibus auctoribus Romanis L. Annaeus Seneca in rebus patris usus sit* (1908), 50.

<sup>118</sup> Even in the softened version of Cremutius Cordus, the author's *audaces sententiae* were there. For Claudius, see Suet., *Claud.* 41, 2: two volumes of *historiae post caedem Caesaris dictatoris*, forty-one *a pace civili*.

<sup>119</sup> As he calls them in *Contr.* 1, pref. 11.

<sup>120</sup> *Contr.* 1, pref. 10.

<sup>121</sup> Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 24–5. Edwards (above, n. 48), xxvi–xxvii does not prove that the compositions started many years before publication.

<sup>122</sup> Above, p. 4, nn. 43–44. Bornecque, 24.

<sup>123</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 5.

<sup>124</sup> *Suas.* 3, 5; 6, 22: Suet., *Gaius* 34 2.

<sup>125</sup> Tac., *Ann.* iv, 52, 66; Dio LIX, 19.

<sup>126</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 8; Tacitus, *Ann.* vi, 3.

<sup>127</sup> *Ann.* vi, 2. On his origins, Syme, *Tacitus* 563, n. 5.

<sup>128</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 344.

<sup>128a</sup> For the rhythm, see now T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* 139 B.C.–A.D. 14 (1971), 8–12.

<sup>129</sup> Syme, 'Caesar, the Senate, and Italy', *PBSR* XIV (1938), 14; Tacitus 603 (warning against excessive confidence in SHA *Hadr.* 1, 2). For other possible Caesarian provincial senators, see Wiseman, o.c. 8, n. 7.

<sup>130</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup>C 1331; Levick, o.c. (n. 33), 107, n. 5.

Baetica, Curvius Silvinus, Domitius Afer, Valerius Asiaticus, and Julius Graecinus from Narbonensis, L. Pedanius Secundus and Antonius Silo from Tarraconensis.<sup>131</sup>

Seneca did not become bitter. Indeed the last years of Tiberius left him with doubts about the wisdom of choosing a public career. His older sons were set in that direction; Mela, the most gifted, he would keep in harbour.

#### IV

For the Spanish poet of Bilbilis, the two Senecas and Lucan were the glories of Corduba.<sup>132</sup> How far was the Elder Seneca conscious of his origins? What difference did it make to his life and character, his thoughts and opinions that he was born in Baetica rather than in Italy?

First, it is clear that Seneca's ties with Spain remained close—despite his long absences, his lack of interest in municipal office and his senatorial ambitions, later transferred to his two sons. After nearly twenty years in Rome, he returned home to marry and produce a family. When he returned to Rome to look after the education of his sons he had under his charge also the son of his friend Clodius Turrinus who had stayed in Corduba.<sup>133</sup> And we have argued that Seneca probably died in Corduba.

A great attachment to his Spanish friends is manifest in the surviving work. He was glad that the request of his sons for samples of early declamation would give him the excuse to bring up again and again the career of his close friend Porcius Latro, to whom the preface of Book I is largely devoted.<sup>134</sup> He also took the opportunity to rescue from oblivion the reputations of two other Spanish declaimers, Gavius Silo of Tarraco and Clodius Turrinus, who had never left Spain. He felt compelled to justify his praise of them to his sons who might attribute it to excessive partiality: he assures them that examples of these speakers' skill will disprove that suspicion.<sup>135</sup> In fact, Seneca does not allow his keen interest in the speakers of his province to cloud his judgment. He cites a considerable number, perhaps more than half-a-dozen in addition to the three already mentioned.<sup>136</sup> L. Junius Gallio is ranked high with Latro,<sup>137</sup> but Seneca 'Grandio' is derided as a madman.<sup>138</sup> Quintilian's ancestor merits an insulting *praeteritio*,<sup>139</sup> Seneca's fellow-townsmen Statorius Victor has to his credit a 'stultam sententiam',<sup>140</sup> and Fulvius Sparsus emerges as an inferior imitator of Latro.<sup>141</sup> As for Brocc(h)us and Cornelius Hispanus, whose Spanish origins are less certain, one is described simply as 'non malus rhetor',<sup>142</sup> the other receives mixed notices.<sup>143</sup> A digression on historians' assessments of Cicero gives Seneca the opportunity to credit a fellow-townsmen Sextilius Ena, with a good line of Latin verse, to which he adds a terse

<sup>131</sup> S. J. De Laet, *De Samenstelling van der Romein-schen Senaat* (1941), nos. 651, 804, 607, 812, 646, 719, 852 'Umbonius Silo' (corrected now by *AE* 1955, 161); Syme, *Tacitus* App. 79–80; Wiseman, o.c. 228. Perhaps we should add as a Spanish senator under Tiberius, C. Sertorius Brocchus (*PIRS* 394), a provincial governor under Claudius, who may be identical with Brocchus, *trib. pl.* in 41 (Josephus, *AJ* xix, 234); but see below on 'Brocchus', n. 142. His talented colleague, Q. Veranius, had been quaestor in 37. That Gallio was Spanish is a conjecture, P-W x, 1035 ff.: the Gallio in Statius, *Silvae* II, 7, 30 is probably his adoptive son, to whom the epithet 'dulcis' was appropriate (cf. Seneca, *NQ* IV, pref. II).

<sup>132</sup> Martial, *Epig.* I, 61.

<sup>133</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 14–15.

<sup>134</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 13–20.

<sup>135</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 16.

<sup>136</sup> For the identification of these, see La Ville de Mirmont, *Bull. Hisp.* xv (1913), 154. I omit Catus Crispus, as 'municipalis rhetor (?)' in *Suas.* 2, 16 does not seem to mean the same as 'municeps meus' used in the immediate context of Statorius Victor. For another possible Spaniard, see p. 16.

