

---

# THE WISE MAN AND THE KING

## *The Relationship between the Philosopher Plotinus and the Emperor Gallienus (253–268) in Porphyry's Vita Plotini*

David Serrano Ordozgoiti  
*Universidad Complutense de Madrid*

### 1. Introduction

Literary sources have occupied a pre-eminent place in the construction of the image of the political protagonists of the past. Biographies of the most illustrious personages are the most widespread and popular way of approaching the personality and characteristics of that personage and, of course, they were also one of the most popular genres among Roman authors. Pliny the Younger, for example, at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, indicated that the *bona fama* of an emperor *non imaginibus et statuibus, sed uirtute ac meritis prorogatur*.<sup>1</sup> And he continued: *Quin etiam leuiora haec, formam principis figuramque, non aurum melius uel argentum quam fauor hominum exprimat teneatque*.<sup>2</sup> The literary image of a given emperor was already formed during the ruler's lifetime, as Pliny did with Trajan, but not always: usually this image was conditioned by the general opinion of the later aristocratic elite, which is what constructed, for better or worse, the account of that particular monarch. In the case of Publius Licinius Gallienus, emperor between 253 and 268, this account was elaborated in different ways depending on the author and the historiographical current in which he wrote. After the assassination of the emperor in Milan in 268, the image created of the *princeps* is a rather positive one. The contemporary Dionysius of Alexandria is the first author to leave us an indelible trace of his political action. The fragments of the Paschal letters addressed to Germanus and Hermammon and quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea present a particularly benevolent image of the emperor Gallienus, represented as a ruler θεοφιλέστατος,<sup>3</sup> παλαιὸς ἄμα

---

<sup>1</sup> Plin. *Paneg.* 55,10–11: and this fame is not perpetuated by images and statues, but by virtue and merit (translation DSO).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 55,11: Indeed, these frivolous things, such as the outward form and figure of the Prince, will not be best expressed and transmitted to posterity by gold and silver, but by the cordial remembrance of the people (translation DSO).

<sup>3</sup> Eus. *Hist.* 7,11,8.

βασιλεὺς καὶ νέος,<sup>4</sup> φιλοθεώτερος,<sup>5</sup> and always part of the ἐκκλησία θεοῦ.<sup>6</sup> The *Oracula Sibyllina*, a collection of 15 books of prophecies in verse written between the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC and the 5<sup>th</sup> century CE, also give a positive image of the emperor, calling him and his father Valerian ἄνδρες ἀρηίθοοι, i.e. “sovereigns and leaders” and “men prepared and ready for war”.<sup>7</sup> One of the most interesting and studied authors of this period is the philosopher Porphyry, a favourite pupil of the Neoplatonic philosopher Plotinus, who also reminds us how ἐτίμησαν δὲ τὸν Πλωτῖνον μάλιστα καὶ ἐσέφηθησαν Γαλιῆνος τε ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ ἡ τούτου γυνὴ Σαλωνίνα.<sup>8</sup> It is this brief mention of Gallienus and his wife Salonina that has caused rivers of ink to flow about the alleged relationship between Gallienus and the celebrated Plotinus. Did this relationship exist? What were its implications? What mark did it leave on the emperor? In this article, we will raise the basic questions of the debate that began more than 100 years ago and we will go further, trying to shed more light on what happened or did not happen between the emperor and the Neoplatonic philosopher, not only through the analysis of the author and the protagonists involved but also through other relevant sources, such as plastic art, numismatics or the epigraphic trace of the emperor Gallienus himself in the south of Italy.

## 2. The Author: Porphyry of Tyre

Born in the year 234<sup>9</sup> in the Phoenician city of Tyre, Porphyry<sup>10</sup> came from a noble family and received, therefore, a careful education, which allowed him to excel in various fields of culture.<sup>11</sup> His real name was Malchus, which in Phoenician means “King”.<sup>12</sup> For this reason, Amelius calls him Βασιλεὺς by metonymy<sup>13</sup> and Longinus Πορφύριος (“purple”) by metonymy,<sup>14</sup> which is the usual name that appears in the historiographical tradition.<sup>15</sup> His first teacher was the Christian Origen,<sup>16</sup> who had been in the

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 7,23,1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 7,23,4.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 7,10,3.

<sup>7</sup> *Orac. Sib.* 13,155–171.

<sup>8</sup> *Porph. Vit. Plot.* 12: Emperor Gallienus and his wife Salonina highly honoured and venerated Plotinus (translation of the DSO).

<sup>9</sup> Other authors place his birth between the summer of 232 and the summer of 233. Igal (1982) 121f. For the full discussion cf. *RE Suppl.* XV, 313, 51–55.

<sup>10</sup> For his biography and personal experiences see especially Bidez (1913); Sheppard / Karamanolis (2007) and the only extant biography of Porphyry in antiquity, that of Eunapius (bilingual edition by H. Baltussen, 2023 for *The Loeb Classical Library*), who could only use the collected data supplied by Porphyry himself. Periago Lorente (1984) 7f. For his philosophical thought cf. Reale (1987) IV, 628–638.

<sup>11</sup> *Eunap. Vit. Soph.* 455.

<sup>12</sup> *Porph. Vit. Plot.* 17,6–15.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Eunap. Vit. Soph.* 456.

<sup>15</sup> Barnes (2006) IX–X; Igal (1982) 121f.; Periago Lorente (1984) 7f.

<sup>16</sup> Origen himself would end his days in Porphyry’s hometown of Tyre in 254. Muscolino (2009) 18.

ancient Roman colony of Caesarea/Stratonos Pyrgos since 231 and had founded a catechetical school there.<sup>17</sup> Porphyry must have been between 18 and 20 years old and, according to some accounts, was also a Christian.<sup>18</sup> Shortly afterwards he abandoned his faith in Jesus Christ and settled in Athens, where his teachers were Apollonius the Grammarian, Demetrius the Geometrician and, above all, the most renowned philologist and critic of his time, Longinus, with whom he formed a lasting friendship and from whom he received a solid philological education as well as his initiation into orthodox Platonism. At the age of 30, in 263, he decided to travel to Rome and follow the teachings of Plotinus (-270), the leading philosopher of the Neoplatonism,<sup>19</sup> who became his teacher<sup>20</sup> and with whom he remained for almost 5 years, until 268.<sup>21</sup> We do not know if Porphyry himself knew or had any access to Gallienus' imperial circle, but if he had, he would have exploited it better and there would be evidence of it in the many writings he produced during his life, so the lack of conclusive evidence in this regard does not even allow us to affirm such a thing.<sup>22</sup> While still in Rome, in 268 he fell ill with a strong melancholy and Plotinus himself recommended that he change climate and environment and move to Lilybaeum, now Marsala, in Sicily,<sup>23</sup> where he remained until after the death of the master, which occurred in 270.<sup>24</sup> He then returned to Rome,<sup>25</sup> where he began to teach the Neoplatonism, and married Marcella, the widow of a friend and mother of seven children.<sup>26</sup> He died in Rome during the reign of Diocletian,<sup>27</sup> thus no later than 305.<sup>28</sup> Porphyry was not only a prolific writer<sup>29</sup> but

<sup>17</sup> Eus. *Hist.* 6,19,5. Eusebius of Caesarea was also educated there a few years later. Muscolino (2009) 18.

<sup>18</sup> Muscolino (2009) 18.

<sup>19</sup> For Plotinus, his work and his doctrine cf. in particular Armstrong (1962); Caluori (2015); Dodds (1960); Emilsson (2017); Gerson (1996); Isnardi Parente (1984); Jerphagnon (1981); Kalligas (2014); O'Meara (1995); Opperman (1975); Ousager (2004); Pugliese Carratelli (1974); Reale (1987) IV, 471–616; Schniewind (2003); Uzdavinyas (2009); Wundt (1919).

<sup>20</sup> Porphyry was not, however, a fervent admirer of Plotinus from the beginning, for he was perplexed and disoriented in the first class he attended and even went so far as to reject in writing his doctrine of the immanence of the Intelligibles. Later, after a discussion with Amelius, a disciple who had been with Plotinus for eighteen years, Porphyry finally decided to retract and follow the master's teachings to the letter (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 18,8–19). Periago Lorente (1984) 8f. For the full discussion of his relationship with the master cf. Smith (1974) XIV–XVIII.

