STOIC AND CYNIC UNDER VESPASIAN*

B.F. Harris

Even the casual reader of the ancient sources for the period A.D. 69-96 becomes aware of a prominent theme — what we may call the 'ideological conflict' between the Flavian emperors and certain teachers of philosophy and others, mainly senators, who were devotees. Whereas in the Julio-Claudian period one reads of intermittent expulsions from Rome and Italy of mathematici, Chaldaei and magi, our sources refer on several occasions to the expulsion of philosophi. This term presumably means 'professional' teachers of philosophy. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish sharply between the teachers and their adherents in the Flavian period, and one of the historian's tasks is to explore the private and public relationships between them. The purpose of this paper is to review the evidence for Stoic, and to a lesser extent, Cynic, activity in the early years of Vespasian.

We may refer initially to the general attitudes of Romans to philosophy in the first century, which come through at various points in our sources. There was a very practical emphasis about philosophizing, both amongst the practitioners and their critics. What we call metaphysics, epistemology and the philosophy of science were all in the background; it was moral philosophy and its application in personal and political life that occupied by far the most attention. Teachers of philosophy were respected if their life-styles were in accordance with their creeds; we think of Pliny's descriptions of Euphrates, who apparently was a profound and articulate thinker but whose highest quality is that 'he leads a wholly blameless life while remaining entirely human; he attacks vices not individuals, and aims at reforming wrongdoers instead of punishing them': and similarly of Artemidorus.¹ These men were both pupils of Musonius Rufus, and were presumably provincial Greeks who did not hold the Roman citizenship.

Philosophizing amongst the Roman senatorial classes was viewed with considerable scepticism. The young Agricola who 'would have imbibed a keener love of philosophy than becomes a Roman and a senator' was restrained by his mother's prudentia. Tacitus by way of explanation says that his father-in-law as a youth looked for gloria in this direction, but that reason and age restored the balance and Agricola at least emerged from his philosophizing with the quality of moderation (ex sapientia modum).² The remarks are significant in the light of what he wrote later in the Annals and Histories on ideological opponents of the
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2. Tac. Agr. 4
Caesars. Seneca, in spite of his fame and popularity as Nero’s mentor, had to defend the reputation of philosophers in general and of Stoics in particular: ‘I say they are wrong who believe that the faithful adherents of philosophy are rebellious and fractious people, despisers of magistrates or kings or other public administrators.’ Quintilian, the leading rhetorician of the age, reflects the common view of its esoteric side when he deplores the fact that ‘philosophy no longer moves in its true sphere of action and in the broad daylight of the forum, but has retired first to porches and gymnasia and finally to the gatherings of the schools’: for him, the true sapiens of the Roman type reveals his statesmanship not in esoteric debates but in the practice and experience of affairs (by which he means chiefly public office). Roman nobles often showed a patronising attitude towards the practitioners of lower rank, and even Nero used them in after-dinner entertainment, since, says Tacitus, he enjoyed the wrangles of philosophers; ‘nec deerant qui ore vultuque tristi inter oblectamenta regia spectari cuperent’.

But the best teachers and the more worthy Senatorial adherents were a much more significant phenomenon than most Romans allowed. On the positive side, they provided some of the most effective and courageous criticism of autocratic power and its abuse by the early emperors; on the negative side, they were accused of very serious subversion, to the point of glorifying tyrannicide and implicating themselves in plots.

In spite of the loss of the later books of the Histories, Tacitus remains the most important literary source for this topic. Libertas is of course a central theme in his account of the principate, and this seems to resolve itself into two main issues. In the political sphere, it is libertas Senatus, that is, the ability of the Senate to take a real share in the government of the empire, to conduct debates on matters of state, to reach decisions and to see them implemented; while with regard to personal conduct, libertas is linked above all to freedom of speech and of writing. Hence the continued tension between the adulatio and the παρρησία themes in both Annals and Histories.