<sup>137</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 13; Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 173; La Ville de Mirmont, o.c. 255 ff.

<sup>138</sup> *Suas.* 2, 17. The *cognomen* is not sufficient evidence for his origins, but the remarks that his name may have reached his sons suggests a possible connection with the family.

<sup>139</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 2; *PIRS* F 57. The author of the *Institutio Oratoria* took his revenge on Seneca's literary son x, I, 125 ff.

<sup>140</sup> *Suas.* 2, 18.

<sup>141</sup> References to him listed by Bornecque, *Les déclamations* 167. For his origin, R. Syme, 'Pliny the Procurator', *HSCP* LXXIII (1968), 232, n. 116. The rare *cognomen* is found twice on inscriptions of Tarraconensis, and appears on a coin of Osca as the name of a local magistrate (Grant o.c., (above, n. 3), 167–8), while the nomen Fulvius is common in Spain, Syme, *Tacitus* App. 78.

<sup>142</sup> *Contr.* II, I, 23; Bornecque, 156; La Ville de Mirmont divined his origin from its appearance on inscriptions in Spain, e.g. *CIL* II, 3203; 1199; 5726. Though Brocc(h)us may be an indigenous Spanish name, the Sabine family of the Brocchi from Forum Novum, attested in the Republic (Syme, 'Senators, tribes, and towns', *Hist.* XIII (1964), 110) raises doubts.

<sup>143</sup> Bornecque, 164. The *cognomen* is the only evidence for his origins, and that is not a reliable indication; see Syme, o.c. (n. above), 105.

appraisal, applying to him Cicero's famous dictum about the poets of Corduba, 'pingue quiddam sonantes atque peregrinum'.<sup>144</sup>

The last is the only reference that Seneca makes to any provincial peculiarities of speech, for the criticism made by the fastidious Messala Corvinus of Porcius Latro—'sua lingua disertus est'—could have been aimed at minor impurities, rather than anything as gross as Spanish expressions.<sup>145</sup> Yet there must have been a Spanish accent, or rather accents, and some distinctive vocabulary and expressions apparent in the speech of men like Latro and Seneca who did not leave Spain until adolescence and returned afterwards for long visits.<sup>146</sup> Seneca was not interested in this, but he did note with pride a certain carelessness with which Latro took life as it came, refusing to do vocal exercises or to care for his physical constitution. For Seneca this was to follow 'illum fortem et agrestem et Hispanae consuetudinis morem',<sup>147</sup> and in this style of life, combined as it was with hard work and a trained memory, Seneca clearly saw a clear contrast with the decadence, luxury and effeminacy of contemporary Roman youth.<sup>148</sup>

His puritanism emerges again in his approval of the *sancta fortia praecepta* of Stoicism and his admiration of Pollio's strict self-control on the occasion of his son's death.<sup>149</sup> Another aspect of his *antiquus rigor* (as his son was to describe it) was his discouragement of his wife's interest in philosophy and literature. Clearly, as we have seen, he did not dislike either of these pursuits where appropriate, but as a husband 'maiorum consuetudini deditus' he held that modern women were given to acquiring erudition for the sake of display.<sup>150</sup> The wife he chose had been brought up 'in antiqua et severa . . . domo',<sup>151</sup> and as she probably grew up in Spain, she provides some evidence that Seneca's old-fashioned standards were in accordance with his provincial background. Later his son was to record the stern legal sanctions against pre-marital kissing that had once been imposed by *Cordubenses nostri*.<sup>152</sup> Yet it is just as important to note that Seneca did not think of his stern morality as provincial or Spanish as compared with Roman.<sup>153</sup> Rather, like any Roman, he contrasted the morality of his own day with that of the Roman past, defined for all time by the character of the Elder Cato.<sup>154</sup> He also shares the literary patriotism of his hero Cicero and, like him, insists that the *egestas linguae Latinae* is a myth. Seneca has the attitudes that go with his native language, Latin: the case of the Spanish *rhetor*, Antonius Julianus (whose name proclaims his native ancestry), defending 'Hispano ore' his 'patria lingua' (Latin) and its early poetry, in the time of Hadrian,<sup>155</sup> forbids us to invoke his Italian stock as an explanation.

So far, friendships and morality. But Seneca is often said to have derived from the 'Pompeian milieu' of his *colonia* the political views that lent his history the Republican colour indicated by his son's description 'ab initio bellorum civilium unde primum veritas retro abiit'. There are grounds for scepticism. Asinius Pollio, Messala Corvinus and Cremutius Cordus had set the fashion for writing about that period and this form of Republicanism, that consisted in preferring Pompey, Brutus and Cato to Caesar, was not normally incompatible with acceptance of the Principate. That it was this sentimental brand that Seneca displayed in his historical work is suggested by the works we have. There he reveals a deep admiration for Augustus, under whom *libertas* (in the sense of free speech)

<sup>144</sup> *Suas.* 6, 27. On his *cognomen* see *FHA* VIII (1959), 145.

<sup>145</sup> *Contr.* II, 4, 8. Bornecque, 191 and A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* (1963) I, 222, see this as an allusion to Spanish expressions, but Seneca does characterize Messala here as 'Latini utique sermonis observator diligentissimus'.

