

# JUSTIN'S *EPITOME*: THE UNLIKELY ADAPTATION OF TROGUS' WORLD HISTORY\*

---

*Abstract:* There has been a longstanding question concerning the authorship of Justin's *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus' world history, *Historiae Philippicae*. What was the purpose of Justin's work? Was he merely an abbreviator, or did he view his work as a literary accomplishment? Herein the historical and historiographical contexts of the *Historiae Philippicae* are discussed in order to understand the 'abbreviator's' influence on the original document. Through an examination of subsequent Roman historians who read Trogus and with the help of modern scholarship on Justin, in particular the work of John Yardley, distinctions can often be made between the work of Trogus and the additions of his so-called epitomator, Justin. Throughout the *Epitome*, Justin maintained a Trogan skeleton, as an abbreviator would, but in several places he did more than abbreviate. Justin reworked Trogus' world history to achieve his own ends, without any concern for the philosophical basis of Trogus' work.

---

## I. Introduction

Justin's so-called *Epitome* of the *Historiae Philippicae* by the Augustan historian Pompeius Trogus provides many challenges to the modern reader. Distinguishing between the words and, more importantly, the purposes of Pompeius Trogus and Justin in the *Epitome* is a difficult task, which cannot be achieved with absolute certainty. However, since Justin's abbreviated history provides such a vast scope and is often one of few, if not the sole written source concerning certain Hellenistic figures, the investigation is a worthwhile undertaking. The history abounds in moral exemplars, accounts of events that differ greatly from other sources, especially with respect to deaths, and simple factual errors. That Justin was interested in the moral teachings of history is made clear in his preface (*praef.* 4):

cognitione quaeque dignissima excerpsi et omissis his, quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria, breve veluti florum corpusculum feci, ut haberent et qui Graece didicissent, quo admonerentur, et qui non didicissent, quo instruerentur.

\* I would like to thank the editors of *Histos* for their assistance, as well as the anonymous reader for the journal. I thank, above all, my supervisor Dr. habil. Altay Coşkun for his guidance, support, and seemingly endless patience, which I surely abused while writing this paper.

I have excerpted everything that is most worthy of recognition (*cognitione quaeque dignissima*) and have made a summary, just like a small bouquet of flowers, by omitting whatever was not pleasing to know or was not required for a model (*exemplo*), in order that those who had learned Greek might be reminded by this work or those who had not learned might be educated.

Such a view is hardly unique and often found in historical prefaces (cf. Liv. *praef.* 9-10).

Without an extant copy of the *Historiae*, it is difficult to know what in the *Epitome* belongs to Justin, and what to Trogus; what words are Trogan, and what passages are inventions of the epitomator (for which there are certainly many examples). In fact, Justin's *Epitome* seems to have overcome Trogus' *Historiae* in popularity so early in antiquity that even Augustine could not ascertain whether or not the opening words of the *Epitome* belonged to the epitomiser,<sup>1</sup> and Orosius knew no more than his own contemporaries.<sup>2</sup> So without even the help of citations from late antiquity, all that modern scholars know of Trogus' *Historiae* is limited to the *Epitome*—this does thankfully contain a copy of one of Trogus' speeches<sup>3</sup>—and a collection of *prologi* summarising the contents of each book. Indeed, the *prologi* are quite discouraging when compared to the *Epitome*; for it is here where it becomes abundantly clear that Justin did not merely abbreviate Trogus' *Historiae*, but created more of an anthology of the contents contained within and, in doing so, removed much of his source material.

Although it is often impossible to separate completely Justin's words from Trogus', it is possible both to identify them in at least some passages and, more importantly, to separate the former's *ideas* from the latter's. In order to do this, the *Epitome* must be approached in several ways: (1) through the analysis of vocabulary; (2) through the examination of core themes, especially those that are also found in the speech of Mithridates and other 'Trojan' passages; (3) through comparisons with other Roman historians, especially Tacitus; (4) with the direct information that Justin provides of Trogus; and lastly (5) with the cautious use of further philological evidence.

Many scholars have approached the challenge of discerning between Justin and Trogus in various manners. Seel, in his *Pompei Trogi Fragmenta*,

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, while quoting Justin, thus wrote about the opening sentence of the *Epitome* (*Civ.* 4.6): *uel iste [Iustinus] uel Trogus scripserit* ('whether [Justin] penned this or Trogus').

<sup>2</sup> Oros. *Hist.* 1.10: *ait enim Pompeius siue Iustinus hoc modo*.

<sup>3</sup> Goodyear (1992b) trusts that Justin maintained the text verbatim; Brunt (1980) 482–3 warns against such assumptions.

demonstrates the similarities between Justin and historians who used Trogus as a source and thereby shows that many passages found in the *Epitome* must closely resemble their original form. Castiglioni (1967) was able to identify, among other things, several formulaic phrases that Justin uses to abbreviate or omit large segments of Trogus' text. In addition, he identified several post-classical syntactical constructions that must belong to Justin. Yardley, in his study of the language of the *Epitome*, compares the occurrences of words, phrases, and syntactical constructions with their use in other Latin sources in order to determine the probable authorship. Ferrero bases his distinctions on stylistic and structural elements, and although he often uses a subjective judgment based on his own approval of the writing to determine which author wrote a particular passage, Yardley nevertheless concedes that Ferrero's findings are 'remarkably consistent' with his own.<sup>4</sup>

However, in such an endeavour it is important to keep in mind Brunt's warnings when dealing with fragments and epitomes. First, abbreviators and epitomators preferred to paraphrase rather than to quote in order that they might 'preserve unity of style'.<sup>5</sup> Secondly, quotations may be verbally incorrect, since they are often provided from memory.<sup>6</sup> Thirdly, short extracts do not provide sufficient information on the 'scope, manner, and quality' of an historian.<sup>7</sup> So, even when Justin copied Trogus closely, we should not expect a verbatim copy, and—all the more dismaying—even if the speech of Mithridates is a verbatim copy, it is not by itself sufficient to judge the style of Trogus.

In this paper, I shall examine the traditional view that scholars have held of Justin, his purpose for creating the *Epitome*, and the method that he employed to do so. Indeed, Justin was not merely a 'fumbling excerptor'<sup>8</sup> who pieced together a 'hurried and slapdash exercise'.<sup>9</sup> As a work based on Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*, the *Epitome* does in fact adhere closely to the original and preserves much of Trogus' original language and many of his ideas—which I shall demonstrate in the first half of this paper—but there are also several passages where the 'epitomator' displays his own rhetorical prowess, other passages where he adds to the information that Trogus had provided, and yet others where he provides a different perspective on an

<sup>4</sup> Yardley (2003) 25.

<sup>5</sup> Brunt (1980) 479.

<sup>6</sup> Brunt (1980) 479, 482–3.

<sup>7</sup> Brunt (1980) 483 (emphasis Brunt's).

<sup>8</sup> Goodyear (1992c) 236.

<sup>9</sup> Goodyear (1992a) 210.

event, and this at times not necessarily with an addition of his own but simply by the omission of text.

## 2. The *Historiae Philippicae* and Ancient Historiography

The *Historiae Philippicae*, despite being the only pre-Christian world history written in Latin, has no truly unique characteristics to distinguish it from the rest of Greco-Roman historiography. Indeed, historiography, since its earliest origins, was a conservative practice and ancient historians sought to imitate their predecessors, affording little space for innovations of their own.<sup>10</sup> Trogus, like many other historians, followed the style of a predecessor in order to 'continue' his work; he chose as his model Theopompus' *Philippica*, another world history replete with digressions.<sup>11</sup> The *Epitome*, although heavily abbreviated, still contains the familiar tropes and conventions that are to be found in earlier historical writings.

The *Epitome* is densely packed with moral tales involving great reversals of fortune whereby the mighty and powerful are brought low, often deservedly, for their own hubris or greed.<sup>12</sup> These reversals in the *Epitome* stand as reminders of *sors humana* (2.13.10) or *fragilitas humana* (17.2.3; 23.3.12). Such attention to the reversals of fortune is not novel, but a common feature already present in Herodotus' *Histories*,<sup>13</sup> and the early writers of local traditions who preceded Herodotus.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, they persevered long after Herodotus: Polybius in his preface even places educational value on the study of such *peripateiai*, through which students may learn to bear their own reversals of fortune with equanimity (Pol. 1.1.2).

The *Epitome* often provides moralising notes that accompany a narrative. Such is characteristic of the writing of Polybius<sup>15</sup> and indeed, to a lesser extent, of earlier world histories as a whole, since Diodorus comments that such universal histories contained a wealth of moral and ethical *exempla*.<sup>16</sup> Although the form in which Trogus' *Historiae* has come to survive is unique compared to other abbreviations, anthologies, and epitomes, the text itself

<sup>10</sup> Marincola (1997) 12–13.

<sup>11</sup> Marincola (1997) 17; see also Alonso-Núñez (1987) 58–9; Yardley and Heckel (1997) 24–5; Engels (1997) 246–8.

<sup>12</sup> See below, §10.

<sup>13</sup> Waters (1985) 106–7.

<sup>14</sup> Marincola (1997) 122.

<sup>15</sup> Davidson (1991) 14–18; Marincola (1997) 11.

<sup>16</sup> Diod. 1.1; Marincola (1997) 46.

contains the familiar subject matter that was to be expected of antiquity's conservative historiographical tradition.

### 3. The Work and Identity of Trogus

Pompeius Trogus was a Vocontian Gaul from Gallia Narbonensis, whose grandfather had received citizenship from Pompey for his participation in the war against Sertorius on the Iberian peninsula (Just. 43.5.11). As Alonso-Núñez points out, the *terminus post quem* of the *Historiae* is 2 BC and most likely AD 6; the *terminus ante quem* is probably AD 9.<sup>17</sup> Alonso-Núñez's argument, however, for his suggested *terminus ante quem* was based on an *argumentum ex silentio* that Trogus finished the *Historiae* before Varus' defeat at the *saltus Teutoburgiensis*, since he makes no mention of it, but this might equally be a deliberate omission.<sup>18</sup> Trogus' purpose in writing his history is unclear now, just as it was in antiquity when Justin could only conjecture whether Trogus had written his history for glory or pleasure.<sup>19</sup>

Although he is no longer a well-known writer from antiquity, Trogus nevertheless enjoyed great popularity among the authors of the first century, especially the historians. Pliny the Elder cites his *De Animalibus* (*N.H.* 7.33: *auctor est Trogus*);<sup>20</sup> and it is likely that Valerius Maximus, Velleius Paterculus, Curtius Rufus, and Frontinus all relied on Trogus' work, both as a historical and as a literary source, from which they drew inspiration.<sup>21</sup> However, much less work has been done on Trogus' influence on Tacitus. Cornelius, one of the earliest modern scholars to analyze the language of the *Epitome* and to compare it with the other ancient historians, correctly observed several similarities between Justin and Tacitus, but assumed this was Tacitean influence on Justin, ignoring the possibility that the words may have originally been those of Trogus.<sup>22</sup> R. H. Martin in his 'Tacitus and his Predecessors' makes no mention of Trogus. Yet, as I shall try to demonstrate, Tacitus was very much indebted to Trogus, and he made use of the *Historiae* both as an historical source and as a stylistic model that he might imitate.

<sup>17</sup> Alonso-Núñez (1987) 60–1.

<sup>18</sup> Levene (2010) 305–6 n. 34.

<sup>19</sup> Just. *praef.* 1: *seu aemulatione gloriae sive varietate et novitate operis delectatus*; cf. Marincola (1987) 61.

<sup>20</sup> Seel (1956) 3–4.

<sup>21</sup> Seel (1954); Yardley (2003) 92–112; Crohn (1882) 6–53; Atkinson (1980) 59–61.

<sup>22</sup> Cornelius (1888) 1–2.

