

IVAN FREMEC

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Osijek
ifremec@ffos.hr

UDC: 929Помпејс Трогус
904(4-15)"01"

ON THE HABITUS OF POMPEIUS TROGUS: ROMANS AND GAULS IN THE WORK OF A “ROMANIZED” GAUL

Abstract. – Pompeius Trogus was an acculturated Gaul whose life and work date to the second half of the 1st century BCE. He is the author of *Historiae Philippicae* (i.e., Philippic History), which survives only in epitomized form (the *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum*) by Justin, a Roman rhetor about whom we know almost nothing. Precisely because the information on the author is scant and we have little insight into his habitus, it is difficult to discern his intentions, motivation, and intended audience – data that are essential for gaining a rounded view of this work. This paper explores the complex social habitus of Pompeius Trogus based on information gleaned from Justin’s epitome and other available sources, combining these findings with linguistic research into the epitome in order to shed clearer light on the issue at hand. The study also focuses on how the epitome portrays the Gauls, about whom we learn the most in Book 24, which deals with their campaign against Delphi in 279 BCE. Since Pompeius Trogus was of Gallic origin and undoubtedly carried Hellenistic influences within himself, an investigation of the discourse on the Gauls (and on the Romans) in the epitome, as well as uncovering Trogus’ habitus in light of the social theory colloquially termed “salad bowl” (here referring to a multicultural, heterogeneous society under the shared denominator of Rome), provides a fresh contribution to the study of this topic. Pompeius Trogus emerges as a Roman and a member of the Roman elite, but with a complex Hellenistic value system and a Gallic heritage, upon which he based his writing.

Key words. – Pompeius Trogus, *Historiae Philippicae*, Marcus Iunius Justinus, Gauls, Romans

Previous Research

On the issue of Justin’s epitome and Pompeius Trogus, almost nothing has been written in Croatian.¹ Croatian historians who use the epitome

¹ The core of this manuscript was written before Josip Miklić’s Croatian translation of the *Philippic History* appeared in 2021. In his very extensive introduction and critical apparatus, the translator addresses the aforementioned issues and provides a concise overview

me as a source in their studies typically remark only that Justin abridged Pompeius Trogus' work, without venturing further.² A similar pattern can be observed among scholars from neighboring countries.³ The content of any digression on the *Historiae Philippicae* generally includes only the facts that it has come down to us through Justin and that Pompeius Trogus was its original author. Some historians additionally note the dating of the original text and the epitome. Furthermore, in secondary literature it is common to attribute a dual authorship to the epitome – referring to Pompeius Trogus and Justin together.⁴ The scholars who have delved most deeply into researching Justin's epitome and the questions of authorship and dating are R. B. Steele, O. Seel, R. Syme, and J.C. Yardley.⁵

One of the primary questions that arises at the very start of any research is: why was the first universal history written in Latin not preserved in its entirety, but came down to us in the epitome of a certain Justin? We know nothing about how Trogus' work was received in his own time,

of research on the life of Pompeius Trogus, where he also mentions the theory that the Caesar referred to in the epitome is not Gaius Julius but rather Augustus, and offers a generally different view of Trogus' sentiment toward Rome and the Gauls. For the chronological reasons, both Miklić's and Watson's translations were used in the writing of this paper.

² Zaninović 2001, 58: "This statement that it was the Celts from the Adriatic who came as envoys to Alexander the Great, rather than those much closer in Pannonia, is sometimes explained by another text, recorded by Pompeius Trogus in Justin (XXIV, 4). Indeed, Trogus' work from the late 1st century BC survives only in abridged form through the excerpts by Junianus Justinus in the 3rd century AD." Domić Kunić 2009, 222: "The arrival of the Celts in Pannonia during the 4th century BC quite captured the attention of Greek and Roman historians, but only a small number of ancient reports about it have reached us. Although Pompeius Trogus (preserved in Justin) describes the Celts coming into Pannonia via 'the Illyrian gulfs' and 'the slopes of the Alps,' and Livy has them entering via 'the Italian pastures' (the Julian Alps), that is true only of the portion of the Celtic migration that settled in the upper Drava and Sava regions, whom the sources call the Taurisci."

³ Mesihović 2018, 108: "In the epitomes (XLIII, 1) of the *Historiae Philippicae* by Pompeius Trogus, Justin says that Pompeius Trogus turned to the history of the rise and development of Rome only after he had described the history of the eastern peoples and almost the entire known world." Mesihović 2011, 26: "A rather valuable account that includes details not found in the aforementioned authors is that of Justin – actually an excerpt of Pompeius Trogus' historical work. If in the 5th book of Justin's excerpt we have quite a high-quality description, we can only lament the loss of Pompeius Trogus' complete work. With Pompeius' history, we might round out events in Athens of 404 and 403 BC and resolve certain disputed or suspect points. Justin, that is, Pompeius Trogus, adopts a very positive attitude toward the movement to restore democracy, especially toward its leader Thrasybulus."

⁴ Rubincam 2005, 266: "Justin/Trogus applies the title *magnus* to two famous generals, Alexander III of Macedon and Pompey of Rome, in somewhat different ways."

⁵ Steele 1917, Syme 1988, Seel 1972, Yardley 1997, Yardley 1998, Yardley 2003. For older literature on the subject, see Syme 1988.

or even a hundred years afterward. The questions we must ask before reading any historical source (or any literary work, for that matter) are: Who is its author? With what aim is the work written? And who is its audience? The mere fact that the work has not survived at its full length – rather, that an individual named Justin discovered it in some dusty Roman library and decided to abbreviate it – tells us that the work was not very popular at the time it was written, whereas the epitome turned out to be quite popular, even during the Middle Ages.⁶ The reasons for this are relatively clear. During the Principate, Augustus was creating a new image of Rome, not only urbanistically but ideologically. Virgil, Ovid, and Horace celebrated the golden age under Augustus and sang of Rome's greatness. But there was no place in that era for the first universal history in the Latin language, and the reason lay in its content, which is the reflection of the author's own thinking, perspectives, and beliefs. The image of Pompeius Trogus as an esteemed historian emerges only in the late 4th century in the *Historia Augusta*,⁷ where he is mentioned twice within the canon of four great historians who wrote in Latin, alongside Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus; it notes that he compiled the first universal history in Latin, the above-mentioned *Historiae Philippicae*.⁸ In addition to the *Historiae Philippicae*, he is also said to have authored now-lost texts on zoological and botanical themes.⁹ Ronald Syme places the *Philippic History* in the third decade of Augustus' reign, basing this on the argument that Justin's abridgment of the episode of the war against the Parthians describes an event when Phraates IV sent four of his sons to Rome as hostages.¹⁰ Since for the purposes of this paper determining the precise year in which Trogus composed his work is not crucial, we can be satisfied with dating it to roughly the end of the first century BCE or the transition from the first century BCE to the first century CE, in the time of the Principate.¹¹ As for the date of the epitome, simply looking up the entry "Justin (Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus)" in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* reveals the state of the research and contradictory views among scholars. Justin's life and

⁶ Miklić 2021, 75

⁷ For a concise overview of the main dating theories concerning the *Historia Augusta*, see Birley 2006. And given the occasionally humorous character of the *Historia Augusta*, we might not wish to take too seriously its mention of Pompeius Trogus as part of the historian canon.

⁸ Yardley 1997, 4; Yardley 2003, 4; LAA 1996, s.v. "Pompej Trog." For a different view on Pompeius Trogus, see Syme 1988

⁹ OCD 2012, s.v. "Pompeius Trogus."

