

Resistance is futile? : Greek literary tactics in the face of Rome

Autor(en): **Whitmarsh, Tim**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **59 (2013)**

PDF erstellt am: **13.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660819>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

II

TIM WHITMARSH

RESISTANCE IS FUTILE?

GREEK LITERARY TACTICS IN THE FACE OF ROME

Did Greeks resist Rome? Which Greeks, and which Romans? When, where, why, how? What would 'resistance' mean in an ancient context, and where should we look for it? These are the kinds of questions that have haunted scholarship on the cultures of the Roman Empire since the 18th century, but particularly since the rise of Nazism and Fascism. It is no coincidence that Harald Fuchs' *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom* — an extraordinary book, a mere 24 pages long (but with 76 pages of notes) — was based on lectures first delivered in 1933, and placed a heavy emphasis on Jewish resistance. Fuchs was himself involved with a number of German scholars who became Nazi refugees: he was close to Werner Jaeger, and replaced first Paul Maas at Königsberg in 1934 then Felix Jacoby at Kiel in 1935, then Kurt Latte at Göttingen in 1938.¹ (*Der geistige Widerstand* was published in book form in 1938.) These questions of resistance are — as Momigliano pointed out in his contribution to the 1987 *Entretiens*, on *Opposition et résistances à l'Empire d'Auguste à Trajan* — our questions, the questions of the age of empires and their decolonisation.²

¹ FUCHS (1938).

² MOMIGLIANO (1987).

Since the concept of resistance is overdetermined by imperial, nationalistic and postcolonial concerns, we had better begin by working out exactly what we think we are looking for. There is, after all, no Greek or Latin word that would serve as an adequate translation: 'resistance', for moderns, is more than a specific instance of hostility towards a dominant order (for which ἀντιμαχεῖν *uel sim.* might do); while we might use the term of a specific *manifestation* of disquiet — an 'act of resistance' — the term in English implies an underlying position of enduring hostility rooted in ideological antipathy.

What exactly, then, is 'resistance'? We can sharpen the question by looking to postcolonial criticism, which has developed (broadly) two different versions of resistance, under the twin pressures of political oppositionalism (as embodied in the work of, say, Franz Fanon) and deconstruction (imagined as, in effect, a resistance to dominant cultural or linguistic orders). This intellectual bifurcation can be decocted into two types of leftist political narrative of resistance, which are not necessarily compatible: one is based around violent insurrection, the other around the quest for utopian anarchism³ (a division that underlies the celebrated face-off between Slavoy Žižek and Simon Critchley).⁴

It is worth holding onto this distinction between two forms of resistance. Classicists, with their characteristic distaste for abstraction, have in general tended to associate resistance more with the first type, which is to say political opposition. The 1987 *Entretiens* volume I noted earlier — with its interestingly slippery distinction in the title between *résistance* and *opposition* — contains much discussion of the supposed manifestations of activity against the emperor and his agents (among the urban plebs and senators; among the provincial elites). But there is relatively little on strategies adopted for adapting and refiguring the linguistic and cultural *representation* of Empire, for

³ JEFFERESS (2008) adds a third form, based in 'transformation'.

⁴ Initiated by ŽIŽEK (2007).

those adjustments to dominant discursive structures. Timpe's paper addresses the interesting (if familiar) question of anti-imperial historiography in the first century, but with more focus on who was writing it than how.

Only in the study of Jewish and Christian religion, in (again) Momigliano's chapter, do we get any sense that the field of representation itself might be a space for resistance. I do not wish to contest Momigliano's claims, but I do think that we should be *prima facie* suspicious of the *restriction* of 'discursive resistance' to that of the monotheistic religions; this suggests a too neat (and ultimately self-serving) polarisation of Judaism and Christianity, on the one hand, and Roman imperialism on the other.

If we focus only on the violent, direct mode of resistance, then it is perhaps right to agree with scholars like Clifford Ando, who argue that the distinctive feature of the Roman Empire as a system is the *absence* of resistance, the result of an exceptionally high degree of integration and manufactured consensus.⁵ The limited number and circumscribed nature of the provincial revolts under the Principate are indeed worth noting. And indeed it is true that the Empire as a whole projected an image of highly reticulated cohesion, through such mechanisms as the imperial cult (which in fact not only generated the impression of homogeneity, but also accommodated and thereby diffused inter-*polis* differentiation through competitive display), public buildings and monuments, and law. But we should be aware that this impression of cohesion is in no sense 'true', i.e. impartial and non-rhetorical. If our evidential base for what the Empire was 'really' derives entirely from the instruments of Empire themselves — from official structures and representations, from bureaucratic appurtenances, from decrees, and above all from Aelius Aristides' laudatory speech *To Rome* (which Ando cites repeatedly) — then we will, self-evidently, end up with a picture of a highly functional and

⁵ ANDO (2000) 49-70.

integrated state. There is no question but that the Roman state sought to perpetuate an experience of 'governmentality',⁶ via the incessant interpellation of the individual, and indeed the individual community, into imperial structures of ever-spiralling intricacy. But this does not mean that history should be written only from the top down, that 'the history of the ancient city *was* the history of empire'.⁷ Methodologically speaking, it stands to reason that imperial apparatuses will never be good sources for the *reception* of imperial apparatuses on the ground; for the microstrategies of resistance, the local bricolages, the biopolitics.

There are many issues at stake here: is the proper subject of history the study of institutions and systems, or of individual subjectivities? Do we give more weight to macrostrategies or microtactics? Structures or particulars? The musical 'score' or the improvisation? The answer is, in one sense, obvious: that no historical account should privilege one side to the exclusion of the other. But I would in this paper like to propose that there is indeed a case for promoting the emphasis upon the improvisatory, the tactical, the local over the structural and the abstract: partly because political structures have no 'reality' except insofar as they are acceded to (or indeed contested) by a set of individuals; but my central reason is in fact because whereas systemic analysis can exist in the abstract and need take no account of local specificities, the converse is not true. We can never deal with local tactics in isolation from larger processes, since the local is always defined at its point of contingency with the supralocal.⁸ Or, if we prefer, the history of the individual, is never the history of the individual in isolation — her "bare life", to use Agamben's phrase⁹ — but of the individual as she emerges in social life, bartering her own needs with the wider abstraction of the community.

⁶ ANDO (2010) 40-45.

⁷ *Ibid.* 45.

⁸ WHITMARSH (2010), with further bibliography.

⁹ AGAMBEN (1998).