<sup>21</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 4,1–9; 5,1–5. Barnes (2006) X; Igal (1982) 122; Periago Lorente (1984) 8. For the time span Porphyry spent with Plotinus cf. Igal (1982) 78.

<sup>22</sup> De Blois (1976) 168. Against Rosenbach (1958) 41–60. For the discussion cf. De Blois (1976) 167–169.

<sup>23</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 11,16–17. There he received a letter from his former teacher Longinus, inviting him to join him in Phoenicia, an offer he did not accept. In Sicily, he wrote at least three of his works: the *Adversus christianos*, the *Εισαγωγή* and the *De abstinentia ab esu animalium*. Periago Lorente (1984) 9.

<sup>24</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 2,12 and 31–32.

<sup>25</sup> We do not know when and for how long he was back in Rome, nor do we know when he visited North Africa. Barnes (2006) X.

<sup>26</sup> Porph. *Ad Marc.* 1. This decision brought him much criticism for having spoken out so often against carnal intercourse. He responded to these criticisms with his writing *Ad Marcellam*, published shortly afterwards. Periago Lorente (1984) 9.

<sup>27</sup> *Suda*, Porphyrios.

<sup>28</sup> Barnes (2006) X; Igal (1982) 122f.; Periago Lorente (1984) 9f.

<sup>29</sup> For Porphyry's works and the titles in the *Suda*, cf. *RE* XXII, 1, 275–313 (R. Beutler), with references to other classical authors.

also a great populariser of late antiquity.<sup>30</sup> A total of 57 works<sup>31</sup> on a wide variety of subjects are attributed to him, philosophical, religious, mythological, historical, biographical, philological or even scientific works, of which only 21 titles<sup>32</sup> have come down to us, most of them fragmentary, others, the fewest, complete, and some even in Latin.<sup>33</sup> There are three differentiated stages in his work: the first, before he met Plotinus, the second during his five-year stay with the master and the third after his death in 270.<sup>34</sup>

### 3. The Author's Vision: the *Vita Plotini*

The *Vita Plotini*<sup>35</sup> is a biography<sup>36</sup> of the philosopher Plotinus, possibly published between 298 and 301,<sup>37</sup> but parts of it were probably written at an earlier date. For its composition, the author relied on valuable information, such as, for example, his experiences in the school of the master during the five years he spent with him in Rome, the autobiographical confidences of Plotinus himself<sup>38</sup> and even the opinions and views of his schoolmates, among them Amelius and Eustochius.<sup>39</sup> The section where the emperor Gallienus appears informs us about the relations of the master with the circle of imperial power:

Ἐτίμησαν δὲ τὸν Πλωτῖνον μάλιστα καὶ ἐσέφθησαν Γαλιηνός τε ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ ἡ τούτου γυνὴ Σαλωνίνα. Ὁ δὲ τῆς φιλίας τῆς τούτων καταχρώμενος φιλοσόφων τινὰ πόλιν κατὰ τὴν Καμπανίαν γεγενῆσθαι λεγομένην, ἄλλως δὲ κατηριπωμένην, ἠξίου ἀνεγείρειν καὶ τὴν πέριξ χώραν χαρίσασθαι οἰκισθεῖσιν τῆς πόλει, νόμοις δὲ χρῆσθαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντες μέλλοντας τοῖς Πλάτωνος καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν αὐτῆς Πλατωνόπολιν θέσθαι, ἐκεῖ τε αὐτὸς μετὰ τῶν ἐταίρων ἀναχωρήσειν ὑπισχεῖτο.

<sup>30</sup> Porphyry occupies a leading position as a transmitter of Ancient culture, analogous to that occupied by Cicero three centuries earlier. He was, in fact, one of the most widely read writers in posterity, despite his firmly anti-Christian stance, and constitutes one of the main links between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Igal (1982) 124.

<sup>31</sup> A total of 72 titles attributed to Porphyry are listed, of which 4 are probably repeated titles and 11 are certainly non-existent works, falsely attributed to Porphyry or simply apocryphal. Periago Lorente (1984) 10.

<sup>32</sup> The complete list is as follows: *De antro nympharum*, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, *In Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*, *Εἰσαγωγή* (cf. Barnes (2006); Muradyan (2014)), *In Aristotelis categorias expositio per interrogationem et responsonem*, *Vita Plotini*, *Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes* or *Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητά*, *Chronica*, *Vita Pythagorae*, *Ad Gaurum*, *Ad Marcellam* (cf. Zimmern (1994)), *On the Return of the Soul*, *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda*, *Περὶ Ἀγαλμάτων*, *Epistula ad Anebontem*, *Adversus Christianos* (cf. Berchman (2005); Hoffmann (1994); Muscolino (2009)), *Homeric Questions*, *Εἰς τὰ Ἀρμονικά Πτολεμαίου Ὑπόμνημα*, *Introduction to the Apotelesmatics of Ptolemy*, *Miscellaneous Questions* or *Συμμικτὰ Ζητήματα* and, finally, *De abstinentia ab esum animalium*. Periago Lorente (1984) 11–14.

<sup>33</sup> As is the case of *On the Return of the Soul*. Periago Lorente (1984) 11.

<sup>34</sup> Barnes (2006) X–XI; Igal (1982) 123f.; Periago Lorente (1984) 10–14.

<sup>35</sup> On the *Vita Plotini* cf. also Kobusch / Erler *et al.* (2002) 581–609.

<sup>36</sup> For the genre of biography in antiquity cf. in particular Marx-Wolf (2021); Watts (2013); *id.* (2017).

<sup>37</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 23,12–14. For discussion cf. Bréhier (1924) I; Igal (1972) 121f.

<sup>38</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 3,1.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 2,12; 23; 29 and 3,37–38. Igal (1982) 125.

Καὶ ἐγένετ' ἄν τὸ βούλημα ἐκ τοῦ ῥόστου τῷ φιλοσόφῳ, εἰ μὴ τινες τῶν συνόντων τῷ βασιλεῖ φθονοῦντες ἢ νεμεσῶντες ἢ δι' ἄλλην μοχθηρὰν αἰτίαν ἐνεπόδισαν.<sup>40</sup>

The emperor Gallienus and his wife Salonina **highly honoured and venerated** Plotinus. And the latter, taking advantage of their **friendship**, asked them to restore a city of philosophers which was reputed to have existed in Campania, but of which otherwise nothing but ruins remained; that, when the city had been founded, the surrounding country should be donated to it; that its future inhabitants should be governed by the laws of Plato, and that the city should be called “Platonopolis”. And Plotinus himself promised to retire there with his companions. And this wish of our philosopher would have been easily fulfilled, had not some of the sovereign’s courtiers prevented him from doing so out of envy, or spite, or some other ill-gotten motive. (translation DSO)

Porphyry’s view of Plotinus is rather distorted by his desire to aggrandise the master 30 years after his death, elevating Gallienus’ feelings for Plotinus in his desire to portray the master as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ,<sup>41</sup> a great sage, respected even by the emperors. The verbs used by the author, τιμάω and σέβομαι, allude not only to respect and approval for elders, rulers or even house guests but, above all, to reverence and adoration for the gods and philosophers, almost mystically equating the two realities.<sup>42</sup> Porphyry wanted to make a clear distinction between the wise men like Plotinus, who for him had great clairvoyance and a supernatural charisma, and the epitomists, imitators, commentators, adapters and other *pedarii* of philosophy, who were only capable of repeating with more or less lucidity the works of the true masters.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 12. The editions of the *Vita Plotini* used have been the bilingual edition by A. H. Armstrong in 1966 for *The Loeb Classical Library* and the Spanish translation by J. Igal in 1982 for *Biblioteca Clásica Gredos*.