The Stoics in the Senate A.D. 69-70

To appreciate the Senate’s mood at the beginning of Vespasian’s reign we must take into account not only the immediate past, i.e. from Galba’s accession and the adoption of Piso Licinianus in January of 69 to the voting of imperial powers to Vespasian in December, but equally the ‘Neronian crisis’ of 66-8, events which were all too fresh still in the memory of the Senate, depleted though it now was both by Nero’s repression and the Civil War.
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The trials and deaths which followed the Pisonian conspiracy throw into the most lurid light Tacitus' theme of autocracy unrestrained by reason and good sense. The philosophic attachments of leading figures have been prominent earlier in the Neronian narrative; after the murder of Agrippina in 59, for example, when the Senate endures the indignity of listening to Nero's hypocritical letter about his escape from his mother's designs on his life, Tacitus comments that Seneca rather than Nero was in bad odour — the Stoic, that is, who had stooped to compose such a nauseating piece.8 There immediately follows, in the account of the adulatory motions of the Senate, the detail that Thrasea Paetus (equally well known as a Stoic) could stand no more and marched out of the House. This juxtaposition is surely not accidental on Tacitus' part, and exhibits starkly the libertas-adulatio contrast.9 Another 'signpost' is recorded in A.D.62 with the trial and death of Rubellius Plautus, then proconsul of Asia.10 It was part of the indictment of him pressed upon Nero by Tigellinus that 'instead of enjoying his wealth and leisure Plautus was parading his imitations of the ancient Romans and had taken upon himself the arrogance of the Stoics, a sect which makes men turbulent and meddlers in public affairs'11 (the implication is that they were involved in treasonous plots.)

Still more emphasis is given by Tacitus to the trial and conviction of Thrasea Paetus and Barea Soranus in 66. There is no need to rehearse the prior actions of the former, who led the Stoic faction: evidently they were all faithfully traversed by the delator Capito Cossutianus, in whose indictment the Stoic faction is satirised: 'he has his followers, or rather his retinue; they do not yet pursue the obstinacy of his ideas, but do his dress and expression — they are unbending and gloomy, so as to reproach your lightheartedness'.12 The mention of M. Cato in the same speech was significant, for Thrasea had written a life of Cato — as an ideological gesture, one might say. Cato had long since been used as a model of philosophic heroism, and Capito's attempt to trace a line of dissent and disloyalty from the Republic onwards is also evident. Tacitus in xvi.28 gives more material from the indictment, in the mouth of Eprius Marcellus the second informer. Three more Stoic names occur, Helvidius Priscus (who with Musonius Rufus forms the chief link between Nero's and Vespasian's principate in regard to the 'philosophical opposition'), Paconius Agrippinus13 and Curtius Montanus (who re-appears in the Histories14). All are said to have insulted Nero's clementia
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14. iv.40, 42.
in different ways. In the case of Barea Soranus the prosecutor called as a witness Publius Egnatius Celer who is here, as in the *Histories*, portrayed as the traitorous friend. For Celer professed the ‘auctoritas Stoicae sectae’, ‘being skilled in displaying the semblance of virtue by his garb and his expression’ as Tacitus puts it.\(^{15}\)

What must have been fresh in the Senate’s memory in December 69 is not only the extinction of these men and many others (including those for whom we have no record from Tacitus for A.D. 67-8) but the enormous monetary and other rewards received by the informers, some of which are mentioned by Tacitus (xvi.33) and others by Cassius Dio.\(^{16}\) They received sums far beyond their legal entitlement, and the knight Ostorius Sabinus (prosecutor of Soranus) with the quaestor’s ornaments gained immediate admission to the Senate. Two things are apparent. First, the ease with which a philosophical attachment, particularly Stoic or Cynic, could be linked with the charge of subversive activity, was plain for all to see. For it appears that once belief translated itself into action, even the negative action of Thrasea Paetus’ abstention from that participation in political affairs which became his rank, there lay open the path to indictment by an unfriendly emperor or his agents; equally dangerous was any show of \(\pi\alpha\rho\rho\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\alpha\) in a senatorial speech or in a piece of writing. Secondly, there were the bitter divisions created within the Senate itself, often no doubt only partly revealed by the way men spoke or voted. Tacitus exaggerates the *servitium* theme in depicting the Senate as a whole, but as a senator and constitutionalist he felt most deeply the corruption of senatorial affairs under the Julio-Claudians, and in the early chapters of the *Histories* heavily underscores this same theme. In i.2, for example, after describing wars and natural disasters he continues ‘atrocius in urbe saevitum’ and includes in that the political and moral degeneration of the senatorial class, with the Civil War following hard upon the Neronian repressions.