<sup>146</sup> Note the Spanish accent of a Hadrianic rhetor from Spain (Gellius, *NA* XIX, 9, 2). A study of the inscriptions of Roman Spain by A. Carnoy, *Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions* I, II (1904-1906), reveals two phenomena present even in early Spanish Latin: (1) archaisms conserved from the speech of the original Italian colonists, and found even on correct and official inscriptions, e.g. I, pp. 109-114; II, pp. 15-17, 47); (2) tendencies in pronunciation and vocabulary distinctive in the Latin of that province, e.g. I, pp. 27-28 (i for e in Dillius, found

only in Spain as a form of Dellius); II, pp. 40-41, preference for *iste* and *ipse* rather than *ille*, *hic*, *is*.

<sup>147</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 16-17.

<sup>148</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 7-9, esp. 8.

<sup>149</sup> *Contr.* II, pref. I; IV, pref. 5-6.

<sup>150</sup> *Cons. Helv.* 17, 3-4.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.* 16, 3.

<sup>152</sup> See n. 192.

<sup>153</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 9-10. In *Ann.* III, 55, 3 Tacitus speaks of the *domestica parsimonia* imported in the Flavian period by men from remote parts of Italy and from the provinces. That quality did not characterize the younger Seneca nor his Narbonensian brother-in-law (Pliny, *NH* XXXIII, 143).

<sup>154</sup> cf. *Suas.* 2, 12 on 'Romani animi magnitudo'.

<sup>155</sup> *Contr.* I, pref. 6; X, 5, 28; X, 4, 23; Gellius, *NA* XIX, 9.

flourished, and a stern contempt for those who practised it to excess, thereby courting danger.<sup>156</sup> For a descendent of real Pompeians, the historian and orator Titus Labienus, 'qui Pompeianos spiritus nondum in tanta pace posuisset',<sup>157</sup> Seneca feels a certain admiration, and he expresses great indignation at the burning of his books. But he is careful to lay the blame on Labienus' personal enemies in the Senate rather than on Augustus, where it probably belongs.<sup>158</sup>

Seneca's sentimental Republicanism was not an attitude peculiar to or even typical of actual ex-Pompeians. In fact, many of the upper-class provincials who supported the Pompeian cause in Spain, like their counterparts in the towns of Italy, consulted expediency before principles. Caesar knew that there was favour to be gained by returning the money that Varro had collected; later on the exactions of Caesar's governor Cassius Longinus roused the province and provoked Annius Scapula 'maximae dignitatis et gratiae provincialem hominem' and others like him, former friends of Cassius, to plot his assassination.<sup>159</sup> Others felt gratitude for personal benefits: Pompey's *beneficia* are often mentioned in accounts of the war in Spain, and Caesar, after the battle of Munda, rebuked the Spaniards for forgetting his.<sup>160</sup> No doubt among those who supported Pompey's sons there were men like Cicero who saw that the Roman constitution was at stake and put that first, but from that point of view the issue was by no means clear. Both sides claimed to represent the legitimate government.<sup>161</sup>

There would thus be no clear line of descent from the events of the Civil War to Seneca's history, even if we assumed that his family followed Pompey's cause. In fact the role of Corduba in that struggle was by no means so clear:

Cum geminis oppressa malis utrimque peribas  
Et tibi Pompeius, Caesar et hostis erat,

the nineteenth epigram of those attributed to the younger Seneca states (compare Martial's Corduban plane tree in IX, 61).

According to the picture we are given by Caesar and the pro-Caesarian author(s) of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and *Bellum Hispaniense*, Hispania Citerior was almost solidly behind Pompey at the start of the Civil War in 49 B.C., because his victories against Sertorius had earned the respect of victors and vanquished. But in Ulterior, where Caesar had been quaestor and praetor, it was different. Varro knew the province was friendly to Caesar (BC 2, 18, 5) and punished states and individuals loyal to him. At Caesar's arrival in the province, all the magistrates, *principes viri* and Roman citizens of the province answered his summons to a conference at Corduba. The *Cordubae conventus* itself and Italica closed their doors to Varro; Gades and Carmo drove out the garrisons Varro had left (BC 2, 19). It was the rapacity of Caesar's legate Cassius Longinus, left in charge in 48-7, that turned the province against Caesar and made Varro's old legions revolt.<sup>162</sup> The people of Corduba were not eager to disobey Caesar, but they were determined to protect their possessions (BA 58, 60), and even after the arrival of Pompey's sons there were pro-Caesarian factions

<sup>156</sup> *Contr.* II, 4, 13; x, pref. 5. Cremutius Cordus had similarly praised Augustus, according to *Ann.* IV, 34; his accusers emphasized the lack of superlatives (Dio LVII, 24, 3.)

<sup>157</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 3 ff. On the family, Syme, 'The Allegiance of Labienus', *JRS* 28 (1938), 113. The family was remarkable for tenacity of political allegiance (Cicero, *Rab. Perd.* 22).

<sup>158</sup> According to Dio LVI, 27, 1, Augustus in his later years punished some writers in this way though the burning was ordered by the senate (Suet., *Gaius* 16, 1): presumably the Princeps took the initiative. Seneca also omits the fate suffered by the works of Cassius Severus, though he mentions his comment on the fate of Labienus' (*Contr.* x, pref. 5), and devotes the entire preface of Book III of *Controversiae* to Cassius. Only in *Contr.* II, 4, 11 does he refer to a trial of Cassius, and he never tells of his conviction. This may be the same trial as that noted in *Ann.* I,

72, 4, where Tacitus holds the Princeps responsible. But recently Baumann (above, n. 26) 257 ff. has denied that the trial in *Ann.* I, 72 is the same as that which produced Cassius' exile and the burning of his books because *Ann.* IV, 21, 5 names an *s.c.* This is strange, as he accepts the connection of Dio LVI, 27 with the senatorial book burnings. His arguments for the identification of the trial in *Ann.* I, 72 with one in Dio LV, 4, 3 are unconvincing: *maiestas* plays no obvious role in the Dio context.