Goodyear did take up the cause of comparing the language of the *Epitome* with Tacitus' works, but he contributed little more than a collection of similar sentences—some more likely to be related than others—without forming a cogent argument for why the words found in the *Epitome* should be given priority over those in Tacitus. Goodyear's opinion of Justin is stated quite clearly in his article on Trogus and Vergil:<sup>23</sup>

Justin excerpted hurriedly and carelessly. He seems to have contributed little, except his blunders and a scattering of synonyms... He had neither the time nor the desire nor the ability to rewrite the historian he so much admired... If this view is right, it looks unlikely that Justin, to any appreciable extent, sought to improve on Trogus by suffusing his excerpts with a mass of Virgilian tints. That coloration, I should maintain, derives from the historian, not his fumbling excerptor.

Yardley dismisses Goodyear's thesis (and rightfully so) on the grounds that it was based 'on his low opinion of the epitomator'.<sup>24</sup> Yardley, nevertheless, does not provide sufficient evidence to assume the opposite, namely that Justin more likely borrowed from Tacitus. I will not speculate on whether or not Justin had read Tacitus; it is quite possible that there is a Tacitean influence to be found in the *Epitome*, but I shall demonstrate that there was a Trogan influence on Tacitus. To this end, I shall first analyse the text of the *Epitome* to isolate Trogan passages that are highly unlikely to belong to Justin, and then compare them with similar passages that exist in Tacitus to form my argument.

#### **4. The Introduction of the *Epitome***

The opening sentence of the *Epitome* does not belong to Justin's *Epitome*. That is to say that Just. 1.1.1 is an introduction for a work that Justin does not provide; it is a programme for the *Historiae Philippicae*, not one for the epitome thereof, and it is quite possibly a verbatim copy of Trogus' original words. Justin's *Epitome* so begins (1.1.1):

Principio rerum gentium nationumque imperium penes reges erat, quod ad fastigium huius maiestatis non ambitio popularis, sed spectata inter bonos moderatio provehebat.

<sup>23</sup> Goodyear (1992c) 236.

<sup>24</sup> Yardley (2003) 114.

In the beginning of history, the command over clans and nations belonged to kings, and not popular favour, but restraint respected amongst honest men carried them to the peak of this grandeur.’

These words cover the major themes and subjects of the *Historiae*, but not so much those of the *Epitome*.<sup>25</sup> The language itself has been dealt with by Yardley, who sees the words as likely Trogan.<sup>26</sup>

Trogus first outlines the massive scope of his history, both chronological and geographical, with the words: *principio rerum gentium nationumque imperium*, thus indicating that his work is a massive world history that encompasses all ages and ethnicities of the known world. Justin acknowledges the exceptionally broad scope of Trogus’ *Historiae* in the preface (*praef.* 2):

Nam cum plerisque auctoribus singulorum regum vel populorum res gestas scribentibus opus suum ardui laboris videatur, nonne nobis Pompeius Herculea audacia orbem terrarum adgressus videri debet cuius libris omnium saeculorum, regum, nationum populorumque res gestae continentur.

Should not Trogus, in whose books are contained the histories of all ages, kings, nations and peoples (*nationum populorumque*), seem to us to have approached the world with Herculean boldness, when to most authors who write the histories of individual kings or peoples their own work seems to be the most difficult task.’

Trogus took such care in writing geographies and ethnographies, which contain the *origines* and *incrementa* of the nations, that they comprise a staggering portion of the *prologi*.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, Trogus used these digressions so

<sup>25</sup> Ferrero (1957) 18–19.

<sup>26</sup> Yardley (2003) 24, 27, 36, 80, 93.

<sup>27</sup> The *prologi* contain: the sites of the Aeolic and Ionic cities and the origins of the Lydians (*prol.* 1); the sites of Scythia and Pontus and the origins of Scythia, of Athens, and of Thessaly (*prol.* 2); the origins of the Peloponnesians (*prol.* 3); a history of the Sicilian people (*prol.* 4); the ancient history of the Macedonians and the origins of the Illyrians and Paeonians (*prol.* 7); the origins of Byzantium and Cyprus, and the history of the Scythians (*prol.* 9); the early history of the Paphlagonians (*prol.* 10); the origins of Caria (*prol.* 11); the origins of the Apulians, Samnites, Sabines and Lucanians (*prol.* 12); the origins of the Quirenae (*prol.* 13); the origins of the Rhodians (*prol.* 15); the origins of Heraclea and Bithynia (*prol.* 16); the origins of the Phoenicians, Velia, Sidon, and Carthage’s early history (*prol.* 18); the origins of the Veneti and of those of the Gauls and Greeks who inhabited Italy (*prol.* 20); the origins of the Bruttii (*prol.* 23); the origins of the

commonly that one can only agree that there is 'an almost universal rule' that Trogus, whenever he came to a new people, would interrupt his narrative to give a brief account of its origins.<sup>28</sup> When Philip II expands the kingdom of Macedon to include neighbouring states, the *Epitome* states: 'And so he established one kingdom and one people out of many clans and nations.'<sup>29</sup> Justin, however, did not care to elaborate fully on who these people were, for he fails to mention the subjugation of the Thessalians, merely reporting that Philip seized some goldmines and quarries in Thessaly (8.3.12). Were Justin truly interested in the *nationes gentesque* that are contained in his *Epitome*, surely a minimal account of the conquests of the eponymous king<sup>30</sup> should be expected. Indeed, of the numerous accounts of ethnicities set out in the *prologi*, comparatively few are maintained in Justin's *Epitome*, a fact that indicates that Justin did not share Trogus' interest in such matters, and therefore the opening sentence is not as fitting a description for the *Epitome* as it is for the *Historiae Philippicae* that Trogus had written.

Moreover, the words of the opening themselves, *gentium nationumque*, are likely Trogan in their wording. Justin uses the pair *nationum populorumque* in the preface (*praef.* 2), and this could be attributed to mere variation, if both pairings appeared on only one occasion. However, the formula of *gentes nationesque* is the standard grouping, with the exception of a couple instances where the authorship is likely to be Justin's. The phrase *populi nationesque* does occur again, in the history of the Pelasgi of Bottia (7.1.4), but the passage is likely Justinian, since it functions as a brief overview for a large passage of time and for the successions of multiple kings, which Trogus had likely included in the *Historiae*.<sup>31</sup> Added to this, the Late Latin writing style of

---

Gauls (*prol.* 24); the origins of Crete (*prol.* 29); the origins of the Cappadocian kings (*prol.* 34); the origins of the Jews (*prol.* 36); the origins of the kings of Pontus, the Bosphorus and Colchis (*prol.* 37); early Parthian, Bactrian and Indian history (*prol.* 41); the origins and site of the Armenians, the history of the Scythians, the Tocharian kings, and the demise of the Saraucæ (*prol.* 42); the origins of the Latins, the site of Rome, the early history of the Ligurians and Massilians (*prol.* 43); and the history of Spain and Carthage (*prol.* 44).

<sup>28</sup> Pendergast (1961) 22. It is perhaps revealing that Trogus does not provide the origins of the Jews until Book 36 (*prol.* 36; Just. 36.2), after the defeat of Demetrius I Soter, in which they played a part, as even Trogus recognised (36.1.10: *Iudaeos quoque, qui in Macedonico imperio sub Demetrio patre armis se in libertatem vindicaverant*). Trogus, it seems, chose not to mention the Jews in his previous Book in order that he not might examine them at that point and thereby interrupt his narrative on the fall of Demetrius.

<sup>29</sup> 8.6.2: *atque ita ex multis gentibus nationibusque unum regnum populumque constituit.*

<sup>30</sup> See n. 11.

<sup>31</sup> Although the Pelasgian kings are not included in *prol.* 7 there are several instances of such *origines* being omitted in the *prologi* although they occur in the *Epitome* (Pendergast (1961) 23–5).



Justin—the use of *usque* as a preposition is post-Augustan<sup>32</sup> and the apposition of a plural noun to *populus* in *populus Pelasgi* is uncommon at best—indicates that he has written this summary himself. As mentioned above, the eponymous king, Philip II, established one people and kingdom out of *multis gentibus nationibusque* (8.6.2); The infamous Ten Thousand Greek mercenaries are described as ‘returning among so many fierce nations and barbaric clans’.<sup>33</sup> After the failed assault on Delphi, *gentes quoque nationesque* are also hunting down the remnants of the Celtic campaign that are on their way home (24.8.15).

### 5. The Themes of the *Historiae Philippicae*

The first theme introduced in the opening sentence is *imperium*. *Imperium*, in this context referring to the right of a king to command his subjects,<sup>34</sup> is a concept central to the *Historiae*, as Trogus traces its passage from one king to another, and also from one empire to another. Trogus structured his *Historiae* around the succession of world empires: the Assyrian; the Median; the Persian; the Macedonian and its successors; and finally the Roman and Parthian empires.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, chronology was secondary to this theme.<sup>36</sup> Justin cares little for this focus on succession, as he ignores the origins of the Parthians in the east, a crucial element in the scheme of succession of empires, which Trogus did set out (*prol.* 35). In fact, even the demise of the two great eastern empires, the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties are ignored in Book 40 of Justin in contrast to the corresponding *prologus*.

Connected to the theme of *imperium* is the position of *reges*, those who wield the *imperium*. In Trogus’ view, monarchy, as Levene says, ‘is the universal condition of human anthropology’.<sup>37</sup> Throughout the *Epitome*, kings are essential for the well-being of the state: since the Macedonians face defeat due to the absence of a king on the battlefield, they therefore resolve to bring the infant king Aeropos to battle and, in doing so, gain victory (7.2.8-12); and not long afterwards, when the Macedonians were facing a losing war, they compelled Philip II to take up the kingship (7.5.10); in Syracuse, the soldiers set up the eldest son of Dionysius I as king, ‘both

<sup>32</sup> Yardley (2003) 118.

<sup>33</sup> 5.11.11: *revertentesque inter tot indomitas nationes et barbaras gentes*.

<sup>34</sup> Pendergast (1961) 37.

<sup>35</sup> Alonso-Núñez (1987) 62.

<sup>36</sup> Van Wickevoort (1993) 48–9.

<sup>37</sup> Levene (2010) 299.

following the law of nature and because they reckoned the kingdom would be stronger if it remained in the hands of one man' (21.1.1-2); and the Cappadocians say that a nation cannot live without a king (38.2.8).<sup>38</sup> Trogus also took care not only to document the origins of peoples, but also of kings; hence the several lists of kings and other rulers that are included in the *prologi* (*prol.* 2; 7; 11; 13; 16; 17; 34; 37; 42).<sup>39</sup>

Moreover, there is Trogus' habit of portraying figures who were not kings as if they were. He reported that the Jewish patriarchs as early as Abraham were kings (36.2.3).<sup>40</sup> Hannibal is presented as somewhat of a king, despite the fact that Trogus was aware of Carthage's constitution. Justin lists Hannibal in a large succession of kings (29.1.7), whom he then describes as *his regibus pueris* (29.1.8). Furthermore, in the summarisation of Hannibal's life, a specific verb with kingly undertones is chosen to describe his command 'when he ruled over (*rexerit*) the armies of different nations'.<sup>41</sup> Although the verb does not have a meaning as strong as *regno*, the etymological connection is certainly not lost on the author, who implies a kingly quality in Hannibal's leadership of his army.

It is unlikely that someone who wished to centre his work on the rise and succession of kings and of empires would have omitted as many successions as Justin so clearly did.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, Justin even omits the reign of many kings

<sup>38</sup> Levene (2010) 300.

<sup>39</sup> Pendergast (1961) 24 n. 2.

<sup>40</sup> Levene (2010) 299.