¹⁰ Syme 1988, 367

¹¹ Regarding the dating of Pompeius Trogus' life and work, historians are largely in agreement. OCD 2012, s.v. "Pompeius Trogus", LAA 1996, s.v. "Pompej Trog", Syme 1988, 367, Yardley 2003, 1, Steele 1917, 19, Alonso-Núñez 1987, 57

work are dated to the second, third, or even fourth century CE, which means the epitome can be dated within a range of some 300 years.¹²

Pompeius Trogus

What we know about Pompeius Trogus comes from Justin's epitome. Approaching the text linearly, the first place we look is the preface, in which Justin praises Trogus' eloquence and compares his undertaking of writing a universal history to the labors of Hercules, sparing no words of praise.¹³ The epitomist also writes that he cut out from Trogus' history what was not useful (*sine fructu erant*), hinting that his own role in editing Trogus' text did not greatly affect its language and style or introduce later additions.¹⁴ The second piece of information about Pompeius Trogus from the epitome appears at the end of Book 43. There, the epitomist states that Pompeius Trogus was from the people of the Vocontii, who then inhabited Gallia Narbonensis.¹⁵ In the 1st century CE, Pliny the Elder, writing about southern Gaul, reports that Gallia Narbonensis was nestled between Italy, from which it was separated by the River Varus (Var) and the slopes of the Alps, and the rest of Gaul, from which it was separated by the Cévennes (Cebenna) and Jura Mountains. On the economic front, Pliny says that Gallia Narbonensis was as wealthy as any province, primarily thanks to agriculture. Its inhabitants were prominent people, and Pliny reckoned that Narbonese Gaul was more a part of Italy than a mere province.¹⁶ Pliny mentions the Vocontii twice in his description of Narbonese Gaul: first, he says they lived close to Tritolli and Segovellauni, north of the Roman ally city Massilia (Marseille)¹⁷ (proximity and Greek influence also constitute an important factor shaping Pompeius Trogus' habitus), and secondly he mentions the allied state of the Vocontii with two cities: Vasio and Lucus Augusti.¹⁸ A cippus found in 1828 in the chapel of Notre-Dame de Nazareth in Entrechaux, near the ancient site of Vasio (modern Vaison-la-Romaine), mentions a certain Pompeius¹⁹ who

¹² OCD 2012, s.v. "Justin (Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus)"; Steele 1917 thus places Justin in the first half of the 3rd century. For a more recent survey of the literature and theories (up to 1988) and argumentation in favor of dating the epitome to the late 4th century, see Syme 1988. For the latest linguistic study and for dating the epitome to the transition from the 2nd to the 3rd century, see Yardley 2003. The *Leksikon antičkih autora* [Lexicon of Ancient Authors] places Justin in the 3rd century: LAA 1996, s.v. "Justin, Marko Junijan".

¹³ Just. *Epit. Praef.* 1.1–3

¹⁴ Just. *Epit. Praef.* 1.3

¹⁵ Just. *Epit.* 43.5.11

¹⁶ Plin. *HN* 3.31–32

¹⁷ Plin. *HN* 3.34

¹⁸ Plin. *HN* 3.37

¹⁹ Yardley 1997, 3

may be connected to Trogus' lineage. Despite the lack of concrete evidence for pinpointing Pompeius Trogus in ancient Vasio, it appears there is a dominant narrative that he resided there, as evidenced in the name of one of the city streets in Vaison-la-Romaine: Rue Trogue Pompée.²⁰ We also learn that his grandfather, likewise named Pompeius Trogus, received Roman citizenship from Pompey the Great thanks to his involvement in the war between Pompey and Quintus Sertorius in Hispania (80–72 BCE).²¹ Given that his *nomen* was taken from his general, we have little reason to doubt this information. Historiographical studies that employ prosopography show that the Vocontii were already highly acculturated in the reign of Augustus, suggesting the process began much earlier.²² Acculturation in the territory of the Vocontii had already started in 123 or 122 BCE, when the consuls Marcus Fulvius Flaccus and Gaius Sextius Calvinus celebrated triumphs over the Ligurians and the Vocontii, after which the Roman province of Gallia Transalpina (i.e., Gallia Narbonensis) was established there.²³ From the epitomist we also learn that Pompeius Trogus' uncle commanded Pompey's cavalry in the war against Mithridates (the third war, 73–63 BCE), and that his father served under Caesar as a close associate tasked with his correspondence and receiving embassies (a personal secretary?), something we may interpret as a fairly high degree of acculturation on the part of Trogus' family and of their incorporation into the Roman world.²⁴ This piece of information also tells us that Pompeius Trogus' father was literate and was most likely a member of the local elite. Nonetheless, the family's allegiance shifted from Trogus' grandfather's loyalty to Pompey, to that of his father's loyalty to Caesar – indicating that Trogus' family had pulled off a political maneuver to join the diametrically opposite camp, transitioning from Pompey's faction to Caesar's. We do not know when or how this happened, but in light of modern historiographical insights into the political and social workings of the Roman Republic, and of the identity of Rome's population, which came to comprise various more-or-less independent indigenous groups, we can speak of Romanness as an “amalgam of different identities that we now recognize as ‘Roman identity’, mostly because of what appears to us as a continuity of political institutions rooted in the city of Rome”, and of “Romanization” as “an active process of acculturation and selective adop-

²⁰ <https://www.google.com/maps/place/Rue+Trogue+Pomp%C3%A9,+84110+Vaison-la-Romaine,+France>, accessed August 19, 2025

²¹ Just. *Epit.* 43.5.11

²² Cuff 2010. Epigraphic inscriptions on votive monuments of Vocontian soldiers serving in the auxiliary units of the Roman army (*ala Vocontiorum*) already in the 1st century AD attest to Roman names such as Simplicius Super, Silvanus, Prima, Aelius Marcus...

²³ OCD 2012, s.v. ‘Gaul (Transalpine)’

²⁴ Just. *Epit.* 43.5.12

tion of certain imperial elements of Roman imperial identity”.²⁵ This perspective allows us to set Trogus’ family, as members of the local elite, in relation to the Roman political center – in this case Pompey, and afterwards Caesar. A critical element that made the Roman political system, spanning an immense geographic area, function was political consensus, i.e., the “willingness of the elite to negotiate with the other structures in society”.²⁶ Precisely this political consensus, as a fluid concept in the realm of *Realpolitik*, allowed a member of the family that bore the *nomen* of Caesar’s later political adversary (Pompey) to find himself in Caesar’s company as a close associate. From this analysis we can conclude that Trogus’ family was quite respectable – and fairly wealthy – because dedicating oneself to writing a universal history requires a great deal of time and presumably relocating to somewhere else: Trogus could most easily find the sources for his work in Rome itself. As for the Gallic portion of Pompeius Trogus’ name, J.C. Yardley relates the cognomen *Trogus* to a Celtic word for “clan”, which is a prevailing view among historians and translators.²⁷ Although this deviates from onomastic standards, it is interesting to consult the alpha version of the Celtic Lexicon project launched by the Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies of the University of Wales, as well as Matasović’s *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. They give different meanings for words that might throw additional light on the lineage of Pompeius Trogus. The Celtic Lexicon of the University of Wales provides several Proto-Celtic words whose morphology can be linked to the cognomen *Trogus*. One of these words is the noun *trougjā-* (“misery”).²⁸ Its derivatives cover a similar semantic range – *troug-agno-* (“miserable, weak”) and *trougo-* (“miserable”).²⁹ A similar meaning can be found in Matasović’s dictionary, which lists the adjective *trowgo-* (“wretched, sad”).³⁰ However – even though this diverges from onomastic standards – it does not seem logical that Pompeius Trogus’ great-grandfather, who was rewarded with Roman citizenship for campaigning under Gnaeus Pompey, would choose a cognomen meaning “miserable” or “wretched” to accompany the *praenomen* and *nomen* he had received from the triumphant Gnaeus Pompey. It seems more likely that he would choose his cognomen from the noun *trougo-karjā-* (“mercy”) or the adjective *trougo-karo-* (“compassionate”),³¹ or *trocar* (also “compassionate”).³²

²⁵ Džino, Domić Kunić 2013, 29, 32

²⁶ Džino, Domić Kunić 2013, 33

²⁷ Yardley 1997, 3, Miklić 2021, 6

²⁸ <https://www.inkeri.cz/epc/?page=79>, accessed August 19, 2025

²⁹ *Ibidem*, accessed August 19, 2025

³⁰ Matasović 2009, s.v. “trowgo-”