<sup>41</sup> The concept of θεῖος ἀνὴρ, sage or divine philosopher, appears in imperial literature at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. The first mentions appear in the works of Bardesanes and Philostratus, and later also in the Babylonian Talmud and Porphyry’s works, including his *Vita Plotini* and the *Vita Pythagorae*. Θεῖος ἀνὴρ was not a clear and unique concept, but a category encompassing various characteristics and attributes. It could refer to a divine figure above the rulers, to a sage capable of performing miracles with his science, or even to an adviser able to provide useful support and advice in all matters, including such practical matters as civil administration, problems related to guardianship or even inheritance. The poet Bardesanes, himself regarded as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, is believed to have had an enormous controlling influence over King Abgar VIII (177–212) of Edessa, the city of Valerian’s defeat and capture, while Philostratus describes Apollonius of Tyana as Vespasian’s adviser, causing, even, the latter to ask him to make him βασιλεύς, to which the θεῖος ἀνὴρ replies that he has already done so by praying to the gods for a ruler like Vespasian (Philostr. *Apoll.* 5,28). Finally, also the Babylonian Talmud mentions a rabbi who was respected by Antoninus (Caracalla) as well as by Ardavan (the Parthian king Artabanus V). De Blois (1989) 70–72. For the figure of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ cf. in particular Alviz Fernández (2016) 11–25; *id.* (2017) 45–64; *id.* (2019a); *id.* (2019b) 210–234.

<sup>42</sup> *Liddell-Scott-Jones* s.vv.

<sup>43</sup> De Blois (1989) 69–75; *id.* (1994) 172.

#### 4. The Wise Man and the King

However, this does not allow us to infer that Plotinus' relationship with Gallienus and Salonina was a literary construct of Porphyry. The extent of such a relationship has been discussed by recent researchers on many occasions.<sup>44</sup> On the one hand, there are those authors who consider the closeness and influence of Plotinus on Gallienus' conception of power to be considerable.<sup>45</sup> It is possible that the relationship between the philosopher and the emperor was forged from 244 onwards when Plotinus arrived in Rome and Gallienus was still a senator from a distinguished aristocratic family. It is also possible that it was first his wife Salonina who was sympathetic to the teachings of the sage,<sup>46</sup> thus also attracting the interest of other senators and notables of the imperial court,<sup>47</sup> such as the *consul ordinarius* of 266, Sabinillus,<sup>48</sup> the rich senator Castricius Firmus,<sup>49</sup> owner of estates in Minturnae<sup>50</sup> or even a certain Rogatianus,<sup>51</sup> who could well have been Caius Iulius Volusenna Rogatianus, proconsul of the province of Asia in the year 254.<sup>52</sup> Gallienus could therefore have been the leader of a group of politicians in tune with Plotinus' teachings,<sup>53</sup> who could influence the self-representation of the emperor himself. Consider Plot. *enn.* 1,2,1,16-26:

Ἄρ' οὖν ἐκεῖνο ταύτας ἔχει; Ἡ οὐκ εὐλογον τὰς γε πολιτικὰς λεγομένας ἀρετὰς ἔχειν, φρόνησιν μὲν περὶ τὸ λογιζόμενον, ἀνδρίαν δὲ περὶ τὸ θυμούμενον, σωφροσύνην δὲ ἐν ὁμολογίᾳ τινὶ καὶ συμφωνίᾳ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ πρὸς λογισμὸν, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκάστου τούτων ὁμοῦ [οἰκειοπραγίαν ἀρχῆς πέρι καὶ τοῦ ἄρχεσθαι]. Ἄρ' οὖν οὐ κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς ὁμοιοῦμεθα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς μείζους τῶ αὐτῶ ὀνόματι χρωμένας; Ἄλλ' εἰ κατ' ἄλλας, κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς ὅλως οὐ; Ἡ ἄλογον μὴδ' ὀπωσοῦν ὁμοιοῦσθαι κατὰ ταύτας – τούτους γοῦν καὶ θεῖους ἢ φήμη λέγει καὶ

<sup>44</sup> For a complete bibliography on the subject cf. Geiger (2013) 268–275.

<sup>45</sup> Among them Alföldi (1967) 255–259, 308f., 368f.; Gagé (1975) 840–843; García-Bellido (1972) 594f.; Grandvallet (2002) 23–45; Ousager (2004) 204–209; Rosenbach (1958) 28–30.

<sup>46</sup> For the suggestion cf. Gagé (1975) 840–843.

<sup>47</sup> Among the political followers of Plotinus, Porphyry also mentions Marcellus Orontius (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,30–31) and the Arab Zethos, a politician and also a physician (*Ibid.* 7,16–24). For the senatorial and equestrian families of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century cf. Mennen (2011).

<sup>48</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,30–31.

<sup>49</sup> He wrote a commentary on Plato's *Parmenides*. Porphyry dedicated his *De abstinentia* to him to remind him of the vegetarianism of the school of Plotinus (Porph. *De Abst.* 1,1; 2,1; 3,1; 4,1). De Blois (1989) 76. For more details cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 543; *PLRE* 340 no. 6.

<sup>50</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,24–29.

<sup>51</sup> According to Porphyry himself, Rogatianus completely abandoned his life as a politician and his possessions and joined Plotinus' circle as a permanent pupil, even curing his chronic gout by leading a new life (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,32–46).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> 1, 629. De Blois (1989) 75f.; Geiger (2013) 268f.; Mennen (2011) 262.

<sup>53</sup> Court philosophers were commonplace in the Roman imperial world. Augustus had been a pupil of the philosopher Athenodorus of Tarsus, while Trajan had been the *patronus* of the orator Dion of Prusa. Even republican generals such as Scipio and Lucullus had been patrons of distinguished philosophers. Edwards (1994) 143. For more similar cases cf. Rawson (1989) 233–257.

λεκτέον ἀμηγέπη ὠμοιωσθαι – κατὰ δὲ τὰς μείζους τὴν ὁμοίωσιν εἶναι. (Plot. 1,2,1,15–26).

Does that principle, then, possess these virtues? Is it not reasonable that it should possess, at least, the so-called ‘civic’ ones: wisdom in the rational part, courage in the irascible, balanced control, consisting in a certain concord and harmony of the appetitive part with the rational, and justice, consisting in the common ‘performance of the proper function’ of each of these parts ‘with respect to commanding and being commanded’. So, we are not alike in the civic virtues, but in their higher counterparts? And if by these others, then not by the civic virtues at all? Really, it is absurd that we are not in any way made godlike by these (fame, at least, celebrates the virtuous of this kind as divine, and so it must be admitted that they are in some way similar to God), but that the resemblance is due to the higher virtues (translation DSO).

Consider further Plot. *enn.* 1,2,3,11–21:

Πῶς οὖν λέγομεν ταύτας καθάρσεις καὶ πῶς καθαρθέντες μάλιστα ὁμοιούμεθα; Ἡ ἐπειδὴ κακὴ μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ [συμπεφυρμένη] τῷ σώματι καὶ ὁμοπαθῆς γινομένη αὐτῷ καὶ πάντα συνδοξάζουσα, εἴη ἂν ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἀρετὴν ἔχουσα, εἰ μὴτε συνδοξάζοι, ἀλλὰ μόνη ἐνεργοῖ – ὅπερ ἐστὶ νοεῖν τε καὶ φρονεῖν – μὴτε ὁμοπαθῆς εἴη – ὅπερ ἐστὶ σωφρονεῖν – μὴτε φοβοῖτο ἀφισταμένη τοῦ σώματος – ὅπερ ἐστὶ ἀνδρίζεσθαι – ἠγούτο δὲ λόγος καὶ νοῦς, τὰ δὲ μὴ ἀντιτείνου – δικαιοσύνη δ’ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο. Τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην διάθεσιν τῆς ψυχῆς καθ’ ἣν νοεῖ τε καὶ ἀπαθῆς οὕτως ἐστίν, εἴ τις ὁμοίωσιν λέγοι πρὸς θεόν, οὐκ ἂν ἀμαρτάνοι. (Plot. 1,2,3,11–21).

In what sense, then, do we call these virtues ‘purifications’? In what way, then, do we mainly resemble them once purified? The answer is that, since the soul is bad when it is ‘amalgamated’ with the body and has shared its passions and opinions in everything, it will be good and virtuous if it does not share its opinions, but acts alone – this is precisely being intelligent and wise – nor shares its passions – this is precisely being temperate – nor fears to separate itself from the body – this is precisely being courageous – and if reason and intelligence are in command and the other parts do not resist – and this will be justice. If then, we call such a disposition of the soul, by which it thinks and is thus immune to the passions, a ‘likeness to God’, we are not wrong (translation DSO).