<sup>159</sup> BC II, 21; BA 55.

<sup>160</sup> cf. the attitude of L. Cornelius Balbus of Gades, whose personal loyalty to Caesar in conflict with earlier obligations to the Corneli Lentuli and Pompey seems to be what determined his conduct in the Civil War (Cicero, *Att.* IX, 7b, 2).

<sup>161</sup> Varro in BC II, 18; Caesar in BH 42.

<sup>162</sup> II, in Spain since 54, and the *legio vernacula* (BA 49, 53).

in the cities.<sup>163</sup> Caesar and his continuator(s), it is true, have probably played down the amount of Pompeian favour in Ulterior in 49 and exaggerated the role of Cassius, in order to explain how the province in which Caesar had served twice could be so disloyal. The narrative itself betrays this : Varro was able to collect vast sums from Roman citizens in the province ; his two legions, when they led the revolt against Cassius, with the support of the province, put Pompey's name on their shields, though later they removed it at the request of the more cautious Cordubans. It is admitted that the leader of the revolt, Thorius of Italica, was moved not only by personal ambition but partly by love of Pompey, ' cuius nomen multum poterat apud eas legiones quas M. Varro obtinuerat ' (BA 58-59). The loyalty of these legions is particularly notable as one was composed of men born in the province (the *legio vernacula*) and the other was ' diuturnitate iam factus provincialis ' (BA 53). Finally, the speech attributed to Caesar after his victory at Munda in the *Bellum Hispaniense* shows that Caesar did not attribute the province's resistance to him solely to opportunism and cowardice ; he blames them for welcoming the young Pompey, a mere ' privatus ex fuga ' (BH 42).

Nonetheless, there is no reason to doubt that Caesar had his supporters in Ulterior from the start. Our sources preserve a few names : Vibius Paciaecus (BH 3,4), perhaps a son or younger member of the family of that rich landowner from the neighbourhood of Malaca who harboured M. Crassus and was killed fighting against Sertorius : <sup>164</sup> Annius Scapula, a prominent man in the province, was a friend of Cassius Longinus to begin with ; perhaps the family of Clodius Turrinus, Seneca's friend, whose grandfather had played host to Julius Caesar in 68.<sup>165</sup> It is by no means certain that the sympathies of Seneca's family were Pompeian.

All we can recover of Seneca's attitudes then points to the unimportance of any national consciousness in this representative of the upper classes of Roman Baetica. But his close ties of friendship do have one interesting feature : they extend to men whose family origins were native, like Porcius Latro and Junius Gallio, as well as to the descendants of Italian settlers or soldiers, like Gavius Silo and Statorius Victor, and they reached beyond Corduba and Baetica to Tarraconensis. It was not only historians and administrators for whom Hispania was an entity :<sup>166</sup> Seneca spoke of *Hispana consuetudo*.

The same attitudes can be found in the next generation of the *domus Annaeana*. The three sons maintained connections with Corduba : they were ' fraterno amore coniuncti ' with the son of Clodius Turrinus. The youngest brother, Annaeus Mela, married a woman of Corduba, and his son, the poet Lucan, was born there. But the only wife of the second and most illustrious brother about whom we know anything was Pompeia Paulina from Narbonensis, and his son, who died in infancy, perhaps at birth, was nursed by his grandmother who came to Rome for the purpose.<sup>167</sup> We do not know if the philosopher ever visited the family estates at Corduba, but it is not unlikely. His friendships repeat the pattern of his father's including men of native and Italian stock : Annaeus Serenus, perhaps a relative, can serve to illustrate the latter ; for the former, there is the historian Fabius Rusticus, and a certain Marullus, perhaps a Junius Marullus, whom he consoled.<sup>168</sup>

Then there is L. Junius Moderatus Columella of Gades who could address the oldest brother familiarly as ' Gallio noster '. He may have enjoyed the patronage of Nero's adviser, of whom he speaks with admiration.<sup>169</sup> For Columella's gravestone survives (*ILS* 2923) and it shows that he was buried at Tarentum. It also shows that in youth he had served with the Syrian legion VI Ferrata, one of the eastern legions that Nero began to settle in 60 at Tarentum. Now Columella's death there probably falls in the 60's, for he was an old man when writing *De Re Rustica* between c. 61 and 65. Perhaps we are entitled to suspect a

<sup>163</sup> Corduba, BH 34 ; Ategua, BH 13 ; Ucubi, BH 21 ; Urso, BH 22 ; Hispalis, BH 35 ; Carteia, BH 37. For the participation of Roman residents in this resistance, Wilson, *Emigration* 37-8.

<sup>164</sup> Münzer in P-W xviii, 2061-2. Caesar took over Crassus' client. The Paciaecus who served with Crassus in Parthia (Plut., *Crassus* 32) probably belongs to the family of his old protector too.

<sup>165</sup> *Contr.* x, pref. 16.

<sup>166</sup> Strabo III, 4, 19.

<sup>167</sup> Vacca, *Life of Lucan* ; *Cons. Helv.* 2, 5 ; 15, 3.

<sup>168</sup> For Serenus, *Ep.* 63 and several dialogues ; Fabius Rusticus, *Ann.* xiii, 20, 3. Syme, *Tacitus* 179 ; Marullus : *Ep.* 99. For the name, see above, n. 71. Perhaps identical with the suffect cos. of 62 for whom possible Spanish origin is noted by Syme, *Tacitus* App. 80.