With regard to the immediate past, from Galba’s accession to the death of Vitellius, the adoption of Piso should first be mentioned, not so much because it is given prominence in *Histories* i, but because the principle enunciated, ‘optimum quemque adoptio inveniet’ (i.16), offered an alternative to the dynastic principle and was apparently taken up in the 70s by some of the critics of Vespasian. The only passage where the theme of political liberty is explicit in this connexion is the famous sentence which concludes Galba’s adoption speech: ‘imperaturus es hominibus qui nec totam servitutem pati possunt nec totam libertatem’ (*ibid*). Although each of the new emperors of 69 made a show of collaboration with the Senate, the later months can only have worsened its internal dissension. The two leading Stoics of the period happen to be mentioned at ii.91. Helvidius Priscus, now praetor-elect, had opposed the wishes

---

15. xvi.32; cf Juvenal’s condemnation of him (*Sat.* iii.116ff.).
of Vitellius on some matter; Vitellius passes off the contention lightly by
remarking that he himself had earlier often presumed to oppose Thrasea. There
is the implication at least that philosophical loyalties were liable at any time to
affect the course of a senatorial debate.

Mucianus and Domitian

In the period December 69 to the first months of 70 it is important to
observe Mucianus and Domitian and their relations with the Senate. Although
Vespasian was to remain far away from Rome until the autumn, once his
imperial powers were voted\(^17\) the Senate could adjust itself to the new realities;
‘laetus et spei certus’ is how Tacitus describes it, but the context is that of relief
from the devastation of war rather than the return of some political vitality. But
there is significance for our topic in the business which followed. The House was
attenuated in numbers and still bitterly divided, but it seems that the Stoic
coterie determined to test the situation by taking the offensive against those
informers who had destroyed their leaders under Nero. In fact Helvidius Priscus,
returned from exile, had already moved to avenge his father-in-law Thrasea
against the formidable Eprius Marcellus the previous spring, under Galba; Tacitus
gives a very favourable description of the man and his creed, with the \textit{libertas}
theme prominent.\(^18\) The upshot, however, was that Helvidius dropped the
charge when Galba failed to make clear his view, and the issue re-opened all the
dissensions about the \textit{delatores} in the Senate’s ranks.

At the end of the year the clash between Helvidius and Eprius Marcellus was
renewed over a motion before the House. This was immediately prior to
Mucianus’ entry into Rome\(^19\) when Antonius Primus was the ‘princeps
Vespasianorum’ in the city, and we may assume that Domitian, appointed
praetor with the consular imperium\(^20\), if not present in the Senate was being
fully informed of the course of its business. It seems that Helvidius had a strong
following at this time, which encouraged him to move once more: he was also
well-disposed towards Vespasian.\(^21\) The two opposing speeches are brilliantly
composed by Tacitus in chs. 7-8, and the ideological dispute, as we may describe
it, was clearly more important than the substance of the motion (about the
choice of envoys to Vespasian).

A Stoic faction-leader had taken the offensive; at the same time a Stoic
teacher, the renowned Musonius Rufus, moved against P. Celer, the betrayer of
Soranus. The case was heard in the courts and the condemnation of Celer was
widely approved.\(^22\) Two other Stoics are also mentioned in the Senate business of
\(^17\) \textit{Hist}, iv.3 at Romae senatus cuncta principibus solita Vespasiano decernit; cf. the ‘\textit{lex de}
imperio Vespasiani’, \textit{ILS} 244.
\(^18\) \textit{Hist}, iv.5-6.
\(^19\) \textit{ibid}, i.11.
\(^20\) iv. 3 fin.
\(^21\) iv.4 fin.
the same day. Curtius Montanus\textsuperscript{23} got a motion passed that the memory of Piso should be honoured as well as of Galba, a motion which may have some significance for the succession issue in the 70s, and Junius Mauricus (later banished by Domitian)\textsuperscript{24} asked Domitian to allow the Senate access to the \textit{commentarii principales}, as a basis for further prosecutions of informers. Not surprisingly, Domitian drew back from this and referred the matter to Vespasian. The \textit{delatores} theme is continued in the next chapters (iv.41-2) with the framing of an oath by the Senate which was intended to unmask further the informers amongst its members. This appears to have encouraged fresh initiatives by the Stoics. Montanus attacked Aquilius Regulus in a speech in which he upholds the \textit{libertas Senatus} and describes Nero’s rule as a tyranny; Helvidius a third time attacked Eprius Marcellus.