These passages, among others, contain statements on how a man can access the divine through his virtues: courage, insight, self-control, justice, reason or serenity. According to some interpretations, this would express in a veiled way how the ruler can

become the mediator between the divine and the human, and in this more akin to the divine. Gallienus would thus come to be assimilated to a μέσον τι, an intermediate position between the Supreme God, whom he had to worship piously, and the earthly world, which he had the duty to protect, a task in which he was assisted by deities invoked as *dei comites* or *dei conservatores*.<sup>54</sup> Several authors mention various examples taken from multiple sources that would confirm such self-representation, such as, for example, the use of the epithet *invictus* in inscriptions,<sup>55</sup> the presence of *dei conservatores*<sup>56</sup> and his effigy in divinities such as Hercules, the *Genius Populi Romani* or even *Demeter/Kore* in numismatics,<sup>57</sup> and, in addition, various passages in the *Historia Augusta* which demonstrate the assimilation of the emperor with the Sun god,<sup>58</sup> as well as the emperor's reflection in statuary in rounded masses.<sup>59</sup> Part of modern research also considers the gaze towards the divine that appears in Plot. *enn.* 1,4,16,10–13<sup>60</sup> as a reflection of what appears in some of Gallienus' coinage from the Mediolanum mint (258/260).<sup>61</sup>

## 5. An Exaggeration by the Author?

On the other side, however, there are those authors who consider Plotinus' influence on Emperor Gallienus' conception of power to be anecdotal or practically non-existent.<sup>62</sup> For them there is no evidence that Plotinus took part in the life of the court, nor is there any indication that he had any influence on the emperor.<sup>63</sup> In the passage of the *Vita Plotini* we have seen, Gallienus and Salonina are mentioned as prominent

<sup>54</sup> Alföldi (1967) 228–311; Brent (2015) 275–277; De Blois (1989) 77f.; *id.* (1994) 173f.; *id.* (2006) 275f.; Geiger (2013) 273f.

<sup>55</sup> *Invictus* is one of the most common epithets of the Sun god. De Blois (1989) 78.

<sup>56</sup> Such as, for example, Mars, Apollo, Jupiter, Sun, Diana, Juno, Neptune, Liber, Aesculapius, Hercules or Mercury. For discussion cf. De Blois (1976) 148–167; Geiger (2013) 240–243; Manders (2012) 272–275; 283–291.

<sup>57</sup> For discussion cf. De Blois (1976) 148–169.

<sup>58</sup> The *Historia Augusta* mentions that the emperor liked to walk *radiatus* (*H.A. Gal.* 16,4,2) and that at a certain point *statuam sibi maiorem colosso fieri praecepit Solis habitu, sed ea imperfecta periit* (*Ibid.* 18,2,1–2) (he ordered the construction of a statue, larger than the Colossus, with the appearance of the Sun, but it was destroyed before it was finished).

<sup>59</sup> De Blois (1976) 148–169; *id.* (1989) 76–79; *id.* (1994) 173f.; Grandvallet (2002) 24–40; Manders (2012) 272–275; 283–291. We have two preserved examples of portraits of the emperor wearing the strophion, a radiate ring crown, similar to the Hellenistic royal diadem, but with rays anchored to the main diameter, typical of the sovereigns assimilated to Ἥλιος/*Sun* and of the priests of his cult. De Kersauson (1996) II, 484f. no. 228; Grandvallet (2002) 36–40.

<sup>60</sup> Ὁρθῶς γὰρ καὶ Πλάτων ἐκεῖθεν ἄνωθεν τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀξιοῖ λαμβάνειν καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο βλέπειν τὸν μέλλοντα σοφὸν καὶ εὐδαίμονα ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἐκείνῳ ὁμοιοῦσθαι καὶ κατ' ἐκεῖνο ζῆν (Plot. 1,4,16,10–13). Plato rightly reckons that whoever aspires to be wise and happy must take the good from above, must set his eyes on it, must resemble it, and must live in conformity with it (translation DSO).

<sup>61</sup> Geiger (2013) 275; Grandvallet (2002) 24–36. Cf. *RIC* V/1, Gallienus, no. 106 = Göbl (2000) no. 929.

<sup>62</sup> Among them Edwards (1994) 137–147; Harder / Marg (1960) 283–286; Jerphagnon (1981) 215–229; John / Hartmann *et al.* (2008) 273; 863–892; 917–924; Legutko (2000) 189f.; Pugliese Carratelli (1974) 65–67.

<sup>63</sup> De Blois (1976) 190f.; Edwards (1994) 146f.; Pugliese Carratelli (1947) 69–73.



pupils of Plotinus' school, but not as permanent members of the master's circle, as Porphyry himself was. The passages from the *Enneads* that are usually cited to demonstrate the influence of his vision on Gallienus are still vague and do not make explicit any connection with the imperial court. Moreover, the gaze towards the divine is also present in the image of Alexander the Great<sup>64</sup> and Constantine I, so it is not exclusive to the Neoplatonism. Gallienus' conception of power was full of influences from Greek culture,<sup>65</sup> as had also been the case with other emperors such as Hadrian<sup>66</sup> or the Antonines,<sup>67</sup> and it is, therefore, possible that Neoplatonism also aroused a certain interest in the emperor and his court which cannot in any way be exaggerated.<sup>68</sup>

## 6. Platonopolis: Fact or Fiction?

The very nature of Plotinus' Neoplatonic philosophy posed, moreover, serious problems for its actual application in the Roman politics of the mid-third century.<sup>69</sup> The teacher continually discouraged his pupils, even the senators among them,<sup>70</sup> from participating in administrative and public affairs, since the σοφοί were not to take too active a part in this world of ἐπιθυμία.<sup>71</sup> The tendency was to withdraw from the earthly world, and so Plotinus asked Gallienus himself to found a πόλις φιλοσόφων in Campania and to call it Πλατωνόπολις, retiring<sup>72</sup> there with his companions. It is not clear what

<sup>64</sup> On the model of self-representation created by Alexander the Great cf. in particular Cadiñanos (2016) 177–282; Castillo Ramírez (2009) 70–80; Fishwick (1987) 8–11; García García (2015) 2–5; Smith (1988) 58–68; Stewart (1993) 29f.; 42f.; 73–75; 341–358; Von den Hoff (2010) 51–57. For the image of Gallienus as Alexander the Great cf. De Blois (1976) 136–138.

<sup>65</sup> For a full discussion cf. De Blois (1976) 145–147; Geiger (2013) 256–267.

<sup>66</sup> For the use of Hadrian in Gallienus' propaganda cf. De Blois (1976) 129–134.

<sup>67</sup> For the philhellenism of Hadrian and the Antonines cf. Evers (2013) 89–99; Lagogianni-Georgakarakos / Papi (2018); Longfellow (2009) 211–232; Oliver (1970) 21–37; Opper (2013); Romeo (2002) 21–37; Spawforth (2012); Varner (2014).

<sup>68</sup> De Blois (1976) 191–193; Geiger (2013) 273–275.

<sup>69</sup> Against Hartmann (2018); O'Meara (2003) 27–139.

<sup>70</sup> As we have seen for the examples of the Arab physician and politician Zethos (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,16–24), of the rich senator Castricius Firmus (*Ibid.* 7,24–29) and, above all, of Rogatianus, a possible proconsul of the province of Asia in 254, ὃς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀποστροφῆς τοῦ βίου τούτου προκεχωρήκει ὡς πάσης μὲν κτήσεως ἀποστήναι, πάντα δὲ οἰκέτην ἀποπέμψασθαι, ἀποστήναι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀξιώματος· καὶ πρᾶιτωρ προιέναι μέλλων παρόντων τῶν ὑπηρετῶν μήτε προελθεῖν μήτε φροντίσαι τῆς λειτουργίας, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ οἰκίαν ἑαυτοῦ ἐλέσθαι κατοικεῖν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τινὰς τῶν φίλων καὶ συνήθων φοιτῶντα ἐκεῖ τε δειπνεῖν κάκει καθεύδειν, σιτεῖσθαι δὲ παρὰ μίαν· (*Ibid.* 7,32–46). He had so far advanced in departing from this life that he gave up all his possessions, dismissed all his servants, and resigned even his office; and so, being about to make his presentation as praetor assisted by his lictors, he neither presented himself nor cared for his office. Moreover, he chose not even to live in his own house, but, visiting some of his friends and acquaintances, he ate here, slept there, and took food only on alternate days (translation DSO).

<sup>71</sup> De Blois (1976) 192; *id.* (1989) 69f.; 80f.; *id.* (1994) 172; Geiger (2013) 270–273.