<sup>41</sup> 32.4.12: *cum diversarum gentium exercitus rexerit*

<sup>42</sup> The instances are numerous: Trogus placed Xerxes' death at the end of his second Book and began the third Book with the succession of Artaxerxes (*prol.* 2-3), whereas Justin covered both events in Book 3 (Just. 3.1); The history of Chandragupta and the Mauryan empire is passed over, despite the relevance of this material to a treatise on world empires (*prol.* 15); Justin delays the succession of Agathocles to the beginning of Book 22 (cf. *prol.* 21); the Seleucus II Callinicus' succession after the death of Antiochus I Soter is ignored (cf. *prol.* 26); Eumenes I is conflated with his successor Attalus I and even the Bithynian king Ziaelas (27.3.1; cf. *prol.* 27); Justin omits the death of Seleucus IV Philopator and the succession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (cf. *prol.* 32); Justin does not end Book 33 with the final king of Macedon, Andriscus, but rather he chooses to end with the return of Aetolian hostages (33.2.8; cf. *prol.* 33); Justin omits the subornment of Attalus II in place of Eumenes II of Pergamum (cf. *prol.* 34); the death of Ptolemy Philometor and Demetrius II Nicator's expulsion from Syria are both omitted (cf. *prol.* 35); Justin erroneously reports that Attalus III Philometor succeeds his uncle Eumenes (36.4.1); the *prologus*, however, has the correct order of succession that Trogus recorded: Attalus III, son of Eumenes II, succeeded Attalus II, his uncle (cf. *prol.* 36); Justin omits Trogus' line of succession of Pontic kings (cf. *prol.* 37); Justin omits the subsequent succession of Ptolemy XI Alexander II and of Ptolemy Auletes (cf. *prol.* 39); the deaths

by simply stating that a succession of several kings has taken place, e.g.: ‘Then after many kings, the royal power came down to Astyages through the order of succession,’<sup>43</sup> a formula which recurs throughout the history (2.6.12; 7.4.3; 43.2.1).<sup>44</sup> The last example, the succession of early Macedonian kings, which amounts to a genealogy, is certainly not a subject that Trogus passed over in one sentence, since the *Historiae Philippicae* are centered around Philip II, Alexander the Great and the successors thereof. Furthermore, there is no reason to think that Trogus would have been intentionally vague in that line of succession, since he provides the exact number of Macedonian kings, thirty, and the number of years that their kingdom lasted, 924 (33.2.6). Justin, therefore, had no reason to stress the importance of kings in an introduction to his *Epitome*, whereas Trogus did have such a reason, since in his books there was ‘the history of all ages, kings, races, and peoples’ (*praef.* 2).

It is here too that Trogus introduces the opposing qualities that act as driving forces in the succession of kings and the transfer of *imperium*: *ambitio popularis* and *moderatio*. Eichert defined the former as ‘*Bewerbung um Volksgunst*’<sup>45</sup> and it stands in contrast to the latter, *spectata inter bonos moderatio*, denoting self-control, temperateness, and restraint, which has earned the respect of the nobility, not merely the support of the common rabble. It was not *cupiditas* or *avaritia* that created kings, but the respect of the *boni*. Indeed, for Trogus restraint is a requirement of a good ruler.<sup>46</sup> Throughout the *Epitome*, *ambitio popularis* and *moderatio* are used to explain historical events. Furthermore, the wars of the Diadochi contain the best examples of this *ambitio popularis*. As soon as Alexander’s death becomes apparent, his generals seek the favour of the soldiers by canvassing the mob (12.15.11: *ambitione vulgi*); Meleager and Attalus seek power by flattering the mob (*ex vulgi adulatione*, 13.3.2); and Ptolemy Ceraunus is eager to acquire favour among the people by the memory of his father and the avenging of Lysimachus (17.2.6).

Hence *moderatio* is important in all aspects of rule. It is often the cause of individuals rising to kingship and obtaining *imperium* throughout the *Epitome*:

---

both of Antiochus VIII Grypus and of his successors are omitted, as is the succession of Antiochus X Eusebes, and little care is given to the final demise of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties, the latter not being mentioned at all (cf. *prol.* 40).

<sup>43</sup> 1.4.1: *post multos deinde reges per ordinem successionis regnum ad Astyagen descendit.*

<sup>44</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 3.

<sup>45</sup> Eichert (1967) 11.

<sup>46</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 78.

Hiero of Syracuse became a king because of his *moderatio*.<sup>47</sup> Indeed, Hiero's appointment as king of Syracuse was merely the inevitable result of his kingly attributes. In the summation of Hiero's greatest qualities that mark him as a king, it is his *moderatio* that is given the most important position of the ascending tricolon (23.4.15):

in adloquio blandus, in negotio iustus, in imperio moderatus, prorsus ut nihil ei regium deesse praeter regnum videretur.

He was charming in his addresses, just in his conduct, and moderate (*moderatus*) in his command. Thus it seemed he lacked no kingly feature except a kingdom.

It is also through a leader's *moderatio* that he maintains the loyalty of his subjects. Ptolemy I Soter brought the Egyptians into his favor by his moderation.<sup>48</sup> Ptolemy's restraint appears later, where it is likened to the idealised kings of prehistory whom Trogus described in his first book, and who engaged in war for the sake of glory and abstained from *imperium* (1.1.7), since Ptolemy undertook a war not for gain, but for his own dignity and to punish Antigonus for his greedy acquisition of the spoils of war (15.1.7-9). Later in the *Epitome*, the narrative on the court of Ptolemy IV Philopator (30.1-2) touches the issue of *luxuria* and regal *maiestas*. Ptolemy becomes complacent with his good fortune and gives himself over to luxury<sup>49</sup> and later, after defeating Antiochus, hurls himself back into his life of luxury, again satisfied with what fortune has supplied him.<sup>50</sup> Ptolemy fails to prove himself worthy of the *maiestas* of his office, since he forgets about it, preferring to spend his days in banquets and his nights among concubines.<sup>51</sup> It should also be noted that when Ptolemy IV Philopator abstains from stripping Antiochus III of his empire, he does so not out of any *moderatio*, but from his lack of *virtus*.<sup>52</sup>

*Moderatio* also safeguards the succession of one's sons. Such was the case for King Anaxilaus, whose *moderatio* made the succession of his sons possible, since the people were more willing to allow a slave to be regent than they

<sup>47</sup> 23.4.1-2: *magistratus Hiero creatur, cuius tanta moderatio fuit, ut consentiente omnium civitatum favore dux adversus Karthaginienses primum, mox rex crearetur.*

<sup>48</sup> 13.6.19: *Quippe et Aegyptios insigni moderatione in favorem sui sollicitaverat.*

<sup>49</sup> 30.1.1: *luxuriae se tradiderat.*

<sup>50</sup> 30.1.7: *sed contentus reciperatione urbium ... revolutusque in luxuriam... inlecebris capitur.*

<sup>51</sup> 30.1.8: *maiestatis oblitus noctes in stupris, dies in conviviis consumit.*

<sup>52</sup> 30.1.6: *spoliassetque regno Antiochum, si fortunam virtute iuvisset.*

were to desert their beloved king's children (4.2.5). Argeus ruled so moderately and thus gained such love from the people that, when his first successor died, his infant son was made heir (7.2.5). Trogus attributes this characteristic to Hannibal as well, who enjoys an incredible loyalty due to his *moderatio* (32.4.12).

Trogus commonly uses *immoderatio* as an explanation for the defection of one's allies, desertion by one's own family and the ultimate loss of one's *imperium*. The Athenians provoked such hatred with the cruelty of their immoderate empire (*immoderati imperii*) that the kingdoms of Greece turned against them (5.1.6); the Greek city-states of the fourth century are described as lacking any restraint, shortly before they fell to the Macedonians (8.1.2).<sup>53</sup>

The most complex character in the *Epitome* to lack *moderatio* is Alexander the Great, who is described as greater than his father both in virtue and vices (9.8.11). Of all the extant ancient historians, the characterisation of Alexander provided in the *Epitome* is by far the most negative.<sup>54</sup> Not surprisingly, the *Epitome* is also the only extant history of Alexander that treats the rumour of his poisoning, a 'fitting' end to a tyrant, as a matter of fact.<sup>55</sup> Lytton argues that the portrayal of Alexander in the *Epitome* is not wholly negative, but rather a moral tale of a good king succumbing to Eastern corruption,<sup>56</sup> yet Alexander is given several flaws in Book 9, which lead directly to his death: his anger is without limit when he is enraged (9.8.14); his drinking caused him to act out violently against his own men, earning him the title in the *Epitome* of *amicorum interfector* (9.8.15-16); he ruled cruelly over his friends (9.8.17); and he preferred to be feared more than loved (9.8.17). In fact, Philip II, who was always bankrupt despite his endless plunder (9.8.6), is still described as frugal in comparison to his son.<sup>57</sup> Alexander's vices are similar to those that will be found in Ptolemy IV: he spends his nights with his concubines (12.3.10); he indulges excessively in banquets (12.3.11); and he even allows his subjects to follow in his vices (12.4.2; cf. 30.1.2).

Justin does provide another reason for Alexander's death, his immoderate drinking, *intemperies ebrietatis*, but he quickly denies this in favour of *insidiae* (12.8.10). And yet it is apparent in the narrative that *intemperies ebrietatis* was the cause of Alexander's death, albeit an indirect cause and one of many; for it was Alexander's increasingly outrageous behaviour

<sup>53</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 78.

<sup>54</sup> Rubincam (2005) 266-7.

<sup>55</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 283-6.

<sup>56</sup> Lytton (1973) 14-16.

<sup>57</sup> 9.8.20: *frugalitati pater, luxuriae filius magis deditus*; Rambaud (1948) 183.

unbefitting of a king (12.12.12; 12.13.7), his adoption of Persian arrogance (12.7.1), his violence against his subjects (12.7.2; 12.10.8; 12.11.8-9; 12.14.1) that led Antipater to fear for his life and to conspire against Alexander's (12.14.5). So Alexander died, and as Justin observes: 'He was finally conquered, not by the excellence of an enemy, but by the treachery of his own men and the deceit of his countrymen.'<sup>58</sup> Alexander's death was the result of *intemperies* or rather *immoderation*; for although he was unconquered on the battlefield, he lacked the qualities of a good king that Trogus had set out in his introduction.

Trogus, moreover, invented in Hannibal an antithesis to Alexander, an individual of the utmost (and exemplary) restraint. As previously mentioned, the Hannibal of the *Epitome* enjoyed an incredible loyalty among his troops due to his moderation. Yet, these two accounts contain remarkably similar language, for Justin says of Hannibal (32.4.12):

moderationis certe eius fuit, ut, cum diversarum gentium exercitus rexerit, neque insidiis suorum militum sit petitus umquam neque fraude proditus, cum utrumque hostes saepe temptassent.

He was doubtlessly of such moderation that, when he ruled over the armies of different nations, he was never the target of his men's treachery or deceitfully betrayed, although his enemies had often made attempts at each.

The words describing Alexander's death, *insidiis suorum* and *fraude*, invite the reader to compare the treachery that the successful Macedonian king suffered with the loyalty that the defeated Carthaginian general enjoyed; the former laid low by his excess, the latter protected by his restraint. The wording in this passage cannot be mere coincidence, since it suggests such a strong moral contrast in these two personae, and an equally strong contrast in the result of their morality. Trogus' contrast of them is quite deliberate, for while Alexander indulged in excessive drinking and feasting (9.8.15, 11.10.1-2, 12.3.11, 6.1-7), Hannibal on the contrary never reclined at dinner or drank more than a pint of wine (32.4.10). Indeed, in order for such a contrast to be made between the character of these 'kings', Hannibal must even be identified as such (29.1.8). Moreover, just as there was foreshadowing of Alexander's immoderation earlier, so the accusations against Hannibal of immoderation are dismissed as false (31.1.8-9).<sup>59</sup> Since Hannibal not only

<sup>58</sup> 12.16.12: *victus denique ad postremum est non virtute hostili, sed insidiis suorum et fraude civili.*

<sup>59</sup> Yardley (2003) 67.

derived his power from his outstanding character and moderation, but, as previously mentioned, also reigned (*rexerit*) over the armies of different nations, his character is reminiscent of how Trogus describes a prototypical king.