Were the Stoics, then, to make the running for a revived Senate? Any such hopes were largely dashed, at least in Tacitus’ view, by the speeches of Mucianus and Domitian at the next session. Domitian advocated a general amnesty, and Mucianus went further by supporting the informers (no doubt in principle chiefly) and dissuading those who now wanted revenge. Tacitus with heavy emphasis writes ‘patres coeptatam libertatem, postquam obviam itum, omisere’\textsuperscript{25} That Mucianus took this action is likely enough; but was he the one who subsequently pressed Vespasian to have the philosophers expelled? This is the tradition preserved in Dio,\textsuperscript{26} and is consistent with the other evidence. Mucianus is portrayed in the \textit{Histories} as basically an opportunist\textsuperscript{27}; at the beginning of Vespasian’s rule he will have watched for any incipient dissidents, as indeed his action in the Senate has already indicated, and Helvidius’ philosophy did look dangerous.

It is also clear that these events of 69-70 had a profound effect on Domitian. At eighteen years of age he seems not to have shrunk at all from the \textit{potentia} that came his way following his escape from trouble in the last days of the war in Rome; he readily accepted the salutation as Caesar.\textsuperscript{28} (We need not, of course, accept wholly the description by Tacitus of his unworthy conduct before Mucianus’ arrival.\textsuperscript{29}) His previous knowledge of the Stoics will have been gained mainly through Vespasian’s friendships under Nero, but now, in the Senate, he must have been acutely aware of the fierce passions which still smouldered there after Nero, and which now began to burst into flame once more. Tacitus had
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\textsuperscript{27.} esp. \textit{Hist.} i.10 — luxuria industria, comitate adrogantia, malis bonisque artibus mixtus. cf. Cass. Dio \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{28.} \textit{Hist.} iii.74, 86.
\textsuperscript{29.} nondum ad curas intentus, sed stupris et adulteriis filium principis agebat (iv.2 \textit{init.}).
found among his sources an indication that Domitian did have some trial of strength against Mucianus in January of 70, when he took up the praetorship, but his language is vague — ‘pleraque Domitianus instigantibus amicis aut propria libidine audebat’ (iv.39). Both Suetonius and Dio also preserve a hostile tradition of Domitian’s activities at this period.\(^{30}\) It seems very reasonable to conclude that his antipathy towards the Stoic faction dates from the events of 69-70, fortified by the case of Helvidius Priscus as it now developed.

**Helvidius Priscus and Musonius Rufus**

With Helvidius and Musonius Rufus we have, as indicated previously, the prime examples of faction-leader and teacher. Both of them ran foul of Vespasian, but there are questions which our evidence raises. Vespasian was without doubt tolerant in many aspects of his administration, and in spite of his outstanding military and senatorial career he never attempted to gloss over his equestrian and Italian origin. Suetonius mentions his patience ‘when philosophers affected to despise him’\(^{31}\) and cites the incident when the banished Cynic teacher Demetrius happened to meet Vespasian and his entourage. His abuse met only a mild reply, in Dio’s expanded version ‘I don’t slay a barking dog!’\(^{32}\)