Where then should we look for such finely granulated cultural-historical data? The Greek literature of the Roman period gives us a rare glimpse into an alternative cognitive space, since it is (exceptionally among our sources for imperial cultural history) largely untrammelled by political institutions. Greek literary texts of the imperial period were not, by and large, directly implicated in the processes of empire: there are exceptions of course, such as the patronal poetry of Antipater of Thessaloniki, Crinagoras of Mitylene, Mesomedes of Crete, Dionysius the Periegete and ps-Oppian,¹⁰ and the laudations of Rome by Dio Chrysostom¹¹ and the afore-mentioned Aelius Aristides. In general, however, Greek literary production seems strikingly free from political institutionalisation. Of course we must concede that we have desperately little firm knowledge about the realities of production and reception of imperial literature; we are always working with what Martin Bernal calls “competitive plausibilities”. Even so, it is striking that there is, to my knowledge, not a single recorded instance (except in the cases of direct sponsorship mentioned above) of intervention of any kind by the Roman authorities in the composition of Greek literature (contrast the situation in Rome itself, where — if we are to believe Tacitus — the recording of history in particular was highly politicised).¹²

It will be noted that most of the Greek authors who survive from the first three centuries of the common era were not

¹⁰ I do not mean to imply that such texts are equally patronal, or patronal in the same way; merely that each adopts traditional forms of Greek patronal poetics (honed by the tradition since Pindar and Bacchylides), and adapts them in addressing, implicitly or explicitly, a powerful Roman.

¹¹ Although I have argued that Dio’s kingship orations make much better sense as fictional ‘re’ enactments of an encounter with the emperor than as verbatim records of a real encounter: WHITMARSH (2001) 325-327.

¹² The one exception might be the famous passage of Plutarch warning against the use of Persian war themes, which can vex Roman authorities (*Praec. Ger. Reip.* 813 e); this suggests at least the possibility that Romans might act in response to the content of Greek literature. But this refers to civic oratory, presumably delivered in full view of such authorities, and not to written texts that will have circulated more discreetly.

independent of Rome, and therefore cannot be expected to 'resist'. This is true enough up to a point. Greek literary writers were by definition members of the elite, and the elite is (almost) by definition implicated in existing structures of power. We know for certain that many such writers (e.g. Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Favorinus, Arrian, Lucian, Philostratus) were Roman citizens; in other instances (e.g. Pausanias) this may be strongly suspected; and in no case, to my knowledge, do we have certain information that an author is *not* also Roman. But such interstitial identities in no way reduce the interest of a subject; quite the contrary, it is precisely the process of negotiation of multiple identities that is of interest. For once we broaden the meaning of resistance beyond openly proclaimed hostility, then we see precisely why discursive negotiation was the preferred route for such figures: not only because it is 'safer' (less open, less directly hostile), but also because it can attach to a safely demarcated area of mental activity that does not (necessarily) conflict with e.g. political duties. It is moreover (I submit) naïve to expect to find Greek opposition that is 'authentic', in the sense of disimplicated, and detached from Roman power; for all forms of imperialism (including that of global capitalism) operate precisely by dividing subjects' loyalties, by setting their affective loyalties against their pragmatic commitments. It is precisely the *inauthenticity* of the imperial subject, the Janus-faced complicity, that is under investigation.

In the remainder of this paper, I want to discuss three different varieties of discursive resistance, set in three distinct types of ectopic space.

1) Localism

In a time of accelerating 'globalisation', we can expect local spaces to become sites of maximal resistance; the threat of absorption and subsumption into a larger, homogeneous cultural

space is countered by an emphasis upon the regional, the diverse, the specific, the particular.¹³

For our purposes, the most important author here is Pausanias, whose vision of Greece as a space of apparently limitless heterogeneity can be seen as a deliberate attempt to contest the image of a seamlessly unified, non-diverse empire described in (e.g.) Aristides' speech *To Rome*: "The whole inhabited world, as it were attending a national festival, has laid aside its old dress and weapons, and has been authorised to turn to adornments and all kinds of pleasures."¹⁴ Let me take but one example, his description of Hadrian's temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens (1, 18, 6-9).¹⁵ Athens, Olympia and Delphi are the most significant spaces in the *Periegesis* in terms of both Hellenism and religious aura; to reflect this, they are strategically placed at the beginning, middle and end. So we should expect Athens to be a place where questions of ownership gather with particular intensity.

The account begins as follows:

πρὶν δὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἵεναι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου — Ἀδριανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς τὸν τε ναὸν ἀνέθηκε καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα θεᾶς ἄξιον, οὗ μεγέθει μὲν, ὅτι μὴ Ῥοδίοις καὶ Ῥωμαίοις εἰσὶν οἱ κολοσσοί, τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγάλματα ὁμοίως ἀπολείπεται, πεποίηται δὲ ἔκ τε ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἔχει τέχνης εὖ πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος ὁρῶσιν —, ἐνταῦθα εἰκόνες Ἀδριανοῦ δύο μὲν εἰσι Θεασίου λίθου, δύο δὲ Αἰγυπτίου· χαλκαῖ δὲ ἐστᾶσι πρὸ τῶν κιόνων ἅς Ἀθηναῖοι καλοῦσιν ἀποίκους πόλεις. ὁ μὲν δὴ πᾶς περίβολος σταδίων μάλιστα τεσσάρων ἐστίν, ἀνδριάντων δὲ πλήρης· ἀπὸ γὰρ πόλεως ἐκάστης εἰκῶν Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως ἀνάκειται, καὶ σφᾶς ὑπερεβάλλοντο Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν κολοσσὸν ἀναθέντες ὀπισθε τοῦ ναοῦ θεᾶς ἄξιον.

¹³ Discussion at WHITMARSH (2010).

¹⁴ Καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ πανηγυρίζουσα πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν φόρημα, τὸν σίδηρον, κατέθετο, εἰς δὲ κόσμον καὶ πάσας εὐφροσύνας τέτραπται σὺν ἐξουσίαι, ARISTID. 26, 97. Pausanias' relationship to Rome has been endlessly discussed: see esp. HABICHT (1985); BINGEN (1996); ELSNER (1992); ARAFAT (1996); SWAIN (1996) 330-356; ALCOCK / CHERRY / ELSNER (2001); HUTTON (2005).

¹⁵ Discussion of Pausanias' account in relation to the real monument at ARAFAT (1996) 172-178.