It is clear, then, that the introduction is not entirely compatible with Justin's *Epitome*, since many ideas that it introduces are not well explored within Justin's work. Moreover, judging from the *prologi* and even Justin's preface, those same ideas were fully explored in the *Historiae Philippicae*. Therefore, at the very least, we can conclude that Justin copied the opening sentence closely, if not verbatim. There is substantially less evidence to form a reasonable conclusion concerning the occurrence of the themes outlined by Trogus through the rest of the *Epitome*. When the subject of a king's *moderatio* is introduced, one cannot know with any degree of certainty, based on an analysis of Justin's text alone, whether Justin is quoting Trogus or simply paraphrasing him, although Yardley's study of the language of the *Epitome* can prove helpful. It can be safely assumed, however, that such an interest is a continuation of an idea set out in Trogus' *Historiae*, and not an addition on the part of the epitomator.

## 6. Trogus and Tacitus

If the introduction to the *Epitome* is to be read as a vestige of Trogus' original, as the evidence suggests, many questions must be answered concerning Trogus' influence on Tacitus; for the opening sentence of the *Annals*, bears a remarkable similarity to that of the *Historiae Philippicae*.<sup>60</sup> There is, first, no reason to doubt that Trogus had influenced Tacitus, since, as mentioned previously, Trogus was popular among later Roman historians, and Tacitus drew upon other historians of that period, most notably Livy and Sallust.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, if Tacitus was a Gaul, and even a Vocontian from Gallia Narbonensis,<sup>62</sup> it should cause no surprise that the historian, who took a great interest in Gallic matters, often treating the Gauls with sympathy, was familiar with the work of his countryman.<sup>63</sup>

The language itself of this passage is somewhat similar, both containing the words *principio* and *reges*, and the latter, as Levene notes, occurring both

<sup>60</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.1: *Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere*; Just. 1.1.1: *Principio rerum gentium nationumque imperium penes reges erat.*

<sup>61</sup> Syme (1958) 200–1.

<sup>62</sup> Syme (1958) 611–24; Gordon (1936) 145–51.

<sup>63</sup> Syme (1958) 624.

times in an emphatic position.<sup>64</sup> Cornelius attributed this introduction to a Tacitean influence on Justin, which, as I have suggested above, is unlikely.<sup>65</sup> However, these opening sentences still differ enough that scholars often trace their origins to different sources: Tacitus' opening is often claimed to be derived from Sallust;<sup>66</sup> indeed, Ferrero credited this passage with influencing Trogus to write his introduction which remains intact in the *Epitome*.<sup>67</sup> Yardley attributes the words *principio rerum* to Livian influence<sup>68</sup> and *ambitio popularis* to a possible Ciceronian influence on Trogus,<sup>69</sup> and he suggests the possibility that *fastigium maiestatis* is Trogan.<sup>70</sup> He does note, however, that both the *Epitome* and the *Annals* also possess a metrical rhythm.<sup>71</sup> Yet such similar passages, expressing such similar ideas, and both expressed in a quasi-metrical rhythm—both begin with three 'hexameter' feet, the *Annals* with three spondees and the *Epitome* with a dactyl and two spondees—should not be seen as mere coincidence when they both take the same important position, the opening sentence of an historical work. This position is not occupied by the usual tropes, such as the authors' justification for their respective choices of their respective topics or methodology.<sup>72</sup>

Perhaps if this were the single significant parallel between the two historians, it could be explained as a mere coincidence. The introductory sentence of the *Annals*, however, was not a lone parallel to be found between the *Epitome* and Tacitus' work. The death of Alexander, as it occurs in Tacitus, is far too similar to Alexander's death at Just. 12.16.12 to be a mere coincidence. For Tacitus writes comparing the deaths of Alexander and Germanicus (*Ann.* 2.73.2):

Et erant qui formam, aetatem, genus mortis ob propinquitatem etiam locorum in quibus interiit, magni Alexandri fati adaequarent. nam utrumque corpore decoro, genere insigni, haud multum triginta annos egressum, suorum insidiis externas inter gentis occidisse.

<sup>64</sup> Levene (2010) 294.

<sup>65</sup> Cornelius (1888) 15–16.

<sup>66</sup> *Cat.* 6.1: *Urbem Romam ... condidere atque habuere initio Troiani*; Martin (1969) 134; Goodyear (1972) 89; Sellge (1882) 60.

<sup>67</sup> Ferrero (1952) 18–19.

<sup>68</sup> Yardley (2003) 23–24.

<sup>69</sup> Yardley (2003) 80.

<sup>70</sup> Yardley (2003) 92–3.

<sup>71</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 7 n. 20.

<sup>72</sup> Levene (2010) 294.



And there were those who compared the form, the age, and the type of death to the fate of Alexander the Great because of even the region in which he died. For both, men of handsome body and noble birth, not much past thirty years old, perished from the treachery of their own men among foreign peoples.

So not only is the passage from Justin's *Epitome* related to this one from Tacitus' *Annals*, but also Tacitus was the one who was influenced by an earlier author, since Trogus is the common source from which they have drawn. In fact, the positive assertion that Alexander died *insidiis suorum* is not universally accepted, and therefore Tacitus is not just using language similar to Justin's *Epitome* to discuss Alexander, but 'he is doing so while drawing on a version of Alexander's history which has a strongly Trogan colouring.'<sup>73</sup>

Indeed, Tacitus was not the first historian to draw on Trogus. Quintus Curtius, who made heavy use of Trogus as a source, has Alexander say, 'Just keep me safe from internal deceit and the treachery of my countrymen.'<sup>74</sup> Admittedly this final example is found in a different context from the others. However, the difference is not too great, since Alexander is here looking to prevent a death resulting from *fraus* and *insidiae*, whereas in Justin he has succumbed to *fraus* and *insidiae*, and in Tacitus merely to *insidiae*. Moreover, although both Curtius' and Tacitus' passage differ much between themselves, they each strongly resemble Justin's passage, a fact that suggests that it belongs to the historian who predated them. Tacitus was drawing from a source that reported Alexander's death as an assassination, and Curtius, despite the lacuna surrounding the events leading up to his illness, clearly does no such thing (10.14).

Seel argued against such a view, asserting that Trogus most likely approached the death of Alexander more cautiously.<sup>75</sup> He bases this argument largely on a later speech, in which Eumenes castigates his soldiers by saying that they were disloyal to Alexander, and that they would have killed him too, if the gods had allowed him to die by a mortal hand (14.4.12). If Trogus had reported the plot as fact, one would not expect to find this contradiction after only two Books. Indeed, Wheatley and Heckel cite this as 'a clear indication that at this time, at least, no one took seriously the

<sup>73</sup> Levene (2010) 304.

<sup>74</sup> Curt. 9.6.24: *vos modo me ab intestina fraude et domesticorum insidiis praestate securum.*

<sup>75</sup> Seel (1956) 118. The *prologi* do not actually indicate how he died, only that his *interitus* is included in Book 12 (*prol.* 12). *Interitus* gives no clear indication either, since it and the verb from which it is derived are used for any death, whether illness (*prol.* 15: *Rex Cassander interiit*) or assassination (*prol.* 20: *ad interitum* [sc. *Dionysii*]).

rumour that the king had been the victim of foul play'.<sup>76</sup> Speakers, however, need not report facts; in the speech of Mithridates, Mithridates shows his dishonesty when he claims that Pyrrhus defeated the Romans in battles on three occasions (38.4.5), despite the fact that Justin repeats that Pyrrhus only defeated the Romans twice (18.1; 23.3.11).<sup>77</sup> Moreover, there is the additional possibility that this section of Eumenes' speech was penned by Justin, and, if that is so, the fault for any lack of accord, if there even is any, would then be Justin's. The latter, however, is consistent in his treatment of the death of Alexander, mentioning in the following book that Alexander was slain (13.2.1: *occiso Alexandro*), and again reporting that Cassander's household payed for the murder of Alexander (16.2.5). It is clear that there is no internal inconsistency concerning the death of Alexander to suggest that Justin contributed it, or removed another account that Trogus preferred. Moreover, this is not the only example of the *Historiae Philippicae* preferring to report a death by treachery rather than disease; for in the *Epitome* Dionysius I is reported to have been killed by the treachery of his own men (20.5.14: *insidiis ... suorum*), whereas Diodorus tells that Dionysius fell ill and died of disease (15.73.5).

In summary, the introduction of the *Epitome* of the *Historiae Philippicae* is a more appropriate introduction to Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*. It is in this passage that a key word that recurs throughout the work is introduced: *moderatio*, which links this passage to the death of both Alexander and Hannibal. These two passages share a common style, in addition to a thematic link, which reflects an intentional comparison and contrast of the leaders on the part of Trogus. Tacitus, in the writing of his *Annals*, used both Trogus' introduction and, like Curtius, Trogus' account of the death of Alexander. Indeed, there are several other possible comparisons that can be made between Trogus and Tacitus, such as Trogus' treatment of the Parthians (Just. 41.1.7) and Tacitus' treatment of Arminius (*Ann.* 2.88.2).<sup>78</sup> So although Yardley is correct in criticising Goodyear's thesis for resting on a low opinion of the epitomator, the argument to be made for a Trogan influence on Tacitus, rather than Tacitus later influencing Justin, need not rely on an assumption that Justin was a lazy and fumbling excerptor. Rather, the isolation of Trogan passages, which have close parallels in Tacitus' work, provide sufficient evidence that Tacitus borrowed his words from Trogus on occasion, and these close parallels show that Justin does maintain many of Trogus' phrases, with little to no modification.

<sup>76</sup> Yardley–Wheatley–Heckel (2011) 188.

<sup>77</sup> See also Adler (2006) on the distortion of fact in Sallust's *Epistula Mithridatis*.

<sup>78</sup> Goodyear (1992a) 231–2; Levene (2010) 304–7.

## 7. Justin and his Contributions to the *Historiae Philippicae*

Justin's identity is still unknown to modern scholars, who are even uncertain whether he was called Iustinus Iunianus or Iunianus.<sup>79</sup> He was not an inhabitant of Rome, but, if his preface to the *Epitome* is to be believed, he composed this work while enjoying leisure time there (*praef.* 9). Whoever he was, it is largely accepted that he wrote in the late 2nd or early 3rd century AD, before the rise of the Sassanian Empire, which would have rendered his final books on the Parthians obsolete. Although Syme has proposed a much later date,<sup>80</sup> and Barnes has made linguistic arguments in support of it,<sup>81</sup> Yardley argues more convincingly why the *communis opinio* should be maintained.<sup>82</sup>

In addition to Justin's identity, so too is his intent unknown. Jal argues that Justin was not an abbreviator or an epitomator, but a rhetor who wished to create his own unique work based on that of Pompeius Trogus.<sup>83</sup> Accordingly, since Justin was 'plus rhéteur qu'historien', he was not concerned with chronological precision and precise titles, whereby he could differentiate among various Hellenistic rulers of the same name and avoid the confusion that would inevitably arise from an abbreviated history of the Hellenistic world. Rather, Justin was interested in making a demonstration of his rhetorical talent.<sup>84</sup>

Without the actual text of Trogus, there can never be certainty whether Justin systematically erased any of Trogus' thoughts that he found disagreeable. However, no evidence for such a practice exists.<sup>85</sup> The fact that Justin expressed great admiration for Trogus (Just. *praef.* 1: *vir priscae eloquentiae*) and undertook a sort of abbreviation of his history—rather than someone else's—indicates that he must have agreed with much of what Trogus wrote. Therefore he chose to reproduce faithfully excerpts and to omit what he felt was neither enjoyable or a servicable model (*praef.* 4).<sup>86</sup> Nevertheless, the extent to which Justin faithfully reproduced Trogus' material is difficult to judge.

<sup>79</sup> Yardley (1997) 8.