Musonius was the most respected Stoic teacher in Rome, and provides our link with the Domitianic period via his pupils, among whom were Artemidorus, Euphrates, Dio of Prusa and Epictetus.\(^{33}\) Some errors of judgment in public affairs (as when he tried unsuccessfully to harangue the Vespasianic troops in N. Italy, a case, as Tacitus says, of *intempestiva sapientia*\(^{34}\)) did not seriously affect his reputation, and he was the only philosopher exempted from the expulsion decree of 71. Vespasian will have known him under Nero, and evidently was also on good terms with the eminent Stoic senators of the 60s, Thrasea, Soranus and Sextus; so at least Helvidius is made to claim in the *Histories*.\(^{35}\) In circumstances unknown to us, however, Musonius was later banished, for his return from exile under Titus is recorded. It can only be said that, tolerant as Vespasian was, he could not have allowed the independence of either teacher or devotee to result in a serious challenge to his imperial power. All our evidence goes to show that in the vital area of *dignitas* and *auctoritas* the Flavians rapidly built and consolidated a secure foundation. As Gavin Townend’s article\(^{36}\) has emphasised, there was a continuity of political and marriage alliances established by the family both before and after Vespasian’s accession to the principate.

Any ideological challenge to the Flavians, then, must have been sharp and
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strong to produce the action it did, and the case of Helvidius is of course clear evidence of this. What was the motivation and form of this challenge? In Dio’s account it is claimed that Helvidius at an early stage openly confronted Vespasian and provoked his hatred not on personal grounds so much as on grounds of principle. Suetonius agrees about the strong provocation during Helvidius’ praetorship in 70, when his actions seem extraordinarily perverse. It is difficult at first sight to reconcile this with Tacitus in *Histories* iv.4, where Helvidius shortly before his praetorship spoke in the Senate: ‘prompsit sententiam ut honorificam in bonum principem...et studiis senatus attol­lebatur.’ Whether his public stance changed gradually or dramatically, he was eventually banished and very reluctantly executed by Vespasian.

It has been claimed by some scholars (for example, Dudley and Toynbee) that the explanation for both Musonius and Helvidius is that in varying degrees they ‘went Cynic’; the former moving from his Stoic principles to some more inflammatory attack on the Flavians, or at least being suspect as a dissident, Helvidius going the full distance into Cynic rabble-rousing and abuse. This is unconvincing. It is pure speculation with Musonius, and in the case of Helvidius rests on the evidence of Dio which is surely confused. Dio treats Stoic and Cynic teachings as virtually interchangeable (LXV.13 *init.*) and Mucianus’ description of the former is obviously the stock one of the vagrant, provocative Cynic. Stoics certainly did not parade any illiteracy! Similarly in LXV 12.2 the description of Helvidius is rather that of a Cynic revolutionary. Dio does better at 12.3 in his contrast between the restraint of Thrasea and the more personal bitterness of Helvidius. On the negative side, there is no evidence elsewhere of Helvidius stirring up the crowds with a revolutionary programme, and more positively, we do see examples of Cynics publicly abusing the Flavian family. Demetrius had been exiled in 71, but it appears that other Cynics infiltrated Rome, of whom Dio gives us two examples, both in connexion with Titus and Berenice and the displeasure many felt at this ‘affair’. Diogenes before a full theatre ‘denounced the pair in a long, abusive speech’, for which he was flogged, and Heras after a similar shameful performance was beheaded.

Now there is a great difference between this type of protest, in the context of a complete casting aside of the conventions of Roman society, and the challenge against the abuse of autocratic power made by Stoic senators. A crowded Roman theatre is not the place a consular like Thrasea or an ex-praetor like Helvidius would choose to publicise his case; it was in the Senate itself, or in
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39. LXV.15.5: the terms used for Heras are πολλά καὶ ἀτοπά κυνηδόν εξέκροσε. The image of public rantings is implicit also in Mucianus’ words (13.1α). It is worth noting that Titus’ second wife was Marcia Furnilla, a relative of the Stoic Barea Soranus, and he appears to have divorced her at the time of Soranus’ condemnation under Nero (Suet. *Tit.* 4).
private gatherings or in writings (as became common under Domitian).

The Dynastic Question

A more likely explanation of Vespasian’s reaction, or at least a factor, is the dynastic question, which was distinct from that of the principate as such. As for the Stoics, there is ample evidence for the early Empire that they harmonised the reality of the principate with their tradition of the ‘kingdom of the wise man’ and consciously displayed an ideal of imperial rule which they hoped would influence the Caesars. In the Neronian period Musonius Rufus was describing a king as ‘Law incarnate, the contriver of good rule and of harmony, imitator of God and like him the father of his subjects’, and Seneca was referring to the emperor as ‘the vice-regent of God on earth’.