<sup>72</sup> The exact term Porphyry uses here is ἀναχωρήσειν, which means, precisely, “to withdraw from the world” (*LSJ*, s.v.). From the same word derive the terms ἀναχωρητής, in Greek, and *anachoreta*, in Latin, the ancestor of our ‘anchorite’, those persons who either chose to live in isolation from the community or renounced material goods, dedicating their lives to prayer and contemplation, something which became increasingly popular among the members of the Christian communities of the second and third centuries, especially in Roman Egypt. For more details cf. Grosskopf / Valtin *et al.* (2017) 55–71; Rubin (2002) 347–352; Williams (1925).

the nature of what Plotinus and his companions wanted to found in Campania was. Some authors believe that it was a pagan cenobitic community, a kind of pagan monastery in which the master and his followers wished to live according to Plato's laws, away from the noise of the city of Rome and its more immediate concerns.<sup>73</sup> Others, however, go further, hypothesising something that would have been the foundation of a true city in which the philosophers would govern the rest of the citizens using Plato's laws.<sup>74</sup> In a time with such demographic problems as the mid-third century, such a town or city could surely only have been populated overnight by veterans from the army.<sup>75</sup> It was therefore necessary to carry out the usual procedure of *deductio* of a colony,<sup>76</sup> which involved, first of all, the approval of a *lex agraria*,<sup>77</sup> for which the support of the emperor was necessary. Campania was also the perfect place for the new community. It was a region historically inhabited by philosophers<sup>78</sup> such as Parmenides (6<sup>th</sup> century BCE),<sup>79</sup> founder of the Eleatic school, or Zeno of Elea (5<sup>th</sup> century BCE),<sup>80</sup> and it was still an area of Greek speech and traditions.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, several friends and pupils of Plotinus had estates in the area<sup>82</sup> and the region was one of the most active in Italy in promoting the image of Gallienus, with a total of 10 inscriptions dedicated to the emperor in various places in the region,<sup>83</sup> or 11.5% of the total of 87 inscripti-

<sup>73</sup> De Blois (1976) 192; *id.* (1994) 173. Plotinus would not have needed the emperor's help if he had wanted to undertake such an enterprise. The master could have pooled the properties of his pupils in Campania and created a philosophical *συνολίχης* without public intervention. Ousager (2004) 208.

<sup>74</sup> Specifically Pl. *Nomoi* 908a.909a.951d–952c.960a.961a–962d.964e–965a.968a.969b. Ousager (2004) 208.

<sup>75</sup> Geiger (2013) 272; Ousager (2004) 208f.

<sup>76</sup> The procedure for founding a colony was quite complex, as two essential problems had to be faced. Firstly, a body of settlers had to be composed and deducted, and secondly, the land on which they were to settle had to be organised and distributed. With regard to the settlers, there were three operations to be carried out: *adscriptio*, *deductio* and *sortitio*. From that moment on, the process of organisational regulation could begin, which involved the constitution of a body of citizens, organised into *curiae* and registered in the colonial album, and the setting up of the municipal institutions: decurional order, magistracies and curiate assemblies. All of this culminated legally with the promulgation of a colonial law regulating local administration following the Roman pattern. Caballos Rufino / Betancourt Serna *et al.* (2006) 362–376.

<sup>77</sup> The *lex agraria* defined the territory to be divided and its legal status, the characteristics that the beneficiaries had to meet, as well as the number and powers of the commissioners in charge of land distribution. Caballos Rufino / Betancourt Serna *et al.* (2006) 362.

<sup>78</sup> The Pythagorean school, which had as its centre of activity the ancient Κρότων/*Croton*, in present-day Calabria, was also linked to *Magna Graecia*. Reale (1987) I, 85–108.

<sup>79</sup> For Parmenides cf. Bormann (1971); Coxon (1985); Reale (1987) I, 119–131; Untersteiner (1958).

<sup>80</sup> For Zeno of Elea cf. Lee (1936); Reale (1987) 132–141; Untersteiner (1963).

<sup>81</sup> Geiger (2013) 272; Ousager (2004) 207.

<sup>82</sup> The Arab physician and politician Zethos owned an estate 6 miles from Minturnae (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 7,16–24) which had already been owned by the wealthy senator Castricius Firmus (*Ibid.* 7,24–29).

<sup>83</sup> Three statue pedestals come from Nola (EDCS 11500207 = *CIL* X, 1278 = *ILS* 6350a = *AE* 2001, 835 = *EDR* 106662; EDCS 11500208 = *CIL* X, 1279 = *ILS* 6350b = *AE* 2001, 836 = *EDR* 106663 and EDCS 11500209 = *CIL* X, 1280 = *ILS* 6350c = *AE* 2001, 837 = *EDR* 106661), a pedestal and a plaque come from the ancient Teanum Sidicinum (EDCS 20400573 = *CIL* X, 4784 = *ILS* 543 = *EDR* 140078 and EDCS 29900358 = *AE* 2003, 348 = *EDR* 153573), another pedestal comes from the ancient Trebula Balliensis (EDCS 19700745 = *CIL* X, 4557 = *EE* VIII.1, 523 = Chioffi, Capurso, Foglia (2005) no. 216 = Solin (1993) no. 5 = *EDR* 102279), two other plaques originate respectively from ancient Cales and Capua (EDCS 69200208 and 61800473 = *AE* 2013, 315 = Camodeca (2013) 52–58 = *EDR* 129218 and EDCS 17800449 = *CIL* X, 3836 = Chioffi / Capurso *et al.* (2005) no. 8 = Solin / Kajava (1998) no. 212 = *EDR* 5672) and, finally, two other unknown

ons in which the emperor appears in Italy and the islands. It was, in short, a suitable place to undertake projects if you had contacts in the imperial circle. Be that as it may, the project would have gone ahead, according to Porphyry, εἰ μὴ τινες τῶν συνόντων τῷ βασιλεῖ φθονοῦντες ἢ νεμεσῶντες ἢ δι' ἄλλην μοχθηρὰν αἰτίαν ἐνεπόδισαν.<sup>84</sup> As to who these συνόντων τῷ βασιλεῖ or companions of the emperor were, there is still much discussion. Some authors suggest that they may have been senators and wealthy Roman landowners opposed to the emperor and his public administration.<sup>85</sup> Others, however, point to the military and administrative specialists of the *ordo equester*<sup>86</sup> who followed Gallienus and fought with him in numerous campaigns as the ultimate cause of the misfortune of Platonopolis, such as the Illyrian generals Aureolus,<sup>87</sup> Macrianus<sup>88</sup> and Heraclianus,<sup>89</sup> the future emperors Claudius II (268–270) and Aurelianus (270–275) or even knights like Petronius Taurus Volusianus.<sup>90</sup> This new ruling class would not take kindly to the emperor's cultural and philosophical activity, which would distract him from the matters that mattered: the defence of the frontiers, the fight against usurpers

---

inscriptions were found in ancient Casinum and Fundi (EDCS 20400972 = CIL X, 5176 = EDR 132443 and EDCS 20800174 = CIL X, 6221 = EDR 159265).

<sup>84</sup> Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 12.10–12: if it had not been prevented by some of the sovereign's courtiers out of envy, or spite, or some other bad motive.

<sup>85</sup> Harder / Marg (1960) 283–286; Jerphagnon (1981) 215–229. The *damnatio memoriae* and the later pro-senatorial literature confirm that there was a strong revulsion and opposition to his reign on the part of the traditional Roman families. For the full discussion cf. De Blois (1976) 78–80.

<sup>86</sup> For a full account of the military officers in Gallienus' time cf. Mennen (2011) 216–240.

<sup>87</sup> We do not know his date of birth, but we do know that he came from the ancient Roman province of Dacia. He entered military service under Valerian and under Gallienus was promoted to *dux equitum*. In 260 he managed to defeat the usurper Ingenuus and in 261 the usurper Macrianus. In 262 he was proclaimed emperor but agreed to return under Gallienus to fight against Postumus, whom he finally swore to protect in 268. After participating in the conspiracy against Gallienus, he was proclaimed emperor a second time in Milan, but the soldiers of Claudius II captured and killed him. Kienast (1990) 228f. For further details cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1672; *PLRE* 138; *RE* II 2.1896.2545 and sqq. (W. Henze); *RIC* V 2, 589 and Peachin (1990) 42.