<sup>80</sup> Syme (1998) 358–71.

<sup>81</sup> Barnes (1998) 589–93.

<sup>82</sup> Yardley (2000) 632–4.

<sup>83</sup> Jal (1987) 196–8.

<sup>84</sup> Jal (1987) 198–9.

<sup>85</sup> Pendergast (1961) 26 n. 6.

<sup>86</sup> Lytton (1973) 7.

There are only a few occasions in the *Epitome* where the words clearly belong to the epitomator, and so this paucity gives an even slighter opportunity for the reader to learn Justin's style and method of adding to Trogus's work. Some few short passages, however, do prove helpful. One such example occurs when Justin writes on Trogus' purpose for including Italy in the *Historiae* and so says (43.1.1):

Parthicis orientalibusque ac totius propemodum orbis rebus explicitis ad initia Romanae urbis Trogus veluti post longam peregrinationem domum revertitur.

After detailing the history of Parthia, the East (*orientalibus*), and nearly the entire world, Trogus turned to the origins of the city of Rome as if returning home from a long journey.

The post-Augustan word *orientalis*, which is unlikely to have been used by Trogus, appears frequently in the *Epitome*, often in passages that may be suspected of belonging to Justin for other reasons; therefore, as Yardley has already observed, with its use in a passage that doubtless was written by Justin, its appearance elsewhere most likely indicates Justin's authorship.<sup>87</sup> Justin compares the Parthian custom for naming their kings with the Roman custom for naming their rulers: 'they called all their kings by this name [sc. Arsaces] just as the Romans have called all theirs Caesars and Augusti'.<sup>88</sup> Justin names previous Roman *principes* as kings, a mistake that Trogus would not have been foolish enough to have made in the Augustan age.

Nevertheless, one must concede that such linguistic evidence on its own is not compelling for two reasons: the first is that Trogus was a late-Augustan historian, a younger contemporary of Livy's, and so one cannot completely discount the possibility that some words that are now seen as 'post-classical' may have appeared in the *Historiae*, especially when so little has survived of the body of Latin literature written in the Augustan age and prior; the second reason is that, as Goodyear has asserted, Justin may have unintentionally contributed his own synonyms to a passage without altering Trogus' thoughts.<sup>89</sup> This being the case, however, later Latin is still a strong marker for a potential insertion made by the epitomator, and, if it exists with other markers of Justin's writing, there is a cogent argument to be made that Justin alone is responsible for a passage and merely used Trogus as a source.

<sup>87</sup> Yardley (2003) 141.

<sup>88</sup> 41.5.8: *Omnes reges suos hoc nomine, sicuti Romani Caesares Augustosque, cognominavere.*

<sup>89</sup> Goodyear (1992a) 211.

There are also stylistic elements that point to Justin's authorship of a passage, but these too can only prove so much, and to the mere likelihood that a passage is not Trogan. Castiglioni asserts:<sup>90</sup>

Quando l'autore riproduce il suo originale o gli sta molto vicino, la frase è abbastanza ricca di pensiero, audace e temperata insieme nel traslato, sostenuta nella collocazione dei suoi elementi sintattici, varia nella struttura, abilmente ellittica a volte e a volte simmetricamente disposta e abbondante senza ridondanza nè sconvenienti tautologie.

Scribes cannot reasonably be blamed for a large part of the repetitions in the *Epitome*, since this would suggest an unprecedented degree of scribal error.<sup>91</sup> Surely not all well-crafted passages found within the *Epitome* should be assumed to be verbatim quotations or close reproductions of Trogan text, nor should Justin be dismissed as incapable of producing anything of literary merit; it is, nevertheless, far more likely that the epitomator wrote the redundant and poorly drafted sections himself rather than the alternative, i.e., that he merely maintained the stylistic errors of the original author.

### 8. Justin and Historiography

Justin, although he reproduced Trogus' world history, was himself not a historian. Accordingly, Justin's version of Trogus' world history only covers the succession of world empires by chance, when the passages that he wishes to maintain happen to contain such material. Trogus did not make use of an annalistic format, but he did provide specific durations of time for individual reigns and empires as a whole, as well as for any other important events in an individual's life or any other duration of time that may have been significant.<sup>92</sup> In contrast, as Castiglioni noted, Justin did not care to lay out the events deliberately into a chronological series and their place in the succession of historical events, although he praised Trogus for this accomplishment in his preface (*praef.* 3); rather, when Justin does provide a connection between events, he provides 'the most meaningless and useless formulae'.<sup>93</sup> Thus, in order to pass over the names of what he saw as less important kings, Justin merely states that a series of kings has passed (1.4.1; 2.6.12; 43.2.1).

<sup>90</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 30.

<sup>91</sup> Goodyear (1992a) 210–11.

<sup>92</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 25–6.

<sup>93</sup> Castiglioni, (1967) 3.

Unlike Trogus, Justin had little interest in military and political history in itself; rather he preferred to focus his attention on exemplary 'biographies' and actions worthy of mention.<sup>94</sup> Justin's lack of interest in such grand matters accounts for the conspicuous absence of ethnographies in comparison to the *prologi*, although even these fail to account for all of Trogus' ethnographies, though they contain twenty-one that do not appear in the *Epitome*.<sup>95</sup> As Castiglioni noted concerning Book 31, 'Questo epitomatore, cui non è sembrato interessante dire nè quando, nè dove o con quali forze s'incontrassero in Asia i Romani ed Antioco, dopo aver conservato integro il racconto, che mette in luce la pristina dignità dell'Africano, si sofferma invece su di un piccolo episodio, davvero significante nell'insieme.'<sup>96</sup> Indeed, it is also in this Book that Justin recounts a moment from the Battle of Magnesia (31.8.6-8); however, unlike Livy (and, presumably, Trogus), one finds not a lengthy narrative of the course of the battle, but rather a brief moment of doubt, in which the Romans almost abandoned the field, and would have done so, were it not for the exemplary actions of a single military tribune. The rest of the battle, which is not integral to this story, is heavily abbreviated or omitted. The language of this passage is likely Trogan;<sup>97</sup> however, the account has been harshly stitched together by Justin for the sake of brevity. This is evidenced by the awkward way in which the legion is said to return to battle, marking the beginning of the Roman victory, followed by a report of the enemy's casualties after the battle (31.8.7), which Justin usually omitted.

It is not at all difficult to find examples of errors concerning military or political matters made by Justin in his version of the *Historiae*. Justin says that Mindarus and Pharnabazus are Spartan generals,<sup>98</sup> an error most likely Justin's, since the Persian satrap is identified correctly at 6.1.2. An error of this sort is doubtless the result of the careless abbreviations of a writer who did not pay as much attention to the details of the victories that led to Alcibiades' return, as he did for the return itself and the shift in fortune that accompanied it. Moreover, this paragraph compresses events of the Decelean War into a much narrower time frame; the Spartan defeat at Cyzicus (5.4.2) and the contemporaneous war being waged by the Carthaginians against the Syracusans (5.4.5) took place in 410/9. Alcibiades'

<sup>94</sup> Franco (1993) 79.

<sup>95</sup> See nn. 27 and 31.

<sup>96</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 6.

<sup>97</sup> Yardley (2003) 18, 68–9.

<sup>98</sup> 5.4.1: *Mindarus et Pharnabazus, Lacedaemoniorum duces.*

return to Athens, however, did not happen until 407/6.<sup>99</sup> Yet Justin's treatment indicates no such passage of time.

Justin, in fact, regularly leaves such gaps in his history, without providing any indication that omissions have been made, such as in the fight between Sparta and Thebes over the hegemony of Greece in the fourth century BC. Justin tells of the arrival of Persian ambassadors in Greece in 387/6 and the peace that they effected (6.6.1-5), and then, without any indication, passes over twenty years of history, proceeding to the year 365/4 and the Spartan victory and subsequent defeat at Cromnus (6.6.6-10). Justin continues to the Theban attack on Sparta and focuses on the absence of the Spartan army and the defense of the city by the old and young (6.7.2-4). Here the incredible bravery that was displayed in defense of the gods and country concerns Justin above all else and so he omits the disastrous battles at Leuctra (371 BC) and Mantinea (370 BC), the loss of Messene, and the numerous Theban invasions of the Peloponnese. In this manner, Justin rewrites a narrative that focused on the fall of the Spartan hegemony in the Peloponnese (*prol.* 6) and turns it into a singular exemplary tale of Spartan courage, thereby disregarding Trogus' intent that this book clearly mark the transfer of *imperium* from Sparta.<sup>100</sup> Here, as elsewhere, Justin's severe abbreviation of Trogus' text and omission of events results in a series of episodes without cohesion or their original purpose.<sup>101</sup>

Such shortcomings on the part of Justin are often easy to find when one compares his account with the *prologi*. That of Book 16, for example, tells us that Trogus' *Historiae* contain Lysimachus' release from his captivity among Dromichaetes, the Thracian king, and the subsequent wars that he proceeded to make on Demetrius in Asia Minor and Pontus (*prol.* 16). Justin, however, reports that Lysimachus proceeded to attack Thrace after he occupied Macedon (16.3.3). Here Justin obviously confused the land that Lysimachus was invading, an all too understandable error, since Lysimachus had attacked Thrace not long before, as even Justin recounts (16.1.19). Justin's tendency to conflate historical personalities has already been briefly mentioned in the discussion on his treatment in the matter of royal succession,<sup>102</sup> and to this list can be added his confusion of Polyperchon and Craterus on multiple occasions (12.10.1 (cf. Arr. *Anab.* 6.15.5); 13.8.5; 13.8.7 (cf. *prol.* 13); 15.1.1).<sup>103</sup> Yet these inaccuracies should not necessarily be

<sup>99</sup> Yardley (1994) 60 n. 8.

<sup>100</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 6.

<sup>101</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 3.

<sup>102</sup> See n. 42.

<sup>103</sup> Yardley and Heckel (1997) 24, 260–1. Yardley–Wheatley–Heckel (2011) 158–9.

considered unintentional; Justin does merge separate events for the sake of brevity and simplicity, although in doing so he created what Lytton calls 'a confused picture of the actual events'.<sup>104</sup>

Justin, most importantly—and perhaps most shockingly—seems not even to have cared about the historical significance of military campaigns that would lead to the transfer of *imperium*, the central theme of the *Historiae*. Indeed, these details were only included in the *Epitome* if they contained something 'exemplary' to instruct the reader or 'fantastic' to delight him. Book 40—at two brief paragraphs in length in Justin's version not much longer than the corresponding *prologus*—tells of the end of the Seleucid Empire and its inclusion into the Roman Empire. This book offers no information concerning the fall of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Justin acknowledges that the East came to belong to the Romans in the final sentence, but he seems to ignore Ptolemaic Egypt and only focuses on Syria and the constant warring between brothers that took place among the Seleucids (40.2.5). This is in obvious contrast to Trogus, who, as previously stated, made the succession of world empires a central theme to his history. This book would have served in some measure as the culmination of the *Historiae*, yet Justin, although he found much that he enjoyed in the *Historiae Philippicae*, gave no particular attention, when excerpting *quaeque cognitione dignissima*, to the historical view of Trogus or the historical relevance of Trogus' material.

### 9. The Oratory of the *Epitome*

Justin does maintain some of Trogus' rhetoric, a fact which is apparent in the similarities between Justin's speeches and those of first century historians, most notably Curtius, who is known to have used Trogus as a source.<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, Justin notes before he introduces Mithridates' speech that Trogus preferred *oratio obliqua* and disapproved of the use of *oratio recta* in Livy and Sallust, because 'they exceeded the bounds of historical writing by inserting speeches in direct discourse into their work rather than using their own words.'<sup>106</sup> Since a Trogan speech remains, whether a verbatim copy or a close reproduction, it provides a means of comparison to other anti-Roman speeches, i.e., the Aetolian response to the Roman embassy (28.2.1-13), Demetrius of Pharos' speech to Philip V (29.2-3.5), and Hannibal's speech to Antiochus III (31.5.2-9).