Dio is thus implausible when he speaks of Helvidius ‘continually attacking kingship and praising democracy’; Hostilianus whom he has just mentioned as being deported for his strong denunciations of monarchy is a much more likely example, and is to be regarded as a Cynic rather than a Stoic.

It may be conceded that our only explicit evidence about the dynastic issue for this period is the saying of Vespasian found in both Suetonius and Dio. Suetonius has the saying ‘either my sons will succeed me or no-one will’ in the context of Vespasian’s confidence in horoscopes, but in Dio it is more persuasively linked to his feud with Helvidius. Vespasian seems to have reacted strongly to any expression of opinion that someone other than Titus might follow him, by a revival of Galba’s ‘adoptio’ principle. He had obviously promoted his dynastic intentions for both his sons as soon as his victory was gained.

It would have been a bold move therefore, but it is not at all impossible that Helvidius or another Stoic might have spoken to a motion before the Senate for the grant of further offices to Titus or Domitian, criticising the dynastic principle and using the very recent precedent of Galba and Piso. Reckless, perhaps, but consistent with libertas and a good conscience, and reference could have been made to a senatorial decree honouring the memory of Piso.

Demetrius and the Cynic element

While it is safe in some respects to speak of ‘Stoic-Cynic’ doctrine in this period, on the question of the principate as well as on others, our

40. Musonius, fr.viii.8.1; Sen. De Clem.i.2. For other examples, Dudley op.cit. p.129.
43. it is interesting that Titus’ name was probably considered in Galba’s selection in 69 (Suet. Tit.5).
44. Tac. Hist. iv.40.
Consideration of Cassius Dio above has shown the need for caution. For emperors, no doubt, and for many senators hostile to any philosophic pretensions, the question of what was common to the two schools and what distinguished them was of no moment at all. Philosophi were to be tolerated if they did not threaten political stability and were to be banished as a group if they did, whatever their individual colours. It was only the few who gained exemption because they had influential links.

In the attacks on Stoics attributed to Mucianus it is natural to refer some of the charges at least to Cynic utterances, in particular the words ‘they despise everyone and call the man of good birth a spoilt child, the low-born a simpleton, the handsome man licentious, the ugly man attractive, the wealthy man avaricious, the poor man slavish’. This wholesale social as well as political denunciation is characteristic of the Cynic, and we have noted above the few examples that occur in our sources of their public raillery.

The Cynic Demetrius, however, was of a somewhat different order. As early as Gaius he had a reputation for integrity, and under Nero he had been a friend of Seneca, who admired his uninhibited sayings. But most notable was his close association with Thrasea Paetus, who chose him to converse with on the immortality of the soul as he faced his death. Demetrius seems then to have been himself exiled, but re-appears in Rome before being again banished by Vespasian. One public act which surprised his contemporaries was his defence of Egnatius Celer the delator when he was prosecuted by Musonius Rufus for having unlawfully brought about the destruction of the Stoic Barea Soranus. We can only guess at his motives, since Tacitus’ words ‘ambitiosius quam honestius’ do not enlighten. Celer was already denigrated as the professed Stoic who had betrayed his fellow. Demetrius, however, will not have been concerned about his public reputation, a fact which is emphasised by his ignoring Vespasian’s retinue in the Suetonius episode.

In spite of some coincidence in their teachings and conduct it was the Stoics of these years who were a force to be reckoned with in public life rather than the Cynics. The great unpopularity of the Cynics appears to have precipitated expulsions by which Stoic philosophers were equally affected, but in the Senate there were political and ideological contentions which were much closer to the seat of power. Here in the early years of Vespasian the Stoic senators continued, though briefly and unsuccessfully, the cause that was to attract the more severe repressions of Domitian twenty years later.

45. see, for example, M. Rostovtzeff’s discussion, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire I.119ff; Dudley op.cit. p.137.
47. Sen. De Ben. vii.11, Ep. Mor. XCI.
48. Tac. Ann. xvi.34.