“Before entering the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus — Hadrian the Roman emperor set up the temple and the statue, one worth seeing, which in size exceeds all other statues save the colossi at Rhodes and Rome, and is made of ivory and gold with an artistic skill which is remarkable when the size is taken into account — there stand likenesses of Hadrian, two of Thasian stone, two of Egyptian. Before the pillars stand bronze statues which the Athenians call ‘colonies’. The whole circumference of the precincts is about four stades, and they are full of statues; for every city has dedicated a likeness of the emperor Hadrian, and the Athenians have surpassed them in dedicating, behind the temple, the remarkable colossus.” (1, 18, 6)

Despite Pausanias’ celebrated recessive narratorial voice (“Pausanias rarely indicates his aim, and never explicitly”),¹⁶ this passage contains a host of telling pointers. Pausanias is here in ‘itinerary’ mode,¹⁷ which places heavy emphasis upon the sequence of events. Note how the statues are said to come “before” (πρὶν) the entrance into the temple; this sense of interruption of a sacred itinerary is mirrored syntactically, as the parenthetic “Hadrian the Roman emperor dedicated ...” disrupts the reader’s expectation that a main sentence will follow the subordinated temporal clause.¹⁸ The emperor’s presence is thus marked as an intrusion, a derailment of the sacred narrative. After all, this is the temple of Olympian Zeus: the Greek genitive suggests not just denomination, but also possession.

Yet the temple ‘of’ Olympian Zeus is itself, of course, a Hadrianic construction. There are two primary emphases in the passage: the issue of agency, and that of cost / size / impressiveness. It is the emperor who is first credited with the creation of this particular space (“Hadrian the Roman emperor dedicated the temple and the statue”). This implies that, despite the space

¹⁶ HABICHT (1985) 22.

¹⁷ HUTTON (2005) 96-110.

¹⁸ There does exist a standard topographical description of a similar but not identical kind: “when x arrived at y, there is a z ...” (cf. SOPH. *Trach.* 752-753, EUR. *Hipp.* 1198-1200, and e.g. EASTERLING (1982) 167. The sense of interruption is not, however, materially weakened by the existence of these parallels.

belonging to Zeus, it is also (in a different register) Hadrianic. Hadrian, as is well known, assimilated himself to Zeus, partly through titles such as *κοσμοκράτωρ*. Pausanias is asking us to consider how well the analogy works: how like Zeus Hadrian really is, how compatible the two registers are. But he is also asking us more searching questions about the processes that underlie the creation of this kind of space. What does it mean to say Hadrian “set up” (*ἀνέθηκε*) the temple? Presumably he did not physically place one block upon another, as the Greek verb in its most literal rendering would imply. Was he even physically present in Athens at all to mandate the dedication, or did he do it remotely (much as “Claudius invaded Britain”)?

Note, in this connection, that Pausanias has another narrative of agency here, whereby the impetus for the dedication of statues at any rate comes from local cities (*ἀπὸ γὰρ πόλεως ἑκάστης εἰκὼν Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως ἀνάκειται*), with the magnitude of the Athenians’ dedication down to their success in this inter-*polis* competition (*σφᾶς ὑπερεβάλοντο Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν κολοσσὸν ἀναθέντες*). Despite the overweening (and intrusive, or at least ‘interruptive’) dominance of the figure of Hadrian in this grandiose space, we are reminded that Athenians too make decisions in Athens, even if (here) at the level of assent to imperial domination rather than autonomous decision-making. Even more powerful is the act of naming described in the reference to the “bronze statues which the Athenians call ‘colonies’”: this points not only to the power of local tradition (a power to create consensus around the description of monuments and history in a particular), but also to the opacity of such traditions to outsiders. Modern critics have no idea what these “colonies” (*ἀποικιοὶ πόλεις*) are;¹⁹ would ancient readers have known any better? There is a hierarchy of knowing being dramatized here:

¹⁹ There is a conventional assumption that the *apoikoi* have to do with the Panhellenion, mentioned at 1, 18, 9; interpretations are surveyed by ARAFAT (1996) 174-175; but that, it should be noted, is a separate building, and in any case Pausanias at any rate seems to understand the ‘colonies’ (rightly or wrongly) as part of an older cultural memory system.

the imperial presence is explicit and unmistakable, but the local knowledge is more recondite, mysterious, and — perhaps — privileged.

The temple of Olympian Zeus, then, is the focus for a series of characteristically Pausanian questions, aligning principally along three major axes: Is sacred space owned by gods or by mortal dedicators? What are the exact dynamics behind the creation of the magnificent temple (how much imperial ‘push’, how much local ‘pull’)?²⁰ And is the ‘truth’ of this sacred site to be located in its explicit, outward-facing, imperial-propagandistic message, or in the deeper, more elusive cultural memory guarded by locals?

Let us now turn to the remainder of the account:

ἔστι δὲ ἀρχαῖα ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ Ζεὺς χαλκοῦς καὶ ναὸς Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας καὶ τέμενος Γῆς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν Ὀλυμπίας. ἐνταῦθα ὅσον ἐς πῆχυν τὸ ἔδαφος διέστηκε, καὶ λέγουσι μετὰ τὴν ἐπομβρίαν τὴν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος συμβᾶσαν ὑπορρυῆναι ταύτῃ τὸ ὕδωρ, ἐσβάλλουσί τε ἐς αὐτὸ ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἄλφιστα πυρῶν μέλιτι μίξαντες. κεῖται δὲ ἐπὶ κίονος Ἰσοκράτους ἀνδριάς, ὃς ἐς μνήμην τρία ὑπελίπετο, ἐπιπονώτατον μὲν ὅτι οἱ βιώσαντι ἔτη δυοῖν δέοντα ἑκατὸν οὐποτε κατελύθη μαθητὰς ἔχειν, σωφρονέστατον δὲ ὅτι πολιτείας ἀπεχόμενος διέμεινε καὶ τὰ κοινὰ οὐ πολυπραγμονῶν, ἐλευθερώτατον δὲ ὅτι πρὸς τὴν ἀγγελίαν τῆς ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχης ἀλγῆσας ἐτελεύτησεν ἐθελοντῆς. κεῖνται δὲ καὶ λίθου Φρυγίου Πέρσαι χαλκοῦν τρίποδα ἀνέχοντες, θεᾶς ἄξιοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ ὁ τρίπους. τοῦ δὲ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς Δευκαλίωνα οἰκοδομησαὶ λέγουσι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν, σημεῖον ἀποφαίνοντες ὡς Δευκαλίων Ἀθήνησιν ὤκησε τάφον τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ νῦν οὐ πολὺ ἀφεστηκότα.

“Within the precincts are antiquities: a bronze Zeus, a temple of Cronus and Rhea and an enclosure of Earth surnamed Olympian. Here the floor opens to the width of a cubit, and they say that along this bed flowed off the water after the deluge that occurred in the time of Deucalion, and into it they cast every year wheat meal mixed with honey. On a pillar is a statue of

²⁰ We should note here the mysterious absence of any recognition on Pausanias’ part that the temple was only *completed* in Hadrianic times, having been begun in the sixth century BCE (*ibid.* 173). If Pausanias knew this, and expected his readers to know this, then the agency plot thickens considerably.