<sup>169</sup> ' Vir excellentis ingenii atque doctrinae ', *RR* III, 3, 3 which is more flattering than Pliny's parallel description of Seneca's viticultural achievement in *NH* xiv, 52.

connection between the presence of the ex-officer agricultural writer and Nero's colony. Columella's powerful contemporary and fellow-countryman Seneca was, on Columella's own evidence, interested in scientific agriculture, and alludes in his own works to the fertility of Tarentum's hinterland.<sup>170</sup> Did he draft his Gaditane friend as an agricultural expert in launching the new project? <sup>171</sup>

Seneca and Gallio were also approached, apparently with some success, by the poet Valerius Martialis of Bilbilis,<sup>172</sup> whose name proclaims his native ancestry.

The strength of home ties would be emphatically demonstrated by Seneca's grateful admiration of one of his father's heroes, Papirius Fabianus, if it were certain that this declaimer and philosopher was a Spaniard. His name certainly has a 'Spanish look': <sup>173</sup> more Papirii are recorded on the inscriptions of Spain than on those of any other province, and this is also true of the name Fabius from which Fabianus derives.<sup>174</sup> Papirius Fabianus made a great impression on both Senecas who testify to his combination of rhetorical and philosophical talents. The father devoted the preface of Book II of the *Controversiae* to him, setting him up before his youngest son as a man who did not desert rhetoric when he became a philosopher. Probably by 10 B.C., at the age of twenty,<sup>175</sup> Papirius had joined the Roman philosophical school of the Sextii to which the younger Seneca later adhered in adolescence. From then on, declamation was just a preparation for disputation and a vehicle for *convicium saeculi*.<sup>176</sup> The young Seneca came under the spell of his sincere style of philosophical discourse, and his voluminous writings (more philosophical works than Cicero) later served him as a model for writing philosophy in Latin.<sup>177</sup> What is significant for our study here is the clear desire of both Senecas to justify their enthusiasm for Papirius Fabianus' style when they were clearly well aware of its defects. The younger Seneca's friend Lucilius read the works on his friend's advice. He was clearly disappointed, and Seneca's defence suggests that Lucilius was probably not alone in this. In fact, by comparing what the two Senecas say, we can see that Fabianus' oral and written style was cold,<sup>178</sup> flat, and lacking in point, brilliance and precision.<sup>179</sup> But he was fluent, and effective as a speaker because of his obvious sincerity and indifference to applause.<sup>180</sup> Early in the reign of Augustus, Fabianus had seemed obscure through compression; by the later reign of Nero, he seemed slow and long-winded.<sup>181</sup> The younger Seneca's own style was largely responsible for this change in taste, so that it is all the more striking to see him defending this hero of his youth. Yet his loyalty might reflect more disapproval of his own imitators or sentimental attachment to an old teacher <sup>182</sup> than loyalty to a fellow-countryman, for neither of the Senecas mentions Fabianus' origins. The Elder Seneca, in fact, indicates origin only for men of his own town, or for those whose activity was mostly or partly confined to Spain. Just as he does not say that the distinguished Junius Gallio came from the province, so perhaps he ignores the origins of Fabianus who had a reputation in Rome. If Papirius Fabianus came from Spain, he provides more proof that there was little national conscious-

<sup>170</sup> Seneca, *Tranq. An.* 2, 13: 'Tarentum petatur laudatusque portus et hiberna caeli mitioris et regio vel antiquae satis opulenta turbae.'

<sup>171</sup> The eastern provenance of the legionaries in Nero's new colonies was noted by Ritterling in P-W XII, 1264, 1595, who suggested that Columella was in charge of Nero's deduction as military tribune (despite Tacitus *Ann.* XIV, 27 'sine rectore'). But *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I, 779 rightly prefers the date of A.D. 36 for the military tribunate, as established by Cichorius, *RS* 417.

<sup>172</sup> *Epig.* 4, 40; 12, 36. For Martial's success in Rome, under Nero, L. Friedländer, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* (1886), I, 4-5; W. Allen, 'Martial: knight, publisher and poet', *CJ* 1970. There is no space here to explore the more indirect evidence of Seneca's attitude to Spain via the advancement of Spaniards in his period of power or his views on provincial government and the extension of the citizenship.

<sup>173</sup> Syme, *HSCP* LXXIII (1968), 222.

<sup>174</sup> Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* 309, 314, 318. Since then more Papirii have been discovered in the province of Corduba, *AE* 1965, nos. 59, 60.

<sup>175</sup> The Elder Seneca heard Fabianus (*Contr.* II, pref. 5), when he had already become a follower of Sextius and was studying with Rubellius Blandus—most likely, then, before father Seneca returned to Spain in 8-5 B.C. Fabianus was then half Seneca's age and past *adulescentia* (*Contr.* II, pref. 1) so that a date c. 10 B.C., when Seneca would be forty, should be right.

<sup>176</sup> e.g. *Suas.* I, 9; *Contr.* II, pref. 2; II, I, 10 ff., II, 6, 2.

<sup>177</sup> Seneca, *Epist.* 100, 12, 9; *Brev. Vit.* 10, 1. Lucilius was reading *Libri civilium*. *Libri Caesarum Naturalium* and *De Animalibus* were used by the Elder Pliny.

<sup>178</sup> *Contr.* II, pref. 2; cp. *Ep.* 100, 10.

<sup>179</sup> *Contr.* II, pref. 2; cp. *Ep.* 100, 5, 8.

<sup>180</sup> His fluency: *Epist.* 40, 12; 100, 1; for his sincerity and modesty, *Contr.* II, pref. 2; *Ep.* 52, II, 6, 11.