³¹ <https://www.inkeri.cz/epc/?page=26>, accessed August 19, 2025

³² Matasović 2009, s.v. “trowgo-”

Confirmation of this theory is found in Cicero, who calls Pompey distinguished and gallant for his treatment of Sertorius' defectors and testifies to the granting of citizenship to people in Hispania after the war with Sertorius.³³ Thus, Trogus' grandfather might have been honoring the general who rewarded him, ensuring his family's place alongside that politically powerful figure (as is also indicated by the role of his son as Pompey's cavalry commander in the war against Mithridates) until the shift in the balance of power during the civil war. Although Trogus' family allied themselves with the Roman elite, that by no means implies they forgot their Gallic habitus. One of the most representative examples of preserving local elite customs and beliefs within a fully developed Roman Empire can be seen in our own region: a tumulus near Vinkovci testifies to a pre-Roman burial of a local elite member in the 3rd century CE.³⁴ It is precisely from Pompeius Trogus' Gallic habitus, and from his Hellenistic background, that there arises what some historians call an anti-Roman sentiment, manifested chiefly in Mithridates' speech in Book 38 of the epitome. Following that line of thought, it is quite plausible to assert that Trogus' origin may have influenced how Gauls are portrayed in Book 24 of the epitome, and in his overall work. In the predominant and generally accepted view of Greek and Roman authors (or authors writing in Greek and Latin), who are often assumed to divide peoples into "civilized" and "barbarians", it is easy to overlook the subtext that emerges from the author's habitus and fail to notice how subtly his social background may have guided his writing. It is precisely this assumption that forms a major part of the theoretical framework for analyzing the Gauls' campaign against Delphi in Trogus' work. Yardley, based on linguistic analysis, argues that while writing his *Philippic History*, Pompeius Trogus consulted the work of his contemporary Livy – *Ab Urbe Condita* being already completed by that time – and, to a lesser extent, Sallust and Caesar.³⁵ Given that Livy's Roman patriotism (and even his Padovan local patriotism) is recognized and well-established, and that Sallust (apart from Adler's stance on the *Epistula Mithridatis*) and Caesar are not authors in whom we see pronounced criticism of Rome, any anti-Roman sentiment must come from Trogus and shape his discourse.³⁶ The atmosphere of the collapse of the First Triumvirate and the ensuing civil war must have influenced Trogus. The family's allegiance to Pompey and then to Caesar – a political game forced upon this Gallic family by Rome's system of consensus and clientelism – likely clashed with ideals of honor and steadfastness of one's convictions, leading to Trogus' disillusionment with Roman

³³ Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.153, Cic. *Balb.* 32

³⁴ Kratofil 2020, 51

³⁵ Yardley 2003, 10

³⁶ Liv. 10.2, Forsythe, 1999, 66, 71, OCD 2012 s.v. 'Livy'

values. Such a sentiment could well explain Trogus' interest in morally edifying episodes that do not paint Rome in its brightest light.

Justin

We know next to nothing about Justin (Marcus Iunianus Iustinus), the epitomist who produced the abridged version of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*. Historians date Justin's life and work to the second, third, or even fourth century CE.³⁷ As is the case with Pompeius Trogus, what we do know about Justin comes from his epitome. In the introduction to the epitome, Justin states that, during his leisure time in the city of Rome, he separated out from Trogus' work those parts which, in his view, were useless, uninteresting to readers, or lacked moral edification, from those that were useful – and that from the latter he assembled a little bouquet of flowers (*breve veluti florum corpusculum*) to refresh the memory of those already versed in Greek history and to teach those who had no knowledge of it.³⁸ From this remark we can glean Justin's intent for his epitome to function as a textbook, aimed at a reader whose identity is unknown but who was asked to correct any errors Justin might have introduced while compiling it.³⁹ This addressee was very likely his (former?) rhetoric teacher, to whom Justin was demonstrating his skill and presenting his "assignment" for review.⁴⁰ This is also borne out by the reference to Cato – one of Rome's most famous orators – whose opinion that even one's leisure required a sort of accounting Justin reproduces in the epitome's introduction.⁴¹ Plutarch deals in special detail with Cato's philosophy of pragmatism and teleological outlook on existence in his *Parallel Lives*.⁴² The consensus among historians is that Justin remained largely faithful to Trogus' work, with Justin's own authorial influence appearing only in sections where he imparts moral lessons to his readers.⁴³ This assumption underpins the thesis of this paper and is partly confirmed by the linguistic research of J.C. Yardley.⁴⁴

³⁷ OCD 2012, s.v. "Justin (Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus)" Regarding the issue of dating Justin's epitome and the dating of his activity in general, see R.B. Steele 1917.

³⁸ Just. *Epit. Praef.* 1.4.

³⁹ Just. *Epit. Praef.* 1.5.

⁴⁰ Yardley 2003, 116–117. By means of linguistic analysis, Yardley shows that the introduction to the epitome features certain expressions of Cicero (and Quintilian), thus clearly indicating Justin's vocation as a teacher of rhetoric.

⁴¹ Just. *Epit. Praef.* 1.5.

⁴² Plut. *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 4.

⁴³ OCD 2012, s.v. "Justin (Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus)"

⁴⁴ Yardley 2003, 5

A Concise Overview of *Historiae Philippicae*

Justin's epitome of the *Historiae Philippicae* consists of 44 books. I find it useful to offer a brief summary of each book's content so that future researchers can more easily navigate the work, and so I can illustrate just how small a portion of it is devoted to Roman history.

Book 1 deals with the kings of Assyria, Media, and Persia, with a special focus on the semi-legendary narrative of the Persian king Cyrus, whose early life strongly recalls that of the Trojan prince Paris – exposed to the wilderness because of a prophecy and raised by a family of shepherds. Book 2 presents the origins and history of the Scythians as well as the mythical past of Athens and an overview of the conflicts of the Greco-Persian Wars, giving an alternative version of the Battle of Thermopylae from the well-known Herodotean one. Namely, according to the epitome, 600 warriors led by Leonidas on the last day of the battle broke into the Persian camp seeking King Xerxes, slaughtering everyone in their path until they themselves succumbed to enemy weaponry. Book 3 recounts the early history of Sparta and the organization of its institutions, from the semi-legendary lawgiver Lycurgus, through the Messenian Wars, up to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Book 4 covers the history and geography of Sicily, as well as Athenian expeditions to Sicily, without delving too deeply into each campaign's details. Book 5 focuses on the later phases of the Peloponnesian War and the siege of Athens and its eventual surrender, along with Alcibiades' death, which closely resembles Plutarch's version (he was assassinated in an attack during which his house was burned down). Book 6 deals with the Spartan conflicts against the Achaemenid dynasty in Asia Minor in the early 4th century BCE, as well as the Corinthian War (395–387 BCE), which ended with the so-called King's Peace. Books 7 to 9 are devoted to the early history and rise of Macedonia up to the death of Philip II. Thus, Book 7 presents the semi-legendary earliest history of Macedonia, mentioning its first kings: Pelagon, Perdiccas, Argaeus, Philip, Aeropus, etc. The bulk of Book 8 centers on the military achievements of Philip II and a review of the disunity among the Greek poleis as one of the main reasons for Philip's success in Greece. Added to that is the constant fear among the poleis that any one of them might gain predominance over the others – fear which, according to the epitome, resulted in the Greeks themselves entangling Philip in their politics, laying the foundations for his later conquest of Greece. Book 9 describes Philip's military campaigns during the third and fourth decades of the 4th century BCE: the campaign against the Scythians, the siege of Byzantium, and the victory at Chaeronea over the allied army of Athenians and Thebans. The book ends with Philip II's assassination by the young Pausanias and an account of the character traits of Philip's heir,