Isocrates, whose memory is remarkable for three things: his diligence in continuing to teach to the end of his ninety-eight years, his self-restraint in keeping aloof from politics and from interfering with public affairs, and his love of liberty in dying a voluntary death, distressed at the news of the battle at Chaeronea. There are also statues in Phrygian marble of Persians supporting a bronze tripod; both the figures and the tripod are worth seeing. The ancient sanctuary of Olympian Zeus the Athenians say was built by Deucalion, and they cite as evidence that Deucalion lived at Athens a grave which is not far from the present temple.” (1, 18, 7-8)

As ever with Pausanias, topography is an index of cultural value. We now move from the outside to “within the precinct” (ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ); and here we move not only find no imperial (or even Roman) markers, but also move sharply backwards in time. Here are the ἀρχαῖα, the ancient things; and, at the end of the passage, the allusion to the “ancient sanctuary” (τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν) contrasts strongly if implicitly with Hadrian’s contemporary building programme. Indeed, there is a strongly primaeval feel to this space: the temple of Cronus and Rhea predates even the establishment of the Olympian order, and Deucalion’s flood was thought to have marked an early stage in the mythical cycle (note again that this Deucalionic connection is associated with Athenian cultural memory: λέγουσι ... λέγουσι). In keeping with this atmosphere of extreme antiquity, we find weird cultic practice: the honeyed cakes that Pausanias tends to associate with chthonic religion.

This air of antiquity also has repercussions beyond the religious, thanks to the statues of Isocrates and the Persians. Both allude to decisive moments in Greece’s (and Athens’) struggles with foreign, imperial domination. The statue of the Persians is obscure and underinterpreted (although it cannot but evoke the fifth-century conflicts); but in the case of Isocrates we are given a strong hermeneutic steer, with the tricolon of notable features culminating in his “most free” (ἐλευθερώτατον: translated paraphrastically above with the phrase “love of liberty”) decision to commit suicide after the battle of Chaeronea, where

the Athenians lost out to the Macedonians. Isocrates gifts to collective memory (ἐς μνήμην) a close identification of personal identity, rooted in ethical liberality, with political liberty. There are important and obvious reasons why this kind of message could not have been presented outside the *peribolos*, in the vicinity of the markers of Roman imperial domination.

This one brief example, then, shows how local spaces could become a site for symbolic resistance to Roman power; how, that is, in the realm of discourse the imperial-Roman and the local-Greek can be marked out as distinct from each other, and laden with culturally asymmetrical values.

2) The Cosmos

At the other extreme, Roman domination could be contested by appealing to the structures that exceed the boundaries of the empire: the world, or even the cosmos. The two modes, the local and the cosmic, are evidently connected by the emphasis on finding spaces that elude imperial control, whether by moving inwards into protected interior spaces or proceeding beyond the outer borders. We should recall just how fundamental to the rhetoric of empire was the conception of space (as Claude Nicolet has shown),²¹ and in particular the fiction that Rome dominated the entire world.

The cosmic strain can be found in a number of texts, particularly those inflected through Stoicism, which has a complex and ambivalent relationship to the rhetoric of empire: the idea of a providentially governed cosmos could of course easily be co-opted as an analogy for the benign functioning of empire, but it could just as well function as a counterpoint, indicating by contrast just how unstable and capricious mortal governance is. (This ambivalence relates to a duality present in Greek thought on the gods, right from the start of the tradition: we

²¹ NICOLET (1991).

might think of how Hesiod's *Theogony* offers Zeus' rule as a paradigm of mortal βασιλεία, while in book 1 of the *Iliad* Zeus' total control over the other gods serves as a *contrast* with Agamemnon's weakness in the face of the other βασιλῆες.) An excellent example of such a stoicising 'reframing' of empire would be Dio's 36th oration, the *Borystheniticus*, which (a) marks its anti-imperial tenor from the start with a reference to the author's exile (1), and soon proceeds to note how one of the locals was mocked for shaving (!) out of flattery of the Romans (16); and (b) purveys a cosmic myth, attributed to the Magi (but transparently Stoic in origin), which focuses on the rationality of the cosmos (30-61).

The list of Greek literary texts we could discuss that probe the limits of Roman power includes many fictional works, particularly Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders beyond Thule*, Lucian's *True Stories*, and Heliodorus' *Charicleia and Theagenes*. It also includes works relating to Alexander's eastern conquests, such as Plutarch's and Arrian's accounts, and also the *Alexander Romance* (a text with Hellenistic strata, but which seems to have achieved a relatively stable form only in the imperial era). We know from Livy that there were "trivial Greeks" (*leuissimi e Graecis*) who liked to contrast Alexander's conquests with those of the Romans, and speculate as to what might have happened had the two met (as indeed Plutarch does, albeit inconclusively, at the end of *De Fortuna Romanorum*).²² The particular interest in the Indian ventures and the questing after the edges of Ocean no doubt played to a consciousness that Rome had conspicuously failed to extend its empire eastwards.

Such considerations underpin Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana*, as I have discussed on several occasions.²³ Here, the idealised sage of the title undergoes his philosophical initiation among the Brahmans of India, passing beyond the borders of

²² LIV. 9, 17-19; MORELLO (2002).

²³ Especially WHITMARSH (2007); KÖNIG / WHITMARSH (2007); WHITMARSH (2012).

Roman control already in book 1. The act of boundary-crossing is carefully and deliberately marked. When he reaches the borders (ὄρια) of Babylon, he meets a guardpost (φρουρά, 1, 21, 1). This is the limit of Sassanid control, but also (at least in Philostratus' time) of Roman.²⁴ He is asked to declare his identity, but refuses to acknowledge royal authority, replying instead that "all the world is mine (ἐμῇ ... πᾶσα ἡ γῆ), and it is open to me to travel through it" (1, 21, 2). This emphasis on travel beyond Roman control, to the edges of the earth, balances and contrasts with (as Jas' Elsner has shown) the climactic book 8, set right in the heart of Domitian's court.²⁵ Yet Apollonius also exceeds *Greek* space, by passing beyond the "limit" (τέρμα) of Alexander's empire, marked monumentally by altars (2, 43). What is more, his education in India — which involves the apprehension of cosmic knowledge (cf. 3, 43, 3 for the cosmic νοῦς) teaches him also how limited the Greek conception of the world is (see esp. 3, 25, where Apollonius is taught the limitations of the 'Greek' view that justice consists in the avoidance of injustice).