<sup>181</sup> *Contr.* II, pref. 2; *Ep.* 100, 1-2, 11.

<sup>182</sup> This is the verdict of Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* I, 261-271, 282, who analyses the judgments of both Senecas on Fabianus in detail.

ness as such in the *domus Annaeana* and that Spanish friends did not seem to them to form a class apart.

As might be expected in the next generation, an increased detachment towards Spain is manifest in the works of the younger Seneca as compared with his father's, an effect to which his general reticence about himself doubtless contributes. Most of his allusions to Spain and Spaniards (and they are not very numerous)<sup>183</sup> contain no hint of a personal connection, and in one passage, containing a reference to Spanish auxiliary troops, Seneca identifies himself completely with Rome, conventionally noting the need for a return to the old *mores Romanos*.<sup>184</sup> Comparison with the numerous Spanish poems of Martial might lead one to wonder if Seneca's Italian origin is partly responsible, but comparison with Seneca's contemporary L. Junius Moderatus Columella, whose name suggests a native origin, soon dispels that notion.<sup>185</sup> Columella's subject matter, of course, allows him to exhibit his firsthand knowledge of agriculture in Baetica and Africa just across the straits, and to quote advice from his uncle Marcus 'diligentissimus agricola Baeticae provinciae'.<sup>186</sup> Only his interest in distinctively Spanish terms<sup>187</sup> can be paralleled in Seneca whose *Consolatio* to his mother, written from exile, gave him the opportunity to note Cantabrian elements in the language of Corsica (and in the native foot- and head-gear).<sup>1</sup> But even Columella, though he sometimes uses *noster* in references to his native Gades, shows no particular attachment to Baetican agricultural methods,<sup>189</sup> and completely identifies himself with Rome in a conventional lament about the dependence of Italy on imports, where Baetica is mentioned as a source of imported wine.<sup>190</sup>

In fact, if Seneca felt particularly conscious of his Italian roots, it becomes impossible to understand what is, in any case, a very strange passage in the same *Consolatio*.<sup>191</sup> In this work, the richest of all his surviving ones in family details, Seneca consoles his mother, living on the family estates in Spain, with the commonplace that exile is a mere change of place and that loss of *patria* is a frequent and tolerable experience: Roman colonists have gone to live in all the provinces, while many men have come to Rome 'ex municipiis et coloniis suis, ex toto denique orbe terrarum' to fulfil ambitions or to be educated. Yet he makes no reference to the loss of *patria* freely sustained by his own ancestors when they went to Corduba, nor to the return journey of the male members of his own family. This passage suggests deracination, rather than mere detachment.

Yet the deracination was not total. The absence of references to his *patria* in the completely preserved works may be somewhat misleading. The extant fragment of his biography of his father shows that he was going to discuss his ancestry with perhaps some emphasis on the provincial setting, and a possible fragment of his *De Matrimonio* talks of 'Cordubenses nostri'.<sup>192</sup> If nothing else, the younger Seneca's detractors kept him aware that he was 'equestri et provinciali loco ortus.'

*Somerville College, Oxford*

#### NOTE A

All discussion of the foundation of the colony at Corduba takes its rise from Strabo's statement in III, 2, 1: πλείστον δ' ἢ τε Κόρδουβα ἠϋξῆται Μαρκέλλου κτίσμα, . . . ᾠκησάν τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἄνδρες ἐπίλεκτοι καὶ δὴ καὶ πρῶτην ἀποικίαν ταύτην εἰς τοῦσδε τοὺς τόπους ἔστειλαν

<sup>183</sup> They are collected in *FHA* VIII, 145-8.

<sup>184</sup> *De Ira* I, 11, 4.

<sup>185</sup> References to Spain in Martial are collected in *FHA* VIII, 250-267; in Columella, *ibid.*, 163. To the latter add *RR* III, 12, 6 and VII, 1, 2.

<sup>186</sup> *RR* V, 5, 15.

<sup>187</sup> Another Spaniard, Quintilian, in *Inst. Or.* I, 5, 8, and I, 5, 57, includes Spanish examples among foreign words that are sometimes used by Latin-speakers. In the latter passage, 'et gurdos, quos pro stolidis accipit vulgus, ex Hispania duxisse originem *audivi*' his 'affectation of not knowing much about a certain local word' (Syme, *Tacitus* 618) is probably the unwillingness of a professor of Latin to show familiarity with Spanish slang current among the Roman lower classes.

<sup>188</sup> *Cons. Helv.* 7, 9, cf. *Cons. Polyb.* 18, 9. See J. Cosimi, 'Sénèque et la langue des Corses', *REL* 32 (1954), 111 ff. Seneca's explanation is an actual immigration from Spain, but cf. *FHA* VIII, 147 and Tovar (above, n. 40), 249-253.

<sup>189</sup> *RR* VIII, 16, 9; X, 185. Critical remarks in IV 14, 2; III, 2, 19 and perhaps II, 2, 22 but cf. Pliny, *NH* VIII, 179.

<sup>190</sup> *RR* I, pref. 20.

<sup>191</sup> *Cons. Helv.* 6-7.

<sup>192</sup> Haase, *fr.* 88. There are good grounds for attributing this fragment to Seneca, but its assignment to the particular work *De Matrimonio* is conjectural: see E. Bickel, *Diatribe in Senecae philosophi fragmenta* (1915), 288, n. 1.