Alexander. Book 10, relatively short compared to the others, describes the political turmoil of the Achaemenid dynasty during the reigns of Artaxerxes II, Artaxerxes III, and Darius III. Books 11 and 12 encompass the period of Alexander the Great's dominance: from his consolidation of power over Thessaly and Athens, and the destruction of Thebes, through his campaign in Asia Minor and Syria (where he defeated Darius at Issus) to his establishment of power in Egypt (where he was proclaimed a god) and his final victory over Darius at Gaugamela and Darius' death in Book 11, followed in Book 12 by his adoption of Persian customs and royal insignia accompanied by despotic behavior, his campaign into India, and finally his death. Book 13 begins with events related to the selection of Alexander's heir and the division of the empire among his generals and commanders, and the political situation in Greece after Alexander's death, ending with the death of Perdiccas. Book 14 covers the conflict between Eumenes and Antigonus and concludes with the death of Olympias, Alexander the Great's mother. Books 15 and 16 trace the ongoing wars between the Diadochi (Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Antigonus, Seleucus, and Pyrrhus), with Book 16 including a digression on the history of Heraclea Pontica and the anecdote of the tyrant Clearchus, who forgot he was merely mortal, breaking the maxim *mēdén ágan* ("nothing in excess"), and was soon punished. The fairly short Book 17 concerns the final conflict between two of Alexander the Great's companions, Lysimachus and Seleucus. In this conflict Seleucus emerges victorious, only to be toppled from the throne shortly thereafter by Ptolemy Ceraunus. This book also includes a digression on the kingdom of Epirus. Book 18 provides an overview of the conflicts between Pyrrhus and Rome, as well as an anecdote about the history of Carthage and its queen, Dido, known in the epitome as Elissa. Book 19 follows Carthaginian warfare in Sicily and the failure that occurred when the army was decimated by a pandemic, forcing those who survived to return home under Himilco's leadership. The protagonist of Book 20 is Dionysius of Syracuse, who, after his successes against Carthage in Sicily, turned toward subjugating the Greek colonies in Magna Graecia. A large portion of Book 20 is dedicated to the philosopher and mathematician Pythagoras. Allies of Dionysius of Syracuse in the war against the Crotoniates are the Gauls, who appear in the Italian region as political and military power after crossing the Alps and taking Rome in the early 4th century BCE. Book 21 follows Dionysius II and his tyrannical rule in Sicily and over the Locrians, concluding with the tyrant's ignominious end in Corinth. Book 22 deals with Agathocles of Syracuse, a tyrant whose deeds were equal to or even greater than those of Dionysius, having waged successful wars against Carthage unscrupulously and without hesitation in order to establish and maintain power. Book 23 continues to describe Agathocles' campaigns in mainland Italy against

the Bruttii, and covers his death; thereafter, Sicily and southern Italy remain the backdrop for ongoing conflicts between Pyrrhus, the Romans, and the Carthaginians.

Book 24 is concerned with Ptolemy Ceraunus and his accession to the throne of Macedonia, as well as with his death during conflict with the Gauls. In this book we find the longest account of the Gallic attack on Delphi, which will be given greater attention below. Book 25, likewise central to our interests here, deals with the Gauls in Macedonia and their migration into Asia Minor after their defeat by Antigonos II Gonatas. The book concludes with a depiction of the conflict between Antigonos II and Pyrrhus, and Pyrrhus' death at Argos. Book 26 describes further campaigns by Antigonos II against the Gauls and events in Cyrene after the death of King Magas. Book 27 follows the conflict between Seleucus II and Ptolemy III, as well as the "brotherly war" between Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax, in which Antiochus was aided by Gallic mercenaries from Asia Minor. Book 28 gives account of unrest in Epirus and includes an interesting anecdote about a conversation between Roman envoys and the Aetolians, in which the Aetolians reflect on the Gauls' campaigns against both Rome and Greece. Book 29 describes Philip's entry onto the Mediterranean battlefield, which at that time was consumed by the Punic Wars; relevant to analyzing Trogus' *habitus* is the passage in which Demetrius of Pharos urges Philip to take action against Rome. Book 30 begins with a portrayal of the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator, which is characterized as weak and poor, and ends with the defeat of Philip V of Macedon by the Romans under consul Titus Quinctius Flamininus. Book 31 focuses on Antiochus III's expedition against Egypt's possessions and on Nabîs' conquests in Greece, which were ended by Rome led by Flamininus. Of particular interest is the speech assigned to Hannibal on Antiochus' court, in which he speaks of the Roman way of warfare. Book 32 depicts strife between the Messenians and Achaeans in the Peloponnese and events at the Macedonian court (the accession of Perseus), concluding with Hannibal's suicide and a short panegyric segment about him. The very short Book 33 describes the conflicts between Perseus, the last Macedonian king, and Rome, ending with the final demise of the Macedonian kingdom and the Peace of Scodra. Book 34 deals with the war between Rome and the Achaean League, which ended with the destruction of Corinth in 146 BCE, and the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, after which Demetrius I Soter seized the Seleucid throne by killing his nephew. Book 35, also very brief, recounts events in the Seleucid Empire during Demetrius I Soter's reign and his conflict with Alexander Balas, who took the helm of the Seleucid Empire, only to be deposed by Demetrius II Nicator, the son of Demetrius I. Book 36 continues to track dynastic changes in the Seleucid Empire and includes a digression on Jewish his-

tory. Book 37 follows the early military achievements of Mithridates VI of Pontus and the conquest of Scythia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Galatia, after which he entered into conflict with Rome. Most of Book 38 is occupied by Mithridates' speech to his soldiers, which Justin explicitly says is by Trogus himself. Book 39 addresses the upheavals in Egypt and the civil war in Syria between Demetrius II and Diodotus Tryphon. The very short Book 40 is basically an aside describing how Tigranes the Great ruled Syria for 18 years until it came under Roman control. In Book 41 the epitome introduces us to the Parthians – their history, geographic position, and habitus. Book 42 continues with the early history of Armenia interspersed with a mythological narrative about Jason and the Argonauts, along with the expansion of Parthia during the reign of Mithridates II and its subsequent history down to Phraates IV. The penultimate book describes the earliest mythical history of Rome and the founding of the Greek colony of Massilia, as well as the wars fought by Greeks against Gauls and Ligurians. The last book provides geographical features and an overview of the past of the Iberian Peninsula up to Augustus' conquests and the organization of that region as Roman provinces.

A “Romanized” Anti-Roman? Pompeius Trogus on Rome

Even this brief overview of Justin's epitome demonstrates an indisputable fact: Trogus' universal history, written in Latin, devotes an exceptionally small amount of attention to Rome compared to the overall length of the work.⁴⁵ The central and largest portion of Trogus' universal history concerns the East, i.e., Macedonia. This is unusual for a Roman historian, but it's not unusual for a Gallic-Roman historian educated in the Hellenistic tradition. This, together with Mithridates' speech in Book 38 of the epitome, is a principal reason why some historians label Pompeius Trogus as anti-Roman.⁴⁶ Mithridates' speech is the most frequently cited

⁴⁵ Syme 1988, 358. Syme assumes that the epitome contains about one-tenth of Pompeius Trogus' original work. If we treat the epitome as a representative sample not only in terms of quantity but also content, we can presume that the space devoted to Roman history in the original is proportionate to what is given to it in the epitome.

⁴⁶ See Adler 2006 and Adler 2011. Adler 2011 surveys the debates on the nature of Mithridates' speech in the epitome (38.4–7), and on the character of the work as a whole, which range from attributing anti-Roman sentiment solely to Pompeius Trogus, to views that such anti-Roman sentiment stems from the sources Trogus used, and that he did everything possible to minimize it. The views of the former camp are bolstered by the already noted fact that, out of a total of 44 books, only two deal with the history of Rome. The views of the latter essentially apply a reversed anachronism that would allow us to dismiss entirely the concept of social habitus and the author's subjective inclinations in writing history. Claiming that an author's expression depends wholly on the sources he used is an outdated approach that has long since been called into question. Ancient writers were undoubtedly conscious of the *Zeitgeist*, and their works were the product of a host of influences, of which the most important are the author's social habitus and the political and

example for those discussing Trogus' ideological standpoint vis-à-vis Rome, since Justin notes explicitly that he reproduced it in its original form from Trogus. This makes it the only part of the epitome for which we can be certain (if we trust Justin) that it comes from the acculturated Gaul. Crucial for identifying and interpreting Trogus' work is Justin's remark that Trogus criticizes Livy and Sallust for using direct discourse (*oratio recta*).⁴⁷ This tells us not only that Pompeius Trogus was familiar with the works of Livy and Sallust but also that he preferred, when quoting the words of historical protagonists, to employ indirect discourse (*oratio obliqua*) – unlike those two authors.