<sup>104</sup> Lytton (1973) 9.

<sup>105</sup> Atkinson (1980) 60.

<sup>106</sup> 38.3.11: *contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint.*



As Trogus made kingship a major theme of his *Historiae*, this is understandably present in the speeches that Justin provides in the *Epitome*, where the Romans' enemies often cite the Roman hatred of kings. The most notable appearance is in Mithridates' speech, in which Mithridates cites the Romans' notorious hatred of kings (38.6.1-7). Demetrius, using similar arguments, appeals to Philip V of Macedon, warning him that the Romans are waging war on all kings (29.2.2) and asserts that it was precisely for that reason that they waged war on him, because he was a king who ruled just beyond their borders; for the greater a kingdom is, the greater the foe the Romans will be (29.2.4-5). Hannibal, on the contrary, says to Antiochus III that he will give counsel, because of his hatred of the Romans and his love for the king (31.5.2). All of these examples exist in *oratio obliqua*, Trogus' preferred style, and the common *topos* is enough to indicate that this argument, as it appears outside of the speech of Mithridates, is most likely Trogan.

Trogus, not surprisingly, was interested in the place of various Celtic peoples in history, a fact which is apparent in his speech of Mithridates, in the *prologi* and in passages of Justin's *Epitome*. In the speech of Mithridates, Trogus gives the Celts a disproportionate amount of attention for what we are supposed to believe to be the military harangue of a first-century Pontic king, who had only a few Celts counted among his auxiliaries (38.4.7-10, 15, 5.3). Such examples are found in the other speeches: the sack of Rome by the Gauls is also mentioned in the Aetolians' rebuke of the Roman envoys (28.2.1,4-7,13); the Celts are named as one of the great forces that Greece has suffered (29.3.2); and Hannibal names the Gauls as the only other force to have defeated the Romans other than himself (31.5.9). These examples must represent Trogus' patriotism, and cannot reasonably be believed to have been created by Justin.<sup>107</sup>

Yet, there can also be no doubt that Justin contributed his own words to the *Epitome*; this is apparent in the use of many non-classical words that occur regularly throughout the text. Yardley makes a compelling argument that many poeticisms found in the *Epitome* are owed to the epitomator.<sup>108</sup> Indeed, many expressions and ideas that echo Statius or Lucan simply cannot belong to Trogus. Yardley, therefore, in using this logic, asserts that it was Justin who wrote the episode in which Themistocles attempts to detach the Ionians from the Persian fleet (2.12.3-7).<sup>109</sup> He bases his argument on several key points: first, there is the dissimilarity of this passage to

<sup>107</sup> Alonso-Núñez (1987) 69; Urban (1982) 1424-43.

<sup>108</sup> Yardley (1998) 104-6; Yardley (1997) 347.

<sup>109</sup> Yardley (1998) 107.

Herodotus' account (Hdt. 8.22); second, Trogus had a distaste for *oratio recta* and the *Epitome* elsewhere tends to contain *oratio obliqua* even where Herodotus uses *oratio recta* (cf. the message of Harpagus to Cyrus (Just. 1.5.8-9 ~ Hdt. 1.124), and the message of Themistocles to Xerxes (Just. 2.12.19-20 ~ Hdt. 8.75)); and third, the language is similar to that of Latin poetry.<sup>110</sup>

If we accept that Justin penned Themistocles' aforementioned message to the Ionians, then similar questions must be raised concerning Eumenes' speech to the Argyraspids (Just. 14.4.1-14), the other example of extended *oratio recta* in the *Epitome*. To answer these questions, a closer look at the content of Eumenes' speech is required. The speech itself closely parallels Plutarch's speech of Eumenes (*Eum.* 6-11):<sup>111</sup> both authors place Eumenes in chains (Just. 14.4.1; Plut. 17.6); both accounts contain the pathos of the undefeated general who only succumbs to the treachery of his soldiers (Just. 14.4.3; Plut. 17.8); Eumenes begs his soldiers to kill him rather than hand him over to Antigonos alive (Just. 14.4.5-7; Plut. 17.8); when this attempt fails, Eumenes then requests a sword to end his own life (Just. 14.4.8; Plut. 17.10); Plutarch reports that Eumenes would absolve the soldiers of their guilt, if they should kill him themselves (17.11) and Justin reports that he would free them from their oaths, should they let him die among them rather than be handed over to Antigonos alive (14.4.7). These two speeches are clearly derived from a common source, probably Hieronymus of Cardia, but Duris has also been suggested; however, that discussion exceeds the limits of this paper.<sup>112</sup>

Yet there is still more to this speech that goes beyond what is found in Plutarch. Wheatley and Heckel note that Trogus preserved a 'fuller version of the rhetoric' of the common source than Plutarch did.<sup>113</sup> Indeed, there are many historical details that Justin could not merely have invented, but are documented by other sources. First, Eumenes claims that the soldiers had sworn an oath to him on three occasions (Just. 14.4.3; cf. Nepos. *Eum.* 10.2).<sup>114</sup> More important is the curse: Eumenes in his curse on the Argyraspids, in which he wishes for them the same that they had done to their generals

<sup>110</sup> See Yardley (1998) 107-8; *quae vos ... dementia tenet* (Just. 2.12.3) is a common rhetorical question in Vergil and appears in later poets as well, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.601: *quae uos dementia adegit*; *Ecl.* 2.69 = *Ecl.* 6.47: *quae te dementia cepit*; Ovid. *Met.* 13.225-6: *quae vos dementia ... concitat*; Sen. *Quaest. Nat.* 5.18.6: *quae nos dementia exagitat*; and the phrase *moenia condere* (2.12.4) is a poetic expression meaning 'to found a city'.

<sup>111</sup> Yardley-Wheatley-Heckel (2011) 187.

<sup>112</sup> Hornblower (1981) 66; Heckel (2013) 175; Wheatley (2013) 24.

<sup>113</sup> Yardley-Wheatley-Heckel (2011) 187.

<sup>114</sup> Hornblower (1981) 204-5.

(Just. 14.4.10), foretells their fate. Eumenes implicates the Argyraspids in the murder of Perdiccas and the attempted murder of Antipater (Just. 14.4.11). Antigenes, a chiliarch of the Argyraspids,<sup>115</sup> who is elsewhere named as one of Perdiccas' murderers (Arr. *Succ.* 1.30-3; Polyæn. 4.6.4; Diod. 18.39.3-4), is reportedly burned alive shortly after the Argyraspids surrender Eumenes to Antigonos (Diod. 19.44.1), a punishment that Plutarch seems to know, but not to mention explicitly (Plut. *Eum.* 19.2). It is rather incredible that Eumenes cursed Antigenes, who advocated loyalty to his general rather than betrayal; though Eumenes was a loyal follower of Perdiccas there is unlikely by this point to have been any resentment for Antigenes' participation in, and profit from, the murder.<sup>116</sup> However, none of these details is to be found in the *Epitome*. What is more surprising is the fact that the curse that Eumenes places on the soldiers—that they spend the rest of their lives exiled to their camp (Just. 14.4.14)—fails to occur in the *Epitome*,<sup>117</sup> but other authors tell us that this curse is fulfilled (Diod. 19.48.3-4; Plut. *Eum.* 19.2).<sup>118</sup> The fact that Justin removes much of the context required to appreciate the speech fully makes it difficult to believe that he had any interest in composing such a speech.

Yet Castiglioni has already suggested that Justin rewrote this passage in his own style.<sup>119</sup> This argument does have its strength. The content of the speech has a glaring inconsistency with the rest of the *Epitome*: Eumenes' remark—'Finally, at your worst, you tormented even Alexander with your mutinies, whom you would have killed yourselves, had it been possible for him to die by a mortal's hand<sup>120</sup>—is seemingly inconsistent with 12.13.10, where Alexander is reportedly killed by a conspiracy of his own generals.

<sup>115</sup> Heckel (2013) 165–7.

<sup>116</sup> Roisman (2012) 182. See also Bosworth (1992) 70, 85 n. 82: it is more likely that Antigenes' loyalty was derived from his enmity for Antigonos; in fact, if this curse has precedents in the earlier accounts of Eumenes' life, then Bosworth is certainly correct in doubting the picture that Plutarch draws of Antigenes' consistent loyalty to Eumenes. Furthermore, when Plutarch's speech is seen in this light, it is not surprising that he chooses to omit a curse that undermines his characterisation of Antigenes.

<sup>117</sup> Justin merely tells that Antigonos returned to the Argyraspids their property (14.4.20).

<sup>118</sup> Heckel (2013) 175–6; see also Roisman (2012) 237: the accuracy of this tradition is questionable, since Polyænus asserts that they fought for Antigonos five years later (4.6.15) an assertion itself that is questionable when one considers their supposed advanced age, for which see Baynham (2013).

<sup>119</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 20.

<sup>120</sup> 14.4.12: *Ipsum denique Alexandrum, si fas fuisset eum mortali manu cadere, interempturi, quod maximum erat, seditionibus agitastis.*

Wheatley and Heckel treat this remark from Eumenes as evidence that no one at this time took the rumour of the conspiracy seriously,<sup>121</sup> and admittedly this would be consistent with the narrative, since Justin says of the conspiracy, 'His friends reported that the cause of death was excessive drinking; however, the truth of the matter is that there was a plot, and the power of the successors covered up the disreputable rumour.'<sup>122</sup> However, this very idea of Alexander's immortality, which occurs elsewhere in the *Epitome* (13.1.2), need not belong to Trogus or another source, but rather to Justin.

The language of the speech, including that immediately preceding and following it, is unlikely to be Trogan. First, Eumenes is led out *catenatus* (14.4.1), a word that only occurs in poetry and post-Augustan prose.<sup>123</sup> In the body of the speech, the same is true for the phrase *devota capita* (4.10) and the word *aevum* in the sense of 'life' (4.14).<sup>124</sup> Following the speech, there is the clumsy change of grammatical number, characteristic of Justin, such as in 14.4.16–17: *Sequitur exercitus prodito imperatore suo et ipse captivus, triumphumque de se ipse ad victoris castra ducit, omnia auspicia regis Alexandri et tot bellorum palmas laureasque una secum victori tradentes*. Here the singular *tradens* would be the expected form, but Justin uses the plural so as to agree with the sense of the noun. Justin in fact treats collective singular nouns as plurals far more than other classical authors do.<sup>125</sup>

Not only does this speech have elements of late Latin and a style that Trogus purportedly refused to use, but it is also a completely different kind of speech. Above all else, this is, in fact, the only true rhetorical discourse that exists in the entire work, an emotional plea by a skilled speaker which attempts to change the minds of his hostile audience.<sup>126</sup> The other speeches are not truly emotive nor do they resemble the usual speeches that are meant to incite the audience, but they work rather to set out the causes for the events at hand and, in the case of Mithridates' speech or that of the Aetolians (28.2.1–13), they explain why instant crises will inevitably be resolved with war.<sup>127</sup> It is entirely plausible, especially if Yardley's view of Justin as a rhetor is correct, that Justin has reworked Trogus' less emotive

<sup>121</sup> Yardley–Wheatley–Heckel (2011) 188.

<sup>122</sup> 12.13.10: *Amici causas morbi intemperiem ebrietatis disseminaverunt, re autem vera insidiae fuerunt, quarum infamiam successorum potentia oppressit*.

<sup>123</sup> Yardley (2003) 147.

<sup>124</sup> Yardley (2003) 122, 147.

<sup>125</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 39–40.

<sup>126</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 20.

<sup>127</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 20–1.

account of Eumenes' last speech into a format that he saw more fitting for the moment, while at the same time changing little of the content—and in doing so undermining Eumenes' accusations and rendering his last words irrelevant.