Ῥωμαῖοι. That the city was a foundation of M. Claudius Marcellus, *cos. III* in 152, no one doubts, and a suitable time would be in 152 after he had finished his operations in Citerior, for Polybius (xxxv, 2, 2) mentions Corduba as his winter quarters. Strabo's phrase Μαρκέλλου κτίσμα may well be from Poseidonios (so Hübner, P-W IV, 1222), but Poseidonios was there probably following the substance of Polybius' account.

The trouble starts with the second part of Strabo's statement, and various opinions exist as to what he means and whether or not he is right. It is well to review first what facts can be ascertained from elsewhere :

(1) The first overseas colony founded by Rome was Carthage (Vell. Pat. I, 15), under the Lex Rubria of 123.

(2) Caesar and the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* refer to Corduba as a *conventus* in 49 and 48 (BC II, 19; BA 57, 5). Seneca's use of 'colonia' in referring to the Civil War period is non-technical (*Contr.* I, pref. 11). Compare *Suas.* 2, 18 where a Corduban is 'municeps meus'. Against this, Vittinghoff (*Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik* (1951), 73, n. 1) cited BC II, 19, 3 as showing that Corduba in 49 had *colonicae cohortes* and was a colony. Even if these cohorts belong to Corduba, the vague adjective would hardly prove the point when Caesar had just called the place a *conventus*; but in any case the cohorts in this passage are clearly not Corduba's (so Wilson, *Emigration* 16, n. 8). It is clear, then, that Corduba was not a colony before 48 B.C. Thouvenot (*La province romaine de Bétique* 190) invoked the description of Corduba as an *oppidum* in the *Bellum Hispaniense* 4, 1 to move the *terminus post* to 45, but that term is too vague (cf. in *BH* 32, 6, used of the Latin colony of Carteia).

(3) Pliny, *NH* III, 1, 10 tells us that as a colony Corduba was called Patricia.

(4) An aes issue, plausibly dated to 47 or 46 (Grant, *Imperium to Auctoritas* 4; Broughton, *MRR* II, p. 287), bears on the reverse the legend *Corduba* which, though frequent in the literary sources, was not used on coins after the title Patricia was conferred.

The last two facts clearly give the *terminus post quem* for the title Patricia and, on the usual assumption that the name and the establishment of the colony were contemporaneous, for the colony as well. As for the *terminus ante*, it has been common, since Hübner's pronouncements in P-W and *CIL* II pp. 306 ff., and Suppl. p. 887 (cf. also Kornemann, P-W IV (1901), 511, n. 82; Grant, 4; Garcia y Bellido, *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* (1959), 451 ff.), to take the fact that neither Julia nor Augusta is attested with Patricia as an indication that the title (and the colony) are of pre-Caesarian date. In fact, too much confidence has been placed in the rule that Caesar and Octavian always gave Iulia as a title; Hasta Regia is probably Caesarian (Vittinghoff, 74), yet it had no such title; further, the case of Corduba could be like that of Hispalis, definitely a Caesarian colony (Dio XLIII, 39; Strabo III, 2, 1) to which Pliny (*NH* III, 1, 11), and coins and inscriptions attribute the title Romula. It is only a chance reference in Isidorus (*Orig.* XVI, 1, 71) that tells us it was called Julia Romula. The title Patricia can hardly be explained by a Pompeian foundation. It suits Caesar or Augustus better (though there is no proof that Augustus applied it to Barcino, see Brunt, *Italian Manpower* 592). Caesar could, then, have settled a punitive colony at Corduba as at Hispalis. On the other hand, Augustus did settle veterans there and, as he authorized coinage celebrating the title (Grant, 220), it seems reasonable to assign the title to him, as does Vittinghoff (73, n. 1). But he separates the title from colonial status, and takes the latter to be early on the basis of his misinterpretation of 'colonicae cohortes'.

Without the support of the argument from the absence of Julia and Augustus in the title, there is really no evidence for a colony before Caesar, and indeed it is hard to believe that if Pompey's sons had founded one, Caesar would have ratified it. (The retention by Salacia of the cognomen *Imperatoria* conferred on it by Sextus in 44 is hardly a parallel, despite Grant, pp. 5, 23. Octavian was not Caesar, and a *cognomen* is not colonial status.) The one difficulty is the passage of Strabo. Now, on a first reading, Strabo appears to say that the Μαρκέλλου κτίσμα was the πρώτην ἀποικίαν ταύτην referred to immediately afterwards. This clearly convicts Strabo of a serious error (above 1 and 2). Two interpretations have been offered to clear him of this :

(a) that καὶ δὴ καὶ etc., tells us a separate fact: the earliest Roman colony in Spain was at Corduba. This would enable us to date the foundation after 48 but before Caesar's bulk settlements in 45 (Dio XLIII, 39). Hübner used this interpretation to support a Pompeian foundation. But πρώτην ἀποικίαν ταύτην and the verb ὤκησαν used of Marcellus' foundation certainly seem to show that Strabo thought he was adding information about Marcellus' work.

(b) that Strabo does not mean by ἀποικίαν a formal colony but just a settlement of Romans (so Vittinghoff). But the following Ἰσπαλις . . . καὶ αὕτη ἀποικὸς Ῥωμαίων shows that he put Hispalis in the same category as Corduba, and Hispalis certainly was a formal colony. This solution, by the way, does not acquit Strabo of error: it makes him overlook Italica and Carteia.