<sup>88</sup> We do not know Macrianus' early career, but we do know that it must have been predominantly military. He defeated the Goths in Achaia, perhaps in 267, after which he defeated them again in the Illyricum, probably with the help of Claudius. In 268 Gallienus again left him in charge of the war against the Goths, this time as *dux*. He took part in the conspiracy against Gallienus, pacifying the rebel troops by bribing them. Mennen (2011) 235–237.

<sup>89</sup> Nor do we have any news of the early career of Aurelius Heraclianus. He likely had a successful military career participating in Gallienus' wars against barbarian invaders and internal usurpers. It is certain, however, that the emperor appointed him *dux per Orientis* to resolve the situation in the east after the death of Odaenathus in 267. He was, however, defeated and his army destroyed by Zenobia's supporters, and he returned to the west without having achieved his goal. On his return, he succeeded Volusianus as *praefectus praetorio* for the years 267 and 268. After the conspiracy against Gallienus in Milan in 268 he decided to commit suicide. Mennen (2011) 231–232; 237.

<sup>90</sup> Volusianus had a busy political and military career. After serving in the *V decuriae* of the capital, he became *centurio deputatus*. He was then promoted to the position of *primus pilus* in Germania Inferior and then *praepositus equitum singularium*, commander of the cavalry contingent acting as imperial bodyguard. He then served directly under Gallienus in the west for some years in the Danube area, perhaps as a commander in the imperial field army. He was then transferred to Rome, where he was promoted first to *tribunus* of a *cohors vigilum*, then of an urban *cohors* and finally of a praetorian *cohors*. It was probably during his tenure as *tribunus cohortis praetoriae* that Volusianus received the title of *protector*, the first known to date. Finally, after the emperor's departure in 266, he became *praefectus urbis*. Mennen (2011) 227–229. For more details cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 313; *PLRE* I, Volusianus 6.

and the proper administrative and economic management of the Empire.<sup>91</sup> Other authors, on the other hand, consider different causes for the failure of the project. Some think that the veterans of Platonopolis were the most likely cause of the cancellation of the plan. They would have been difficult to manage, especially in such an unstable political situation, or they would have made Plotinus a superior leader to the emperor, capable of rivalling him.<sup>92</sup> Other scholars emphasise Gallienus' mistrust of the feasibility of the project,<sup>93</sup> and the rest simply put the lack of support down to the difficulties the Empire was facing: an exponential currency devaluation and growing needs to finance the army and the extraordinary salaries of the top military officials.<sup>94</sup>

## 7. Conclusions

Porphyry's picture of the emperor Gallienus, a supposed member of Plotinus' circle, is brief but nuanced. It is an eminently positive effigy, emphasising his *pietas* for the great philosophers of his time,<sup>95</sup> such as Plotinus, and highlighting his generous *liberalitas* towards his most illustrious subjects.<sup>96</sup> It also manages to cheerfully excuse him from any possible final failure of the projects allowed or directly supported by the emperor, such as the foundation of a city of philosophers, Platonopolis, a failure the reasons for which he identifies, instead, in other causes unrelated to his august person. Undoubtedly, Porphyry's vision is very much conditioned by his partial and interested devotion to his master Plotinus. Gallienus, within the *Vita Plotini*, is but a tiny notch of the admiration and veneration of the author and pupil for his master, like Plato's for his master Socrates. All this, however, does not allow us to eliminate the influence of Plotinus and his Neoplatonism in the perception of the image of the power of the emperor Gallienus himself. There is enough evidence to at least seriously consider this possibility, and this has been recognized by numerous researchers for decades, down to the smallest detail. Of course, the new data that we can put on the table, such as those derived from the study of plastic art, numismatics or the epigraphy of certain local regions of southern Italy, such as Campania and its surroundings, all related to the emperor Gallienus and his circle of senators who supported him in Italy, give us

<sup>91</sup> De Blois (1976) 191f.; *id.* (1989) 79–81.

<sup>92</sup> De Blois (1989) 71; Geiger (2013) 272; Ousager (2004) 207; 209; Pugliese Carratelli (1974) 66.

<sup>93</sup> Geiger (2013) 271f.

<sup>94</sup> Edwards (1994) 147. To gain the support of the army, Gallienus donated large *congiaria* to the military commanders and decentralised the imperial mints throughout the Empire. Manders (2012) 270f.; Panvini Rosati (1978) 251–260; Weder (1994) 77–88. Consequently, the main currencies suffered extreme devaluations: the *aureus* fell to 90–93% of precious metal, the *antoninianus* to a derisory 5%, while the *sextertius* directly disappeared to give way to copper and lead alloys of lower intrinsic value. Savio (2001) 186; 197; Sear (2005) 22. There are even some official *antoniniani* minted in Rome from the period 267–268 (*BnF* 8862 and *BnF* 11259) with a ridiculously low silver content of 2%. Deraisme / Barrandon (2008) 835–854.

<sup>95</sup> For the context cf. De Blois (1976) 145–147.

<sup>96</sup> For more details on his *liberalitas* cf. De Blois (1976) 140–143.

possible clues about a more than probable influence of the teachings of the master Plotinus on the emperor Gallienus. However, what is the real extent of such influence? The reality is that it is certainly limited in all the sources studied so far. It appears, as we see, fleetingly in Porphyry and is often related to the imperial cult of Ἡλιος/*Sun*, which appears, above all, most clearly reflected in the numismatics of the emperor. Is this enough to certify such influences? Certainly not, but it cannot be completely ruled out either. In conclusion, it could be said that Plotinus is, at most, one more influence in the self-representation of the emperor Gallienus, but by no means the most notable, as is the case, on the other hand, with his military propaganda, which dominates almost all spheres of his literary, plastic, numismatic and epigraphic self-representation.<sup>97</sup> However, Porphyry's third-century view of Gallienus and Plotinus is not the only one regarding the image of the third-century Roman monarch. A year before the beginning of the composition of Porphyry's *Vita Plotini*, in 297, in the *Panegyrici Latini*, a compilation of 12 encomiastic speeches addressed to Roman emperors of various dates, a clear change in the hitherto publicised image of the emperor is noted, when it is stated:

*Minus indignum fuerat sub principe Gallieno quamuis triste harum prouinciarum a Romana luce discidium. Tunc enim siue incuria rerum siue quadam inclinatione fatorum omnibus fere membris erat truncata res publica,*<sup>98</sup>

This evidences a clear doubt about the government and management of Gallienus himself, possibly influenced by the anti-Gallienus propaganda of part of the lost historiography of Postumus' *Imperium Galliarum*, which we can glimpse throughout the work. We see, therefore, the first signs at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century of a clear paradigm shift that would lead to the demonisation of Gallienus' image in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

davidserrano91@hotmail.com

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR** Dr. David Serrano Ordozgoiti is a historian with expertise in Roman imperial power, especially its self-representation during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE. Dr. Serrano Ordozgoiti employs a multidisciplinary approach, examining literary, artistic, and archaeological evidence – including coins, inscriptions, and papyri – to uncover how emperors like Gallienus constructed their public image. This research has resulted

---

<sup>97</sup> The army and its representations have a notable place in the Latin epigraphy related to the emperor Gallienus: 15% of the total dedicators of the whole Empire are part of military estates while 64% of the epithets associated with Gallienus have to do with military units decorated by the emperor through his name or that of his *gens*. Various divinities related to the military, such as Iuppiter (14%), Victory (6%), Hercules (4%) or Mars (3%), also represent a notable percentage of divinities associated with the imperial image in Latin epigraphy throughout the Empire.

<sup>98</sup> *Paneg.* 8,10,1–3: The desertion of these provinces from the light of Rome, though sad, was less dishonourable during the reign of Gallienus. For then, either by the neglect of affairs or by a certain deterioration of our fortunes, the State was dismembered of almost all its members (translation DSO).

in a PhD thesis, published articles in journals, and presentations at international conferences across Europe, America, and beyond. Dr. Serrano Ordozgoiti has been trained at universities like Sapienza University of Rome and Oxford. Beyond academia, Dr. Serrano Ordozgoiti is fostering public engagement with history through publications, interviews, and collaborations with museums and local communities. He teaches university courses and contributes to educational initiatives.

## Abbreviations

AE 1888–: Mireille Corbier *et al.* (eds.), *L'Année Épigraphique*, Paris.