### 10. Fortune and the Divine in the *Epitome*

The *Epitome* contains several examples of sudden reversals of fortune and also of a moral order by which individuals receive just punishments for their previous crimes. Indeed, such justice is often attributed to the gods.<sup>128</sup> While it is convenient to attribute these features to either the original author or his epitomator, it is clear that both Trogus and Justin valued the role of fortune and a the notion of a moral order in their works. Justin, therefore, often maintains Trogus' treatment of these matters and at times even further stresses what Trogus had already pointed out. Indeed, Eumenes' speech is one such example of a reversal of fortune to which Justin contributes his own words. Eumenes, who shortly before had obtained power among the Argyraspids through his rhetorical prowess (14:2.8-12), is unable to dissuade them from betraying him and so he blames them for turning him, the conqueror, into the conquered (14.4.3). Finally, the formerly unconquered Argyraspids lead a triumph over themselves, as they go in a great procession to surrender themselves to Antigonus (14.4.16-18).

Justin, however, is not alone in his construction of such events. The manner in which he foreshadows Seleucus' downfall<sup>129</sup> is not wholly consistent with his style. As Castiglioni pointed out, Justin commonly used a construction uncharacteristic of classical Latin, a substantive clause introduced by *quod* rather than an accusative with infinitive construction after verbs of knowing (cf. 25.1.6: 31.4.8).<sup>130</sup> Here, as well as in Mithridates'

<sup>128</sup> Pendergast (1961) 132–46.

<sup>129</sup> 17.2.3: *ignarus prorsus non multo post fragilitatis humanae se ipsum exemplum futurum.*

<sup>130</sup> Castiglioni (1967) 86–7. In fact, Castiglioni did not make note of the fact that the following are ablative absolutes, which are inserted to contextualise the sentences in which they stand: 1.7.9: *cognito quod inlatum Croeso bellum esset*; 2.5.13; 16.5.1: *cognito quod Athenienses Ionis contra se auxilium tulissent*; 27.3.8: *cognito quod insidiae sibi pararentur*; 32.3.14: *cognito quod Argonautae...fecissent*. Moreover, all of these examples are those of a man learning of another party making war, a subject that Justin makes a habit of hurriedly passing over or omitting entirely, when it is not crucial for the narrative. Kuhner–Stegmann I.778–9 say of the use of the ablative absolute *cognito*, 'Bei Livius mit folgendem Acc. c. Inf. oder einem Nebensatze: ... *cognito* (und andere)'; in Livy, however, *cognito* only appears with a following accusative and infinitive.

speech, the classical construction is retained.<sup>131</sup>

Indeed, Justin did not excise sections from Trogus' account only for the sake of isolating his favourite episodes; but by doing so he also created a greater impression of cause and effect, thus imbuing his version of history with a providentialism that would not have been felt as strongly in Trogus' original, although it would still have been present.<sup>132</sup> Such remnants of Trogus' interest in the reversals of fortune are still detectable within the *Epitome*. Nowhere is this more apparent than in his treatment of the Hellenistic monarch Cleopatra IV. Her death under the orders of her sister Tryphaena (39.3.11) is followed immediately by her husband capturing Tryphaena and sacrificing her to the shades of his wife (39.3.12). It is unlikely that Trogus, the historian who chronicled the succession of world empires, would have so carelessly passed over Cyzicenus' capture of Antioch and Grypus' flight to Aspendus<sup>133</sup> with so little as a mere ablative absolute<sup>134</sup>—and one that is in the style of a later author no less!<sup>135</sup>—in order to tell of the divine punishment visited upon one cruel queen; this is the work of Justin. Indeed, the *prologus* indicates that Trogus focused on the war between the brothers, whereas Justin gave preferential treatment to the feud between the sisters.<sup>136</sup> Justin had no interest in the brothers' conflict, so he excised all the events that happened after Cleopatra's death, and added Trogus' words on Tryphaena's death, using only his own words to inform the reader of a brief passage of time and of the change in the fortunes of war.<sup>137</sup> It is in this manner that Justin creates, or rather enhances, the providential nature of history; Tryphaena orders her sister to be torn from a temple and murdered, and therefore she quickly pays for her crime with her own life after an almost instantaneous reversal of fortune.

Yet the Tryphaena episode is not the first incident such as this one in the *Epitome*. A similar construction ends the narrative on Dionysius I: 'Not much later, Dionysius, whom shortly before neither Sicily nor Italy could contain,

<sup>131</sup> 38.4.4: *Romanosque vinci posse cognitum non sibi magis quam ipsis militibus.*

<sup>132</sup> Alonso-Núñez (1987) 66.

<sup>133</sup> Errington (2008) 276.

<sup>134</sup> 39.3.12: *Nec multo post repetita proelii congressione.*

<sup>135</sup> Yardley (2003) 124–5.

<sup>136</sup> All that the *prologus* says concerning this matter is the following; *Dehinc cum fratre suo Antiocho Cyziceno bellum in Syria Ciliciaque gessit* (*prol.* 39: Then [Grypus] waged a war in Syria and Cilicia with his own brother, Cyzicenus).

<sup>137</sup> At 39.3.12, it is not likely that Justin would have written of Tryphaena *quae paulo ante sororem interfecerat* only two sentences after Tryphaena actually gave the orders to have her sister killed, and just one sentence following her death.

broken and conquered by the continuous battles of war was at last killed by the treachery of his own men.<sup>138</sup> Before this, all that is mentioned is a new Carthaginian offensive in Italy, then a digression on the general Hanno. Much like the ablative absolute of the previous example, the change in the fortunes of war is expressed solely with a participial phrase, which contains a poetic element, *adsiduis belli certaminibus*, likely belonging to Justin.<sup>139</sup> This participial phrase is also not integral to the sentence, it merely informs the reader on what has been omitted previously.

These two events that Justin heavily abbreviated must be compared to other events in the *Epitome* for which Justin had more care. Cyrus' defeat of Croesus also contains this reminder of previous fortune and success, which is used to finish an episode with a moral example.<sup>140</sup> The idea contained within this passage, the deleterious nature of *otium* and *desidia*, is common throughout the *Epitome* and occurs in several Trogan passages.<sup>141</sup> Justin also spends three chapters (24.6–8) describing Brennus' attack on Delphi and the subsequent defeat of the Celts. Without omitting any important events, he finishes the book saying, 'in this manner it happened that no one from so great an army, which shortly before would even spurn the gods, confiding in its own strength, even remained to remember so great a slaughter.'<sup>142</sup> Here, since Justin carefully described these events, the concluding sentences contain no such removable elements that would necessitate the use of *nec multo post* to indicate a brief passage of time. Moreover, even the words of the relative clause in the latter example are likely Trogan,<sup>143</sup> which indicates a possible formula in Trogus' *Historiae* for concluding sections of narrative that involve a reversal of fortune. Indeed, the conclusion of Xerxes' campaign into Greece is offered as an example of the nature of human fortune and it closely resembles the conclusion of Dionysius I's life, as mentioned above.<sup>144</sup>

<sup>138</sup> 20.5.14: *Nec multo post Dionysius, quem paulo ante non Sicilia, non Italia capiebat, adsiduis belli certaminibus victus fractusque insidiis ad postremum suorum interficitur.*

<sup>139</sup> Yardley (2003) 133, 155.

<sup>140</sup> 1.7.13: *Ac sic gens industria quondam potens et manu strenua effeminata mollitie luxuriaque virtutem pristinam perdidit et quos ante Cyrum invictos bella praestiterunt, in luxuriam lapsos otium ac desidia superavit.*

<sup>141</sup> Cf. 2:15.13: *ne vires otio corrumpent;* 20.1.1: *grave otium regno suo periculosamque desidiam tanti exercitus ratus;* 30.1.3: *otio ac desidia corrupti marcebant;* 35.1.1: *otium periculosum ratus.*

<sup>142</sup> 24.8.16: *Quo pacto evenit, ut nemo ex tanto exercitu, qui paulo ante fiducia virium etiam deos contemnebat, vel ad memoriam tantae cladis superesset.*

<sup>143</sup> Yardley (2003) 29, 40, 58, 60, 77, 245.

<sup>144</sup> 2.13.10: *Erat res spectaculo digna et aestimatione sortis humanae, rerum varietate miranda in exiguo latentem videre navigio, quem paulo ante vix aequor omne capiebat, carentem omni etiam servorum ministerio, cuius exercitus propter multitudinem terris graves erant.*

However, unlike the other passages in which events are omitted, there is no appearance of *nec multo post* in any of these examples, since Justin gave them a more complete treatment.

It would seem that the use of *nec multo post* should be attributed to Justin, since it is one tool he uses to stitch together his narrative when he omits events. Throughout the *Epitome*, those three words are used whenever Justin wishes to pass over an event. The death of the Spartan regent Pausanias is passed over quickly; Justin recounts his communication with Xerxes and then says *nec multo post accusatus Pausanias damnatur* (2.15.16). Similar omissions with this construction are to be found in the event of Alexander's death at the hands of Eurydice (7.5.4), in the punishment of Malchus (18.7.18), and in the death of Antigonos III Doson, where the war against the Illyrians is omitted. Trogus must have used the death of Antigonos III in order to make his digression on the Roman war with the Illyrians (*prol.* 28). When Justin tells that the Aetolians were alone against Rome after the defeat of Antiochus 'and not much later lost their liberty,'<sup>145</sup> he omits the capture of Heraclea and instead uses a participial phrase, just as in the other examples, to indicate that the Aetolians were defeated. Justin uses this formula again later in the same chapter after discussing the death of Philopoemen.<sup>146</sup> The use of *nec multo post* is not meant to indicate a reversal of fortune in the same way that *paulo ante* makes an intentional contrast with one's earlier fortune; therefore, any emphasis that Justin may seem to add is merely incidental. Furthermore, the construction *nec multo post ... qui paulo ante* is not correlative; in fact, it occurs nowhere elsewhere among Roman historians. These are two separate techniques, utilised by two different authors. As it occurs in the *Epitome*, *nec multo post* is used to pass over events that do not seem noteworthy. Such a use cannot be reasonably attributed to Trogus, since these omissions even include the battles that were pivotal in the rise and fall of various kingdoms and empires, for which Trogus maintained a precise chronology. However, the use of *paulo ante* in a relative clause is likely a remnant of the style of Trogus, who, meaning to imbue his history with an element of providence, wished to remind the reader of a person's prior hubris in the moment of his downfall.

Now, if the final sentences on Tryphaena's and Dionysius I's lives are Trogan, there are other passages that must also be brought into question. Dionysius is said to have moved his troops into Italy after expelling the Carthaginians from Sicily and seizing the *imperium* of the entire island,

<sup>145</sup> 32.1.2: *nec multo post victi libertatem ... amiserunt.*

<sup>146</sup> 32.1.10: *Nec multo post reparato bello Messenii vincuntur poenasque interfecti Philopoemenis pependerit.*



because he judged that peace and idleness were dangerous to his kingdom.<sup>147</sup> This introduction, whether or not it contains Trogus' own words, represents the irony that Trogus saw in Dionysius' wars of expansion; the king, who sought to avoid his own ruin, was instrumental in bringing it about. A similar example is found in the career of Demetrius I Soter, who decided to expand his territory and increase his wealth after seizing the imperium over Syria, because he too judged that peace was dangerous to his new position.<sup>148</sup> The language of these passages, which both contain similar ideas contained by the participial phrases *occupato* and *ratus*, is similar enough to indicate that they were crafted by the same author. Demetrius' fate, although it is more abbreviated and the reversal is not explicitly stated, is also similar to Dionysius'; the one who had just previously waged war to protect his kingdom and avert danger consequently dies in that very war (35.1.11).<sup>149</sup> Indeed these passages indicate a more conservative element of Justin's writing: he does not always seek to rewrite Trogus *in toto*, but instead chooses to keep, and perhaps modify, the passages that he enjoyed.