The complexity of *Apollonius*, which seems *both* to play the Greek philosophical tradition off against the Roman imperial system, *and* (more subtly) to assimilate the two as limited ways of knowing the world, makes it a special case. But such complexity, I have argued, does not limit a literary work's status as 'resistance literature', for identity politics are always embattled and multiform. The crucial point is that the text describes a world outside and beyond the empire, at times painting marvellously sublime (and, to my knowledge, unparalleled) panoramic vistas sweeping across the heavens (2, 5, 3), the Caucasus mountains (2, 2, 1) and the west coast of Africa (5, 1).²⁶ The

²⁴ Mesopotamia was annexed under Septimius. Philostratus acknowledges this shift with the reference in the previous chapter to the 'Arab' lands through which Apollonius has travelled, "which were not yet (οὐδ' ... πω) under the Romans" (1, 20, 3).

²⁵ ELSNER (1997) 32.

²⁶ WHITMARSH (2012).

text as a whole points up the limitations of mortal (including, especially, imperial) boundaries; so Apollonius' escape from Domitian's clutches in the final book is only the physical embodiment of a grandiose elusivity that has been built up to throughout.

3) The body

My third area of resistance is the representation of the body, particularly the body that endures state violence. This trope is associated in modern criticism primarily with early Christianity, whose martyr acts are peppered with lurid descriptions of violence ineffectively perpetrated on devout bodies. Such martyrologies are often post-Constantinian, which means that they are not so much mimetic of contemporary life as engaged in a process of imaginative reconstruction of Christian identity through an anachronistic, exaggerated, and perhaps even fictitious fantasy of persecution.²⁷ Like the elite Greeks discussed elsewhere in this paper, post-Constantinian Christians were working out, in the realm of discourse, an identity distinct from Roman imperialism *precisely because* they were implicated in it.

Yet Christianity did not, of course, invent this persecution discourse as much as refine it and accentuate it. We can already find in the Hellenistic²⁸ 2 and (particularly) 4 *Maccabees* an account of the gruesome torture of seven Jewish brothers by Antiochus IV, with the same emphasis on the embrace of punishment as an opportunity to display one's steadfast commitment: "On that day virtue was the umpire and the test to which they were put was a test of endurance. The prize for victory was incorruption in life without end" (4 *Macc.* 17, 11).

²⁷ POTTER (1993); SHAW (1996); GRIG (2004).

²⁸ 4 *Maccabees* may be imperial: arguments are surveyed (without commitment) by DESILVA (1998) 14-18.

It is also found in non-monotheistic contexts, and not just in paraliterary texts such as the so-called *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*. In Philostratus' *Apollonius*, the philosopher is threatened with torture (βασανίζειν) by the Parthian border guard mentioned in the previous section (1, 21, 2), and indeed fettered and imprisoned by Domitian's men (7, 22-8). The failure of tyrannical states to inflict their violence on the elusive Apollonius figures the protagonist's moral and cultural superiority, his "freedom" (ἐλευθερία) in that distinctively Greek double sense that merges political autonomy with ethical self-control. The Greek novelists too frequently represent their protagonists as suffering at the hands of brutal oppressors: either actual imperial systems, like the Persian apparatus that condemns Chariton's Chaereas to hard labour and (eventually) crucifixion, or surrogates like Achilles Tatius' Thersander, "tyrannical" in a metaphorical sense, who threatens Leucippe with violence (she responds by inviting him to torture her), and has Clitophon imprisoned, and threatened with torture.²⁹

This emphasis on the body as a site of resistance to overweening violence is, as Brent Shaw has argued, the result of a demonstrable shift occurring in the first century CE towards the celebration of endurance (ὑπομονή / Latin *patientia*) as a virtue.³⁰ Shaw's analysis is plotted along the axis of gender: he shows decisively that (i) 'endurance' is a masculine virtue, linked to stoicising conceptions of fortitude; (ii) yet violence is associated with the abasing, even the 'feminising' of the recipient body; (iii) the discourse of bodily violence thus tells a complex story of gendered virtues, whereby both masculine and feminine elements are integrated into a single ideal.

Even more notable in the sources, however, is a continual renegotiation of the language of slavery. The importance of slavery in ancient Jewish thought as a metaphor for wrongful

²⁹ See 6, 6, 1 for Clitophon's imprisonment, 6, 18-20 for the Leucippe scene (with Thersander said to be 'tyrannizing' at 6, 20, 3), and 7, 12, 1-2 for the announcement of Clitophon's impending torture. See KING (2012).

³⁰ SHAW (1996).

subordination to another mortal has been well discussed,³¹ but it is found in polytheist sources too. Take in particular Achilles Tatius' Leucippe passage, mentioned above. Thersander thinks that Leucippe is his slave, and on this basis attempts to dominate her sexually ("you refuse to accept that it's a great privilege to kiss your master (δεσπότην) ... since you are unwilling to submit to me as a lover, try me as a master (δεσπότης)!", 6, 20, 3). Yet Thersander's adoption of this position of overweening authority also serves, from both Leucippe's and the narrator's (Clitophon's) perspective, to demote him to the status of slave. Leucippe: "You are not acting as a free man (ὡς ἐλεύθερος), a noble, should; you are mimicking [Thersander's slave] Sosthenes; the slave merits his master" (6, 18, 6). The narrator: "Thersander was no longer free (ἐλεύθερος) ... he was entirely Leucippe's slave (ὄλος δοῦλος)" (6, 19, 5 and 7). The critical point here is that correct ethical behaviour is truer and stronger than, and hence can subvert, socio-political categories. The true ἐλεύθερος is not one who possesses the legal status, but one who acts, in Leucippe's words, "as a free man (ὡς ἐλεύθερος)": that little word "as" (ὡς) marks the crucial point that the compatibility of ethics and status is not to be taken for granted.

For our purposes, however, most significant of all is the political dimension: each of these stories centres upon a power asymmetry that is, or can be allegorised as, imperial. They all thus offer themselves as metaphors for resistance, however abstract, to imperial Rome. From the time of Augustus, power was ever-increasingly concentrated, both symbolically and practically, in the figure of the emperor. For provincials in particular (cut off as they were from any vestiges of senatorial decision-making at Rome), the homology between emperor and subjects, on the one hand, and master and slaves, on the other, presented itself with ever more clarity. And given that the right to inflict violence on another was enshrined in Roman

³¹ HEZSER (2005) 341-344.

law in the distinction between master and slaves,³² the discourse that we have been tracing — the reencoding of the abased body as ethically superior — serves as a powerful metaphor for the (cathected) reversal of imperial hierarchies.