CIL 1863–1936: Theodor Mommsen *et al.* (eds.), *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin.

EDCS 1990–: Manfred Clauss (ed.), *Epigrafik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby*, Zurich / Eichstätt / Ingolstadt.

EDR 2003–: Silvia Panciera, Silvia Orlandi (eds.), *Epigraphic Database Roma*, Rome.

EE 1872–1913: Walter Henzen (ed.), *Ephemeris epigraphica: Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementum*, Rome / Berlin.

ILS 1892–1962: Hermann Dessau (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin.

Liddell-Scott-Jones 1996: Henry George Liddell *et al.* (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford.

PIR<sup>2</sup> 1933–: Edmund Groag *et al.* (eds.), *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, Berlin / Leipzig.

PLRE 1971: Arnold Hugh Martin Jones *et al.* (eds.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge.

RE 1894–1980: Georg Wissowa *et al.* (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neue Bearbeitung*, Stuttgart.

RIC 1923–1994: Harold Mattingly and Edward Allen Sydenham (eds.), *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, London.

## Bibliography

- Alföldi 1967: Andreas Alföldi, *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus*, Darmstadt.
- Alviz Fernández 2016: Marco Alvarez Fernández, “El concepto de θεῖος ἀνὴρ en la antigüedad tardía: Hacia un nuevo marco definitorio”, in: *Espacio, tiempo y forma. Serie II, Historia antigua* 29, 11–25.
- Alviz Fernández 2017: Marco Alvarez Fernández, “El concepto de Theios aner: En la frontera de lo divino”, in: Marco Alvarez Fernández, David Hernández de la Fuente (eds.), *De oros a limes: el concepto de frontera en el mundo antiguo y su recepción*, Madrid, 45–64.
- Alviz Fernández 2019a: Marco Alvarez Fernández, *Hacia una historia social del theios aner pagano en la antigüedad tardía. Un estudio sobre la figura del hombre divino como maestro carismático de la educación superior Helena en los siglos III y IV a través de las obras biográficas de Porfirio de tiro y Eunapio de Sardes*, Madrid.
- Alviz Fernández 2019b: Marco Alvarez Fernández, “Τοῦτον ἐζήτουν. Algunos ejemplos de iniciación filosófico-religiosa en los Bioi di de hombres divinos de Porfirio de tiro y Eunapio de Sarde”, in: David Hernández de la Fuente, Javier Alvarado Plana (eds.), *Morir antes de morir: ritos de iniciación y experiencias místicas en la Historia de la cultura*, Madrid, 210–234.
- Armstrong 1962: Arthur Hilary Armstrong, *Plotinus*, New York.
- Barnes 2006: Jonathan Barnes, *Porphyry Introduction*, Oxford.
- Berchman 2005: Robert Berchman, *Porphyry Against the Christians*, Leiden.
- Bidez 1913: Joseph Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre, le philosophe néo-platonicien: avec les fragments des traités Perì agalmaton et De Regressu animae*, Ghent / Leipzig.
- Bormann 1971: Karl Bormann, *Parmenides. Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten*, Hamburg.
- Bréhier 1924: Émile Bréhier, *Ennéades*, Paris.
- Brent 2015: Revd Allen Brent, *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity before the Age of Cyprian*, Leiden.
- Caballos Rufino / Betancourt Serna et al. 2006: Antonio Caballos Rufino, Fernando Betancourt Serna, José Antonio Correa Rodríguez, *El nuevo Bronce de Osuna y la política colonizadora romana*, Sevilla.
- Cadiñanos 2016: Begoña Martínez Cadiñanos, *La imagen de Alejandro en Roma: desde los Escipiones a los severos*, Madrid.
- Caluori 2015: Damian Caluori, *Plotinus on the Soul*, Cambridge.



- Camodeca 2013: Giuseppe Camodeca, "Novità sulle iscrizioni senatorie da Teanum e Cales", in: Heikki Solin (ed.), *Le epigrafi della valle di Comino, Atti IX Conv. Epigrafico Cominese*, San Donato Val di Comino, 41–58.
- Castillo Ramírez 2009: Elena Castillo Ramírez, *Propaganda política y culto imperial en Hispania (de Augusto a Antonino Pío): reflejos urbanísticos*, Madrid.
- Chioffi / Capurso et al. 2005: Laura Chioffi, Laura Capurso, Margherita Foglia, *Museo provinciale campano di Capua: la raccolta epigrafica: le iscrizioni latine: cortili, sale, depositi*, Capua.
- Coxon 1985: Allan Hartley Coxon, *The Fragments of Parmenides: a Critical Text with Introduction, and Translation, the Ancient Testimonia and a Commentary*, Assen / Wolfenbüttel.
- De Blois 1976: Lukas De Blois, *The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus*, Leiden.
- De Blois 1989: Lukas De Blois, "Plotinus and Gallienus", in: Antonius Adrianus Robertus Bastiaensen, Antoine Hilhorst, Corneille Henri, Joan Marie Kneepkens (eds.), *Fructus centesimus: melanges offerts a Gerard J.M. Bartelink a l'occasion de son soixante-cinquieme anniversaire*, Dordrecht, 69–82.
- De Blois 1994: Lukas De Blois, "Traditional Virtues and New Spiritual Qualities in Third Century Views of Empire, Emperorship and Practical Politics", in: *Mnemosyne* 47 (2), 166–176.
- De Blois 2006: Lukas De Blois, "Emperorship in a Period of Crises. Changes in Emperor Worship, Imperial Ideology and Perceptions of Imperial Authority in the Roman Empire in the Third Century A.D. ", in: Lukas de Blois, Peter Funke, Johannes Hahn (eds.), *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual and Religious Life in the Roman Empire*, Leiden / Boston, 268–278.
- De Kersauson 1996: Kate De Kersauson (ed.), *De l'année de la guerre civile (68–69 après J.- C.) à la fin de l'Empire*, Paris.
- Deraisme / Barrandon 2008: Aurelie Deraisme, Jean Noël Barrandon, "Unofficial Coinage in the Third Century AD in the Gallo-Roman World: Chemical and Physical Analyses for Determining the Localization of the Workshop", in: *Archaeometry* 50 (5), 835–854.
- Dodds 1960: Eric Robertson Dodds (ed.), *Les sources de Plotin: dix exposés et discussions*, Vandoeuvres-Genève.
- Edwards 1994: Mark Edwards, "Plotinus and the emperors", in: *Symbolae Osloenses* 69, 137–147.
- Emilsson 2017: Eyjólfur Kjalar Emilsson, *Plotinus*, New York / Oxford.
- Evers 2013: Cécile Evers, "Images of a Divine Youth: The Brussels Antinous and its Workshop", in: Thorsten Opper (ed.), *Hadrian: Art, Politics and Economy*, London, 89–99.
- Fishwick 1987: Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Leiden / New York.