## II. Conclusion

It is clear that Justin has added his own words, thoughts, and style to the work of Trogus that he so admired; there are examples of this scattered throughout the *Epitome*, which cannot have been added during, or even immediately after, the Augustan period. There is an abundance of information that is either incorrect, or differs vastly from other historic traditions; one need only look at the *prologi* to see that Justin must be blamed for certain historical inaccuracies. It is, however, less clear whether such so-called 'mistakes' were always the product of careless abbreviation or at times reflect the deliberate attempt by a rhetorician unconcerned with historical accuracy to simplify a complex narrative. Examples such as Pharnabazus, the *Lacedaemoniorum dux*, certainly point to the former, whereas the deliberate falsehood in the speech of Eumenes that a mortal man could not kill Alexander surely is an example of the latter. Nevertheless, many of the incongruities with other historical sources, such as the apparent preference

<sup>147</sup> 20.1.1: *Dionysius e Sicilia Karthaginiensibus pulsus occupatoque totius insulae imperio grave otium regno suo periculosamque desidiam tanti exercitus ratus copias in Italiam traiecit.*

<sup>148</sup> 35.1.1: *Demetrius occupato Syriae regno novitati suae otium periculosum ratus ampliare fines regni et opes augere finitimorum bellis statuit.*

<sup>149</sup> Cf. the decision of Antiochus VII Sidetes to wage war on the Parthians: *His auditis Antiochus occupandum bellum ratus exercitum, quem multis finitimorum bellis induraverat, adversus Parthos ducit* (38.10.1).

for tales of poisoning and *insidiae*, should not be so quickly attributed to Justin and his moralising tendencies.

There are numerous elements that remain of Pompeius Trogus' original history. The work had a highly moralistic tone that existed before Justin's abbreviation of it. Trogus was fond of stories of plots and assassinations, as can be seen in his versions of how both Alexander the Great and Dionysius I died. He made use of a set of recurring moral themes, most notably *moderatio*, which is introduced in the opening lines of his work and has been dutifully preserved by Justin. Indeed, a fragmented picture of Trogus' worldview is preserved in the *Epitome*; the positions of kings and the succession of rulers and the transfer of *imperium* may not have mattered to Justin, but vestiges of these prevalent themes survive throughout the forty-four books.

The one method whereby it is possible to identify Trogan language in the *Epitome*, as others have already discovered, is to compare the language of a passage with that of the speech of Mithridates and the subsequent Roman authors Quintus Curtius Rufus, Valerius Maximus, and Velleius Paterculus. Indeed, Mithridates' speech contains many anti-Roman elements reminiscent of other speeches found earlier in the *Epitome*. Tacitus must also be numbered among these other historians, since he too used the *Historiae Philippicae* as both a historical source and a model for his own writings. Indeed, it is not at all unexpected that Tacitus, who also borrowed heavily from Livy and Sallust, made use of an historian who enjoyed great popularity in the years of the principate.

Justin's writing is rather conservative in many respects; he maintains the many *topoi* of Trogus' speeches, both when he abbreviates and when he rewrites them. There are several passages that are probably not completely Justin's, but rather vestiges of Trogus' writing that survived into Justin's version of the *Historiae*. Justin, however, also adds his own voice with poetic language borrowed from later authors and with vivid speeches. At times he even omits extended passages of Trogus' narrative to a degree that the original content is no longer apparent. From a corpus of forty-four books concerned with the succession of *imperium* and the history of the known world outside of Rome, he made a body of loosely—if at all—connected exemplary and fantastic tales.

Justin was content to act as an abbreviator at times, as an anthologist at others, and throughout he made rhetorical contributions, colouring the text with poeticisms and vivid speeches. He composed the various sections of the *Epitome*, depending on how he regarded that section of Trogus' *Historiae*. When he did not just omit a section completely, he would abbreviate and simplify the narrative, he would insert his own words, both to show his rhetorical talents and to update a two-hundred-year-old history, and he

once did what no other epitomator or abbreviator would dare, namely, insert a full speech of his source into his own work. Justin followed Pompeius Trogus, based his 'epitome' on the *Historiae Philippicae*, often quoting it and paraphrasing it, but what he created was not a summary. He did not share Trogus' concerns and philosophy, he did not bother himself with the succession of empires or the practice of ethnography, nor did he care about historical accuracy and chronological precision. Justin reworked the *Historiae* into a series of loosely connected episodes, which were based on what he felt were the passages *cognitione dignissima*. All that did not meet this criteria he either abbreviated or omitted entirely.

Justin maintained many words, phrases, sentences, and even an entire speech of Trogus and only rarely did he depart from the structure of Trogus' *Historiae*. Yet, in spite of all this, Justin's work does not resemble its model; there is no longer a clear purpose for the work, only remnants, which happen to have survived by chance, to show what Trogus intended his work to be.

*University of Waterloo*

BRETT BARTLETT  
b2bartle@uwaterloo.ca

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, E. (2006) 'Who's Anti-Roman? Sallust and Pompeius Trogus on Mithridates', *CJ* 101: 383–407.
- (2011) *Valorizing the Barbarians: Enemy Speeches in Roman Historiography* (Austin).
- Alonso-Núñez, J. M. (1987) 'An Augustan World History: The *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus', *Greece & Rome* 34: 56–72.
- (1995) Rev. of B. R. Van Wickevoort Crommelin, *Die Universalgeschichte des Pompeius Trogus. Herculea Audacia Orbem Terrarum Adgressus*, *JRS* 85: 328–9.
- Atkinson, J. E. (1980) A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' *Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 3 and 4* (Amsterdam and Uithoorn).
- and J. C. Yardley (2009) *Curtius Rufus: Histories of Alexander the Great, Book 10* (Oxford).
- Barnes, T. D. (1998) 'Two Passages of Justin', *CQ* 48: 589–93.
- Baynham, E. (2013) 'Alexander's Argyraspids: Tough Old Fighters or Antigonid Myth?', in Troncoso and Anson (2013) 110–20.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1971) 'The Death of Alexander the Great: Rumour and Propaganda', *CQ* 21: 112–36.
- (1992) 'History and Artifice in Plutarch's *Eumenes*', in P. A. Stadter, ed., *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London and New York) 56–89.
- Brunt, P. A. (1980) 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30: 477–94.
- Castiglioni, L. (1967) *Studi Intorno alle 'Storie Filippiche' di Giustino* (Rome).
- Cornelius, E. (1888) *Quomodo Tacitus, Historiarum Scriptor, in Hominum Memoria Versatus Sit Usque ad Renascentes Literas Saeculis XIV. et XV* (Marburg).
- Crohn, H. (1882) *De Pompei Trogi apud Antiquos Auctoritate* (Straussburg).
- Davidson, J. (1991) 'The Gaze in Polybius' Histories', *JRS* 81: 10–24.
- Eichert, O. (1967) *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur Philippischen Geschichte des Justinus* (Hildesheim).
- Engels, J. (1999) *Augusteische Oikumenengeographie und Universalhistorie im Werk Strabons von Amaseia* (Stuttgart).
- Errington, R. M. (2008) *A History of the Hellenistic World, 323–30 BC* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford).
- Ferrero, L. (1957) *Struttura e metodo dell'Epitome di Giustino* (Torino).
- Franco, C. (1993) 'Trogo-Giustino e i successori di Alessandro', in L. Braccesi, A. Coppola, G. Cresci Marrone and C. Franco, edd., *L'Alessandro di Giustino: dagli antichi ai moderni* (Rome) 71–98.
- Goodyear, F. R. D. (1972) *The Annals of Tacitus, Vol. I* (Cambridge).
- (1992a) 'Pompeius Trogus and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*', Goodyear (1992d) 280.

- (1992b) ‘On the character and text of Justin’s compilation of Trogus’, in Goodyear (1992d) 210–33.
- (1992c) ‘Virgil and Pompeius Trogus’, in Goodyear (1992d) 234–44.
- (1992d) *Papers on Latin Literature*, edd. K. M. Coleman, J. Diggle, J. B. Hall and H. D. Jocelyn (London).
- Gordon, M. L. (1936) ‘The Patria of Tacitus’, *JRS* 26: 145–51.
- Habicht, C. (2006) *The Hellenistic Monarchies: Selected Papers* (Ann Arbor).
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1983) *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: the so-called Vulgate authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge).
- Heckel, W. (2013) ‘The Three Thousand: Alexander’s Infantry Guard,’ in B. Campbell and L. A. Tritle, edd., *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World* (New York and Oxford) 162–78.
- Hornblower, J. (1981) *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford).
- Jal, P. (1987) ‘A propos des *Histoires Philippiques*: quelques remarques’, *REL* 65: 194–209.
- Kühner, R and Stegmann C. (1982) *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, Vol. 1 (Hannover).
- Levene, D. (2010) ‘Pompeius Trogus in Tacitus’ *Annals*’, in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola and C. Pelling, edd., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford) 294–311.
- Lytton, R. H. (1973) *Justin’s Account of Alexander the Great: A Historical Commentary* (Diss. Pennsylvania State University).
- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Martin, R. H. (1969) ‘Tacitus and his Predecessors’, in T.A. Dorey, ed., *Tacitus: Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence* (London) 117–47
- Pendergast, J. S. (1961) *The Philosophy of History of Pompeius Trogus* (Diss. University of Illinois).
- Rambaud, M. (1948) ‘Salluste et Trogue-Pompée’, *REL* 26: 171–89.
- Richter, H. D. (1987) *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Historiographie: Die Vorlagen des Pompeius Trogus für die Darstellung der nachalexandrischen hellenistischen Geschichte (Iust. 13–40)* (Frankfurt).
- Roisman, J. (2012) *Alexander’s Veterans and the Early Wars of the Successors* (Austin).
- Rubincam, C. (2005) ‘A Tale of Two Magni: Justin/Trogus on Alexander and Pompey’, *Historia* 54: 265–74.
- Seel, O. (1972) *Eine römische Weltgeschichte: Studien zum Text der Epitome des Iustinus und zur Historik des Pompejus Trogus* (Nürnberg).
- , ed. (1956) *Pompeii Trogi Fragmenta* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- , ed. (1972) *M. Iuniani Iustini: Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi* (Stuttgart).

- Sellge, I. (1882) *De Studiis in Sallustio Crispo a Pompeio Trogo et Iustino Epitomatore Collocatis* (Sagani).
- Steele, R. B. (1917) 'Pompeius Trogus and Justinus', *AJP* 38: 19–41.
- Syme, R. (1958) *Tacitus*, 2 vols. (Oxford).
- (1988) 'The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus', *Historia* 37: 358–71.
- Troncoso, V. A. and E. M. Anson, edd., *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323–281 BC)* (Oxford).
- Urban, R. (1982) "Gallisches Bewußtsein" und "Romkritik" bei Pompeius Trogus', *ANRW* II.30.2: 1424–43.
- van Wickevoort Crommelin, B. R. (1993) *Die Universalgeschichte des Pompeius Trogus. Herculeae Audacia Orbem Terrarum Adgressus* (Dortmund).
- Waters, K. H. (1985) *Herodotus the Historian* (London and Sydney).
- Wheatley, P. (2013) 'The Heidelberg Epitome: A Neglected Diadoch Source', in Troncoso and Anson 17–29.
- (1997) 'Stabbing One's Own Vitals in Justin (Justin 3.2.1, 13.6.17)', *Mnemosyne* 50: 347.
- (1998) 'Trogus and the Aetna', *Phoenix* 52: 103–108.
- (2000) 'Justin on Tribunes and Generalships, Caesars, and Augusti', *CQ* 50: 632–634.
- (2003) *Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's Epitome of Trogus* (Toronto).
- , trans. (1994) *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus* (Atlanta).
- Yardley, J. C. and W. Heckel (1997) *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, Vol. I: Books 11–12: Alexander the Great* (Oxford).
- Yardley, J. C., W. Heckel, and P. Wheatley (2011) *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, Vol. 2: Books 13–15: The Successors to Alexander the Great* (Oxford).