In the speech in Book 38, attributed in its entirety to Pompeius Trogus by Justin, Mithridates exhorts his soldiers to wage war against Rome. The Romans are depicted as aggressors and plunderers, who have hitherto been overcome by the Epirotes, Hannibal, the Gauls, and the Cimbri.⁴⁸ In contrast to Mithridates, who is of noble birth, the Romans are merely a motley mass of settlers of different origins whose ancestors, suckled by a she-wolf, produced a bloodthirsty and tyrannical people.⁴⁹ Passages of this speech, assigned by Trogus to Mithridates, suffice on their own to characterize Trogus as anti-Roman. Yet what is omitted is even more revealing: after the end of the speech, Justin writes that Mithridates thus commenced war on the Romans.⁵⁰ However, Trogus must have been aware (his uncle fought Mithridates under Pompey) of the massacre of Roman and Italian inhabitants in Anatolia in 88 BCE, orchestrated by Mithridates, which was the *casus belli* for the wars between Rome and the Kingdom of Pontus. Among the sources that document the massacre are Appian and Plutarch: Appian lists the cities where atrocities were committed against men, women, and children, while Plutarch notes that 150,000 Romans in Asia were killed in one day.⁵¹ Omitting this episode entirely, while simultaneously underlining Rome's desire for others' lands and the Romans' characteristic hatred of kings – since at the mere mention

social circumstances. This is demonstrated as well by a letter of Horace to Gaius Maecenas (*Hor. Epist.* 1.19.15–16: *rupit Iarbitam Timagenis aemula lingua, / dum studet urbanus tenditque disertus haberi.*) in which Horace warns that writing in the style of Timagenes of Alexandria is dangerous. Adler concludes that the Mithridates' speech is Trogus' own composition. However, he also claims that Sallust is more critical of Rome than Trogus, and that Trogus' view of early Rome is generally positive. Yet the parts of the epitome that we can confidently attribute to Trogus on the basis of linguistic and syntactic parallels, or those Justin explicitly says are Trogus' words, show no favor toward Rome.

⁴⁷ Just. *Epit.* 38.3.11, Yardley 2003, 10

⁴⁸ Just. *Epit.* 38.4

⁴⁹ Just. *Epit.* 38.6

⁵⁰ Just. *Epit.* 38.8.1

⁵¹ App. *Mith.* 5.22, Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 24.4

of their own kings these “Etruscan servants ... turn red”⁵² – is highly significant. Besides this fundamental basis for arguments about Trogius’ anti-Roman sentiments (i.e., Mithridates’ speech), there are other sections of the epitome which, on grounds of linguistic similarity, may be attributed to Pompeius Trogius. Our starting point of comparison here is the speech of Mithridates, which Trogius presents in *oratio obliqua*. Another’s statements can be presented in two ways: *oratio recta* (direct speech) quotes the speaker’s exact words, referring to himself in the first person. *Oratio obliqua* (indirect speech) is a paraphrase of what someone else said, focusing on its content rather than giving a verbatim quote, with the original speaker referred to in the third person. In Croatian, indirect speech mostly consists of subordinate clauses introduced by the conjunction *da* (“that”). Since Latin does not have a *da* + subordinate clause construction, *oratio obliqua* most often uses the accusative + infinitive: main verbs in indirect speech become infinitives, while in subordinate clauses expressing opinions or beliefs of the original speaker, verbs are put in the subjunctive.⁵³ For instance, Mithridates expresses that he is certain of victory if the soldiers are courageous (*Esse autem sibi uictoriae fiduciam, si sit illis animus*)⁵⁴ or tells his soldiers that he hears Hannibal prevailed in Italy for 16 years, and that jealousy and the envy of his compatriots – not Roman power – prevented him from taking Rome (*Audire Hannibalem sedecim annis Italiae uictorem inmoratum, et quin ipsam caperet urbem, non Romanorum illi uires restitisse sed domesticae aemulationis atque inuidiae studium*).⁵⁵

We also find *oratio obliqua* in Book 28 of Justin’s epitome, again a speech – this time delivered by the Aetolians to Roman envoys. The Acarnanians, fearful of the Aetolians who had expressed territorial ambitions on their lands, asked Rome for assistance, prompting Rome to send envoys. In their speech, the Aetolians tell the Roman envoys to remember who it is that is threatening whom, noting that the Romans could not defend their city against the Gauls by force of arms and had had to ransom it with gold, whereas they (the Aetolians) vanquished the Gauls without enlisting foreign help or summoning their entire domestic army (*Meminisse deinde iubent, qui quibus minentur. Aduersus Gallos urbem eos suam tueri non potuisse captamque non ferro defendisse, sed auro redemisse; quam gentem se aliquanto maiore manu Graeciam ingressam non solum nullis externis uiribus, sed ne domesticis quidem totis adiutos uniuersam delesse*).⁵⁶ They go on to call the Romans mere shepherds who

⁵² Just. *Epit.* 38.6.7

⁵³ Arnold 1849, 162–167.

⁵⁴ Just. *Epit.* 38.4.4

⁵⁵ Just. *Epit.* 38.4.6

⁵⁶ Just. *Epit.* 28.2.3–5

seized the land from its rightful owners, men who resorted to kidnapping women because their lowly origins prevented them from winning brides otherwise, and who founded their city on fratricide, staining the very foundation of its walls with a brother's blood (*Quos autem homines Romanos esse? nempe pastores qui latrocinio iustis dominis ademptum solum teneant, qui uxores cum propter originis dehonesta menta non inuenirent, ui publica rapuerint, qui denique urbem ipsam parricidio condiderint murorumque fundamenta fraterno sanguine adperserint*).⁵⁷ A perspective on Rome's earliest history quite unlike that of Livy, for example.⁵⁸

In Book 31, Hannibal also speaks of Rome, again in indirect speech. This time he is issuing instructions – practically a textbook example – on how best to fight Rome. In that book, Hannibal, at the court of Antiochus III (who was at odds with republican Rome because of his attempts to assert control over certain Greek cities), lays out a model for effectively waging war on the Roman Republic. Hannibal's key insistence is that one should not fight the Romans in Greece – or anywhere else, for that matter – other than in Italy itself, because the Romans wage war differently from other peoples (*Veniam deinde libertati praefatus nihil se aut consiliorum aut coeptorum praesentium probare ait, neque sedem belli Graeciam sibi placere, cum Italia uberius materia sit; quippe Romanos uinci non nisi armis suis posse nec Italiam aliter quam Italicis uiribus subigi; siquidem diuersum ceteris mortalibus esse illud et hominum et belli genus*).⁵⁹ One must attack the Romans in Italy, where it is possible to subdue them using their own resources, as Hannibal himself did – otherwise they will forever be reborn from each defeat to continue the war.⁶⁰ Hence Hannibal reasons that it would be foolish not to invade Italy, as it is easier to conquer Rome than its provinces. After all, the Gauls did it, and he himself nearly defeated Rome in his campaign, only losing the war once forced to withdraw to Carthage.⁶¹ It is worth adding that the Roman envoys to Antiochus' court in Book 31, also speaking in indirect speech, refer to Hannibal as an honorable man who loves his country, concluding that he waged war against the Romans more from love of his homeland than from hatred of them.⁶²

Oratio obliqua is found in Book 29 as well, where Demetrius of Pharos states that Romans – dissatisfied with having just Italy – crave the

⁵⁷ Just. *Epit.* 28.2.8–10

⁵⁸ Liv. 1.4.1 *Sed debebatur, ut opinor, fati tantae origo urbis maximique secundum deorum opes imperii principium.*

⁵⁹ Just. *Epit.* 31.5.3–4

⁶⁰ Just. *Epit.* 31.5.5–6

⁶¹ Just. *Epit.* 31.5.6–9

⁶² Just. *Epit.* 31.4.5–7

entire world. They have gone to war with every kingdom, including his own, purely because his dominion borders Roman territory.⁶³ It is interesting to note that in that passage the Romans are portrayed in the same way as the Gauls at the start of Book 25 – as a greedy people coveting wealth not rightfully theirs. Pompeius Trogus, speaking to Philip V, says that above Italy a great cloud full of blood and cruelty is forming, and it will drench the entire world in a bloody rain⁶⁴ – instigated, of course, by the Romans.