Let me, finally in this section, point very briefly to a pair of speeches by the sophist Polemo. These classicizing, historical *controversiae* have nothing explicitly to do with Rome: the personae are assumed of the fathers of Cynegirus and Callimachus, who died at Marathon; each argues to the Athenians that his son is worthy of the greater honour. Yet as we shall see, the deployment of parallel tropes suggests an analogy between Persia and Rome.

Cynegirus died through blood loss when he laid first one hand then the other on the prow of a Persian ship; Callimachus when he was pin-cushioned with so many arrows and spears that his corpse remained erect.³³ The grotesque subject-matter is mirrored by comically florid rhetoric: in one chapter (1, 34), Cynegirus' father apostrophises his son's severed hands or hand in the vocative 15 times ("O Marathonian hands, hands most dear, reared by these hands of mine; o hands that saved Greece, o hands that fought in the first ranks of the Athenians ..." [etc.]). Yet this is not simply lurid slasher-flick entertainment; it is also an iconic celebration of the mutilated body as resistance to foreign invasion. Cynegirus' father imagines the Persians reporting back to their king: "King, we sailed against men of adamant [the Greek word of course implies 'unconquerable'], who do not even care if their hands are cut off; against right hands that were a match for entire ships. It was only with difficulty that we escaped Cynegirus and set out to sea" (1, 43). This image of adamantine endurance is revived in Callimachus' father's response:

³² Other categories were also distinguished by rights of violence, e.g. *honestiores* and *infames*.

³³ Details in READER / CHVALA-SMITH (1996).

ἐνθα πολλὰ μὲν βελῶν καὶ κοντῶν καὶ ξιφῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν βλημάτων ὑπεδέξατο, πάσας δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπέμεινε τὰς προσβολὰς ὡσπερ ἐξ ἀδάμαντος ὢν πύργος ἢ τεῖχος ἄρρηκτον ἢ ἀντίτυπος πέτρα ἢ θεὸς ἀνθρώποις μαχόμενος, ἕως πάντα ἀνήλωσε τὰ τῆς Ἀσίας βέλη καὶ καμεῖν ἐποίησε τὴν πολλὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βασιλέως.

“There he received many missiles and spears and swords and all types of shots, and he endured (ὑπέμεινε) all their attacks like a tower of adamant or an unbreakable wall or a beaten-against stone or a god fighting mortals, until he used up all the missiles of Asia and he wearied the king’s entire force.” (2, 10)

Callimachus’ self-sacrifice thus becomes a parable of endurance (ὑπομονή) in the face of foreign imperial domination; his martyred body becomes a symbol of Greece’s unbreakability (the tower, wall and rock similes implicitly compare him to a Sophoclean protagonist, and thus lock him intertextually too into a vision of eternal Greekness). Yet the punctured, wounded body is also — contrariwise — a symbol of vulnerability, of the damage that can be inflicted on an individual by imperial forces (despite the fact that the Persians were, of course, defeated at Marathon). Cynegirus and Callimachus exist not as total, integrated bodies, but as divided, anatomised parts. Callimachus’ father opines that:

ὁ μὲν τὴν χεῖρα μόνην, ὁ δὲ ὅλα τὰ μέρη τοῦ σώματος· πᾶσι γὰρ μεμάχεται καὶ τοῦ πολέμου πάντα μείζονα.

“The one [Cynegirus] gave³⁴ his hand alone, the other all the parts of his body; he fought which each of these parts, and all were too much for the fight.”

The damaged body is thus a symbol simultaneously of strength and of weakness; it represents a site of conflict between the foreign invader and the resisting Greek. More than this, it plays out a hierarchy of values: though punished, brutalised, abased, it nevertheless displays its ethical supremacy. “Callimachus was a paradigm of virtue (ἀρετῆς)” (2, 32); “through the superiority of

³⁴ This or a similar verb should be supplied for sense.

his virtue (ἀρετῆς περιουσίαν) he mastered (ἐκράτησε) the whole battle and became the reason for the honour that is now being undertaken" (2, 49). Note here in particular the language of supremacy (περιουσία, κρατεῖν) applied, paradoxically, to the defeated body. This ambivalence points to the central ideological work enacted by this text: the creation of two distinct spheres, the military/political and the ethical spheres, and the use of shared language of evaluation to allow the second to be assessed as superior to the first.

Conclusion

These three spaces — the protected interior of the local, the 'beyond', the corporeal — should be understood in terms of their relationship not to physical reality as such, but to the imagination as it is projected onto that reality. But whereas the realm of the imagination is usually understood as an abnegation of reality, I would see it here rather as a modification of the *perception* of reality. The sites of conflict I have identified are not simply escapist fantasies; they are testing-grounds for an alternative 'truth', whereby ethics and values are assessed as superior to military dominance. This is what I mean by 'discursive' resistance: imaginative literature has the power to shift our perspectives, so that the reach of imperial control no longer seems infinite, but bounded and contained; and the defeated can become victors. As I hope I have made abundantly clear, such attempts to define an imaginary space that resists imperial control should be seen not as directly mimetic of oppositional ideology (these are not the works of political separatists) but as attempts to forge distinct identities *precisely on the part of those whose identities are most confused*. 'Resistance', that is to say, should not be thought of merely as the materialisation of political ideology; it exists, too, in the sphere of the emotional and the intellectual, the space of literature.

Works cited

- AGAMBEN, G. (1998), *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford).
- ALCOCK, S.E. / CHERRY, J.F. / ELSNER, J. (2001) (ed.), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York).
- ANDO, C. (2000), *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London).
- ANDO, C. (2010), "Imperial Identities", in T. WHITMARSH (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (New-York-Cambridge), 17-45.
- ARAFAT, K. (1996), *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge).
- BINGEN, J. (1996) (ed.), *Pausanias historien: Huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Vandœuvres-Genève).
- DESILVA, D.A. (1998), *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield).
- EASTERLING, P.E. (1982), *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Cambridge).
- ELSNER, J. (1992), "Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World", *P&P* 135:3-29.
- ELSNER, J. (1997), "Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*", *JHS* 117:22-37.
- FUCHS, H. (1938), *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt* (Berlin).
- GRIG, L. (2004), *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London).
- HABICHT, C. (1985), *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London).
- HEZSER, C. (2005), *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford).
- HUTTON, W. (2005), *Describing Greece: Language and Literature in the Periēgesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge).
- JEFFERESS, D. (2008), *Postcolonial Resistance: Culture, Liberation and Transformation* (Toronto).
- KING, D. (2012), "'Taking it Like a Man': Gender, Identity and the Body in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*", in M.P. FUTRE PINHEIRO / M.B. SKINNER / F.I. ZEITLIN (ed.), *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel* (Berlin), 147-157.
- KÖNIG J. / WHITMARSH, T. (2007), "Introduction", in J. KÖNIG / T. WHITMARSH (ed.), *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge), 3-39.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1987), "Some Preliminary Remarks on the 'Religious Opposition' to the Roman Empire", in A. GIOVANNINI (éd.), *Opposition et résistances à l'Empire d'Auguste à Trajan* (Vandœuvres-Genève), 103-129.