- Gagé 1975: Jean Gagé, "Programme d'italicite' et nostalgies d'hellenisme autour de Gallien et Salonine. Quelques problèmes de 'paidéia' impériale au IIIe siècle", in: Hildegard Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. 2, 2.2, Politische Geschichte (Kaisergeschichte)*, Berlin / Boston 1975.
- García García 2015: Cristina García García, "Análisis iconográfico de las monedas de Alejandro Magno y los Diádocos", in: *Revista Numismática Hécate* 2, 1–52.
- García-Bellido 1972: Antonio García-Bellido, *Arte romano*, Madrid.
- Geiger 2013: Michael Geiger, *Gallienus*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Gerson 1996: Lloyd Phillip Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*, Cambridge.
- Göbl 2000: Robert Göbl, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Valerianus I., Gallienus, Saloninus (253/268), Regalianus (260) und Macrianus, Quietus (260/262)*, Vienna.
- Grandvallet 2002: Claire Grandvallet, "Le prince et le philosophe: Gallien et la pensée de Plotin", in: *Cahiers Numismatiques* 39 (152), 23–45.
- Grosskopf / Valtin et al. 2017: Birgit Grosskopf, Stephanie Valtin, Anna-Katharina Rieger, "Byzantine Burials at Abar El-Kanayis on the Marmarica-Plateau: a Trace of Anchorites in the Libyan Desert?", in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 72, 55–71.
- Harder / Marg 1960: Richard Harder, Walter Marg, *Kleine Schriften*, Munich.
- Hartmann 2018: Udo Hartmann, *Der spätantike Philosoph: die Lebenswelten der paganen Gelehrten und ihre hagiographische Ausgestaltung in den Philosophenviten von Porphyrios bis Damaskios*, Bonn.
- Hoffmann 1994: Raymond Joseph Hoffmann, *Porphyry's Against the Christians*, Amherst / NY.
- Igal 1972: Jesús Igal, *La cronología de la vida de Plotino de Porfirio*, Bilbao.
- Igal 1982: Jesús Igal, *Vida de Plotino*, Madrid.
- Isnardi Parente 1984: Margherita Isnardi Parente, *Introduzione a Plotino*, Rome.
- Jerphagnon 1981: Lucien Jerphagnon, "Platonopolis ou Plotin entre le siècle et le rêve", in: *Cahiers de Fontenay* 19–22, 215–229.
- Johne / Hartmann et al. 2008: Klaus-Peter Johne, Udo Hartmann, Thomas Gerhardt (eds.), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin.
- Kalligas 2014: Paul Kalligas, *The "Enneads" of Plotinus, Volume 1: A Commentary*, Princeton / Oxford.
- Kienast 1990: Dietmar Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt.
- Kobusch / Erler et al. 2002: Theo Kobusch, Michael Erler, Dirk Cürsgen, Irmgard Männlein-Robert (eds.), *Metaphysik und Religion. Zur Signatur des spätantiken Denkens. Akten des Internationalen Kongresses vom 13.–17. März 2001 in Würzburg*, Munich.

- Lagogianni-Georgakarakos / Papi 2018: Maria Lagogianni-Georgakarakos, Emanuele Papi, *Hadrianus - Αδριανός: Ο Αδριανός, η Αθήνα και τα Γυμνάσια = Adriano, Atene e i Ginnasi = Hadrian, Athens and the Gymnasia*, Athens.
- Lee 1936: Henry Desmond Pritchard Lee, *Zeno of Elea: a Text, with Translations and Notes*, Cambridge.
- Legutko 2000: Paul Allan Legutko, *Roman Imperial Ideology in the Mid-Third Century A.D.: Negotiation, Usurpation, and Crisis in the Imperial Center*, Ann Arbor.
- Longfellow 2009: Brenda Longfellow, “The Legacy of Hadrian: Roman Monumental Civic Fountains in Greece”, in: Cynthia Kosso, Anne Scott (eds.), *The Nature And Function of Water, Baths, Bathing, and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, Leiden / Boston, 211–232.
- Manders 2012: Erika Manders, *Coining Images of Power: Patterns in the Representation of Roman Emperors on Imperial Coinage, A.D. 193–284*, Leiden / Boston.
- Marx-Wolf 2021: Heidi Marx-Wolf, *Sosipatra of Pergamum: Philosopher and Oracle*, New York / Oxford.
- Mennen 2011: Inge Mennen, *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193–284*, Leiden / Boston.
- Muradyan 2014: Gohar Muradyan, *David the Invincible Commentary on Porphyry’s Isagoge: Old Armenian Text with the Greek Original, an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*, Leiden / Boston.
- Muscolino 2009: Giuseppe Muscolino, *Contro i cristiani: Nella raccolta di Adolf von Harnack con tutti i nuovi frammenti in appendice*, Milan.
- Oliver 1970: James Oliver, “Hadrian’s Reform of the Appeal Procedure in Greece”, in: *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 39, 332–336.
- O’Meara 1995: Dominic O’Meara, *Plotinus: an Introduction to the Enneads*, Oxford.
- O’Meara 2003: Dominic O’Meara, *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Oxford / New York.
- Opper 2013: Thorsten Opper (ed.), *Hadrian: Art, Politics and Economy*, London.
- Opperman 1975: Hans Opperman, *Plotins Leben: Untersuchungen zur Biographie Plotins*, Nendeln.
- Ousager 2004: Asgar Ousager, *Plotinus on Selfhood, Freedom and Politics*, Aarhus.
- Panvini Rosati 1978: Francesco Panvini Rosati, “Tre zecche imperiali. Treviri, Mediolanum, Ravenna”, in: *Bollettino di Numismatica* 37, 251–261.
- Peachin 1990: Michael Peachin, *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235–284*, Amsterdam.
- Periago Lorente 1984: Miguel Periago Lorente, *Sobre la abstinencia*, Madrid.
- Pugliese Carratelli 1947: Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, “La crisi dell’Impero nell’età di Gallieno”, in: *Parola del Passato* 2, 48–73.

- Pugliese Carratelli 1974: Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, *Plotino e il neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Rome.
- Rawson 1989: Elizabeth Rawson, "Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser", in: Miriam Griffin, Jonathan Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, Oxford.
- Reale 1987: Giovanni Reale, *Storia della filosofia antica*, Milano.
- Romeo 2002: Ilaria Romeo, "The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece", in: *Classical Philology* 97, 21–37.
- Rosenbach 1958: Manfred Rosenbach, *Galliena Augusta: Einzelgötter und Allgott im Gallienischen Pantheon*, Tübingen.
- Rubin 2002: Rehav Rubin, "The Melagria: On Anchorites and Edible Roots in Judaeian Desert", in: *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum* 52, 347–352.
- Savio 2001: Adriano Savio, *Monete romane*, Rome.
- Schniewind 2003: Alexandrine Schniewind, *L'éthique du sage chez Plotin. Le paradigme du spoudaios*, Paris.
- Sear 2005: David Sear, *Roman Coins and their Values III. The 3rd Century Crisis and Recovery AD 235–285*, London.
- Sheppard / Karamanolis 2007: Anne Sheppard, George Karamanolis (eds.), *Studies on Porphyry*, London.
- Smith 1974: Andrew Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition: A Study in Post-Plotinian Neoplatonism*, The Hague.
- Smith 1988: Roland Ralph Redfern Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford / New York.
- Solin 1993: Heikki Solin (ed.), *Le iscrizioni antiche di Trebula, Caiatia e Cubulteria*, Caserta.
- Solin / Kajava 1998: Heikki Solin, Mika Kajava, *Analecta epigraphica, 1970–1997*, Rome.
- Spawforth 2012: Antony Spawforth, *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge / New York.
- Stewart 1993: Andrew Stewart, *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / Oxford.
- Untersteiner 1958: Mario Untersteiner, *Parmenide: Testimonianze e frammenti*, Firenze.
- Untersteiner 1963: Mario Untersteiner, *Zenone: testimonianze e frammenti*, Firenze.
- Uzdavinys 2009: Aldis Uzdavinys (ed.), *The Heart of Plotinus: The Essential Enneads*, Bloomington.
- Varner 2014: Eric Varner, "Maxentius, Constantine, and Hadrian: Images and the Expropriation of Imperial Identity", in: Stine Birk, Troels Myrup Kristensen, Birte Poulsen (eds.), *Using Images in Late Antiquity*, Oxford / Havertown, 48–77.
- Von den Hoff 2010: Ralf Von den Hoff, "Retratos de Alejandro y de los soberanos helenísticos", in: Svend Hansen et al. (eds.), *Alejandro Magno: encuentro con Oriente: Centro de Exposiciones Arte Canal*, Regensburg, 51–58.

- Watts 2013: Edward Jay Watts, "Damascius' Isidore: Collective Biography and a Perfectly Imperfect Philosophical Exemplar", in: Maria Dzielska, Kamilla Twardowska (eds.), *Divine Men and Women in the History and Society of Late Hellenism*, Cracow, 159–168.
- Watts 2017: Edward Jay Watts, *Hypatia: The Life and Legend of an Ancient Philosopher*, New York.
- Weder 1994: Marcus Weder, "Mint Forgeries of Siscia and Some 'Dates' of Gallienus", in: *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 73, 77–95.
- Williams 1925: Charles Allyn Williams, *Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite: The Theme of the Hairy Solitary in its Early Forms with Reference To Die Lügend Von Sanct Johanne Chrysostomo (Reprinted by Luther, 1537) and to Other European Variants*, Urbana.
- Wundt 1919: Max Wundt, *Plotin: Studien zur Geschichte des Neuplatonismus*, Berlin.
- Zimmern 1994: Alice Zimmern, *Porphyry's Letter to his Wife Marcella: Concerning the Life of Philosophy and the Ascent to the Gods*, Grand Rapids.