Pompeius Trogus on the Gauls

For an analysis of the description of the Gallic expedition against Delphi in the epitome, we can employ Donald Kagan's concept that at the core of classical Greek civilization stand individuals characterized by unceasing internal struggle between the vast potential of humanity and its limitations, as summarized by the two maxims: γνῶθι σεαυτόν ("know thyself") and μηδὲν ἄγαν ("nothing in excess"). The first highlights the need to be mindful of one's mortal limits, while the second stresses the importance of moderation in life, arising precisely from man's mortal nature. Pompeius Trogus, as a Hellenistically educated member of the Gallic-Roman elite, was undoubtedly an advocate of these ideas. Many parts of the epitome concern figures who, by their arrogant and reckless actions, exceeded the boundaries of mortal life and thus earned a fated punishment. This philosophy is quite in keeping with the era in which Pompeius Trogus was writing, more so than that of Justin, and is a representative example of Horace's well-known quote, *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio* ("Captive Greece captured her fierce conqueror and introduced the arts into rustic Latium"), revealing yet another piece of Trogus' habitus.⁶⁵

The Gallic attack on Delphi is recounted in Book 24 of Justin's epitome. The Gallic expedition occurs immediately after the narrative on Ptolemy Ceraunus, with the Gauls introduced into Macedonian affairs as a kind of karmic or divine vengeance punishing Ptolemy for the murder of his sister Arsinoe and his nephews.⁶⁶ Indeed, Ptolemy in Book 24 is painted in extremely negative tones, with adjectives like *impius* ("impious") and *facinorosus* ("criminal"), and the noun *scelus* ("crime") referring to his misdeeds.⁶⁷ Shortly thereafter, the epitome states that the immortal gods descended upon Ptolemy by sending the Gauls, and that the cruel ruler died by the sword with which he himself had caused many

⁶³ Just. *Epit.* 29.2

⁶⁴ Just. *Epit.* 29.3

⁶⁵ Hor. *Epist.* 2.1

⁶⁶ Just. *Epit.* 24.2–3

⁶⁷ Just. *Epit.* 24.2.1

deaths.⁶⁸ Within that narrative, the Gauls enter the epitome's discourse as instruments of the gods punishing a godless king for his crimes, not inherently as a barbarian people menacing Hellenistic civilization.

At the start of the digression on the Gauls, the author also mentions an episode deeply stamped on Roman history: the Gauls' seizure and burning of the city in 387 BCE, which resulted from Gallic territorial expansion demanded by the inability of their native land to sustain them.⁶⁹ In this part, we see a similarity with Livy.⁷⁰ Another dimension of Trogus' complex *habitus* also appears: the concept of *ver sacrum*.⁷¹ This was an ancient Italic custom during the times of crisis, consisting of a vow to a god (usually Mars) whereby all animals born in the following spring would be sacrificed, and all men and women also born in spring would leave the settlement upon reaching a certain age and establish a colony elsewhere.⁷² Livy mentions this custom in the context of Rome in the 3rd century BCE, but it is generally associated with ancient Italic tribes, with whom the Vocontii may have interacted east of the Rhône. Trogus observes that the reason for the Gallic *ver sacrum* was to alleviate overpopulation, saying that three hundred thousand Gauls left their homeland in search of new territory.⁷³ While one might attribute mention of this concept to Trogus' use of Livy as a source, Livy does not say that men and women were included in the *ver sacrum*, only animals – suggesting that Trogus might have known the idea of sending young people away in a vow from his own *habitus*. We also learn that another group of Gauls moved eastward and, after slaughtering the local barbarians, settled in Pannonia.⁷⁴

In the epitome, the Gauls are not introduced as barbarians, but rather as a people who, in the 4th century BCE, participated in the political and societal developments of the age on an equal footing with existing polities, with the tribes they subdued described as barbarians. The Gauls are portrayed as a fierce, bold, and warlike people (*gens aspera, audax, bellicosa*), adjectives Livy does not apply in his own portrayal of the Gauls, and they are compared in their bravery to Hercules.⁷⁵ According to the epitome, the Gauls launched military expeditions from Pannonia southward, reaching Macedonia and striking fear into neighboring tribes and peoples. The narrative then returns to Ptolemy, who refuses the help

⁶⁸ Just. *Epit.* 24.3.10

⁶⁹ Just. *Epit.* 24.4.1–2

⁷⁰ Liv. 5.33.2

⁷¹ Just. *Epit.* 24.4.1

⁷² OCD 2012, s.v. '*ver sacrum*'

⁷³ Just. *Epit.* 24.4.1

⁷⁴ Just. *Epit.* 24.4.4

⁷⁵ Ibid. For a different opinion, see Miklić 2021.

of the Dardanians (20,000 soldiers) and, in a prime illustration of *hubris*, tells them that he would be wretched if he were to accept their help when he has conquered the entire East – at which the Dardanian king remarks that the great Macedonian empire will soon fall because of the young king's rashness.⁷⁶

The epitome names Bolgius as the leader of the Gallic expedition into Macedonia.⁷⁷ Bolgius offered Ptolemy the chance to buy peace, but the latter, in his arrogance, demanded the Gauls hand over their chieftains and their arms, bragging to his courtiers that the Gauls were proposing peace only out of fear.⁷⁸ In the developments that follow, Ptolemy is killed by the Gauls, and Trogus writes that only flight saved the Macedonians, many of whom were slain.⁷⁹ Salvation was brought to the Macedonians by their commander Sosthenes, unmentioned by Pausanias, but noted in the epitome as having repelled the Gauls' attack at a critical moment.⁸⁰ Yet the Gallic threat did not end, because Brennus, the leader of another group of Gauls who had invaded Paionia, spurred on by the riches of the East, gathered an army of 150,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry and attacked Macedonia.⁸¹ Having defeated Sosthenes and plundered Macedonia – so the epitome says – he turned to the temples of the gods in search of treasure.⁸² Similarly to the episode with Ptolemy, in this moment Brennus becomes excessively arrogant, laying hands on that which is forbidden to mortals – wealth dedicated to the gods. Brennus abandons the concept of *μηδὲν ἄγαν* and is punished in a manner reminiscent of Ptolemy's fate. Thus, Brennus' Gallic expedition marched against Delphi, the most famous Greek religious center, hoping to gain boundless riches on the slopes of Mount Parnassus. The epitome's description of the oracle states that it is encircled by natural barriers in the form of rocky cliffs shaped like an amphitheater, causing sounds and shouts from the sanctuary to echo many times over – striking intense fear and amplifying the dread of Apollo among those unaware of the underlying acoustic effect.⁸³ This digression on the nature of the place and the physical factors that produce echoes amounts to a sort of Gallic *apologia* for the battle that follows. Once the Gauls had drawn near to the sanctuary, the Aenianians and Thessalians

⁷⁶ Just. *Epit.* 24.4.9–11

⁷⁷ Paus. 10.19.7 also mentions Bolgius as one of three Gallic chieftains. In addition to Bolgius, who led the Gauls against the Macedonians and Illyrians, Cerethrius was at the head of the Gauls attacking the Thracians and Triballi, while Brennus and Acichorius, with part of the Gauls, fought in Paionia.