- MORELLO, M.-R. (2002), "Livy's Alexander Digression (9.17-19): Counterfactuals and Apologetics", *JRS* 92:62-85.
- NICOLET, C. (1991), *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor).
- POTTER, D. (1993), "Martyrdom as Spectacle", in R. SCODEL (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor), 53-88.
- READER, W.W. / CHVALA-SMITH, A.J. (1996), *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo* (Atlanta).
- SHAW, B.D. (1996), "Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs", *J ECS* 4:269-312.
- SWAIN, S. (1996), *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (Oxford).
- WHITMARSH, T. (2001), *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford).
- WHITMARSH, T. (2007), "Prose Literature and the Severan Dynasty", in S. SWAIN / S. HARRISON / J. ELSNER (ed.), *Severan Culture* (Cambridge), 29-51.
- WHITMARSH, T. (2010), "Thinking Local", in T. WHITMARSH (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (New-York-Cambridge), 1-16.
- WHITMARSH, T. (2012), "Philostratus", in I.J.F. DE JONG (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), 463-479.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (2007), "Resistance Is Surrender", *London Review of Books* 29 (22):7.

DISCUSSION

H.-G. Nesselrath: Polemons Darstellung des Kallimachos als "lanzengespickter" Körper, der einen feindlichen Angriff aufhält, ist mindestens zu einem großen Teil ein Topos. Im sechsten Buch der *Pharsalia* (*Phars.* 6, 118-262) verwendet Lucan diesen Topos, um die Widerstandskraft von Caesars Centurio Scaeva zu zeigen, der ebenfalls mit seinem von vielen Geschossen durchbohrten Körper den Angriff der Gegner (in diesem Fall der Truppen des Pompeius) aufhält; aber Scaeva ist kein Bewahrer von Freiheit gegen einen fremden Gegner, sondern ein Vertreter Caesars, der die römische Freiheit zerstören wird. Deshalb die Frage: Wie naheliegend ist es im Fall Polemons, den Topos metaphorisch auf "Widerstand" gegen Rom zu beziehen?

T. Whitmarsh: Yes, one might see the punctured body as a *topos*, although it is not the most *commun* of *lieux communs*. The question then is what one makes of this topicality. To dismiss it as a 'mere' topos would be hasty. Motifs become *topoi* only if they have the capacity to be reworked to bear new meaning in new contexts. So there is no problem in seeing Lucan and Polemo as operating in very different ways. I would not claim, incidentally, that the Polemo case is directly metaphorical of resistance to Rome; Polemo was after all hardly a freedom fighter. It is about the body as a site of resistance to foreign military invasion; this is a powerful and suggestive image that makes available the anti-Roman allegory, but can just as well be read literally in connection with historical Persians.

A. Heller: Le corps violenté dans le roman grec a fait l'objet d'autres interprétations, en particulier à travers le prisme du

genre: je pense au livre de Sophie Lalanne,³⁵ qui souligne que la violence touche le corps des héroïnes bien plus que des héros et développe l'idée que cette violence joue un rôle de *paideia* et de rite de passage, destiné à préparer la jeune fille à son rôle social et à la contrainte que la société (et les hommes) feront peser sur elle. Que pensez-vous de cette interprétation et, le cas échéant, comment l'articulez-vous avec celle d'une allégorie de la résistance au pouvoir politique et à l'autorité de Rome?

T. Whitmarsh: It is true that in the Greek novels violence is much more commonly directed at the female body than at the male, although I think scholarship has focused on the former at the expense of the latter. I agree broadly with Sophie Lalanne and others that the famous 'sexual symmetry' of the novels is compromised by strong undercurrents of asymmetrical violence, and a full account of the representation of the body in this genre would certainly focus in this area. Does this mean that gender is the only power dynamic at work here? I don't think so. Part (I stress, part!) of the reason why the female body is emphasized is because it is seen as both vulnerable and, as the bearer of virginity, virtuous. The threat of violence, particularly sexual violence, against women should be taken both literally — with all its deeply disturbing consequences — and as potentially figurative of a political struggle between overweening political authority (and note that aggressors are almost always foreign) and innate, traditional virtue.

L. Van der Stockt: Thank you for the workable analysis of the notion of 'resistance'! Can that analysis help us in determining if and to what degree Plutarch's oeuvre shows signs of resistance?

³⁵ LALANNE, S. (2006), *Une éducation grecque: Rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien* (Paris).

T. Whitmarsh: I can see little reason to dispute your conclusion that Plutarch is, overall, a pretty conservative figure whose primary concern is to negotiate a consensual 'deal' between Greeks and Romans. However, we should take his works on a case-by-case basis. I do think, as I mentioned in the discussion of your paper, that *De fortuna Romanorum* is more provocative than conciliatory, perhaps because its rhetorical context encourages experimentation. It is also interesting to consider at the microanalytical level what linguistic choices he makes when he speaks of Roman institutions. Which terms does he translate, which does he transliterate (e.g. in the *Quaestiones Romanae*). Such decisions tell us much about what aspects of Roman society Plutarch feels comfortable with, and which he does not. I have always been struck by his refusal to use the available Greek terms for patronage, for example: although he seems in favour of the institution (in *Romulus*), I think it jars heavily with his belief that friendship should be non-hierarchical.

U. Gärtner: In Ihrer Behandlung der Pausaniaspassage konnte besonders die Betonung der narrativen Beschreibung überzeugen, indem offensichtlich wurde, wie der Weg von außen nach innen, von Gegenwart zur Vorzeit, von römisch zu griechisch instrumentalisiert wurde, d.h. wie der intellektuelle Ort den realen überlagerte. Es stellt sich mir hier die Frage zum einen nach dem Freiraum der Darstellungsart; d.h. war es nicht naturgemäß, den Leser auf einen Gang von außen nach innen mitzunehmen? Zum anderen ließe sich fragen, ob und wie dies für den Rezipienten als Stilisierung zu erkennen war. Lassen sich für eine solche Erzählstrategie weitere Belege bei Pausanias finden?

T. Whitmarsh: Yes, I think so. Here I am resting heavily on the interpretation of my colleague Jas' Elsner, who has influentially argued that Pausanias' narrative mode is that of a pilgrim, that he sees the place of maximal sacred and cultural values as the innermost point, and hence by definition the point most

protected from the external gaze. I find this very convincing, although in my view (and William Hutton's recent book reinforces this) Pausanias was also a heterogeneous writer who experimented with multiple modalities. The question of the reception of the actual Athenian temple is of course more inscrutable, but we do know that at least one ancient viewer saw it in this way!