If we decide that Caesar established the colony at Corduba, we convict Strabo of error, for the Caesarian arrangement after Munda affected several cities at once, and if one could be singled out as

first, it would probably be Hispalis where he held his *contio* announcing his plans (*BH* 42). If we credit Augustus with Colonia Patricia, we likewise judge Strabo mistaken, but, in this case, we can at least explain the error by assuming that he may have it taken over from his Caesarian-Augustan source. For it is possible that Augustus' title Patricia may not have referred to his own *gens*, and if it lacked Julia or Augusta that is even more likely. His colony may date from about the time of Emerita (a lost coin assigned it the same legions) in 25 or later (Dio *LIV*, 23, 7). Before that, in 29 B.C. under a Lex Saenia of the year before, he had created some patricians among whom almost certainly were the Claudii Marcelli, the family of his nephew and favoured heir. (There is no direct evidence, but the great honours accorded to his nephew must surely have indicated elevation to the patriciate, as is generally assumed: K. Heiter, *De Patriciis gentibus* (1909), 52-3; H.-H. Pistor, *Princeps und Patriziat* (1965), 20-21. The aedileship in 23 is no obstacle, as the rule exempting patricians from that office need not have been established until shortly before 18 B.C. when Tiberius would otherwise have held it.) Augustus may have emphasized that he was simply strengthening the foundation of Marcellus' ancestor and honouring his town with the title that signified the new status of the family. We may compare the emphasis on Marcellus' ancestors in the funeral *laudatio* (from which derives Plut., *Comp. Pelop. et Marc.* 3). Strabo's account, then, reflects Augustus' own view of his foundation.

Since this note was drafted, Brunt has suggested that Corduba became a colony under Augustus (*Italian Manpower* 215, 236, 590), but he does not argue the case. I am indebted to Mr. D. Hoyos of Worcester College, Oxford, for discussion of this problem.

## NOTE B

A list of earlier participants in the debate on the authorship of the Lactantius fragment (*Inst. Div.* 7, 15, 14; above, pp. 10 f.) is available in S. Brandt's edition of Lactantius (*CSEL* xix (1890), Pars 1, 633). F. J. Kühnen, *Seneca und die römische Geschichte*, chap. 7, brings the bibliography down to 1962. Add now, at least, P. Jal, *La Guerre Civile à Rome* (1963), 244; I. Hahn, 'Appien et le cercle de Sénèque', *Acta Antiqua* xii (1964), 74, who favour the Elder Seneca; R. Häussler, 'Vom Ursprung und Wandel des Lebensaltervergleichs', *Hermes* xcii (1964), 315-316 who defends the younger Seneca; F. Vittinghoff, 'Zum geschichtlichen Selbstverständnis der Spätantike', *Hist. Zeits.* cxcviii (1964), 529 ff., who is undecided; A. Garzetti, 'Floro e l'età adrianea', *Athenaeum* xlii (1964), 136 ff.; P. Archambault, 'The Ages of Man and the Ages of the World', *Rev. ét. August.* xii (1966), 195, and Momigliano, *Quarto Contributo* 242, who assume that the Elder Seneca is the author. His claim is also upheld by M. Lausberg, *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Fragmenten* (1970), 3 and W. Trillitzsch, *Seneca im literarischen Urteil der Antike* (1971), 141 ff.

The case for Seneca the philosopher, as Kühnen, one of its champions, points out, is a matter for parry, not thrust, for it is the natural assumption. Since Lactantius often cites Seneca, whom he knew well and often mentions, by *cognomen* alone, it is unlikely that he would have knowingly introduced a passage written by the obscure father with 'non inscite Seneca'. The possibility that he did this in ignorance because he had a manuscript including works of the Elder Seneca under his son's name was suggested by L. Castiglioni, 'Lattanzio e le storie di Seneca Padre', *Riv. di fil.* lvi (1928), 474, n. 1. Now P. Faider, 'Etudes sur Sénèque', *Univ. de Gand, Rec. de trav.* xlix (1921), 96, n. 1, did note some evidence that Jerome already failed to distinguish father and son—a confusion that later led the first editors (starting in 1490) of the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* to include them as part of the son's works. But there is no reason to put the confusion between the two Senecas back to Lactantius' time, and it is likely that the history, if it was ever published, was lost before confusion in the manuscripts started, or it might have been preserved. But in fact there is no convincing evidence, outside this fragment, that the history ever was published (above p. 10 f.).

There are no serious obstacles to the philosopher's authorship: that he produced no historical work is not one, for the fragment could be a digression in a philosophical one. The style of the paragraph cannot be invoked as it has clearly been heavily influenced by Lactantius (W. Hartke, *Römische Kinderkaiser* (1951), 393; but note the criticisms of Hartke's exaggerations by Kühnen, 80, n. 2). There is no space here to deal with the resemblances which exist between the fragment and the philosopher's views elsewhere. The only difficulty would be presented by the tribute to Brutus ('amissa enim libertate, quam Bruto duce et auctore defenderat, ita consenuit tamquam sustentare se ipsa non valeret, nisi adminiculo regentium niteretur') if, as is sometimes assumed, a reference to Marcus Brutus is intended, for in *De Beneficiis* II, 20 Seneca condemns the murder of Caesar on the grounds that *libertas* could not be recovered at that date. But there is no reason to assume Marcus Brutus is meant: the *enim* shows that the phrase is explanatory and need not be temporarily subsequent to the *regimen singularis imperii* (Caesar's dictatorship) mentioned just before. For *libertas* as the Republican constitution, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* I, 1 and Seneca, *Cons. Marc.* 16, 2. For the idea in *defenderat* as regards L. Brutus, cf. Cicero, *Rep.* II, 46, 'in conservanda civium libertate', Livy, II, 1 on Brutus as *custos libertatis*, and Vergil, *Aen.* vi, 820-23.

The notion that this passage is a garbled version of Florus' preface is, happily, heard of no more.