⁷⁸ Just. *Epit.* 24.5

⁷⁹ Just. *Epit.* 24.5.6–7

⁸⁰ Just. *Epit.* 24.5.12

⁸¹ Just. *Epit.* 24.6.1–2

⁸² Just. *Epit.* 24.6.4

⁸³ Just. *Epit.* 24.6.6–8

who had joined them urged Brennus to launch an immediate attack so as not to let the Greeks prepare a defense.⁸⁴ The Gauls, however, weary from their long journey, rushed off to plunder the local populace, who had been instructed by the sanctuary not to hide their food or wine from the Gauls – an excellent strategy, as the Gauls, who are not freed from typical “barbarian” tropes in the narrative, got drunk, while the Greeks used the extra time to rally reinforcements from other Greeks.⁸⁵ Justin mentions the sizes of the two opposing forces: the Gauls numbered 65,000 infantry, while the Delphians and other Greeks numbered no more than four thousand.⁸⁶ After hearing Brennus’ speech about the immense treasure in the shrine, the Gauls – still half-drunk from the previous night – charged forward, only to be met by defenders invigorated by the enthusiasm of Apollo’s priestesses, who were encouraging them with the message that Apollo himself and the goddesses Diana and Minerva had descended from Olympus to defend the sanctuary.⁸⁷ According to the epitomist, an earthquake then struck, causing large fragments of rock to break away and tumble down on the Gallic army; next came a storm accompanied by piercing cold, which finished off the more seriously wounded Gauls.⁸⁸ Brennus ended his own life. Another commander of the Gallic force, left unnamed by the epitomist, began withdrawing the entire Gallic army – some ten thousand wounded men – out of Greece. Their retreat was grueling, plagued by poor weather conditions (rain, sleet, snow), as well as hunger, exhaustion, and sleeplessness, not to mention attacks from the local Greek population as they went.⁸⁹ The epitome does not say which route the Gauls took to head north from Delphi, but there is no reason to assume it was any other than the path they took southward via Thermopylae,⁹⁰ given that they had already subdued some of the local population

⁸⁴ Just. *Epit.* 24.7.2

⁸⁵ Just. *Epit.* 24.7.4–8

⁸⁶ Just. *Epit.* 24.7.9

⁸⁷ Just. *Epit.* 24.8.3–7

⁸⁸ Just. *Epit.* 24.8.8–10

⁸⁹ Just. *Epit.* 24.8.8–10

⁹⁰ Brennus’ campaign against Macedonia and Greece and the battle at Delphi are also recorded by Diodorus Siculus in the *Library of History*, though not in great detail. Diodorus first notes that the Gauls ravaged Macedonia and killed King Ptolemy (Ceraunus), who was young, rash, and inexperienced in warfare, and that they destroyed the entire Macedonian army (Diod. Sic. 22.2.3). After that, Brennus advanced on Delphi with 150,000 infantry (the same figure found in the *Philippic History*) and 10,000 cavalries (Diod. Sic. 22.9). Diodorus writes that the army was accompanied by a large number of merchants and more than two thousand wagons, indicating an intent at permanent resettlement due to a Celtic population boom. The text concerning conflicts in Macedonia in Diodorus contains lacunae and is thus not entirely clear, but Diodorus’ main point seems to be that the losses in Macedonia were so severe as to ultimately cause the defeat of the Gauls at Delphi, which actually contradicts his own narrative (Diod. Sic. 22.9, 22.2.3). As for

there. According to Diodorus, not a single Gaul made it home, though in the *Library of History* there is a note that Apollodorus of Cassandreia hired Gauls as mercenaries so he could maintain his tyranny.⁹¹ Since ancient Cassandreia (Potidaea) was located on the westernmost of the three peninsulas of Chalkidike, we can track the Gauls' movement northward, i.e. eastward. The last sentence of Book 24, which is also the last sentence of the account of the Gallic march on Delphi, fittingly completes the motif of μηδὲν ἄγαν: of that mighty army that dared hold even the gods in contempt, nothing was left.⁹²

In Book 36, however, the topic of the Gauls reemerges. Reporting on the Third Macedonian War between Rome and the Macedonians, the epitome names the Scordisci as people who sided with the Macedonians at Philip V's urging.⁹³ A subsequent digression in the epitome about the Scordisci mentions their campaign against Delphi, where they lost their leader Brennus, fleeing first to Asia and Thrace, then retracing their steps home. Part of them settled at the confluence of the Sava and the Danube and adopted the name Scordisci.⁹⁴ Since this version of events diverges from Book 24's conclusion on the aftermath of the Gallic expedition against Delphi, it is fair to assume that it is drawn from a different source. This is further confirmed by the mention of the enormous amount of gold and silver that the Tectosages supposedly discarded.

Book 25 mentions the Gauls whom Brennus had left to guard the northern borders of their territory, before heading south with part of the army to Delphi. These Gauls "had been left to watch over the boundaries of their people" (*ad terminos gentis tuendos relictī fuerant*), i.e., to defend the homeland's frontiers. They then organized 15,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry and attacked the Getae and the Triballi, whom they subdued, next planning to invade Macedonia.⁹⁵ Since the Getae occupied the lower Danube south and east of the Carpathians (present-day northern Bulgaria and southern Romania), and the Triballi inhabited parts of modern southern Serbia, northern North Macedonia, and western Bulgaria,

the actual battle at Delphi, Diodorus devotes only one sentence to it: he says it was a large confrontation in which Brennus lost tens of thousands of Gauls, and that Brennus himself was wounded three times. Brennus then advised the surviving Gauls to choose Acichorius as their leader, burn all their wagons, and kill their wounded to ensure the quickest, easiest possible retreat home (Diod. Sic. 22.9). Along the way to Thermopylae, they left behind 20,000 who could not keep up, and, according to Diodorus, not a single Gaul returned home (i.e., to their point of origin), because all were killed as they passed back through the territory of the Dardanians (Diod. Sic. 22.9).

⁹¹ Diod. Sic. 22.5.2

⁹² Just. *Epit.* 24.8.16

⁹³ Just. *Epit.* 32.3.5

⁹⁴ Just. *Epit.* 32.3.6–8

⁹⁵ Just. *Epit.* 24.8.16

the Gauls' territory should be sought north and northwest of there – that is, in the Scordisci lands.⁹⁶ According to the epitome's narrative, the Gauls thus already lived on territory that came to be associated with the Scordisci before the march on Delphi, because the Scordisci could not have originated from the remnants of Brennus' army if none of it survived, as Justin states. It is certainly possible that in the 4th or early 3rd century BCE, the Gauls had reached some stage of political complexity around the confluence of the Sava and Drava with the Danube, subjugating indigenous tribes, though that region was far from the main political events of that era, so we lack any testimony.

This branch of the Gauls, after defeating the Getae and Triballi, sent emissaries to Antigonus II Gonatas to negotiate peace, under the pretense of evaluating the situation and estimating the worth of Macedonian plunder. Once again, the Gauls are portrayed employing “barbarian” discourse as people driven primarily by greed for gold and silver, quickly opting for battle and suffering defeat by trickery near Lysimachia in Thrace.⁹⁷ What was left of them – yet still a large number – then crossed the Hellespont into Asia Minor, where they settled and hired themselves out as mercenaries to local rulers.⁹⁸

Book 26 of the epitome presents a markedly negative image of the Gauls, which at first glance could be taken to signify that Trogus regarded his own fellow Gauls quite badly. Yet we are likely dealing with the standard hyperbole of the “barbarian” discourse familiar from numerous ancient sources.⁹⁹ Thus, the epitome asserts that as the Gauls waited to fight Antigonus II, and after their *haruspices* saw a bad omen, they slew their own wives and children, initiating the war by murdering their loved ones.¹⁰⁰ Here, the Gauls appear as archetypal savages incapable even of fear; they have no reason, driven instead by frenzied madness toward unthinkable acts. Miklić posits similarly that “all that negative material need not be ascribed to Trogus' attitude toward his own people ... but rather to his blind reliance on Greek (Hellenistic) sources, which typically portray the Gauls in a negative light.”¹⁰¹ I would agree to some extent, but the assumption that an author “blindly” follows his sources, failing to incorporate his own thinking, viewpoints, assumptions, cultural heritage, and subjective inclinations, should be scrutinized. Following this line of thought, one must ask why Pompeius Trogus, writing in an era that favored a certain ideological stance, devoted so little space to Rome and its history,

⁹⁶ OCD 2012, s. v. ‘Getae’, Papazoglou 1969, 47–50.