H.-G. Nesselrath: Pausanias' Darstellung des Isokrates (in 1, 18, 7-8) bedient sich bekannter "Fakten" der biographischen Isokrates-Überlieferung und interpretiert sie neu: Isokrates' überlieferte Ängstlichkeit und schwache Stimme wird hier positiv zu lobenswerter Zurückhaltung vor politischer Vielgeschäftigkeit (πολυπραγμοσύνη) umgedeutet und sein freiwilliges Aus-dem-Leben-Scheiden durch Nahrungsverweigerung nach der Schlacht von Chaironeia als Akt des Widerstandes, wie er einem Demosthenes gut zu Gesicht gestanden hätte. Könnte man hierin Hinweise sehen, wie sich Pausanias die Haltung griechischer Redner/Sophisten zu seiner Zeit gegenüber der römischen Macht wünschte?

T. Whitmarsh: Thank you for this point, which is very interesting. I am not aware of any systematic studies of the biographical traditions surrounding Isocrates. It looks a very promising area.

P. Schubert: On pourrait être surpris de prime abord par la manière dont Pausanias dépeint — dans le cadre de la description du temple de Jupiter érigé par Hadrien — l'activité d'Isocrate, lequel se serait abstenu d'une activité politique et ne se serait pas mêlé des affaires publiques. Certes il n'a pas mené une activité de premier plan dans l'Assemblée athénienne, mais ses écrits affichent néanmoins un programme politique très vaste. Ce paradoxe ne suggère-t-il pas que le contre-modèle implicite auquel pense Pausanias est représenté par Démosthène? Et le cas échéant, en quoi cela pourrait-il nous éclairer

sur les limites de l'activité politique en Grèce à l'époque de Pausanias?

T. Whitmarsh: I like this idea very much. Perhaps, to push it a little further, we could see Pausanias as reimagining Isocrates as the idealized fantasy of a 'second sophistic' intellectual: compensating for the absence of political influence (the Demosthenic mode) by employing discursive resistance instead.

J.-L. Charlet: À propos de votre paragraphe sur "the homology between emperor and subjects... master and slaves", ne faudrait-il pas introduire le problème du titre de *dominus* qu'Auguste n'a pas voulu prendre, mais que Domitien, lui, avait voulu, non sans opposition, se faire attribuer?

T. Whitmarsh: This too is a very interesting point. Domitian's title *dominus et deus* — wonderfully rhythmic and alliterative, and apparently punning on the very name Domitianus — does indeed suggest a double homology: emperor is to subjects as master is to slaves, as god is to mortals. Perhaps power can only be described by analogy or pleonasm, as Barthes famously said of beauty. We have Greek sources too (e.g. Philostratus' *Apollonius*) suggesting that δεσπότης was the Greek translation of *dominus* in this context.

A. Heller: Le concept de résistance discursive tel que vous le développez me paraît très séduisant et pertinent. Mais à mon avis sa portée ne se limite pas à l'espace de la littérature, et il y a place pour de telles stratégies discursives dans certains documents officiels, ainsi que dans les discours politiques tenus devant les Assemblées et les Conseils civiques. Par exemple, certaines inscriptions honorifiques convoquent les grandes figures du passé grec pour faire l'éloge des notables locaux dans le présent; elles établissent ainsi implicitement une continuité par-delà le passage sous domination romaine, qui se trouve de cette manière occulté, voire nié — alors même que le pouvoir

impérial est abondamment célébré dans les mêmes inscriptions. De manière similaire, les discours bithyniens de Dion de Pruse (sur la rivalité entre Nicée et Nicomédie, entre Pruse et Apamée) suggèrent que les luttes pour l'obtention de statuts privilégiés de la part de l'empereur se fondent en partie sur une sorte de négation de la réalité de l'Empire romain. Un statut de centre juridique (comme celui de capitale de *conuentus*) ou de centre religieux (comme celui de cité néocore) attise les conflits car il est interprété à la lumière des paradigmes de l'époque classique sur l'hégémonie: se rendre dans une autre cité pour accéder à la justice, y envoyer des délégués pour un sacrifice commun et lui verser des contributions financières, ce sont aux yeux des Grecs des signes de dépendance politique; inversement, la cité où la justice est rendue, où les fêtes sont célébrées, se voit reconnaître une position de supériorité par rapport aux autres. Que la justice soit rendue par le gouverneur et les fêtes célébrées en l'honneur de l'empereur n'empêche en rien les provinciaux d'inscrire dans ces événements des rapports de force locaux. Il me semble que cette attitude s'apparente à une forme de résistance discursive, les Grecs continuant à s'affronter symboliquement selon les mêmes schémas que par le passé, bien qu'ils soient par ailleurs conscients que le monde a changé.

T. Whitmarsh: I take your point; it is certainly a fault characteristic of literary scholars to superelevate their texts! I would not want to rule out the possibility of discursive resistance in other media, and the epigraphic examples you point to are rich. My point was really about the apparent absence of institutional determination for much pre-Constantinian imperial Greek literature: for Plutarch, Philostratus *et al.* there is apparently no equivalent to the patronal structures of the court of Hieron or the Alexandrian museum, or even the public festivals of the poets. Nor are there any cases I know of where provincial Greeks are chastised for anti-Roman utterances (in spite of Plutarch's Roman boot). Of course, there are always constraints of some form on expression — no one can truly

sentire quae uelis et quae sentias dicere — but in general, imperial Greek literary writers seem to have been relatively free from direct political pressure.

H.-G. Nesselrath: Hadrians Leistung beim athenischen Olympeion (in 1, 18, 6) wird als beeindruckend nur in monumentalen Ausmaßen (μέγεθος), nicht aber unbedingt aufgrund seines künstlerischen Wertes beurteilt. Kann man darin eine implizite Hadrian-Kritik entdecken?

T. Whitmarsh: I am not sure: there is, after all, a mention of a high level of artistic accomplishment (τέχνη) too, even if this is phrased in a guarded way (it is technically good *if you consider its size*). Pausanias is as a rule very nice about Hadrian: I think it is hard to explain away all his encomia in ironic terms. I would not see Pausanias as *anti-imperial*, still less anti-Roman, any more than Plutarch; what he resists, rather, is the imperial attempt to dominate all space. Discursive resistance is not necessarily oppositional or aggressive; it operates by imagining (utopian) spaces that are beyond imperial control, qualitatively different, protected from foreign intervention.