⁹⁷ Just. *Epit.* 25.1–2

⁹⁸ Just. *Epit.* 25.2.8–11

⁹⁹ Hdt. 4.64, Hippoc. *Aer.* 16–23, Diod. Sic. 5.29, Amm. Marc. 27.4.4

¹⁰⁰ Just. *Epit.* 26.2

¹⁰¹ Miklić 2021, 62

while harshly criticizing Rome in passages that Justin assures us belong directly to Trogus. The answer flows directly from Trogus' habitus.

Instead of a Conclusion

Applying more recent theoretical frameworks to a reading of Pompeius Trogus' *Philippic History* through Justin's redaction inevitably ushers in new dialogue and further research on a text which, although surviving in significantly abbreviated form, remains sufficiently intriguing to merit scholarly discussion. Were we inclined to end by exclaiming something along the lines of, "Ah, Pompeius Trogus had no idea how many pages would be written about his work!" – we would be classifying ourselves among those who believe that ancient (and even modern) historians simply compile data without infusing themselves into their works. Yet unearthing a historian's habitus, which speaks through his text, is indeed possible and opens up many perspectives through which we can reorder the facts into a new, or at least different, mosaic. Pompeius Trogus – Hellenistically educated, a member of the Roman elite, but of Gallic origin – offers a vivid example of the multiculturalism that flourished across the Roman Empire. He is proof that Romanization did not eradicate local identities; they remained firmly embedded in the consciousness of countless people who had found themselves subsumed under the political rubric of the Roman Republic and Empire. Above all, this paper contributes to a more heterogeneous vision of the Roman Empire, in which its inhabitants – despite speaking Latin, serving in the same army, paying the same taxes, and being ruled by the same political structure – remained a mosaic of innumerable multicolored pieces, a kaleidoscope in which each individual was unique in how he or she saw the world.

ABBREVIATIONS

OCD – Oxford Classical Dictionary

LAA – Leksikon antičkih autora [Lexicon of Ancient Authors]

SOURCES

Ammianus Marcellinus. *History*, Volume III: Books 27–31. *Excerpta Valesiana*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 331. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

- Appian. *Roman History*, Volume III. Edited and translated by Brian McGing. Loeb Classical Library 4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019.
- Cicero. *The Verrine Orations*, Volume II: *Against Verres*, Part 2, Books 3–5. Translated by L. H. G. Greenwood. Loeb Classical Library 293. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*, Volume XI: *Fragments of Books 21–32*. Translated by Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*, Volume III: Books 4.59–8. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 340. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*, Volume II: Books 3–4. Translated by A. D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 118. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Hippocrates. *Ancient Medicine. Airs, Waters, Places. Epidemics 1 and 3. The Oath. Precepts. Nutriment*. Edited and translated by Paul Potter. Loeb Classical Library 147. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022.
- Horace. *Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry*. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library 194. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Livy. *History of Rome*, Volume I: Books 1–2. Translated by B. O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 114. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Livy. *History of Rome*, Volume III: Books 5–7. Translated by B. O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 172. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.
- Marcus Junianus Justinus. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Translated, with notes, by the Rev. John Selby Watson. London, Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Convent Garden, 1853.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*, Volume IV: Books 8.22–10. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 297. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Pliny. *Natural History*, Volume II: Books 3–7. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 352. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume IV: Alcibiades and Coriolanus. Lysander and Sulla*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 80. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume II: Themistocles and Camillus. Aristides and Cato Major. Cimon and Lucullus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 47. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Eric. 'Who's Anti-Roman? Sallust and Pompeius Trogus on Mithridates'. *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 101, No. 4: 383–407. 2006.
- Adler, Eric. *Valorizing the Barbarians : enemy speeches in Roman historiography*. Austin, University of Texas Press. 2011.
- Alonso-Núñez, José Miguel. 'An Augustan World History: The 'Historiae Philippicae' of Pompeius Trogus'. *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 34, No. 1: 56–72. 1987.
- Arnold, Thomas Kerchever. *A Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition*. Derbyshire, Francis & John Rivington. 1849.
- Birley, Anthony Richard. 'Rewriting second- and third-century history in late antique Rome: the Historia Augusta'. *Classica - Revista Brasileira de Estudos Clássicos*, 19, 19–29. 2006.

- Centre for Advanced Welsh & Celtic Studies, Celtic Lexicon, accessed 19 August 2025, <https://www.inkeri.cz/epc/?page=1>
- Cuff, David B. *The auxilia in Roman Britain and the Two Germanies from Augustus to Caracalla: Family, Religion and „Romanization“*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto. 2010.
- Domić Kunić, Alka. 'Jugoistočna Panonija u antičkim literarnim vrelima'. *Slavonija, Baranja i Srijem: Vrela europske civilizacije*, ur. Vesna Kusin,, Branka Šulc, 220-231. Zagreb, Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske, Galerija Klovićevi dvori. 2009.
- Drinkwater, John Frederick. s.v. 'Gaul (Transalpine)', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (ed.) S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2012.
- Džino, Danijel, Domić Kunić, Alka. *Rimski ratovi u Iliriku. Povijesni antinarativ*. Zagreb, Školska knjiga. 2013.
- Forsythe, Gary. *Livy and Early Rome: A Study in Historical Method and Judgment*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag. 1999.
- Kratofil, Boris, Dizdar, Marko, Vulić, Hrvoje. 'Zaštitno arheološko istraživanje rimskodobnoga tumula 1 u Starim Jankovcima 2017.–2019. godine'. *Godišnjak Instituta za arheologiju*, XVI – 2020, 39-51. 2020.
- Matasović, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden, Brill. 2009.
- McDonald, Alexander Hugh, Spawforth, Antony. s.v. 'Justin (Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus)', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (ed.) S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2012.
- McDonald, Alexander Hugh, Spawforth, Antony. s.v. 'Pompeius Trogus', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (ed.) S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2012.
- Mesihović, Salmedin. *Revolucije stare Helade i Rimske Republike*. Sarajevo, Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu. 2011.
- Mesihović, Salmedin. *Hrestomatija. Origines. Izbor iz izvorne građe o nastanku rimskog svijeta*. Sarajevo, Udruženje za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih klasičnih civilizacija Bathinvs. 2018.
- Miklić, Josip. *Izvadak iz Filipove povijesti Pompeja Troga*. Zagreb, Latina et Graeca. 2021.
- Papazoglu, Fanula. *Srednjobalkanska plemena u predrimsko doba*. Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine. 1969.
- Rubincam, Catherine. 'A Tale of Two "Magni": Justin/Trogus on Alexander and Pompey'. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Bd. 54, H. 3: 265-274. 2005.
- Seel, Otto. *Eine römische Weltgeschichte: Studien zum Text der Epitome des Iustinus und zur Historik des Pompejus Trogus*. Nürnberg, Hans Carl. 1972.
- Steele, Robert Benson. 'Pompeius Trogus and Justinus'. *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 38, No. 1: 19-41. 1917.
- Syme, Ronald. 'The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus'. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 37, H. 3: 358-371. 1988.
- Wilkes, John. s.v. 'Getae' u: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (ed.) S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2012.
- Yardley, John C. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Vol. 1. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1997.
- Yardley, John C. 'Justin, Trogus, and the "Aetna"'. *Phoenix*, Vol. 52, No. 1/2: 103-108. 1998.
- Yardley, John C. *Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's Epitome of Trogus*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press Incorporated. 2003.
- Zaninović, Marin. 'Jadranski Kelti'. *Opuscula archaeologica* 25: 57-64. 2001.
- „Pompej Trog“, in: *Leksikon antičkih autora*, Zagreb, Latina & Graeca. 1996.
- „Justin, Marko Junijan“, in: *Leksikon antičkih autora*, Zagreb, Latina & Graeca. 1996.